



## **Planning Proposal**

**Additional Permitted Use –  
Public Administration Building**

**Lot 261 DP728943  
Moama Recreation Reserve  
Kirchhofer Street  
MOAMA**



This Report has been prepared for:

**Murray River Council**

PO Box 21  
MATHOURA NSW 2710

This Report has been prepared by:

**EDM Group**

99 Hume Street Wodonga VIC 3690  
P.O. Box 317 Wodonga 3689  
Phone: (02) 6057 8578  
[www.edmgroup.com.au](http://www.edmgroup.com.au)



Planning  
Institute  
Australia

**EDM Ref No. 16012248**

**Date: 23 July 2018**

#### Document Control

Version	Date	Title	Author	Review	Issued
1	30 Jun 2018	Draft for client review	POD	MRC	
2	23 Jul 2018	Draft for client review	POD	MRC	

#### Environment Design Management

Town Planning   Surveying   Engineering   Environmental Planning   Building Design   Project Management

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
Part 1 – Objectives or Intended Outcomes.....	3
Part 2 – Explanation of Provisions.....	3
Part 3 – Justification.....	3
Section A – Need for the planning proposal.....	3
1. Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?.....	3
2. Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way? .....	4
Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework.....	4
3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional, sub-regional or district plan or strategy (including any exhibited draft plans or strategies)? .....	4
4. Is the planning proposal consistent with a council's local strategy or other local strategic plan? .....	5
5. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?.....	5
6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.9.1 Directions)?.....	7
Section C – Environmental, social and economic impact.....	11
7. Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal? .....	11
8. Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?.....	11
9. Has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects? .....	11
Section D – State and Commonwealth Interests.....	11
10. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?.....	11
11. What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination?.....	12
Part 4 – Maps .....	13
Part 5 – Community Consultation.....	15
Part 6 – Project Timeline.....	16

APPENDIX 1: Title Particulars  
APPENDIX 2: Property Report

## INTRODUCTION

This planning proposal has been prepared on behalf of Murray River Council (the “Council”) in support of an amendment to the Moama Local Environmental Plan 2011 (MLEP) so as to facilitate the use of the former Moama Sports Club (MSC) building and grounds for the purposes of a Public Administration Building.

Consistent with the provisions of Section 3.33 (2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (the “Act”) this planning proposal includes the following components:

- Part 1– A statement of the objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed instrument;
- Part 2 – An explanation of the provisions that are to be included in the proposed instrument;
- Part 3 – The justification for those objectives, outcomes and the process for their implementation;
- Part 4 – Maps, where relevant, to identify the intent of the planning proposal and the area to which it applies;
- Part 5 – Details of the community consultation that is to be undertaken on the planning proposal; and
- Part 6 – Project timeline

### 1.1 Basis of Proposal

Following ongoing discussions between Council officers and representatives of the Rich River Golf Club Ltd (RRGC) over the future of the MSC building and grounds it had been decided by Council, at its meeting of March 2018, that to provide greater flexibility in possible future land uses for this building, that the MLEP be amended to include in Schedule 1 Additional permitted uses the land use, “public administration building”. The intent of this decision was to allow for an additional use to be permitted thus providing greater flexibility and opportunities for this building.

Subsequent to this decision RRGc announced the closure of the MSC building on June 30 2018, after which it was reported that Council would take over the lease on the site and convert the complex for offices and associated council facilities.

### 1.2 Subject Land

The former MSC building was a registered club premises owned and operated by the RRGc. The building is located within an ‘L’ shaped parcel with a total area of 3.4 hectares (Maps 1 & 2). This land is a Crown Land parcel of land forming part of the overall area identified as the Moama Recreation Reserve. Although at the time of writing no Certificate of Title has been issued in respect of the subject land it is currently identified as Lot 261 DP728943 (Appendix 1). The land is also currently subject to a perpetual lease land held by Rich River Golf Club Limited (Special Lease 1989/2 Deniliquin – expires 31/12/2029.)

