

Planning Team Report

MOONEY MOONEY and PEAT ISLAND Amend Gosford LEP 2014 to rezone surplus government land from SP2 Hospital, SP2 Educational Establishment and RE1 Recreation to R1 Low Density Residential etc. (Yield projection at lodgement : 268 dwellings and 93 tourist units)

Proposal Title :	land from SP2 Hospital, SP2 Educational Establishment and RE1 Recreation to R1 Low Density Residential etc. (Yield projection at lodgement : 268 dwellings and 93 tourist units)				
Proposal Summary :					
	The proposal seeks to allow residential development, community facilities, a neighbourhood retail centre, recreation, a marina, relocation of existing emergency services facilities and addition of land to Popran National Park.				
PP Number :	PP_2017_CCOAS_006_00	Dop File No :	17/06254		
Proposal Details			dink helicinis		
Date Planning Proposal Received :	15-Jun-2017	LGA covered :	Central Coast		
Region :	Hunter	RPA :	Central Coast Council		
State Electorate :	GOSFORD	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal		
LEP Type :	Precinct				
Location Details					
Street :					
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :		
Land Parcel : Various lots on eastern and western sides of M1 motorway at Mooney Mooney including Peat Island					
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Garry Hopkins				
Contact Number :	0243454402				

Contact Email : garry.hopkins@planning.nsw.gov.au

RPA Contact Details

Contact Name :	Robert Drew
Contact Number :	0243258344
Contact Email :	robert.drew@centralcoast.nsw.gov.au
DoP Project Mana	ger Contact Details

Contact Name :

Contact Number :

Contact Email :

Land Release Data

Gro	owth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
	gional / Sub gional Strategy :	Central Coast Regional Plan 2036	Consistent with Strategy :	No
MD	P Number :		Date of Release :	
Are :	ea of Release (Ha)		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Both
No.	. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	268
Gro	oss Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	158

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 Notes : The site is surplus government land formerly used for health facilities and a school. The land is zoned to support the former institutional uses at the site.

A previous version of this planning proposal was submitted by Gosford City Council in 2015. A Gateway determination was not issued for the earlier proposal (see PP_2015_GOSFO_001 on the Department's LEP Tracking system). The Department wrote to Council and the proponent Property NSW (PNSW) in September 2015 advising of additional information that was required before the proposal could be further considered for Gateway determination.

The information requested included improved strategic justification, consideration of alternative options including potential recreational uses, and justification for the applicant's preferred approach given site constraints and community feedback from earlier consultation.

A revised proposal was submitted by Central Coast Council in May 2017. The proposal differs from the original proposal in a number of ways including: - changes to proposed future zonings notably the zoning of Peat Island (changed from R1 to SP3);

- removal of residential from steeper vegetated land (now proposed as E1 and RE1);
- lowering of maximum height in the residential zones (from 17 metres to 12 metres);
- lowering of the expected residential yield (from circa 450 to 268 dwellings);
- increase in the amount of land proposed for publicly accessible open space and to be dedicated for conservation (total 4.6 ha to total 21.3 ha);
- increased public foreshore access; and
- restriction of vehicular access to Peat Island.

	The revised planning proposal draws on a number of supporting studies prepared for PNSW. One of the supporting studies ('B Urban Design Report') describes the process undertaken to inform the scale and type of development proposed in the revised planning proposal. A combined site constraint map led to a proposed development footprint. A series of options were investigated for different areas with the preferred options being brought together into a consolidated concept plan. The concept plan, which has also taken into account agency, council and community feedback, is shown on page 2 of the planning proposal.
	While additional agency and community feedback is required through the planning proposal process, which may also lead to further refinement of the proposal, the concept plan and the process taken to develop it are considered sufficient to support a Gateway determination to proceed.
	The Department requested clarification on the revised proposal to, among other things, confirm Council's support for and link the planning proposal to the supporting studies. A amended planning proposal was provided by the Council on 15 June 2017 and is the basis for this report and recommended Gateway conditions.
	The Urban Design Report was not listed in the amended planning proposal but should be, as it provides documentation of how the proposal has evolved.
External Supporting Notes :	geo moutig teo na fut tan ong but tan anti gitan anti gitan anti gitan anti nan nang teo na gitan anti gitan an gitan anti gitan anti g

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : The statement of objectives is adequate.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The explanation of provisions is adequate.

