**Manly LEP 2013 Planning Proposal – Amendment 3**

**Part 1 – Objectives of the planning proposal**

**A.** The first objective of the planning proposal is to resolve a deferred matter in the Manly LEP 2013. The deferred matter is at the site known locally as ‘Royal Far West’ (RFW). By resolving the deferred matter, the development standards of the exhibited Draft Manly LEP 2011 will apply to the land.

**B.** The second objective of the planning proposal is to amend a mapping error in the Manly LEP 2013 Floor Space Ratio (FSR) map at the site known as ‘Whistler Street Car Park and Library’. By correcting this error, suitable FSR development standards will apply to the land.

**C.** The third objective of the planning proposal is to amend a mapping error in the Manly LEP 2013 Land Zoning Map (LZN) to correct the foreshore zoning boundaries of Lots 39 to 42 DP 11241 (aka 85 - 91 Gurney Crescent) such that the Zone RE1 Public Recreation is omitted from these privately owned properties. All the land at 85-91 Gurney Crescent should be Zone E3 – Environmental Management.

**D.** The fourth objective of the planning proposal seeks to reinstate land classified as ‘Class 2’ omitted from Manly LEP 2013 Acid Sulfate Soil Map. ‘Class 2’ was originally included in the exhibition mapping of the Draft Manly LEP 2011. There is no reason for its omitted status.

**E.** The fifth objective of the planning proposal seeks to amend a heritage item number to the Manly LEP 2013 Heritage Map (HER) to ensure correct heritage identification, as listed in Schedule 5 of the LEP.

**F.** The sixth objective of the planning proposal seeks to amend a wording error at clause 4.6 (8) (cb) of the Manly LEP 2013 to reflect the intent of the exhibited Draft Manly LEP 2011.

**Part 2 – Explanation of provisions**

The proposed outcomes will be achieved by:

**A.** Amending the Manly LEP 2013 deferred site known as ‘Royal Far West’ to incorporate the exhibited Draft Manly LEP 2011 mapped development standards. These standards include:

1. Amending the Manly LEP 2013 Land Zoning Map for the RFW site from ‘DM – Deferred Matter’ to ‘Zone B2 – Local Centre’ as exhibited in the Draft Manly LEP 2011.
2. Amending the Manly LEP 2013 Height of Building Map for the RFW site from ‘DM – Deferred Matter’ to various height controls that are detailed in Part 4 of the planning proposal, as exhibited in the Draft Manly LEP 2011.
3. Amending the Manly LEP 2013 Floor Space Ratio Map for the RFW site from ‘DM – Deferred Matter’ to ‘V – 3.00’ and ‘U – 2.5’ at Lots identified in Part 4 of the planning proposal, as exhibited in the Draft Manly LEP 2011.

**B.** Amending the Manly LEP 2013 Floor Space Ratio Map at the site known as ‘Whistler Street Car Park and Library’ to show the FSR of ‘V – 3.00’. The site currently does not have an FSR control. The site is detailed in Part 4 of the planning proposal.

**C.** Amending the Manly LEP 2013 Land Zoning Map at foreshore land of 85-91 Gurney Crescent from Zone RE1 – Public Recreation to Zone E3 – Environmental Living

**D.** Amending the Manly LEP 2013 Acid Sulphate Soil Map by showing the ‘Class 2’ Acid Sulphates

**E.** Amending the Manly LEP 2013 Heritage map Grid 005 of Heritage item number I131 to I254 as this is the correct heritage number (map Grid 003 shows the correct item number I254)

**F.** Amending the wording of Manly LEP 2013 Clause 4.6 (8) (cb) from ‘*a development standard on land to which Part 6 applies*’ to ‘*development standard on land to which clause 6.19 applies’*.

**Part 3 – Justification**

These following sections address questions set out in Section 2.3(a) of *A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals* in meeting the objectives of the planning proposals.

