

Proposal Title :	Removal of Minimum Lot Size Street area to facilitate mediun		to the Kyogle CBD in the Groom nent
Proposal Summary :	The proposal seeks to amend to greater residential densities ar include the removal of the 1,50	nd housing diversity adjacent	
PP Number :	PP_2016_KYOGL_003_00	Dop File No :	16/15175
Proposal Details	والمتعادية والمتعادية		
Date Planning Proposal Received :	25-Nov-2016	LGA covered :	Kyogle
Region :	Northern	RPA :	Kyogle Council
State Electorate :	LISMORE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Policy		
Location Details			
Street :			
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :
Land Parcel : Gre	een Street Precinct, Kyogle		
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Luke Blandford		
Contact Number :	0266416612		
Contact Email :	luke.blandford@planning.nsw.g	ov.au	
RPA Contact Detai	ils		
Contact Name :	Lachlan Black		
Contact Number :	0266320211		
Contact Email :	lachlan.black@kyogle.nsw.gov.a	au	
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Tamara Prentice		
Contact Number :	0266416612		
Contact Email :	tamara.prentice@planning.nsw.	gov.au	
Land Release Data		-	
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Far North Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes

Groom Street area to t	acilitate medium densi	ty residential development	
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)		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 :		g and Environment's Code of Pra ings with lobbyists has been com	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :		e has not met any lobbyists in rela y meeting between other officers	
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :			
External Supporting Notes :			
Adequacy Assessmen	t		
Statement of the obj	iectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	•	ives adequately describes the inte ousing density and diversity with	-
Explanation of provi	sions provided - s55(2))(b)	
Is an explanation of pro-	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :	objectives and intended	provides an explanation of the inte outcomes. This includes an ame ove the 1,500m2 minimum lot size	ndment to the Lot Size Map –
Justification - s55 (2)(c)		
a) Has Council's strateg	y been agreed to by the Dire	ctor General? Yes	
b) S.117 directions iden	tified by RPA :	2.3 Heritage Conservation	
* May need the Director	General's agreement	 2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas 3.1 Residential Zones 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufac 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protect 	ransport

		5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far
		North Coast 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
		6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
Is the Director Gener	al's agreement required	? Yes
c) Consistent with Stand	lard Instrument (LEPs) (Drder 2006 : Yes
d) Which SEPPs have th	ne RPA identified?	SEPP No 15—Rural Landsharing Communities
		SEPP No 21—Caravan Parks
		SEPP No 30—Intensive Agriculture
		SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection
		SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land
		SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage
		SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008
		SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2006 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004
		SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007
		SEPP (Temporary Structures and Places of Public Entertainment)
		2007
e) List any other matters that need to		the applicable directions and SEPPs is provided within the ion of this planning team report.
be considered :		
Have inconsistencies with	th items a), b) and d) be	ing adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :	See the 'Assessm	ent' section of this planning team report
Mapping Provided -	s55(2)(d)	
Is mapping provided? Ye	es	
Comment :	The Planning Prop proposed LEP ma	posal has included mapping that identifies the subject land and p amendments.
	consultation. Map	owever not considered to be of a suitable scale to facilitate public s of a suitable scale showing the current and proposed minimum lot r the land should therefore be included prior to community
	consultation.	
Community consulta		
Community consulta	ation - s55(2)(e)	25
-	ation - s55(2)(e) ation been proposed? Ye	es osal has indicated a 21 day public exhibition/community consultation
Has community consulta	ation - s55(2)(e) ation been proposed? Ye The Planning Prop period. The proposal woul Department's Guic with the strategic p uses. A minimum d	
Has community consulta	ation - s55(2)(e) ation been proposed? Ye The Planning Prop period. The proposal woul Department's Guic with the strategic p uses. A minimum ' issue with Council	oosal has indicated a 21 day public exhibition/community consultation d meet the definition of a 'low impact' proposal, as defined in the delines. This is because the proposed LEP amendment is consistent planning framework and does not change zones or permitted land 14 day exhibition period in this regard would be suitable. There is no exhibiting the proposal for longer however.
Has community consulta Comment :	ation - s55(2)(e) ation been proposed? Ye The Planning Prop period. The proposal woul Department's Guic with the strategic p uses. A minimum issue with Council General's requireme	nosal has indicated a 21 day public exhibition/community consultation Id meet the definition of a 'low impact' proposal, as defined in the delines. This is because the proposed LEP amendment is consistent planning framework and does not change zones or permitted land 14 day exhibition period in this regard would be suitable. There is no exhibiting the proposal for longer however.

