

Proposal Title :	Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011 - Rezoning of land for residential and environmental purposes in the Lincoln Road, Castle Court and Marian Drive area of Port Macquarie		
Proposal Summary :	This Planning Proposal aims to rezone land in the Lincoln Road, Castle Court and Marian Drive area of Port Macquarle from RU1 Primary Production and E2 Environmental Conservation to R1 General Residential, E2 Environmental Conservation and E3 Environmental Management. It also proposes to amend the development provisions of the land relating to minimum lot sizes, height of buildings and floor space ratios.		
PP Number :	PP_2016_PORTM_005_00	Dop File No :	16/12597
Proposal Details			
Date Planning Proposal Received :	20-Sep-2016	LGA covered :	Port Macquarie-Hastings
Region :	Northern	RPA :	Port Macquarie-Hastings Counci
State Electorate :	OXLEY	Section of the Act:	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning		
Location Details			
Street : Line	coln Road, Castle Court and Maria	in Drive	
Suburb :	City :	Port Macquarie	Postcode : 2444
Land Parcel : Lot	1, DP 1066820 and Lot 34, DP 856	163	
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Jon Stone		
Contact Number :	0267019688		
Contact Email :	jon.stone@planning.nsw.gov.au		
RPA Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Sandra Bush		
Contact Number :	0265818025		
Contact Email :	sandra.bush@pmhc.nsw.gov.au		
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Tamara Prentice		
Contact Number :	0266416610		
Contact Email :	tamara.prentice@planning.nsw.g	ov.au	

Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Mid North Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :	1.90	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Residential
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	8
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created ;	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with : If No, comment :	The Department of Planning and communications and meetings w		
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists?	Region's knowledge. No		
If Yes, comment :	The Northern Region has not me Northern Region been advised of lobbyists concerning the propos	f any meeting between other	
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :			
External Supporting Notes :			
Adequacy Assessmen	t		
Statement of the obj	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes			
Comment :	The objectives and intended o for the proposed amendment t		posal are adequately expressed js LEP 2011.
Explanation of provi	isions provided - s55(2)(b)		
Is an explanation of pro-	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :	The Planning Proposal provide the objectives and intended on	-	intended provisions to achieve

### Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's stra	tegy been agreed to by the [	Director General? <b>Yes</b>	
b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :		1.2 Rural Zones	
* May need the Direc	tor General's agreement	1.5 Rural Lands 2.1 Environment Protection Zones 2.3 Heritage Conservation	
		3.1 Residential Zones	
		3.3 Home Occupations	
		3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils	
		4.3 Flood Prone Land	
		4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	
		5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies	
		6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	
	neral's agreement required?		
	andard Instrument (LEPs) O		
d) Which SEPPs have	e the RPA identified?	SEPP No 14—Coastal Wetlands SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection	
		SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land	
		SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008	
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :			
Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes			
If No, explain :		the consistency of this Planning Proposal with the S117 Directions and d later in this report.	
Mapping Provided	- s55(2)(d)		
Is mapping provided?	' Yes		
Comment :		provided in the Planning Proposal to illustrate the proposed e are considered adequate for public exhibition.	
		arliamentary Counsel opinion for the Plan, LEP mapping prepared the Department's technical mapping guidelines will need to be	
Community consu	Itation - s55(2)(e)		
Has community consultation been proposed? Yes			
Comment :		sal identifies a 28 day exhibition period. This is considered	
		ezoning is located outside of the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy boundaries and partly involves Council owned land.	
Additional Directo	r General's requiremen	nts	
Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No			
If Yes, reasons :			