**A. Resolution of Deferred Matter at ‘Royal Far West’ site.**

**Section A – Need for the planning proposal**

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

The site was subject to a Part 3A assessment – *Concept Plan Application for Mixed use Development at 14-22 Wentworth Street and 16 and 19-21 South Steyne, Manly (MP10\_0159)’*. As such, Council and the Department of Planning and Infrastructure decided to defer the matter in the Manly LEP 2013 until the Planning Assessment Commission had made a recommendation on the site in regards to the ‘Concept Plan’.

The Planning Assessment Commission made a recommendation for determination under Ministerial delegation on 18 April 2013.

As the PAC decision relates to a development proposal (i.e. the Concept Plan), Council now seeks to adopt the exhibited Draft Manly LEP 2011 development standards, as resolved at its Ordinary Meeting in 16 July 2012. This will allow Council to accordingly assess any future development proposals for the site.

Any development proposal submitted that relates to the ‘Concept Plan’ will be subject to the conditions imposed by the PAC, with those conditions superseding LEP development standards for that development proposal only.

Any other development proposals not related to the ‘Concept Plan’ will be subject to the development standards of the LEP.

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

Yes. The site is one of four (4) deferred matters in the Manly LEP 2013. As such, the planning proposal is the best means of applying development standards under the Manly LEP 2013.

**Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework**

**3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?**

Yes. The proposal will remove the deferred status of the subject site and allow the exhibited land use and development standards of the Draft Manly LEP 2011 to be applied to the site. This will better allow the LGA in meeting employment and housing targets proposed by current regional and sub-regional strategies (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies) in the Manly CBD.

**4. Is the planning proposal consistent with Council’s local strategy or other local strategic plan?**

Yes. The planning proposal seeks to reinstate the development standards already exhibited in the Draft Manly LEP 2011 between 30 April 2012 to 29 June 2012. The development standards of the planning proposal were considered consistent with Council’s strategies when the Draft Manly LEP 2011 was submitted to the Department (Section 68 submission).

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

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2011. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

**6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?**

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2011. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

**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**

No. The site is within an established suburban area and does not currently support any natural vegetation. No critical habitat, threatened species, populations, ecological communities or their habitats will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal.

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

No. The site is not affected by natural hazards such as land slip, flooding or bushfire hazard.

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

Yes.

During the exhibition of the Draft Manly LEP 2011, only three submissions were received that related to the site. In light of submissions made, Council resolved at its Ordinary Meeting on 16 July 2012 to not amend exhibited development standards in the Draft LEP that related to the site. Council proceeded to adopt the exhibited development standards for the site, together with the rest of the Draft Manly LEP 2011.

In this respect, the planning proposal which contains the already exhibited development standards is considered to have adequately addressed any social and economic effects.

**Section D - State and Commonwealth interests**

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

The site has convenient access to public transport. Bus and ferry services are located in close proximity to the site.

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

Relevant public authorities were consulted as part of the exhibition of the Draft Manly LEP 2011. Council met all consultation requirements with State and Commonwealth public authorities leading to the Section 68 submission.

**B. Mapping error at ‘Whistler Street Car Park and Library’**

**Section A – Need for the planning proposal**

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

No. There is no strategic study or report associated with the intended floor space ratio.

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

Yes. The Planning Proposal is the best means of achieving the intended outcome of applying floor space ratio development standards to the site.

**Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework**

**3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?**

Yes. The proposal seeks to apply relevant and suitable FSR development standards to the site allowing all of the central CBD location to be quantified in development standard terms and quantifiable in regional or sub-regional strategies.

**4. Is the planning proposal consistent with Council’s local strategy or other local strategic plan?**

Yes.

It has always been the intention of Council to map a Floor Space Ratio and Height of Buildings on the site. Both these standards were originally detailed in Council’s Manly DCP for the Business Zone 1989 (Business Zone DCP)– on pages 10 and 15. This refers to the Manly Town Centre (which the site falls within) to contain an FSR of ‘3.1’ and HOB of ’15 metres’

During the process of conversion of the Manly LEP 1988 to the standard instrument LEP, Council decided to retain FSR and HOB standards found in its DCPs and incorporate them into the new standard instrument LEP mapping requirements for FSR and HOB. This was successful across all sites, with the FSR and HOB maps successfully forming part of the Manly LEP 2013.