Does the proposal meet	the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	 Minor amendments are required to the Planning Proposal prior to it being publicly exhibited. This is to include: references to all the land zones affected by the proposal; a list all of the property addresses and title descriptions that are impacted by the proposal; maps of a suitable scale showing the current and proposed minimum lot size provisions for the land; and an updated timeline.
	 The Planning Proposal generally satisfies the adequacy criteria by: Providing appropriate objectives and intended outcomes; Providing a suitable explanation of the provisions proposed by the Planning Proposal to achieve the outcomes; Providing an adequate justification for the proposal; Providing maps which suitably identify the site and intended outcomes (noting the changes required prior to exhibition); Outlining a proposed community consultation program including a 21 day public exhibition period; and Providing a project timeframe which suggests the submission of the proposal to the Department for finalisation within 4 months.
	Timeline - Due to the potential delays around the Christmas period, it is considered that a 9 month time frame would be appropriate. This does not restrict Council from finalising the LEP amendment sooner. Council should update the timeline under the proposal to account for any delays associated with this Christmas period and requirement to update the proposal.
	Delegation - Council's resolution and 'Evaluation for Issuing Plan Making Functions', indicates that Council seeks Plan Making Functions for this LEP Amendment. It is considered that these functions should be delegated to Council given that the proposal is consistent with the Regional and Local Growth Strategies (see below) and will result in a relaxation of development standards that will promote increased development opportunity.
oposal Assessment	
Principal LEP:	
Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The Kyogle LEP 2012 is a Principal LEP. The Planning Proposal seeks to amend this planning instrument.
Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	The facilitation of more housing diversity, affordable living and seniors accommodation in the LGA is recognised as a key local and regional strategy.
	The land subject to the proposal is zoned predominantly R1 General Residential and part R3 Medium Density Residential and part B2 Local Centre. The B2 zone only applies to a roadway however. It does not affect private land. The current LEP lot size provisions preclude the subdivision of land into lots less than 1,500m2. Removing this minimum lot size provision will promote housing densities and diversity in the Kyogle CBD, such as facilitating 'small lot housing development'. This is consistent with the R1 and R3 zone

It is also noted that other land in the Kyogle CBD also does not have a minimum lot size provisions applied to it. The proposal in this regard is consistent with the strategic planning approach for the Kyogle CBD.

The proposed LEP amendment is the best means for achieving the objectives of the proposal.

Council is updating its DCP to reflect this LEP amendment.

Consistency with strategic planning	FAR NORTH COAST REGIONAL STRATEGY (FNCRS)
framework :	The proposal does not result in the zoning of urban (residential or business) land outside of the Town and Village Urban Growth Boundaries. It seeks to intensify development opportunities on 'infill sites', contributing to housing provision within the existing urban footprint.
	The proposal is consistent with the aims, objectives and intent of the Strategy.
	DRAFT NORTH COAST REGIONAL PLAN
	The Draft North Coast Regional Plan was publicly exhibited for 3 months, which concluded on 2 June 2016. Once adopted this Plan will replace the FNCRS and will guide strategic planning across the North Coast over the next 20 years.
	The Draft Plan includes a range of actions for considering LEP amendments. The key actions specific to this proposal relate to focusing growth to the least sensitive and constrained areas and providing sufficient housing supply.
	Of particular note, the Draft Plan includes requirements for containing growth to agreed growth areas.
	The proposal is consistent with the actions of the Draft Plan given that it will permit new housing opportunity on land identified within the urban growth area.
	KYOGLE COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN 2016-2026
	The proposed intensification of residential development is a key desired outcome under the Strategy.
	STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICIES
	The proposal does not result in any inconsistency with the relevant SEPPs.
	In accordance with SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land, Council has considered that the proposed LEP amendment will not affect the ongoing operation of the SEPP. This suggests that Council is confident that land contamination can be appropriately considered at 'development stage'. Future development proposals would need to determine if any potentially contaminating activities (under slab contamination, asbestos, etc.) have occurred on individual sites and identify what remediation works, if any, are required to ensure the land is suitable for redevelopment.
	All future development on the land will need to demonstrate consistency with the relevant SEPPs including (but not limited to): - SEPP 55 Remediation of Land – as noted above.
	 SEPP 55 Remediation of Land – as noted above. SEPP 65 Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings (where applicable) – ensuring residential flat development achieves high levels of design quality, sustainability and liveability
	 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) – ensuring the effective delivery of new affordable rental housing opportunities
	SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS
	The following s117 Directions are applicable to the Planning Proposal.
	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones; 2.1 Environmental Protection Zones, 2.3 Heritage Conservation, 2.4 Recreational Vehicle Areas, 3.1 Residential Zones, 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates, 3.3 Home Occupations, 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport, 4.3 Flood Prone Land; 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection, 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies, 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements and 6.2 Reserving Land