Overall adequacy o	f the proposal	
Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes		
If No, comment :	<ul> <li>The Planning Proposal and accompanying documentation are considered to satisfy the adequacy criteria by:</li> <li>1. Providing appropriate objectives and intended outcomes;</li> <li>2. Providing a suitable explanation of the provisions proposed by the LEP to achieve the outcomes;</li> <li>3. Providing an adequate justification for the proposal;</li> <li>4. Outlining a proposed community consultation program; and</li> <li>5. Providing a project time line.</li> </ul> Council has requested an authorisation to exercise its plan making delegations. As the Planning Proposal deals with matters of only local significance, it is considered appropriate that an authorisation to exercise plan making delegations be issued to Council. The RPA has provided a project time line which estimates that the LEP will be ready for	
Proposal Assessment	submission to the Department for notification in April 2017. To ensure an adequate period to complete the proposal a 9 month timeframe is recommended.	
Principal LEP:		
Due Date :		
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011 was made in February 2011.	
Assessment Criteria	a	
Need for planning proposal :	Council has identified the need for the proposal due to the significant public benefit that will result from the dedication to Council of 30ha of environmentally sensitivity land. The proposal is best way of ensuring adequate protection, rehabilitation and permanent conservation of the residue environmental lands, whilst allowing a minor expansion of the	

existing residential area onto the less sensitive areas of the site.

Consistency with	REGIONAL STRATEGIES
strategic planning framework :	While the proposed residential lands are located outside of the identified Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries of the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy (MNCRS), the proposal is considered to remain consistent with the MNCRS as minor variations to the UGAs are permitted subject to appropriate consideration of infrastructure / servicing, environmental
	constraints and natural resources, and the regional settlement hierarchy. In this regard a
	minor variation is supported and considered to be consistent with the MNCRS as the minor
	residential infill will have access to existing infrastructure and servicing, has catered
	appropriately for natural constraints and natural resources (refer to discussion below
	regarding SEPP 14) and is not inconsistent with the regional settlement hierarchy.
	The exhibited draft North Coast Regional Growth Plan is also applicable. The proposal is consistent with the draft Regional Growth Plan as it will contribute towards providing
	sufficient housing supply to meet the demands of the growing North Coast population. This
	development can be considered a minor variation to the mapped urban growth area
	consistent with the provisions of the draft Plan.
	LOCAL STRATEGIES
	Council's Urban Growth Management Strategy 2010 – 2031 identifies that Council will
	continue to investigate opportunities for infill development across the LGA. This Planning
	Proposal is the outcome of this process and is therefore considered to be in accordance with the Urban Growth Management Strategy, which was endorsed by the NSW
	Department of Planning and Environment in May 2011.
	STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICIES
	SEPP 14 - COASTAL WETLANDS The proposal seeks to zone the vast majority of the mapped SEPP 14 on the site as E2
	Environmental Conservation or E3 Environmental Management which is considered
	appropriate. A very small area of the proposed Castle Court residential rezoning
	encroaches into the SEPP 14 wetland. Discussions will Council staff have confirmed they
	raise no objection to the Gateway requiring the residential zone in this location to be aligned with the mapped SEPP 14 boundary. This is considered appropriate to retain the
	integrity of the existing mapped wetland area.
	SEPP 44 KOALA HABITAT PROTECTION
	The ecological report determines that this land does not contain potential koala habitat.
	SEPP 55 REMEDIATION OF LAND
	A preliminary investigation of Lot 1 in accordance with the Contaminated Land Guidelines
	was undertaken. It was determined that the land was not contaminated. No investigation
	of Council's land that is included in the Castle Court infill footprint has however been undertaken. Council has advised that this investigation will be completed and the
	information included in the planning proposal prior to public exhibition.
	SEPP (Rural Lands)
	See discussion below regarding compliance with Section 117 Directions.
	SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS
	A number of S117 Directions apply to this Planning Proposal. The proposal is considered to
	be consistent with all relevant s117 Directions except in relation to the following:
	1.2 Rural Zones
	The proposal is inconsistent with this Direction as it seeks to rezone land from RU1 Primary
	Production to R1 General Residential. This inconsistency is considered to be of minor
	significance due to the small area of rural zoned land involved and as the land holds negligible agricultural potential.
	1.5 Rural Lands
	The proposal is inconsistent with this Direction as it unable to comply with all of the rural
	planning and subdivision principles of SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 as it seeks to rezone land

from RU1 Primary Production to R1 General Residential. This inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance due to the small area of rural zoned land involved and as the land holds negligible agricultural potential.