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 Zones
- 1.4 Oyster Aquaculture 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
- 2.2 Coastal Protection
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.3 Home Occupations
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
- 4.3 Flood Prone Land

Page 3 of 13

- 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 5.10 Implementation of Regional Plans

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

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

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 19—Bushland in Urban Areas SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection SEPP No 55-Remediation of Land SEPP No 62—Sustainable Aquaculture SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection SREP No. 20 - Hawkesbury-Nepean River (No. 2 - 1997) e) List any other matters that need to be considered : Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Unknown SEPPs If No, explain : SEPP 19 - The proposal will rezone bushland to residential such as part of the land to be rezoned to R2 in the eastern precinct. The planning proposal requires further discussion on how the provisions of SEPP 19 regarding giving priority to retaining bushland unless satisfied that benefits outweigh the value of the bushland (cl. 10(b)) have been considered. SEPP 44 - The supporting ecology report states 'potential koala habitat' is likely to occur but that this is not considered 'core koala habitat'. SEPP 55 - Contamination of the site has been identified. Under the terms of the SEPP the planning authority needs to be satisfied that the land is suitable in its contaminated state (or will be suitable, after remediation) for all the purposes for which land in the zone concerned is permitted to be used. The planning proposal needs to be updated to address the specific terms of the SEPP. SEPP 71 - The site is wholly in the coastal zone. Matters for consideration under SEPP 71 are addressed in the planning proposal but some require finalisation of studies (eg. heritage). Part 5 of SEPP 71 would apply to a proposed future subdivision. These future requirements should be considered in the preparation of the proposed DCP to avoid the potential need to prepare a separate SEPP 71 DCP at subdivision. Future development under mean high water mark, for the proposed marina, would also require referral to the Secretary under Part 3 of the SEPP. SREP 20 - Planning considerations, policies and strategies to be addressed in the preparation of environmental planning instruments are set out in the deemed SEPP. Some assessment has been included in the planning proposal however a more thorough assessment against SREP 20 should be conducted as required by cl. 4(2). The site is mapped under the deemed SEPP as being of State scenic significance and an assessment has been prepared against relevant provisions and the supporting Scenic Quality Study. Part of SREP 20 wetlands numbers 10 and 11 are in very close proximity to or within the site and the provisions of the deemed SEPP relating to wetlands should be considered in the planning proposal. These wetlands are included in the draft Coastal Management SEPP with 'proximity areas' (a 100 metre buffer) and the effect of that mapping should also be considered in the planning proposal. s.117 directions

1.1 The planning proposal contains business zones not identified in an endorsed strategy. The inconsistency is likely to be justifiable as the B2 is proposed to be sized and located so as to not adversely affect other centres. Although the CCRP has not considered development at this site, the proposed business zone supports the other proposed development at the site and is considered appropriate for inclusion in the planning proposal. Following agency consultation and resolution of any outstanding issues, the Secretary could agree that any provisions of the planning proposal that are inconsistent with the direction are of minor significance.

1.4 Consultation with Department of Primary Industries re. oyster aquaculture is required then reconsider the 117 direction.

2.1 The direction requires a draft LEP to include provisions that facilitate the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas. Environmental sensitivity of the site relates to its scenic values, flora and fauna, estuarine location etc. The 117 direction should be reconsidered once issues are resolved and proposed planning controls further developed.