As noted at Appendix 1 the subject land being Lot 261 is neither dedicated or reserved Crown Land. In this regard it is understood that the RRGc as lessee of a part of the land has been appointed by the Minister as the Crown Land manager of that part of the land while the remainder of the property is managed by Council under the public land provisions of the Local Government Act 1993.

The surrounding Moama Recreation Reserve area of the property is also managed by Council. Under this current framework Council’s responsibilities for the day-to-day management of the overall reserve area, apart from the RRGc leasehold

section of the site, are delegated to the Moama Recreation Reserve Management Committee which comprises tenant and user groups.

Following completion of the LEP Amendment process and the taking over of the RRGc leased area by Council it is expected that Council will also be conferred with relevant Crown Land management responsibilities under the provisions of the Crown Land Management Act 2016 (CLM Act).

While the subject land has legal access to Kirchhofer Street from the eastern frontage, that apart of Lot 261 DP728943 occupied by the MSC building is more generally accessed from the south off Perricoota Road via a sealed accessway along Lot 266 DP822981 (Map 2). This adjoining land is also Crown Land.

The MSC building is a two storey complex located in the southern section of the land (Photos 1 & 2). Also situated on the land to the north of the MSC is a part of the Moama Playpark, part of a multi-purpose playing field (Brick Alley) which accommodates soccer, cricket and touch football, part of a toilet block facility, and land used for vehicle access and public carparking. In addition there is also a solar array comprising 400 panels which have been installed in the north western section of the property by RRGc to service the Sports Club building as well as other sporting facilities within the reserve.



**Photo 1: Looking south easterly across carpark towards MSC building**



**Photo 2: Looking north easterly across subject land towards MSC building**

The southern section of the land containing the MSC building is zoned RE2 – Private Recreation under the provisions of the MLEP (Appendix 2). The remainder of the parcel is zoned RE1 – Public Recreation. The land is not affected by environmental constraints and is not mapped as bush fire prone.

Although the MSC premises is surrounded by Crown Land, other development in the broader vicinity of the site includes a school to the north, residential development to the west, tourist and industrial development to the south and commercial development to the east.

## PART 1 – OBJECTIVES OR INTENDED OUTCOMES

The objective of this planning proposal is to include in Schedule 1 Additional permitted uses, the land use, “public administration building” in respect of Lot 261, DP728943 being land accessed off Perricoota Road, Moama. This will facilitate future consideration of a Development Application for consent the use the land for Council offices and facilities.

## PART 2 – EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

The planning proposal does not involve changes to the Land Zoning Map. The proposed amendment is limited to the written instrument, in particular Schedule 1 of the MLEP. The proposed amendment to Schedule 1 is as follows:

### Schedule 1 Additional permitted uses

Insert the following entry

*2 Use of part of the Moama Recreation Reserve, Perricoota Road, Moama*

*(1) This clause applies to land within the Moama Recreation Reserve, Perricoota Road, Moama, being Lot 261, DP728943.*

*(2) Development for the purpose of a public administration building is permitted with development consent.*

Relevant to the above it is also to be noted that under the existing provisions of the MLEP the following definition is applicable:

**public administration building** means a building used as offices or for administrative or other like purposes by the Crown, a statutory body, a council or an organisation established for public purposes, and includes a courthouse or a police station.

## PART 3 – JUSTIFICATION

This section of the Planning Proposal sets out the justification for the intended outcomes and provisions, and the process for their implementation. The questions to which responses have been provided are taken from the Department of Planning and Environment’s (DPE) *A guide to preparing planning proposals* (August 2016) (“the Guide”).

### SECTION A – NEED FOR THE PLANNING PROPOSAL

#### 1. Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

The planning proposal results from lengthy discussions between Council and the RRG as lessee with regards to the future of the MSC building.