for Public Purposes

The proposal is consistent with the relevant Directions, except for those listed below:

	 Direction 2.1 Environment Protection Zones This Direction requires a proposal to include provisions that facilitate the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas. The site does not include these areas however and it is noted that environmental protection provisions are already included under Council's LEP and DCP. The inconsistency with this Direction is of minor significance and justifiable in the terms of the Direction.
	 Direction 2.3 Heritage Conservation This Direction requires a proposal to include provisions that facilitate the conservation of items of heritage significance. The site does not include these areas however and it is noted that heritage conservation provisions are already included under Council's LEP and DCP. The inconsistency with this Direction is of minor significance and justifiable in the terms of the Direction.
	 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land A small portion of land in the nothern section of the site is mapped as being below the flood planning level. The proposal therefore seeks to increase housing densities on land that is mapped as being flood prone. However, all development on this land would need to be consistent with Council's LEP, DCP and Flood Management Plan (which has been prepared in acccordance with the Floodplain Development Manual). The inconsistency is therefore considered to be minor significance. It is however recommended that consultation with the Office of Environment and Heritage still be undertaken in regard to this matter.
	 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection The proposal notes that part of the site is within a bushfire prone buffer area. Consistency with the Direction is currently unresolved. Consultation with the NSW Rural Fire Service would be required post Gateway to satisfy the requirements of the Direction.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The potential for environmental impact associated with the redevelopment and use of land will be reviewed as part of any future DA. It is considered that any potential impacts would be minor given that it would relate to infill development.
	Bushfire and flooding constraints can be suitably managed through development design.
	The Planning Proposal has indicated that there is adequate infrastructure in place to service increased development product within the Precinct. It is recognised that upgrades to existing services can be undertaken to increase capacities due to increased loads. A detailed review of service provision including water, sewer, drainage, road, telecoms and electrical capacity would be required with future Development Applications.
	The proposal will facilitate increased development opportunities within an existing urban precinct. Increased residential densities will improve housing supply, choice and affordability and will utilise existing infrastructure. The proposal is likely to have have a positive social and economic impact.