The HOB control was successfully mapped on to the site from the Business Zone DCP. However, the FSR standard for the site was omitted in error. The error was not originally detected due to the site being split between map grids 003 and 005 of the Draft Manly LEP 2011 and Manly LEP 2013 FSR maps.

Council now seeks to correct the mapping error. This is to ensure that the intention of Council to incorporate the FSR and HOB controls from its Business Zone DCP is fair and consistent across the Manly Town Centre and the rest of the Manly Local Government Area.

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

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2012. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

**6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?**

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2012. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

**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**

No. The site is within an established suburban area and does not currently support any natural vegetation. No critical habitat, threatened species, populations, ecological communities or their habitats will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal.

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

No. The site is not affected by natural hazards such as land slip, flooding or bushfire hazard.

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

Yes. Social and economic effects are minimal due to the transfer of established and existing controls from the Manly DCP for the Business Zone 1989 (pages 10 and 15) to the Manly LEP 2013 – a requirement of the standard instrument.

**Section D - State and Commonwealth interests**

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

Yes. The site itself is currently occupied by a public car park and library. The site has convenient access to public transport. Bus services are located in close proximity to the site.

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

It is not anticipated State and Commonwealth public authorities will need to be consulted in a Gateway determination due to the nature of such a small scale planning proposal and the presence of existing FSR controls to be transferred from the DCP to the Standard Instrument LEP.

**C. Mapping error at the foreshore of 85-91 Gurney Crescent**

**Section A – Need for the planning proposal**

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

No. There is no strategic study or report associated with the intended outcome of the planning proposal.

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

Yes. The Planning Proposal is the best means of achieving the intended outcome of applying correct land zoning to the sites by amending the relevant LEP land zoning map.

**Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework**

**3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?**

Yes.Zone RE1 Public recreation should not apply to privately owned properties. Council has no intention of purchasing the land. No strategy details Council ownership and the zoning is made in error. All land at 85-91 Gurney Crescent should be Zone E3 – Environmental Management. It would not be a viable use of public recreation open space as described in applicable regional and sub-regional strategies Therefore correcting this zoning will ensure consistency with applicable strategies.

**4. Is the planning proposal consistent with Council’s local strategy or other local strategic plan?**

Yes. This proposed amendment is to correct the foreshore zoning boundaries of 85-91 Gurney Crescent. Zone RE1 Public recreation should not apply to privately owned properties. All land at 85-91 Gurney Crescent should be Zone E3 – Environmental Management. Therefore correcting this zoning will ensure the local strategy is fair, enforceable and legally valid.

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

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2011. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

**6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?**

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2011. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

This planning proposal ensures further consistency with the standard instrument.

**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**

No critical habitat, threatened species, populations, ecological communities or their habitats will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal.

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

No. The site is not affected by natural hazards such as land slip, flooding or bushfire hazard.

The site is identified as a foreshore area in the Manly LEP 2013 Foreshore Building Line Map. As such, any development on the land will be subject to clause 6.10 ‘Limited development on foreshore area’ of the LEP. The planning proposal does not affect this mapping, clause, or remove any environmental protections.

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

This proposed amendment is to correct the foreshore zoning boundaries of 85-91 Gurney Crescent. Zone RE1 Public recreation should not apply to privately owned properties. All land at 85-91 Gurney Crescent should be Zone E3 – Environmental Management.

Council does not seek to own the land zoned as RE1 Public recreation on this site. Therefore correcting this error will ensure consistency with Council’s social and economic commitments in regards to the land, and enable the land to be correctly zoned E3 consistent, which is the primary zoning of each privately owned lot.

**Section D - State and Commonwealth interests**

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

Adequate public infrastructure is not relevant for this planning proposal. The proposal removes community expectation of the use of the land as RE1 and therefore community open space. Council does not own the land nor has any intention of owning the land and is an administrative zoning error only.

