

Proposal Title :	Amendment to Cessnock	LEP 2011 - 12m building h	eight 'Cessnock Civic'	Vincent St
Proposal Summary :	The Planning Proposal aims to place a 12 metre maximum building height control on land zoned B7 Business Park at 'Cessnock Civic' site in Vincent Street, Cessnock.			
PP Number :	PP_2011_CESSN_006_00	Dop File No	11/18030	
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	04-Oct-2011	LGA covered :	Cessnock	
Region :	Hunter	RPA:	Cessnock Cit	ty Council
State Electorate :	CESSNOCK	Section of the Act	: 55 - Planning	Proposal
LEP Type :	Housekeeping	2		
Location Details				
Street : Vin	cent			17
Suburb :	Ci	ty : Cessnock	Postcode :	2325
	251 DP 606348, Lot 21 & 22 084 Land to be zoned B7 Bu		45986, Pt Lot 1 DP 1036	300, Lot 1-3 DP
DoP Planning Officer Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Susan Blake			
Contact Number :	0249042709			
Contact Email :	susan.blake@planning.nsv	v.gov.au		
RPA Contact Detail	ls			
Contact Name :	Bo Moshage			
Contact Number :	0249934100			
Contact Email :	council@cessnock.nsw.go	v.au		
DoP Project Manag	er Contact Details			
Contact Name :				
Contact Number :				
Contact Email :				
Land Release Data				Э.
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Nam	ne: N/A	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Lower Hunter Regional Strategy	Consistent with St	rategy ; Yes	

	ock LEP 2011 - 12m building		Vincent of
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 :	To date, all dealings with this PP ł There have been no meetings/con	-	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			+
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The Cessnock Civic Planning Prop commenced in 2004 and has had a and environmental issues on the s Planning Panel resulted in a numb limitation of the proposed busines the site and introduction of a build regarding the implications of post advice on the matter via email to t Council and the Department were height limitation post exhibition. V with the Executive Director Planni the issue of re-exhibition was one Panel) to consider, the introduction re-exhibition.	a lengthy history complicated site. Consideration of the fina- ber of post-exhibition amend is zone to the least environm ling height limitation. Due to -exhibition changes, Council he Regional Director on 4 Ju concerned about the implica Vith the assistance of Legal I ng Operations, the Departme for the relevant planning aut n of a height limitation may I	d due to mine subsidence al proposal by the Cessnock ments including the nentally sensitive portion of a level of ambiguity requested the Department's ly 2011. In particular tion of the introduction of a Branch and in consultation ent advised that, although thority (Council/ Planning be considered to warrant
α 5	Council has advised that re-exhibi re-assessment of the financial sup business identified for the site.		
	Upon reconsideration of the matte on 15 September 2011 - Report No proposal and introduce the height	PPEE50/2011, to proceed to	finalise the Cessnock Civic
	This Planning Proposal seeks to a zoned in the Cessnock Civic amen		
	The Regional Team appreciates the that relies upon the gazettal of a co unusual. However it is considered approach necessary.	omprehensive LEP and an ea	arlier planning proposal is
Notes :	This Planning Proposal seeks to a implemented in the Cessnock Civi Civic' planning proposal (PP_2010 publicly exhibited and was suppor 2011 for submission to the Departm	c amendment to the Cessnoo _CESS_003_00) referred to in ted by the Cessncok Plannin	ck LEP 2011. The 'Cessnock n this report has been ng Panel on 15 Septebmer

Adequacy Assessment

Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a)

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The statement of objectives satisfactorily outlines the intended outcome of the Planning Proposal (PP) ie. to amend the Cessnock LEP 2011, to enable a 12 metre building height limit over lands proposed to be zoned B7 Business Park in 'Cessnock Civic' Vincent Street, Cessnock.

Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

This PP will be an amendment to the Cessnock LEP 2011. The PP will amend the Height of Buildings Map to show the subject land zoned B7 Business Park being Lot 251 DP 606348, Lot 21 & 22 DP 845986, Pt Lot 23 DP 845986, Pt Lot 1 DP 1036300, Lot 1-3 DP 608084 with a 12 metre maximum building height.

This LEP amendment aims to resolve concerns raised in submissions received from a prior PP that rezoned the Cessnock Civic area - PP_2010_CESSN_003_00. Council has determined that a control of the building height requires a separate PP to amend the outcomes of the original Cessnock Civic PP.