ssessment Proces	S		
Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	14 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months	Delegation :	RPA
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environr NSW Rural Fire S	ment and Heritage ervice	
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No	
(2)(a) Should the matter	r proceed ?	Yes	
If no, provide reasons :			
Resubmission - s56(2)(l	b) : No		
If Yes, reasons :			
Identify any additional s	tudies, if required.		
f Other, provide reason	s:		
		: :	
		J :	
No internal consultatio	n required		
	n required	d : ucture relevant to this plan? No	
No internal consultatio	n required		
No internal consultatio Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons :	n required		
No internal consultations in ternal consultations is the provision and functions is the provision in the provision and functions is the provision and funct	n required		Name Is Public
No internal consultation Is the provision and funct If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name	n required	ucture relevant to this plan? No	Name Is Public Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Inning Team Recom	in required ding of state infrastru mendation	ted at this stage : Recommended with C	Yes
No internal consultations is the provision and fund of Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Uning Team Recom Preparation of the plann	in required ding of state infrastru mendation ing proposal support 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V	ted at this stage : Recommended with C Deservation Vehicle Areas	Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Inning Team Recom	in required ding of state infrastru mendation ing proposal support 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z	ted at this stage : Recommended with C Inservation Vehicle Areas	Yes
No internal consultations is the provision and fund of Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Uning Team Recom Preparation of the plann	in required ding of state infrastru mendation ing proposal support 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z 3.2 Caravan Park	ted at this stage : Recommended with C reservation Vehicle Areas Zones ks and Manufactured Home Estates	Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Inning Team Recom	in required ding of state infrastru mendation ing proposal support 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z 3.2 Caravan Park 3.3 Home Occup	ted at this stage : Recommended with C reservation Vehicle Areas Zones ks and Manufactured Home Estates	Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Inning Team Recom	in required ding of state infrastru mendation ing proposal support 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z 3.2 Caravan Park 3.3 Home Occup	DocumentType DocumentType Proposal ted at this stage : Recommended with C aservation /ehicle Areas Zones ks and Manufactured Home Estates bations and Use and Transport	Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons : Examents Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Inning Team Recom Preparation of the plann	in required ding of state infrastru mendation ing proposal support 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z 3.2 Caravan Park 3.3 Home Occup 3.4 Integrating La 4.3 Flood Prone 4.4 Planning for	ted at this stage : Recommended with C DocumentType Proposal rehicle Areas Zones ks and Manufactured Home Estates bations and Use and Transport Land Bushfire Protection	Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons : Examents Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf Inning Team Recom Preparation of the plann	in required ding of state infrastru mendation ing proposal support 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z 3.2 Caravan Park 3.3 Home Occup 3.4 Integrating La 4.3 Flood Prone 4.4 Planning for 5.1 Implementati	ted at this stage : Recommended with C DocumentType Proposal rehicle Areas Zones ks and Manufactured Home Estates bations and Use and Transport Land Bushfire Protection ion of Regional Strategies	Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and fund If Yes, reasons : 	in required ding of state infrastru mendation 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z 3.2 Caravan Park 3.3 Home Occup 3.4 Integrating La 4.3 Flood Prone 4.4 Planning for 5.1 Implementati 5.3 Farmland of S	ted at this stage : Recommended with C DocumentType Proposal rehicle Areas Zones ks and Manufactured Home Estates bations and Use and Transport Land Bushfire Protection ion of Regional Strategies State and Regional Significance on the	Yes
No internal consultation Is the provision and func- If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Planning Proposal.pdf	in required ding of state infrastru mendation 2.3 Heritage Con 2.4 Recreation V 3.1 Residential Z 3.2 Caravan Park 3.3 Home Occup 3.4 Integrating Li 4.3 Flood Prone 4.4 Planning for 5.1 Implementati 5.3 Farmland of S 6.1 Approval and	ted at this stage : Recommended with C DocumentType Proposal rehicle Areas Zones ks and Manufactured Home Estates bations and Use and Transport Land Bushfire Protection ion of Regional Strategies	Yes

	Planning, determine under section 56(2) of the EP&A Act that an amendment to the Kyogle Local Environmental Plan 2012 to remove the minimum lot size provisions from land adjacent to the Kyogle CBD should proceed subject to the following conditions:
	1. The planning proposal is to be amended, prior to community consultation, to include:
	 references to all the land zones affected by the proposal; a list all of the property addresses and title descriptions that are impacted by the proposal; maps of a suitable scale showing the current and proposed minimum lot size provisions for the land; and
	- an updated timeline.
	2. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ("the Act") as follows:
	(a) the Planning Proposal must be made publicly available for 14 days; and (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 local environmental plans (Planning and Environment, 2016)'.
	3. Consultation is required with the following public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the Act and/or to comply with the requirements of relevant S117 Directions:
	 NSW Rural Fire Service; and Office of Environment and Heritage
	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. 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.
	5. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 9 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.
	6. Section 117 Directions - It is recommended that:
	(a) The Secretary's delegate note that the inconsistency with Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection can not be unresolved until consultation with the NSW Rural Fire Service has occurred;
	(b)The Secretary's delegate can be satisfied that the Planning Proposal's inconsistency with Direction 2.1 Environment Protection Zones, 2.3 Heritage Conservation and 4.3 Flood Prone Land are justified in accordance with the terms of the Directions; and (c)The Secretary's delegate can be satisfied that the Planning Proposal is consistent with all other relevant s117 Directions; and
	7. The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with all relevant SEPPs.
Supporting Reasons :	The proposal is consistent with the Strategic Planning Framework. The recommended conditions to the Gateway are required to provide adequate consultation and accountability.

54

	ot Size Provisions over land adjacent to the Kyogle CBD in the acilitate medium density residential development
Signature:	D.
Printed Name:	Crang Diss Date: 5 December 2016