The planning proposal is an outcome of a Council resolution of 28 March 2018 for the inclusion of an additional permitted land use in respect of part of the Moama Recreation Reserve, Perricoota Road, Moama. The land presently contains a



former registered club premises which has been recently closed by the current leaseholder of the land. The planning proposal seeks to facilitate a significant opportunity to improve public access to Council's administration functions in Moama in a fit-for-purpose building.

**2. Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?**

It is considered that the introduction of an additional permitted land use in respect of the site is the best way to achieve the objectives of the planning proposal. In this way the existing RE1 and RE2 zones can remain in place without alteration at this point in time.

## **SECTION B – RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK**

**3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional, sub-regional or district plan or strategy (including any exhibited draft plans or strategies)?**

The Riverina Murray Regional Plan 2036 (RMRP) provides a 20 year blueprint for the Riverina Murray.

Among other things the RMRP provides a framework and context to guide the preparation of new LEP's. This overarching document builds on an earlier draft Strategy (Murray Regional Strategy - October 2009).

Relevant to this planning proposal it is noted that the RMRP promotes an outcome of whereby strong regional cities are supported by a network of interdependent centres, including local centres, towns and villages. This is evidence by the stated goals, directions and nominated actions of the RMRP which include:

*GOAL 1 – A growing and diverse economy*

*DIRECTION 6: Promote the expansion of education and training opportunities*

*Action: 6.3 Facilitate joint venture opportunities for the development of shared community/school facilities on school sites, including sporting fields, amenities, parking, community halls, child care, arts and library facilities.*

*GOAL 4 – Strong, connected and healthy communities*

*DIRECTION 23: Build resilience in towns and villages*

*Helping towns and villages to become more robust and dynamic places will increase their appeal for residents and contribute to their growth and prosperity..*

*Action 23.2 Work with councils to better understand the drivers of population change and implications for local communities.*

*DIRECTION 28: Deliver healthy built environments and improved urban design.*

*Good urban design can add to the community's cultural, economic and physical wellbeing by creating safe, healthy and socially inclusive places that meet the needs of children, young people, families, singles, people with disabilities and seniors.*

Murray River LGA provides a wide range of community services and functions to the greater council area, administered through the customer services centres in Mathoura, Moulamein, Barham and Moama.

While the strategic focus of the RMRP is clearly aimed at the three largest cities within the region, namely Albury, Wagga Wagga and Griffith the plan also includes discussion relevant to smaller settlements including the following commentary:

*Population growth across the region will not be evenly distributed, with Albury, Wagga Wagga and Griffith projected to experience the highest rates of growth, followed by the Murray River Local Government Area. Investment in major services, facilities and*

*industrial activity will drive growth in these places, distributing benefits across the region.*

*The population across other smaller towns and villages is likely to remain relatively stable or, in some cases, decline. However, these numbers don't reflect the dynamic nature of some communities, with high levels of transient workers and populations that fluctuate at different times of the year.*

In response it is to be noted that through a change of use of an existing conveniently located building that a significant opportunity now presents itself for Council to improve public access to its administration functions in Moama in a fit-for-purpose building that will serve the community for many years to come.

This outcome is seen as a potentially important strategy to not only cater for the existing community but also provide an outcome where the economic life of a significant vacant two storey building within the Moama township is protected through a change in tenancy.

#### **4. Is the planning proposal consistent with a council's local strategy or other local strategic plan?**

In respect of Council's Community Strategic Plan 2015/2016-2024/25 under Theme 1 – Governance the Plan seeks to establish:

*“ ... strong government and regional networks, involving the community to contribute to the future direction of the Murray Shire and providing sound governance and administrative frameworks.*

Under Strategic Area (C) and (E) the following objectives are of relevance:

*Develop a workforce and work environment that maximises its ability to be at the forefront of Local Government industry, providing best practice customer service.*

*Establish and maintain administrative and information technology systems that underpins the delivery of corporate goals.*

In addition to the above, under the Theme 4 – Economic , Strategic Area (B) Asset Management the following objective is also of relevance:

