

Planning & Environment

Amendment to Maitland LEP 2011S - 73A to correct minor error in heritage schedule					
Proposal Title :	Amendment to Maitland LEP 2	2011S - 73A to correct minor	r error in heritage schedule		
Proposal Summary	Maitland City Council seeks to correct an error in Schedule 5 - environmental heritage of the Maitland LEP 2011. Heritage item number 1206A at 67–69 Swan Street Morpeth is incorrectly described as having a SP instead of a DP in the property description.				
	Council has requested the pla	an be amended under sectio	n 73A of the EP&A Act 1979.		
PP Number :	PP_2014_MAITL_002_00	Dop File No :	14/17077		
roposal Details		-	the first of the second se		
Date Planning Proposal Received	09-Oct-2014	LGA covered :	Maitland		
Region :	Hunter	RPA :	Maitland City Council		
State Electorate :	MAITLAND	Section of the Act :	73A - Minor Matter		
LEP Type :	73A				
Location Details					
Street : S	wan Street				
Suburb : M	lorpeth City :		Postcode : 2321		
Land Parcel : L	ot 1, DP 72883				
DoP Planning Of	ficer Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Dylan Meade				
Contact Number :	0249042718				
Contact Email :	dylan.meade@planning.nsw.go	ov.au			
<b>RPA Contact Det</b>	ails				
Contact Name :	Josh Ford				
Contact Number :	0249349728				
Contact Email :	joshf@maitland.nsw.gov.au				
DoP Project Man	ager Contact Details				
Contact Name :					
Contact Number :					
Contact Email :					
Land Release Da	ta				
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :			
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with Strateg	<b>у</b> :		

# Amendment to Maitland LEP 2011S - 73A to correct minor error in heritage schedule MDP Number : Date of Release : Area of Release Type of Release (eg (Ha): Residential / Employment land) : No. of Lots : 0 No. of Dwellings 0 (where relevant) : Gross Floor Area: n No of Jobs Created : Λ The NSW Government Yes Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with : If No, comment : Have there been No meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? If Yes, comment : Supporting notes Internal Supporting BACKGROUND: Notes : The error was introduced during the legal drafting stage of an LEP (Amendment 6 to the Maitland LEP 2011) made in June 2013. USE OF S73A: Council indicates the matter should be progressed under s73A as it considers the change to be a minor and transitional matter (s73A(2)). This assessment is supported. As the incorrect property description of an heritage item solely relates to a legal drafting error, it is considered that s73A is the appropriate mechanism for correcting this mistake. **PLAN-MAKING DELEGATION** Council has accepted plan-making delegation for PPs generally. However it has not requested delegations for this amendment as it will be progressed as a combined amendment (Amendment 15) with PP\_2013\_MAITL\_002 which does not have delegation. Council's request not to be given plan-making delegation is supported. External Supporting Notes : Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided?  $\ensuremath{\textbf{Yes}}$ 

Comment :

The original planning proposal (relating to Amendment 6) has been provided and clearly specifies the desired property description. This, coupled with additional information provided by Council is considered sufficient for explaining what Council seeks to achieve with this amendment.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

As with the Statement of Objectives, the information provided by Council clearly explains the provisions which are to be changed. The property description of item 1206A will be

## Amendment to Maitland LEP 2011S - 73A to correct minor error in heritage schedule

changed to from 'Lot 1, SP 72883' to 'Lot 1, DP 72883'. This will be achieved through Amendment 15 to Maitland LEP 2011.

## Justification - s55 (2)(c)

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

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

\* 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?

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? No

Comment :

The proposal seeks to rectify a wording error. Mapping is not required.

#### Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? No

Comment : Council proposes the change occur as part of a 73A amendment and so no community consultation is proposed. This is supported.

#### **Additional Director General's requirements**

Are there any additional Director General's requirements?

If Yes, reasons :

### Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? No

If No, comment : While technically not complying with the Agency's "Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals", the information provided by Council is considered sufficient for the adminstrative change sought.

The change is to correct a minor wording error introduced during the LEP drafting process. As a result, the preparation of new PP documentation detailing consistency with s117 directions, SEPPs, and other required information outlined in the guide is not necessary.

#### Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation to Principal LEP :

The principal Maitland LEP was gazetted in 2011.

# Amendment to Maitland LEP 2011S - 73A to correct minor error in heritage schedule

## **Assessment Criteria**

Need for planning proposal :	The need for the proposal is to correct a wording error of an heritage item.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	These matters were considered by Council and the Department when it considered Amendment 6 to Maitland LEP 2011.

Environmental social<br/>economic impacts :These matters were considered by Council and the Department when it<br/>considered Amendment 6 to Maitland LEP 2011.

#### **Assessment Process**

No internal consultation					
Identify any internal co					
If Other, provide reasor					
If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional s	studies, if required. :				
Resubmission - s56(2)	(b) : <b>No</b>				
If no, provide reasons :		*			
(2)(a) Should the matte	r proceed ?	Yes			
Is Public Hearing by the	e PAC required?	No			
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :		x			
Timeframe to make LEP :	3 months	×	Delegation :	DG	
Proposal type :	Minor	×	Period :		

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions

Amendment to Maitland LEP 2011S - 73A to correct minor error in heritage schedule				
S.117 directions:				
Additional Information :	This planning proposal should proceed subject to the following conditions: 1. This is a minor matter that can be dealt with under section 73A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ("EP&A Act").			
	2. No community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the EP&A Act.			
	3. No consultation is required with public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the EP&A Act.			
	4. No public hearing is required to be held into the matter under section 56(2)(e) of the EP&A Act.			
	5. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 3 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.			
Supporting Reasons :	It is proposed to amend a property description of a heritage item. This proposal is supported as it correct a minor wording error to introduced through a previous amendment (Amendment 6).			
Signature:	Olal			
Printed Name:	KOFLAMERTY Date: 9/10/14			