2.2 The planning proposal needs further consideration of SEPP 71 once related matters (eg. Heritage) are resolved.

2.3 Consult with OEH and Aboriginal community and undertake the further Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage work identified. Determine an agreed outcome in terms of the heritage on the island and propose any planning instrument changes (eg. additional items in the LEP Heritage schedules). Amend planning proposal to remove reference to Singleton Mill which is not at this location.

3.1 The planning proposal contains residential zones not identified in an endorsed strategy however the existing planning provisions for the site are obsolete and require amendment. The process that led to development of the concept plan has considered a mix of potential uses which includes residential. Progression of the planning proposal, including further consultation and investigation, may see further refinement of the proposed planning provisions including location and scale, the mix of potential uses is considered appropriate for a positive Gateway determination. Following agency consultation and resolution of any outstanding issues the Secretary could agree that any provisions of the planning proposal that are inconsistent with the direction are of minor significance.

3.4 Consult with RMS and Transport for NSW and consider all relevant transport matters including effect on existing road network, proposed internal roads, public transport, maritime transport and future transport needs in this strategic corridor, then reconsider the 117 direction.

4.1 Address the terms of the 117 direction.

4.3 The planning proposal contains a flooding map showing some overlap between the area affected by the 1% AEP and proposed development areas. The flooding supporting study discusses filling on part of this site. No flood investigation has been provided for the areas east of the motorway. An evacuation plan has been provided but this requires further consideration given the evacuation route from the island is below the 1% AEP. Consider proposal against provisions of the 117 direction and consult with OEH and SES.

4.4 Consult with RFS and reconsider consistency with the direction.

5.10 Not consistent as the CCRP does not provide specifically for development at this site. However, given the planning controls require update, the direction could be

satisfied provided constraints, impacts and relevant policies are appropriately considered, agency and community consultation occurs and infrastructure needs are met. Proposal needs to reconsider direction following agency consultation and resolution of any outstanding issues. 6.2 Proposes to rezone some land E1 and needs consultation with NPWS. Other land is proposed to be rezoned from RE1 to RE2 so the terms of the direction should be addressed. 6.3 The proposal includes additional permitted uses in the RE2 zone. The planning proposal should be updated to consider alternatives (eg. amend land use table to make the uses permissible across the site or use different zone where uses are permissible) and the consistency with the terms of the direction should be reconsidered. It is noted also that the proposal intends to introduce an SP3 zone into Gosford LEP 2014 and consideration will need to be given to the eventual outcome of a combined Central Coast LEP given an SP3 zone already exists in Wyong LEP 2013. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes The lots affected by the planning proposal need to be confirmed. The list in Council's Comment : planning proposal does not match the property descriptions in the applicant's supplied information. A map clearly showing the land the subject of the planning proposal including current lot numbers should be included. Following agency consultation and resolution of issues a complete set of maps clearly showing the amendments intended by the planning proposal should be prepared. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Council has recommended 3 months community consultation. Comment : At least 28 days would be appropriate for formal community consultation required as part of the planning proposal process. In addition, given considerable public interest in the site, Council and the proponent should consider opportunities to engage the community that go beyond the statutory requirements of the EP&A Act. Government Property NSW has already undertaken community consultation and has developed a project website and published community newsletters. Continued community engagement during the planning proposal process is recommended. The future of this land will interest residents of the Mooney Mooney peninsula and the broader lower Hawkesbury community, in both Central Coast and Hornsby local government areas. It will also be of interest to occupants of vehicles passing the site and river users. Considerable community interest is expected given the visibility of the site and its prominence to the lower Hawkesbury community. **Additional Director General's requirements** Are there any additional Director General's requirements? Yes

If Yes, reasons :

Council has prepared a project timeline suggesting the proposal would be submitted to the Department for finalisation in approximately 12 months. An additional 6 months is recommended for a total of 18 months.