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

It is not anticipated State and Commonwealth public authorities will need to be consulted in a Gateway determination due to the nature of such a small scale planning proposal.

**D. Mapping error – amendment to Acid Sulfate Soils map.**

**Section A – Need for the planning proposal**

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

No.

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

Yes. Acid Sulphate Soils were mapped as part of the exhibited Draft Manly LEP 2011. The planning proposal seeks to amend the error of the omission from the Manly LEP 2013.

**Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework**

**3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?**

Yes. Accurate mapping of Acid Sulfate Soils are an essential requirement ensuring development does not cause environmental damage. As such, the proposal is consistent with regional/sub-regional strategies in protecting the environmental impacts of development on land and mitigating this through applying clause 6.1 of the Manly LEP 2013 to correctly identified land.

**4. Is the planning proposal consistent with Council’s local strategy or other local strategic plan?**

Yes. The planning proposal seeks to reinstate the Acid Sulphate Soils already exhibited in the Draft Manly LEP 2011. The Acid Sulphate Soils of the planning proposal were considered consistent with Council’s strategies when the Draft Manly LEP 2011 was submitted to the Department (Section 68 submission).

This proposed amendment reinstates land classified as ‘Class 2’ omitted from Manly LEP 2013 Combined Map 1 Acid Sulphate Soils and Land Slide Risk Map (CL1). The ‘Class 2’ land was correctly exhibited in the Draft Manly LEP 2011. The display of ‘Class 2’ land is a requirement of the standard instrument LEP.

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

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2011. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

**6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?**

Council received its Section 65 Certificate to exhibit its draft comprehensive standard instrument LEP – the ‘Draft Manly LEP 2011’ – on 19 April 2011. The certificate issued from the Department ensured the Draft LEP was consistent with SEPPs, 117 Directions and the Department’s drafting guidelines required for the exhibition of the standard instrument LEP.

**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**

No. The presence of Class 2 Acid Sulphate Soils has already been recognised and accurately represented by Manly Council in the Manly LEP 1988 Amendment 32 (gazetted 10 March 2000), and the exhibited Draft LEP 2011, and Section 68 submission. It is unclear why this mapping of the Class 2 layer did not appear in the Manly LEP 2013.

Including this layer will improve management of the environment. If the LEP is not amended to reflect this fact, clause 6.1 ‘Acid Sulfate soils’ of Manly LEP 2013 cannot be legally applied to the land which is known to contain it.

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

No.

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

Social and economic effects are not relevant for this part of the planning proposal.

**Section D - State and Commonwealth interests**

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

Adequate public infrastructure is not relevant for this part of the planning proposal.

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

Relevant public authorities were consulted as part of the exhibition of the Draft Manly LEP 2011. Council met all consultation requirements with State and Commonwealth public authorities leading to the Section 68 submission.

**Minor Mapping and Administration Errors**

**E. Mapping error – amendment to Heritage Map**

**Justification.**

The proposed amendment aims to correct an incorrect item number on Grid 005 of the Manly LEP 2013 Heritage Map. The land labelled I131 in Grid 005 is incorrectly labelled. It should be I254. Grid 003 correctly identifies this as I254. The correct labelling of heritage items is a requirement of the standard instrument LEP.

**F. Wording error – amendment to Clause 4.6 (8) (cb)**

**Justification**

This has been worded incorrectly. It does not reflect the intentions of the exhibited Draft Manly LEP 2011 and Council’s resolution to adopt the Draft LEP. In the exhibited Draft LEP the clause read ‘*a development standard on to which Part 7 applies’* of the LEP, where Part 7 were the development standards for St Patricks Estate.

During the final drafting stages by Parliamentary Counsel, Part 7 was incorporated into Part 6 of the LEP, forming Clause 6.19 ‘Development in St Patrick’s Estate.’ Therefore the current Clause 4.6 (8) (cb) is incorrect and should not apply to the whole of Part 6 of the LEP. It should only apply to 6.19 ‘Development in St Patrick’s Estate’.