*Develop and maintain asset management governance, skills, processes, systems and data in order to provide the level of service the Murray Shire community need at present and in the future, in the most cost effective and fit for purpose manner.*

Further to the above Council's draft Community Strategic Plan 2018-2028 (August 2017) seeks to outline the community's aspiration and long-term vision of the communities of the Council area. This draft plan acknowledges that the growth in population is likely to continue to focus on growth in Moama and that this means that Council and community need think about future demand for services and infrastructure, and where to provide those services to support the communities

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with the above, in this instance seeking to follow through on an opportunity to significantly improve public access to Council's administration functions in Moama.

#### **5. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?**

The following provides an assessment of the Planning Proposal against all State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPP's). In summary, the majority of SEPP's are not applicable to Murray River Council and those that are, are generally not applicable to the circumstances of the Planning Proposal.

The following Table 3 provides a response to each of the SEPPs applicable to the subject land.



State Environmental Planning Policy	Comment
Murray Regional Environment Plan (REP) No 2	Noted. The subject site is mapped as Murray Regional Environmental Plan 2 – Riverine Land. However detailed consideration of the various provisions of the REP2 is not required in this instance as the proposed development is not deemed to be a defined development within the riverine environment of the River Murray.
SEPP No.1 – Development Standards	Noted. The planning proposal does not seek to vary and development standards
SEPP No 21 – Caravan Parks	Noted. The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, development consent, and subdivision provisions. There are however no caravan parks or camping grounds proposed.
SEPP No 30 – Intensive Agriculture	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, strategies, development consent, assessment and location provisions. There are however no cattle feed lots, piggeries or compost facilities proposed. Further it is noted that 'intensive agriculture' is prohibited in the RE1 & RE2 zones
SEPP No 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, strategies, development consent, assessment and location provisions. The land however has never been used for hazardous or offensive industry. Further it is noted that industry is prohibited in the RE1 & RE2 zones.
SEPP No 36 – Manufactured Home Estates	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, strategies, development consent, assessment and location provisions. Given the nature of the planning proposal it does not contemplate "suitable zones, locations and provisions" for caravan parks, camping grounds and/or manufactured home estates.
SEPP No 44 – Koala Habitat Protection	There is no native vegetation required to be removed from the subject land as a consequence of the inclusion of an additional permitted use. Further the subject land does not constitute core koala habitat. As a consequence the planning proposal is seen as complying with SEPP 44.
SEPP No 50 – Canal Estate Development	Not applicable. No canal development proposed.
SEPP No 55 – Remediation of Land	There is no information available that would indicate that the property is subject to contamination. This notwithstanding the proposal to include a public administration building within the list of permitted use of the site is considered to be appropriate in overall context of the land.
SEPP No.62 – Sustainable Aquaculture	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, development consent requirements and assessment criteria for sustainable aquaculture.
SEPP No 64 – Advertising and Signage	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, development consent requirements and assessment criteria for advertising and signage
SEPP No 65 – Design Quality of	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate

State Environmental Planning Policy	Comment
Residential Flat Development	from any relevant SEPP aims, development consent, assessment, information and notification requirements.
SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims. Nothing in the proposal seeks to specifically discriminate against the provision of affordable housing including affordable rental housing.
SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004	Not applicable.
SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims and functions with respect to exempt and complying development provisions.
SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, development standards, and information requirements.
SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, and/or requirements relating to infrastructure.
SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007	Not applicable.
SEPP (Miscellaneous Consent Provisions) 2007	The planning proposal does not seek to deviate from any relevant SEPP aims, and/or requirements relating to temporary structures.
SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008	Not applicable as the Planning Proposal relates to land within the RE1 & RE2 Zones.
SEPP (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017	The proposal does not involve the removal of any vegetation from the property

**Table 1: State Environmental Planning Policy Assessment**

## 6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.9.1 Directions)?

The Minister for Planning, under section 9.1(2) [formerly s.117(2)] of the EP&A Act may issue directions that a Council must follow when preparing planning proposals for new LEPs. The directions cover the following broad categories:

- employment and resources;
- environment and heritage;
- housing, infrastructure and urban development;
- hazard and risk;
- regional planning; and
- local plan making.