#### 2.1 Environment Protection Zones

The proposal is inconsistent with this Direction as it seeks to rezone a small area (less than 0.2ha) of existing E2 zoned land to R1 General Residential adjoining Marian Drive. This inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance due to the degraded nature of the land involved, and the environmental benefit that will result from the overall net increase in E2 zoned land from the proposal, and the greater protection and rehabilitation that will occur from the 30ha of land being dedicated to the public for conservation purposes. It is also noted that the owner has given consent to the proposed application of E2 and E3 zones across the site over existing rural zoned land as part of the proposal.

#### 3.6 Shooting Ranges

The proposal is inconsistent with this Direction as it seeks to rezone land adjacent to an existing shooting range for a more intensive land uses than that which are permitted under the existing zone. The inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance because the distance between the closest proposed infill residential area and the rifle range is 320m, which is no closer to the rifle range than existing housing in the locality. In addition, council has advised the topography and vegetation between the proposed infill areas and rifle range are significant and comprise approximately 30 ha of dense tall coastal paperbark swamp forest, with no direct line of sight. The dedication of the residue environmental lands to Council for conservation purposes will ensure retention of an adequate buffer to the rifle range into the future. Council has advised that prior to public exhibition, consultation with the NSW Police Firearms Registry as the relevant rifle range licensing body will be undertaken.

#### 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils

The proposal is inconsistent with this Direction as the site contains Class 3 and 5 acid sulfate soils and an acid sulfate soils study as not yet been prepared. This inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance as this matter can be adequately addressed at development application stage as Port Macquarie-Hastings LEP 2011 contains appropriate provisions requiring the consideration of acid sulfate soils.

#### 4.3 Flood Prone Land

The proposal is inconsistent with this Direction as it will permit an increase in the development potential of the land. While Council's Hastings River Flood Study (2006) indicates that the proposed residential infill areas are located mainly in areas designated as 'Flood Fringe' with a low to medium hazard category, and Council has advised that they are satisfied that the proposed filling to a minimum floor level of 4.1m AHD will have minimal impact on the flooding characteristics in the locality, it is considered appropriate that the inconsistency remain unresolved until after the Office of Environment and Heritage have had an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal.

#### 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

This Direction is relevant as the Planning Proposal will affect land that is identified as bushfire prone land. The Direction requires the RPA to consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service after a Gateway Determination has been issued. Until this consultation has occurred the consistency of the proposal with the Direction remains unresolved.

Environmental social economic impacts :

#### FLORA AND FAUNA

Council mapping indicates that the site contains three endangered ecological communities (EECs). The majority of EECs are located within the residue of Lot 1 which is proposed to be dedicated to Council for ongoing environmental conservation. An Environmental Assessment report includes an assessment of EECs where they are impacted by the proposed residential infill areas. It is considered the impacts on the EECs are likely to be minimal due to their existing degraded state and will be offset by the environmental gains of dedication of the residue of Lot 1 to Council.

burposes in the Emcor	n Road, Castle Court and Ma	anali brive area of Port i	Macquarie
	An intact EEC at the rear of the proposed Lincoln Road residential area is proposed to be retained in an E2 Environmental Protection zone and managed in private ownership in accordance with a Vegetation Management Plan to be approved by Council. This is considered appropriate.		
	BUSHFIRE HAZARD A Bushfire Hazard Assessment report (Oct 2015), indicates that the proposed building envelopes of the proposed new residential zoned land can achieve a 21m wide Asset Protection Zone to protect future development from bushfire hazard. Consultation with the NSW Rural Fire Service will be undertaken to ensure thsi is appropriate.		
	FLOODING Council's Hastings River Flood Study (2006) indicates that the proposed residential infill areas are located mainly in areas designated as 'Flood Fringe' with a low to medium hazard category. Council has advised that the proponent has submitted information, to the satisfaction of Council staff, which demonstrates that filling these areas approximately 900 mm above the 1 in 100 year flood level (i.e. a minimum floor level of 4.1m AHD), will have minimal impact on the flooding characteristics in the locality. This is considered appropriate subject to consultation with OEH.		
	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT One of the proposed residential areas is in the vicinity of a temporary stormwater basin which Council considers no longer necessary for future stormwater management purposes. Council has supported an alternative stormwater control solution that takes the existing drainage through to the rear of the proposed Marian Drive residential infill area. This will require the existing basin to be filled, under geotechnical supervision, and installation of the alternative system in accordance with the Stormwater Concept Plan that is included in the Planning Proposal. It is considered that the proposal will resolve existing stormwater management issues associated with development in the locality.		
	CULTURAL HERITAGE The proponent has undertaken a search of the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System and did not identify any recorded/declared Aboriginal sites or places on or within 200m of the site. Despite this Council has identified that consultation will be undertaken with the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, the Birpai Aboriginal Land Council and the NSW Aboriginal Land Council, prior to public exhibition. This is considered appropriate.		
	Due to the small area of residential infill development consistent with adjacent residential development, any other social and economic impacts are expected to be negligible.		
Assessment Process	5		
Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months	Delegation :	RPA
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Essential Energy NSW Aboriginal Land Council Office of Environment and Herit NSW Rural Fire Service Other	age	

