

Planning Team Report

Port Macquarie-Hastings LEP 2011 Amendment No 41 - Rezone Lot 7 DP 1142473, Reading St, Port Macquarie

Proposal Title :	Port Macquarie-Hastings LEP Port Macquarie	2011 Amendment No 41 - R	ezone Lot 7 DP 11	42473, Reading St,
Proposal Summary :	The planning proposal relates residential development by: * rezoning the portion of the Conservation; * rezoning a portion of the lot conservation to R1 General Re * amending the relevant lot size	lot currently zoned R1 Gene currently zoned RU6 Trans esidential; and	eral Residential to ition and E2 Enviro	E2 Environmental
PP Number :	PP_2016_PORTM_004_00	Dop File No :	16/12298	
roposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	14-Sep-2016	LGA covered :	Port Macquai	ie-Hastings
Region :	Northern	RPA :	Port Macquai	ie-Hastings Counci
State Electorate :	OXLEY	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning	Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
Street : R	eading St			
Suburb :	City :	Port Macquarie	Postcode :	2444
Land Parcel : Lo	ot 7 DP 1142473			
DoP Planning Off	icer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Gina Davis			
Contact Number :	0267019687			
Contact Email :	gina.davis@planning.nsw.gov.a	au		
RPA Contact Det	ails			
Contact Name :	Stephen Nicholson			
Contact Number :	0265818529			
Contact Email :	stephen.nicholson@pmhc.nsw	.gov.au	5	
DoP Project Mana	ager Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Tamara Prentice			
Contact Number :	0266416610			
Contact Email :	tamara.prentice@planning.nsw			

	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Growth Centre :			Yes
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Mid North Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	165
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)	0.30	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Residential
No. of Lots	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	3
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :		nd Environment's Code of Prac s with lobbyists has been comp	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Yes		
If Yes, comment :		is not met any lobbyists in relat neeting between other officers v	ion to this proposal, nor has the vithin the agency and lobbyists
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	subject lot for the purpose of	to swap the location of the cur facilitating residential developn at has less environmental const J.	nent. The proposed R1 zone
External Supporting Notes :			
Notes : equacy Assessmen			
Notes : equacy Assessmen Statement of the ob			
Notes : equacy Assessmen Statement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives	s adequately describes the inte les to land in Reading St, Port M	ntion of the Planning Proposal in lacquarie.
Notes : equacy Assessmen Statement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment :	jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives	es to land in Reading St, Port N	
Notes : equacy Assessmen Statement of the ob Is a statement of the ob Comment :	jectives - s55(2)(a) ojectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives relation to proposed chang isions provided - s55(2)(b)	es to land in Reading St, Port N	

1000

7.66

Justification - s55 (2	2)(c)	
a) Has Council's strateg	gy been agreed to by the [Director General? Yes
b) S.117 directions ider	ntified by RPA :	1.5 Rural Lands
* May need the Directo	r General's agreement	 2.1 Environment Protection Zones 2.2 Coastal Protection 3.1 Residential Zones 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
Is the Director Gene	ral's agreement required?	Yes
c) Consistent with Stan	dard Instrument (LEPs) O	rder 2006 : Yes
d) Which SEPPs have	the RPA identified?	SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	Port Macquarie Urb	an Growth Management Strategy 2011-2031
Have inconsistencies w	vith items a), b) and d) bei	ng adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :	Refer to the the ass of minor significan	sessment section of his report. Any inconsistency is considered to be ce.
Mapping Provided -	s55(2)(d)	
Is mapping provided?	ſes	
Comment :	Proposal includes	LEP map sheets have not been provided at this stage, the Planning maps identifying the land and the proposed changes. These are te for public exhibition purposes.
Community consul	tation - s55(2)(e)	
Has community consul	tation been proposed? Ye	\$
Comment :	28 day community related development	I is considered to be low impact in nature, Council has identified a consultation period as they also intend to concurrently exhibit the nt application and proposed Voluntary Planning Agreement. The n timeframe is considered appropriate.
Additional Director	General's requireme	nts
Are there any additiona	al Director General's requi	rements? No
If Yes, reasons :		
Overall adequacy o	f the proposal	· · · · ·
Does the proposal mee	et the adequacy criteria?	/es
If No, comment :	adequacy criteria b 1. Providing appro 2. Providing a suita outcomes;	osal and accompanying documentation are considered to satisfy the by: priate objectives and intended outcomes; able explanation of the provisions proposed by the LEP to achieve the equate justification for the proposal;
	4. Outlining a prop	osed community consultation program; and
	5. Providing a proj	ect time line.

Council is seeking an authorisation to exercise its plan making delegations. As the proposal deals with only matters of local significance, it is recommended that an authorisation to exercise plan making delegations be issued to Council in regard to this matter.

