

Planning Team Report

Broken Hill City Council - to permit an animal pound facility at Broken Hill Airport being Lot 1 DP 1162606, Airport Road Broken Hill				
Proposal Title :	Broken Hill City Council - to permit an animal pound facility at Broken Hill Airport being Lot 1 DP 1162606, Airport Road Broken Hill			
Proposal Summary	Amend the Broken Hill Local Environmental Plan 2013 to permit a Council animal pound facility at the Broken Hill Airport			
PP Number :	PP_2016_BROKE_001_00	Dop File No :	16/11867-1	
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	09-Sep-2016	LGA covered :	Broken Hill	
Region :	Western	RPA :	Broken Hill City Council	
State Electorate :	BARWON	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
Street : Air	port Road			
Suburb : Bro	oken Hill City :	Broken Hill	Postcode : 2880	
Land Parcel : Lot	1 DP 1162606			
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Tim Collins			
Contact Number :	0447510369			
Contact Email :	timothy.collins@planning.nsw.go	ov.au		
RPA Contact Detai	ils			
Contact Name :	Tracey Stephens			
Contact Number :	0880803313			
Contact Email :	Tracey.Stephens@brokenhill.nsv	v.gov.au		
DoP Project Manager Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Wayne Garnsey			
Contact Number :	6841218000			
Contact Email :	wayne.garnsey@planning.nsw.go	ov.au		
Land Release Data				
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Ν/Α	Consistent with Strategy	N/A	

TET TTOZOGO, Amport	rtead Broken min		
MDP Number :		Date of Release	
Area of Release (Ha)	0.00	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :			
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists?	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	Proposal can be supported given the site is suitable to support the proposed animal pound facility and the existing airport uses and activities will not be negatively impacted on by the operation of this proposed facility. The site is suitable from a noise impact point of view given the distance between the proposed site and the closest adjoining residential area as well as being located on a site that by nature of the activities being carried out produces some significant levels of noise. An Additional permitted use is the most appropriate method in this instance to allow for the proposed development permissibly. (For example refer to Port Macquarie- Hastings LEP 2011 Item 5 Schedule 1) Animal Pound Facilities are not specifically defined in the Standard Instrument LEP		
	Council seeks to clarify that the u	•	
External Supporting Notes :			
Adequacy Assessment			
Statement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	The statement of objectives cle an animal pound facility.	early states the intent of the	planning proposal is to allow for
Explanation of prov	isions provided - s55(2)(b)		
Is an explanation of pro	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :	The intent of the planning prop Hill Local Environmental Plan 2 1162606, Airport Road, Broken	2013 to include an Additional	

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes

* May need the Director General's agreement

Is the Director General's agreement required? No

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land

e) List any other The planning proposal is generally consistent with all relevant State Environmental matters that need to Policies and S117 Ministerial Directions.

3.5 Development near Licensed Aerodromes - The proposal is not inconsistent with with this ministerial direction. The proposed use is proposed to be located amongst existing structures and buildings. It will be single story development and there will be no impact on the Obstacle Limitation Surface.

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes

If No, explain :

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

Adequate land identification maps have been provided which will suffice for public exhibition purposes. The Gateway determination will be conditioned to require formal LEP maps to be produced in accordance with the technical standards with the s59 submission.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

Council's proposed community consultation is acceptable. Council intends to publicly exhibit the planning proposal for a period of 14 days.

Council proposes community consultation that will include notification in the local newspaper and notification letters to surrounding neighbouring leaseholders and land owners. This is adequate.

Additional Director General's requirements

Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No

If Yes, reasons :

Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes

If No, comment : The planning proposal is adequate in the information provided.

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date : August 2013

Comments in relation Broken Hill LEP 2013 was notified on 30 August 2013 to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	To achieve the proposed outcome a planning proposal is required. It is agreed that the proposed additional permitted use is the best mechanism to achieve the outcome in this case.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The proposal is not inconsistent with the endorsed Broken Hill Strategic Land Use Plan dated September 2012. The proposed amendment will retain zone SP1 Special Activities and permit the additional permitted use as an Animal Pound Facility on this site.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The environmental, social and economic impacts are site specific development application considerations. The proposal will utilise an existing Council owned compatible site. There are no significant environmental, social or economic outcomes identified.

Assessment Process

Timeframe to make 6 months LEP: Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) i Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? Ves 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 So internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons :	Proposal type :	Minor		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days
Consultation - 56(2)(d) : Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? No (2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? Yes (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 relevant to this plan? No		6 months		Delegation	RPA
(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. : Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : If Other, provide reasons : Identify any internal consultations, if required : No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No					
If no, provide reasons : Resubmission - \$56(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 relevant to this plan? No	Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
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 relevant to this plan? No	(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
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 relevant to this plan? No	If no, provide reasons :	If no, provide reasons :			
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 relevant to this plan? No	Resubmission - \$56(2)(r				
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 relevant to this plan? No		5) . NO			
If Other, provide reasons : Identify any internal consultations, if required : No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No					
Identify any internal consultations, if required : No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No					
No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No	If Other, provide reasons :				
Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No	Identify any internal consultations, if required :				
	No internal consultation required				
If Yes, reasons :	Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No				
	If Yes, reasons :				

Documents

Document File Name

DocumentType Name

Is Public

Planning Team Recommendation			
Preparation of the plannir	ng proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions		
S.117 directions:	3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes		
Additional Information :	1. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the EP&A Act as follows:		
	(a) The planning proposal is required to be made publicly available on exhibition for 14 days as described in A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning and Infrastructure 2013).		
	(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. No consultation is required with agencies.		
	2. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the EP&A 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).		
	3. Prior to the submission of the planning proposal under section 59 of the EP&A Act the final LEP Additional Permitted Use Map is to be compliant with the Department's "Standard technical requirements for datasets and maps".		
	4. The planning proposal is to be finalised within 6 months of the Gateway Determination date.		
Supporting Reasons :	Council has provided justification that the site is suited to the proposed development. The additional permitted use is the best mechanism to achieve the proposed outcome. The Director Regions, Western can use delegation in this instance as the proposal is consistent with the surrounding land use and is a one off proposal which should provide a positive impact on the local community in terms of employment and animal welfare.		
11			
Signature:	Tim Collin Date: 16/9/2016_		
Printed Name:	Tim Collin Date: 16/9/2016		

Endoned Mganney TLWR 14/9/16