Is Public Hearing by the PAC required?	Νο
(2)(a) Should the matter proceed ?	Yes
If no, provide reasons :	
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No	
If Yes, reasons :	
Identify any additional studies, if required. :	
If Other, provide reasons :	
Identify any internal consultations, if required :	
No internal consultation required	
Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure	a relevant to this plan? No
If Yes, reasons :	

### Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public	
Cover Letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes	
Planning Proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes	
Council Report.pdf	Proposal	Yes	
Council meeting minutes.pdf	Proposal	Yes	

### Planning Team Recommendation

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

S.117 directions:	1.2 Rural Zones
	1.5 Rural Lands
	2.1 Environment Protection Zones
	2.3 Heritage Conservation
	3.1 Residential Zones
	3.3 Home Occupations
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
	5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies
	6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
Additional Information :	It is recommended that:
	1. That the proposal be supported.
	2. Prior to agency consultation, the planning proposal shall be amended to
	a. amend the residential zone in Castle Court to align with the mapped SEPP wetland
	boundary, with the resulting residue of the mapped SEPP wetland to be zoned E3
	Environmental Management; and
	b. include the outcomes from the land contamination assessment for the Council owned
	land.
	3. Prior to community consultation, consultation is required with the following public

Port Macquarie Hastings LEP 2011 - Rezoning of land for residential and environmental
purposes in the Lincoln Road, Castle Court and Marian Drive area of Port Macquarie

	authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the Act and/or to comply with the requirements of relevant S117 Directions:	
	<ul> <li>NSW Office of Environment and Heritage</li> </ul>	
	NSW Rural Fire Service	
	Birpai Aboriginal Land Council	
	NSW Aboriginal Land Council	
	NSW Police Firearms Registry	
	Department of Primary Industries - Lands	
	Essential Energy	
	Telstra	
	Each public authority is to be provided with a copy of the planning proposal and any	
	relevant supporting material, and given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal.	
	4. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the Act as follows:	
	(a) the planning proposal must be made publicly available for a minimum of 28 days;	
	(b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public	
	exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for material that must be made	
	publicly available along with planning proposals as identified in section 5.5.2 of A Guide	
	to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning and Environment 2016).	
	5. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the Act. This does not discharge Council from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a	
	submission or if reclassifying land).	
	6. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 12 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.	
	8. That the Secretary's delegate determine that the inconsistencies with s117 Directions 1.2 Rural Zones, 1.5 Rural Lands, 2.1 Environmental Protection Zones, 3.6 Shooting Ranges and 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils are justified as being of minor significance.	
	9. The Secretary's delegate note the outstanding inconsistency of the proposal with s117 Directions 4.3 Flood Prone Land and 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection.	
	10. That a written authorisation to exercise plan making delegations be issued Council.	
Supporting Reasons :	The rezoning of the subject land will provide additional infill residential development adjoining an established residential area and provide for the conservation of significant environmentally constrained land.	
Signature:	Di	
Printed Name:	Cray Digg Date: 29 9/16	