The following Table 4 provides commentary against the s117 directions as follows:

Direction	Requirements	Compliance
<b>1. Employment and Resources</b>		
1.1 Business and Industrial Zones	4(b) Retain the areas and locations of existing business and industrial zones.	Not applicable
1.2 Rural Zones	(4) A draft LEP shall: (a) not rezone land from a rural zone to a residential, business, industrial, village or tourist zone.	Not applicable

Direction	Requirements	Compliance
	(b) not contain provisions that will increase the permissible density of land within a rural zone (other than land within an existing town or village).	
1.3 Mining Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries	Not applicable	Not applicable
1.4 Oyster Aquaculture	Not applicable	Not applicable
1.5 Rural Lands	The planning proposal must be consistent with the Rural Planning Principles and the Rural Subdivision Principles listed in SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008.	Not applicable
<b>2. Environment and Heritage</b>		
2.1 Environment Protection Zones	Must include provisions that facilitate the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas. Must not reduce protection standards for environmental protection zones.	Consistent .The subject land has no identified environmentally sensitive areas. The planning proposal does not involve environmental protection zones or land otherwise identified for environment protection purposes.
2.2 Coastal Protection	Not applicable	Not applicable
2.3 Heritage Conservation	Planning proposal must incorporate provisions that facilitate the conservation of European and Aboriginal heritage items or places.	No known items of European or Aboriginal heritage.
2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas	Not applicable	Not applicable The planning proposal does not advocate the designation of the subject land as a recreation vehicle area pursuant to an order in force under section 11 (1) of the Recreation Vehicles Act 1983
2.5 Application of E2 and E3 Zones and Environmental Overlays in Far North Coast LEPs	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>3. Housing, Infrastructure and Urban Development</b>		
3.1 Residential Zones	The planning proposal must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broaden the choice of housing types and locations.</li> <li>• Make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services.</li> <li>• Reduce consumption of land.</li> <li>• Housing of good design.</li> <li>• Residential development not permitted until land is adequately serviced.</li> <li>• Not contain provisions that will reduce residential</li> </ul>	Not applicable

Direction	Requirements	Compliance
	density.	
3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates	The planning proposal must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain provisions that permit development of caravan parks.</li> <li>Appropriate zone for existing caravan parks.</li> </ul>	Not applicable. The proposal does not contemplate "suitable zones, locations and provisions" for caravan parks, camping grounds and/or manufactured homes estates.
3.3 Home Occupations	The planning proposal must permit home occupations in dwelling houses without development consent.	Not applicable.
3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport	A planning proposal must locate zones for urban purposes that give effect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improving Transport Choice – Guidelines for planning and development (DUAP 2001), and</li> <li>The Right Place for Business and Services – Planning Policy (DUAP 2001)</li> </ul>	Not applicable. No change of zone proposed
3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	Not applicable	Not applicable. No aerodromes are located within proximity of the subject land.
3.6 Shooting Ranges	Not applicable	Not applicable. No shooting ranges are located adjacent or adjoining the subject land.
<b>4. Hazard and Risk</b>		
4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils	A council shall not prepare a draft LEP that proposes an intensification of land uses on land identified as having a probability of containing acid sulfate soils on the Acid Sulfate Soils Planning Map unless the council has considered an acid sulfate soils study assessing the appropriateness of the change of land use given the presence of acid sulfate soils.	Not applicable The planning proposal does not involve land identified on the Acid Sulfate Soils Planning Map.
4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	The objective of this direction is to prevent damage to life, property and the environment on land identified as unstable or potentially subject to mine subsidence.	Not applicable. The planning proposal does not involve mine subsidence areas or areas identified as unstable.
4.3 Flood Prone Land	A planning proposal must not rezone land within the flood planning areas from Special Use, Special Purpose, Recreation, Rural or Environmental Protection Zones to a Residential, Business, Industrial, Special Use or Special Purpose Zone.	Not applicable. The planning proposal does not involve land with a flood planning area.
4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	A planning proposal in bush fire prone land: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is to be referred to the</li> </ul>	Not applicable. The land is not identified as subject to Bush Fire Risk on Council's Bush Fire Prone Land