Submissions received during exhibition of the Cessnock Civic PP, raised concerns regarding the impact of the potential future development on the adjoining residential amenity. Although a Development Control Plan will assist with protecting the residential amenity of surrounding land, the Cessnock Planning Panel resolved that a 12 metre maximum building height over the B7 zoned land would assist to limit the visual scale of development and reduce impacts on the amenity and adjoining streetscape.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones6.3 Site Specific Provisions

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

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

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

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 :

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

Council has provided a locality plan and a building height map identifying the site, zone and controls for the land.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

The proposal is a relatively minor matter being a 'low impact' proposal, as indicated in

the Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning 2009). The Regional Team recommends a 14 day public exhibition period.

Additional Director General's requirements

Are there any additional Director General's requirements? Yes

If Yes, reasons : The PP is consistent with s117 Directions except 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones and 6.3 Site Specific Provisions, which are addressed below. In assessing this PP consideration has been given to s117 Direction 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land and 4.3 Flood Prone Land. The prior PP that rezoned the Cessnock Civic area - PP_2010_CESSN_003_00 addressed these matters. This PP only seeks to amend a building height standard, and mine subsidence and flooding would be subject to further assessment as part of the future development application on the site. **Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones** The Council identified that the PP is consistent with this Direction, however the PP could be considered inconsistent to a minor extent. In accordance with cl. 4(c) a PP must not reduce the total potential floor space area for employment uses and related public services in business zones. The introduction of a height limit may be considered a limit on the floor space. Council has identified that the site requires a 12 metre maximum building height to limit the visual scale of development and reduce impacts on the amenity and adjoining streetscape. The proposed building height is consistent with the adjoining Cessnock CBD building height limit of 12 metres which is included in draft Cessnock LEP 2011. No taller building heights have been identified in the draft Cessnock LEP 2011. Consequently, the Director-General (DG) or his delegate may agree under cl.5(d) of this Direction that the provisions of the PP that are inconsistent are of minor significance. **Direction 6.3 Site Specific Provisions** The Council identified that the PP is consistent with this Direction, however the PP could be considered inconsistent to a minor extent. In accordance with cl.4(c) a PP that will amend another environmental planning instrument in order to allow a particular development proposal to be carried out must allow the land use on the relevant land without imposing and development standards or requirements in addition to those already contained in the principal environmental planing instrument being amended. As this amendment will alter Cessnock LEP 2011, the PP proposes to impose a maximum building height control via the Building Height Map over the B7 zone within the Cessnock Civic site. It is a new control for this site, but consistent with controls for other business areas. As indicated above, this measure has been proposed to provide resolution of resident and public concerns over the proposed future development of the subject land. Consequently, the Director-General (DG), or his delegate, may agree under cl. 6 of this Direction that the provisions of the PP that are inconsistent are of minor significance. Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : Sufficient information has been provided to assess the proposal in preparation of the gateway determination. The Gateway should determine that references to the Cessnock LEP 1989 be removed prior to exhibition to limit confusion, as this PP will be an amendment to Cessnock LEP 2011.

Page 4 of 7

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date : October 2011

Comments in relation	The Principal Plan known as Cessnock LEP 2011 is reaching the final processes to be made.
to Principal LEP :	This PP aims to amend the Building Height Map in the proposed B7 Business Park zone on the subject land. The zone and building height limits and associated maps are elements of the Principal Plan and are not in Cessnock LEP 1989. Consequently, due to the publication time-frame of Cessnock LEP 2011, this PP will be an amendment to the Principal LEP, not Cessnock LEP 1989.
Assessment Criteria	a
Need for planning proposal :	Cessnock City Council has identified the subject land as B7 Business Park to meet the future employment and business needs of Cessnock and surrounding regions.
	As indicated previously, this PP aims to resolve concerns raised in submissions received from a prior PP that rezoned the Cessnock Civic area - PP_2010_CESSN_003_00.
ся П	Submissions received during exhibition of the Cessnock Civic PP raised concerns regarding the impact of the potential future development on their residential amenity. Although a Development Control Plan will assist with protecting the residential amenity of surrounding land, the Cessnock Planning Panel resolved that a 12 metre maximum building height over the B7 zoned land would assist to limit the visual scale of development and reduce impacts on the amenity and adjoining streetscape. This building height limit is also consistent with other business zones in Cessnock.
Consistency with	Lower Hunter Regional Strategy
strategic planning framework :	The Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 2006 identifies the Cessnock City Centre as a major regional centre. The subject land of this PP is too small to identify individually within the strategy. However, the development of the Cessnock Civic site seeks to increase economic activity and employment in the Cessnock centre which are consistent with the aims and objectives of the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy.
	Council's Community Strategic Plan - Our People, Our Place, Focus on Our Future The PP assists with implementation of: Objective 2.1 - Diversifying Local Business options; and
	Objective 2.2 - Achieving More Sustainable Employment Opportunities.
	Cessnock City Wide Settlement Strategy The development of the Cessnock Civic area is identified as an action in the Cessnock City Wide Settlement Strategy.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The PP aims to appropriately resolve concerns from the public regarding the proposed development intensity on the land and impact on the amenity of the surrounding locality.
	The limit on building height is likely to have some economic impact as it provides a constraint on development. However, given that the site is limited to some extent by mine subsidence, a constrained building height already exists. It is not considered that this PP places an unreasonable economic impact on the site.