The RPA has provided a project time line which estimates that the LEP will be ready for notification in February 2017. This 6 month timeframe may however prove to be difficult to achieve given that it incorporates the Christmas period. A 9 month timeframe is considered more suitable to allow Council to adequately complete the draft LEP.

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation **Port Macquarie-Hastings comprehensive LEP 2011 was made in February 2011.** to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal : Whilst the planning proposal is consistent with the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-31(MNCRS) and Council's Urban Growth Management Strategy 2011-2031 (UGMS), it is not a direct result of these.

The planning proposal aims to permit residential development on the subject land by essentially swapping the location of the existing R1 General Residential zoned portion of the site (south-eastern corner) to a location (western side) that will have less environmental impact once developed. Council believes that re-configuring the specific locations of zones within the subject land will provide better habitat connectivity to the vegetated Wrights Creek corridor to the north and the Sea Acres Nature Reserve to the east. The proposal will also allow for residential lots to be created on land that is entirely flood free.

Council is also concurrently considering a development application for a boundary adjustment between the subject land and the adjoining Lot 15 DP 1099742, the creation of 3 residential lots within Lot 7 DP 1142473 and the dedication of the balance of Lot 7 (proposed Lot 5) to Council as a public reserve. This dedication of approximately 1.5 ha to Council will require a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA). Council proposes to exhibit both the DA and VPA with the planning proposal.

As a result of the concurrent planning proposal and DA (the proposed development for the land is currently prohibited under existing zoning), Council have foreshadowed the possible need for the draft LEP to contain a savings provision that will allow Council to consider the DA and determine it once the land has been rezoned. A draft clause to this effect has been included in the planning proposal. As this is a drafting issue it is unnecessary and confusing to have references to this issue in the planning proposal. A condition will be included that references to the need for savings provisions should be removed from the proposal and can be included by parliamentary counsel if needed at drafting stage.

A comprehensive ecological assessment has been undertaken of the site and found that: * No critical habitat will be affected;

* The site does contain threatened flora species - Biconvex Paperbark which is located over the central, eastern and western parts of the site in both the wet sclerophyll forest and swamp rainforest communities. This paperbark is common on adjoining land, throughout Port Macquarie and likely to occur within the Wrights Creek corridor. Clearing of the APZ for the proposed R1 zone will necessitate the removal of approximately 6 trees

with a trunk diameter of over 20m. This will have a negligible impact on the local populations of Biconvex Paperbark; and

* The site as a whole contains 3 Endangered Ecological Communities (EEC). The proposed R1 zone and residential lots do not however contain any EEC, while the current R1 zone does.

The proposed rezoning is considered to be the only means by which to achieve the intended outcomes.

-		
	Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The proposed rezoning is considered to be consistent with the objectives and actions of the MNCRS. The proposal is also consistent with the relevant actions of the UGMS.
	namework.	
		Standard Instrument LEP
		The principles behind the proposed additional provisions are not inconsistent with the
		mandatory clauses of the Standard Instrument LEP.
		manualory clauses of the Standard Instrument LLF.
		The proposal is considered to be consistent with all relevant SEPPS and s117 Directions except in relation to the following:
		1.2 Rural Zones
		This direction provides that a planning proposal shall not rezone land from rural to
		residential, business, industrial, village or tourist. A planning proposal may be
		inconsistent with this direction if the provisions which are inconsistent are justified by a
		strategy, a study or a regional strategy or are of minor significance. The land to be zoned
		from RU6 Transition to R1 General Residential is currently cleared and provides an asset
		protection zone (APZ) to Lot 15. A Bushfire Assessment has shown that an adequate APZ is
		able to be met on the eastern boundaries of the new lots. Whilst the proposal will result in
		the loss of rural zoned land (approximately 886m2), the area is relatively small and the
		intentions of the RU6 zoning are able to still be met due to the large size of the proposed
		residential lots. Any inconsistency with this direction is therefore considered to be of minor
		significance.
		1.5 Rural Lands
		This direction applies as the planning proposal will affect land within an existing rural or
		environmental protection zone and will change the existing minimum lot size (MLS) of
		such land. Whilst the planning proposal will result in a small loss of rural zoned land
		(detailed above) the amount of land zoned for environmental purposes will actually
		increase from 13,761m2 to 14,965m2 and will lead to greater habitat connectivity. Any
		inconsistency with this direction is therefore considered to be of minor significance.
		2.4 Environmental Distoction Zapas
		2.1 Environmental Protection Zones
		This direction provides that a draft plan must not reduce the environmental protection
		standards which apply to the land. The planning proposal will rezone a small portion of
		existing E2 zoned land to R1 in lieu of gaining additional E2 zoned land currently zoned
		R1. This will result in the removal of an 1800m2 patch of vegetation to the west of the site.
		The effect of this is a reduction in habitat available to the subject species in the locality
		and removal of a number of Melaleuca biconvexa plants (refer earlier discussion). Despite
		this, the ecological assessment that was undertaken concluded that the proposal is not
		expected to significantly impact of any of the known or potentially occurring threatened
		species on site or in the study. This is because of the the scale of the development,
		retention of most of the site habitat and the fact that local populations extend beyond the
		study area. Required ameliorative measures will also help to mitigate any potential
		impact from the proposed development. Essentially this zone swap will result in a net
		increase of E2 zoned land of approximately 1200m2. The MLS and FSR will also be
		amended accordingly for the R1 zoned land. Any inconsistency with this direction is
		considered to be of minor significance due to the overall increase that will occur in land
		zoned for environmental protection purposes.
		2.2 Coastal Protection
		This direction applies the subject land is within the 'coastal zone' as defined in the Coastal
		Protection Act 1979. It is considered however that any inconsistency is of minor
		significance as the associated development application for a boundary adjustment and
		subdivision of the subject land will be assessed in accordance with the NSW Coastal
		Policy and Coastal Design Guidelines.
		2.4 Desidential Zames
		3.1 Residential Zones
		This direction applies as the planning proposal will affect land within an existing
		residential zone. Any inconsistency with this direction is considered to be of minor
		significance as the planning proposal is assentially just relocating the R1 zoned land from