Direction	Requirements	Compliance
	<p>Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service following receipt of a gateway determination prior to community consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have regard to Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006.</li> <li>Restrict inappropriate development from hazardous areas.</li> <li>Ensure bush fire hazard reduction is not prohibited within the APZ.</li> </ul>	Map.
<b>5. Regional Planning</b>		
5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies	The planning proposal must be consistent with the Riverina Murray Regional Plan 2036 (RMRP).	Consistent. The planning proposal is consistent with the RMMP. Refer to Part 3, Section B of this report for further detail.
5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchments	Not applicable	Not applicable
5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast	Not applicable	Not applicable
5.4 Commercial and Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast	Not applicable	Not applicable
5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek	Not applicable	Not applicable
5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>6. Local Plan Making</b>		
6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	<p>A planning proposal should not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contain provisions requiring concurrence, consultation or referral of a Minister or public authority without approval from the relevant Minister or public authority; and the Director General of Department of Planning &amp; Environment (DP&amp;E).</li> <li>identify development as designated development unless justified.</li> </ul>	<p>Consistent. The planning proposal does not introduce concurrence, consultation or referral requirements.</p> <p>The planning proposal does not relate to designated development.</p>
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes	A planning proposal must not create, alter or reduce existing zonings or reservations of land for public purposes without approval of the relevant public authority and the Director General of DP&E.	<p>Consistent. The planning proposal will not create, alter or reduce existing zonings or reservations of land for public purposes.</p> <p>The planning proposal is subject to the approval of the DP&amp;E.</p>
6.3 Site Specific	A planning proposal to allow a	Complies. The planning proposal will

Direction	Requirements	Compliance
Provisions	particular land use (residential development) must rezone the site to an existing zone already applying to the LEP that allows the land use, without additional development standards to those already in use in that zone.	not result in any unnecessarily restrictive site specific planning controls.  The inclusion of an additional permitted land use within Schedule 1 will ensure that a change of use from registered club to a public administration building will be able to be carried out in the zone the land is situated on.
<b>7. Metropolitan Planning</b>		
7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Strategy	Not applicable	Not applicable

**Table 2: Section 117 Direction Assessment**

## **SECTION C – ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT**

### **7. Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?**

The planning proposal is highly unlikely to impact upon any threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats. The land that forms the subject of the planning proposal is located within the urban boundary of the Moama township and is land that has been highly modified and contains no areas of critical habitat.

### **8. Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?**

There are no likely negative environmental effects associated with the planning proposal. The land is generally clear of constraints and is not mapped as being bush fire prone and/or within a flood planning area.

### **9. Has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?**

The proposed addition of an additional use with Schedule 1 of the MLEP will not compromise public and/or recreational opportunities in Moama. The property contains a significant building which has been recently closed by the current owner. The property comprises leasehold Crown Land. The planning proposal will facilitate the change of use of the building without compromising other recreational uses and operations across the Moama Recreation Reserve. Being previously occupied by a registered club facility since the 1990's this section of the subject land has already been largely removed from public recreation. The change in use will ensure however that the land continues to be managed for public / community purposes.

The scale and location of the MSC building within the context of the overall Moama Recreation Reserve offers the community a positive opportunity to change the use from a private to a public purpose. Benefits to the Moama area will also be derived from significantly improved public access to Council's administration functions within a fit-for-purpose building that will serve the community for years to come.