ssessment Proce	SS				
Proposal type :	Minor		Community Consultation	14 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 Month		Delegation :	DDG	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :					
		×			
Is Public Hearing by th	e PAC required?	Νο			
(2)(a) Should the matte	er proceed ?	Yes		*	
f no, provide reasons :	:				
Resubmission - s56(2)	(b) : No				
f Yes, reasons :	(0) - 110				
dentify any additional	studies. if required.				
f Other, provide reaso	ns :				
Identify any internal co	nsultations, if required	1:			
		1:			
No internal consultation	on required		to this plan? No		
No internal consultations in the provision and fur	on required		to this plan? No		
No internal consultations in ternal consultations in the provision and fur lif Yes, reasons :	on required		to this plan? No		
No internal consultations in the provision and fur if Yes, reasons :	on required		to this plan? No	me	ls Public
Identify any internal co No internal consultation Is the provision and fur If Yes, reasons : Cuments Document File Name Planning_Proposal_B	on required nding of state infrastru uilding_Height_			me	Is Public Yes
No internal consultations in ternal consultations in the provision and fur if Yes, reasons :	on required nding of state infrastru uilding_Height_ Civic.pdf		DocumentType Na		
No internal consultations in ternal consultations in the provision and fur of the provision and	on required nding of state infrastru uilding_Height_ Civic.pdf ept_2011.pdf		DocumentType Na Proposal		Yes
No internal consultations in the provision and fur if Yes, reasons : 	on required nding of state infrastru uilding_Height_ Civic.pdf ept_2011.pdf	cture relevant	DocumentType Na Proposal	g Letter	Yes
No internal consultations in the provision and fur If Yes, reasons : 	on required Inding of state infrastru uilding_Height_ Civic.pdf ept_2011.pdf Immendation ning proposal support 1.1 Business and	cture relevant	DocumentType Na Proposal Proposal Covering	g Letter	Yes
No internal consultations in the provision and fur lif Yes, reasons :	on required Inding of state infrastru uilding_Height_ Civic.pdf ept_2011.pdf Immendation ning proposal support 1.1 Business and 6.3 Site Specific	ed at this stage Industrial Zo Provisions	DocumentType Na Proposal Proposal Covering	g Letter ditions	Yes Yes
No internal consultations in the provision and fur If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Planning_Proposal_B Controls_Cessnock_C Council_Letter_ 23_Se	on required Inding of state infrastru uilding_Height_ Civic.pdf ept_2011.pdf Immendation ning proposal support 1.1 Business and 6.3 Site Specific The Planning Pro 1. References to	ed at this stage d Industrial Zo Provisions oposal should Cessnock Loc al prior to put	DocumentType Na Proposal Proposal Covering e : Recommended with Cond nes proceed subject to the follo cal Environmental Plan 1989 plic exhibition, to limit confu	g Letter ditions wing conditions:	Yes Yes

(a) the planning proposal is classified as low impact as described in a Guide to Preparing

Amendment to Cessno	ock LEP 2011 - 12m building height 'Cessnock Civic' Vincent St
	LEPs (Department of Planning 2009) and must be 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 and materials that must be made publicly available along with planning proposals as identified in section 4.5 of A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning 2009).
	3. No consultation is required with public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the EP&A Act.
	4. The time frame for completing the LEP is 6 months from the week following the date of the Gateway Determination.
	5. The DG (or delegate) agrees to the inconsistencies with section 117 Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones and 6.3 Site Specific Provisions, as the inconsistencies are of minor significance.
Supporting Reasons :	This LEP amendment aims to resolve concerns raised in submissions received from a prior PP that rezoned the Cessnock Civic area - PP_2010_CESSN_003_00.
	This PP is an amendment to Cessnock LEP 2011, therefore reference to the present LEP is to be removed.
	\bigcap
Signature:	ground an
Printed Name:	Monica Gibson Date: 24 October 2011