Therefore, Clause 4.6 (8) (cb) should be reworded to state ‘*a development standard on to which Clause 6.19 applies’* to reflect the above intentions of the Draft LEP.

**Part 4 – Mapping**

There are a total of ten (10) maps in regards to both objectives of this planning proposal.

**A. Resolution of Deferred Matter at ‘Royal Far West’ site.**

Please see the 6 (six) attached maps –

* Three ‘Current’ Land Use Zoning, Floor Space Ratio and Height of Building, and
* Three ‘Proposed’ Land Use Zoning, Floor Space Ratio and Height of Building.

**B. Mapping error at ‘Whistler Street Car Park and Library’**

Please see the two (2) attached maps -

* ‘Current’ Floor Space Ratio map, and
* ‘Proposed’ Floor Space Ratio map

**C. Mapping error at the foreshore of 85-91 Gurney Crescent**

Please see the two (2) attached maps

* ‘Current’ Land Use Zoning Map at 85-91 Gurney Crescent
* ‘Proposed’ Land Use Zoning Map at 85-91 Gurney Crescent

**D. Mapping error – amendment to Acid Sulfate Soils map**

The correct mapping is already with the Department of Planning and Environment (then Department of Planning and Infrastructure) ready to be uploaded to the NSW Legislation website.

**Part 5 – Community Consultation**

**Objective A Resolution of Deferred Matter at ‘Royal Far West’ site, and**

**Objective D Mapping error – amendment to Acid Sulfate Soils map.**

The proposed development standards were exhibited in line with statutory exhibition requirements for a new comprehensive LEP. The exhibition took place between 30 April 2012 and 29 June 2012, with State Agencies/Bodies notified of the exhibition. Submissions were considered post exhibition with Council resolving to make the Draft LEP at its Ordinary Meeting 16 July 2012.

As the development standards have already been exhibited, with submissions received and considered by Council at its Ordinary Meeting on 16 July 2012, and the successful publication of the Manly LEP 2013, it is considered that the Planning Proposal has already met the community consultation requirements.

**Objective B Mapping error at ‘Whistler Street Car Park and Library’, and**

**Objective C Mapping error at the foreshore of 85-91 Gurney Crescent.**

Objective B – It is not anticipated extensive consultation will be required in the Gateway determination due to the nature of such a small scale planning proposal and the transfer of existing DCP controls to the standard instrument LEP.

The Whistler Street Car Park and Library was an error of omission by Council from Draft Manly LEP 2011 and Manly LEP 2013 FSR Map

It has always been the intention of Council to apply both FSR and HOB to the site. This is consistent with the immediate site area and Business Zone DCP which was applicable to the site from 1989 to 2013. Therefore Council requests that the previous Manly DCP for the Business Zone 1989 FSR is reinstated on the site.

Objective C - It is not anticipated extensive consultation will be required in the Gateway determination due to the nature of such a small scale planning proposal.

**Objective E Mapping error – amendment to Heritage Map, and**

**Objective F Wording error – amendment to Clause 4.6 (8) (cb)**

Council considers these to be minor errors. Council considers community consultations of these amendments are not required for the sites due to the nature of the minor drafting errors.

**Part 6 – Project timeline**

**The proposed timeline for completion of the planning proposal is as follows:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Plan Making Step** | **Estimated Completion** |
| Anticipated commencement date (date of Gateway determination) | June 2014. |
| Anticipated timeframe for the completion of required technical information | None anticipated – already completed for Draft Manly LEP 2011 |
| Timeframe for government agency consultation (pre and post exhibition as required by Gateway determination) | None anticipated – already completed during Draft Manly LEP 2011 exhibition. |
| Public exhibition period | None anticipated – already completed during Draft Manly LEP 2011 exhibition |
| Timeframe for consideration of submissions | None anticipated – already completed post exhibition of the Draft Manly LEP 2011 |
| Date of submission to the department to finalise the LEP | July 2014. |
| Anticipated date RPA (Manly Council) will make the plan (if delegated) | July 2014. |
| Anticipated date RPA (Manly Council) will forward to the department for notification | July 2014. |