## **SECTION D – STATE AND COMMONWEALTH INTERESTS**

### **10. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?**

The planning proposal will not result in increased demand for public infrastructure.



The subject land has legal and practical access to Kirchhofer Road which is a sealed local road. Alternative access is also available over adjoining Crown Land that is also within the RE2 Zone.

All other relevant utilities with adequate spare capacity are available to the site.

**11. What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination?**

The proposed inclusion of an additional permitted use on the subject land has been discussed with NSW DoI – Lands and Water, who will also be involved in future lease termination and review processes involving both RRG and Council.

The proposal is otherwise considered to be of a relatively minor nature and involving land unconstrained by flood, bush fire, cultural heritage or significant biodiversity values. Council is of the view that the planning proposal does not warrant consultation with other public authorities.

Draft

## PART 4 – MAPS

The planning proposal is limited to amendments to the written instrument only and no mapping changes are proposed.

The following maps are provided in support of the Planning Proposal.

### Moama Township



Disclaimer: This report has been generated by various sources and is provided for information purposes only. Spatial Services does not warrant or represent that the information is free from errors or omission, or that it is exhaustive. Spatial Services gives no warranty in relation to the information, especially material supplied by third parties. Spatial Services accepts no liability for loss, damage, or costs that you may incur relating to any use or reliance upon the information in this report.

Map 1: Locality Plan (source SIX Viewer)



## Lot 261 DP728943



Disclaimer: This report has been generated by various sources and is provided for information purposes only. Spatial Services does not warrant or represent that the information is free from errors or omission, or that it is exhaustive. Spatial Services gives no warranty in relation to the information, especially material supplied by third parties. Spatial Services accepts no liability for loss, damage, or costs that you may incur relating to any use or reliance upon the information in this report.

Map 2: Site Context (source SIX Viewer)

## **PART 5 – COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

The proposal is considered to be low impact as described in the Guide and as a consequence an exhibition period of 28 days is considered appropriate.

Consultation will be carried out in accordance with the statutory requirements set by the EP & A Act and its regulation.

The proposed consultation strategy for this proposal will include:

- written notification to landowners adjoining the subject land;
- public notices to be provided in local media, including in a local newspaper and on Councils' website;
- static displays of the Planning Proposal and supporting material in Council public buildings; and
- electronic copies of all documentation being made available to the community free of charge (preferably via downloads from Council's website).

The Gateway determination will confirm the public consultation requirements.

At the conclusion of the public exhibition period Council staff will consider submissions made with respect to the Planning Proposal and prepare a report to Council.

Draft

## PART 6 – PROJECT TIMELINE

The project timeline for the planning proposal is outlined in Table 3.

Typical of the strategic planning process however it needs to be noted that there are indeed many factors that can influence compliance with the timeframe including the cycle of Council meetings, consequences of agency consultation and consequences of public exhibition.

As a consequence the following project timeline in respect of this planning proposal should be regarded as providing an indicative outline only as a mechanism to monitor the progress of the planning proposal through the plan making process.

Milestone	Date/timeframe
Anticipated commencement date (date of Gateway determination)	August / September 2018
Anticipated timeframe for the completion of required studies (if required)	2 months from Gateway determination
Timeframe for government agency consultation (pre and post exhibition as required by Gateway determination)	2 months from Gateway determination
Commencement and completion dates for Commence public exhibition period	3 months from Gateway determination
Dates for public hearing (if required)	Within 2 weeks of public exhibition completion
Timeframe for consideration of submissions	2 weeks following completion of exhibition
Timeframe for the consideration of a proposal post exhibition	1 month following completion of exhibition
Anticipated date RPA will make the plan (if delegated)	2 weeks following consideration of proposal
Anticipated date RPA will forward to the department for notification (if delegated).	1 month following consideration of proposal

**Table 3: Suggested Project Timeline**

# **Appendix 1**

## **Title Particulars**



# **Appendix 2**

## **Property Report**

Draft