significance as the planning proposal is essentially just relocating the R1 zoned land from

	infrastructure and	the protectio	land to the western side. In r n of the environmental value will maintain the provisions	es of the land, this relo	
	mapped as Bushfir Commissioner of t	levant as the re Prone lanc he NSW Rura onsultation l	ction I and the subject of the to th I. The Direction requires the al Fire Service after a gatewa has occurred the consistenc	RPA to consult with t y determination has b	he een
	The planning prop	osal is other	wise consistent with S117 di	rections.	
Environmental social economic impacts :	The planning proposal will not have any direct adverse impact on critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats. Similarly the planning proposal will not have any direct adverse effect on the natural, built or socio-economic environment.				
	proposed amendm	ent. The soc	en consideration to social an ial and economic impacts w ly development of land more	ill be largely positive a	
			nas been supported by the la tion and proposal to dedicat		
ssessment Proces	6				
Proposal type :	Routine		Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environm NSW Rural Fire Se		itage		
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(I	b) : No				
If Yes, reasons :		204	14		2
Identify any additional s	tudies, if required. :				
If Other, provide reason	s :				
Identify any internal con	sultations, if required	1			
	on required	<i>2</i>			

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No

If Yes, reasons :

Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
2016-09-14 PLANNING PROPOSAL PP2015-4.1 LEP Amend 41 Reading St 2016-09-12.pdf	Proposal	Yes
PMHC_Cover Letter_Reading St.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
2016-09-14_PMH Council Minutes_Reading St.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Att 4 Eval criteria_completed.pdf	Proposal	Yes

Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions

S.117 directions:	1.5 Rural Lands
	2.1 Environment Protection Zones 2.2 Coastal Protection
	3.1 Residential Zones
	3.1 Residential Zones 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	4.3 Flood Frone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
	6.3 Site Specific Provisions
Additional Information :	1. The Planning Proposal be supported;
	2. The Planning Proposal be exhibited for 28 days;
	3. The Planning Proposal be completed within 9 months;
	4. Prior to exhibition Part 2 of the planning proposal be amended to remove references to the possible need for a savings provisions;
	5. That the RPA consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Services in
	accordance with the requirements of S117 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection;
	6. That the Secretary (or her delegate) note the current inconsistency with section 117
	Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection and that this inconsistency will need to be
	resolved prior to the proposal being finalised;
	7. It is recommended that a delegate the Secretary agree that the inconsistency of the
	proposal with S117 Directions 1.2, 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1 are justified in accordance with the terms of the directions:
	8. That consultation be undertaken with the Office of Environment and Heritage; and
	9. A written authorisation to exercise delegation be issued to Port Macquarie – Hastings Council.
Supporting Reasons	The reasons for the recommendation are as follows:
	1. The proposal will not result in any detrimental impact on critical habitat,
	threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitat;
	2. The proposal will result greater connectivity to adjoining wildlife corridors;
	3. The proposal will allow for residential development on land better suited in regards to
	the provision of infrastructure, avoidance of flooding and connectivity to adjoining residential development;
	3. The inconsistencies of the proposal with the S117 directions are of minor significance; and
	4. The proposal is consistent with all relevant local and regional planning strategies and SEPP's.

Port Macquarie-Hastings LEP 2011 Amendment No 41 - Rezone Lot 7 DP 1142473, Reading St, Port Macquarie					
Signature:	Thertice				
Printed Name:	TEMARE Rentice Date: 21 September 2016				

.

- 1