Delegation

Timeline

> Council has requested delegation to make the plan however it is recommended that given the nature of the proposal (eg. State proponent, strategy inconsistent, community interest, multiple matters requiring resolution) it is considered to be beyond local significance and the Department should retain delegation.

Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes

If No, comment :

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation Will amend Gosford LEP 2014 or the proposed new Central Coast LEP, depending on timing. to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	The planning proposal is needed because the current planning provisions are obsolete. The 'do nothing' alternative is not appropriate as a better mix of uses can be accommodated through review of the planning provisions via the planning proposal
	process.
	The planning proposal supports a concept plan which has been developed following
	consideration of site constraints and options, and community, council and agency views.
	Regist for any way of a net generative grant of the second second second second second second second second se
	The mix of proposed uses recognises that parts of the site have previously been developed
	and that of these, some are in a degraded state requiring rehabilitation before public access can be provided. Development of parts of the site for residential and business
	purposes will provide revenue for rehabilitation.
	The business uses will support both new and existing residents and provide some
	employment opportunities.

Consistency with	Redevelopment of the site is not identified in the Central Coast Regional Plan or in Council
strategic planning framework :	planning strategies. However, updating obsolete planning provisions is an appropriate undertaking consistent with the Objects of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 which include encouraging:
	- the proper management, development and conservation of natural and artificial
	resources, including agricultural land, natural areas, forests, minerals, water, cities, towns
	and villages for the purpose of promoting the social and economic welfare of the
	community and a better environment,
	 the promotion and co-ordination of the orderly and economic use and development of
	land,
	- the provision of land for public purposes,
	- the provision and co-ordination of community services and facilities, and
	- the protection of the environment, including the protection and conservation of native
	animals and plants, including threatened species, populations and ecological
	communities, and their habitats. (excerpt from s.5 of the EP&A Act, 1979).
	The Department's "A guide to preparing local environmental plans" recognises that
	strategic merit can be established in cases like this when a planning proposal responds to
	changes in circumstances that have not been recognised by existing planning controls (p.11).
	Provided all relevant constraints, impacts, policies and infrastructure requirements are
	considered in the determination of the ultimate planning controls, and the planning
	proposal is subject to appropriate agency and community consultation, the outcome the
	planning proposal seeks to achieve is supported.
Environmental social	The planning proposal is supported by a number of studies prepared for Property NSW.
economic impacts :	Some matters will require further consideration during planning proposal stage to ensure
	there is sufficient detail to satisfy statutory planning provisions (s.117 directions and
	SEPPs), to meet agency requirements and to provide sufficient support for the detail of the
	proposed planning provision amendments (eg. zone boundaries). Other matters requiring
	consideration at development application stage may see a need for provisions to be
	included in Council's proposed development control plan to set out development
	application requirements.
	The following matters require further consideration and/or consultation:
	Terrestrial biodiversity - confirm appropriateness of zonings eg. of section of proposed R2
	shown on concept plan as ecological corridor, consider SREP 20 wetlands, consult with
	OEH, resolve 117 direction 2.1
	Aquatic biodiversity/aquaculture - confirm appropriateness of proposed future marina
	given sensitivity of the intertidal mudflats, consult with DPI Fisheries, resolve 117 direction
	1.4 and SEPP 62
	Haritana hath Abarian I and you Abarian linuartigations to be finalized consultation
	Heritage - both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal investigations to be finalised, consultation with OEH, Darkinjung LALC and Guringai Tribal Link, determine proposed arrangements
	for buildings to be retained including the need for any amendments to LEP Heritage
	provisions
	Contamination - address the terms of SEPP 55
	Acid Sulfate Soils - prepare study required and resolve 117 direction 4.1
	Foreshore/riparian areas - consult with DPI Water
	Transport - consult with RMS and Transport for NSW, resolve 117 direction 3.4

	Bushfire - consult with RFS, resolve direction 4.3
	Additions to Popran National Park - consult NPWS, resolve direction 6.2
	Proposed land dedications - confirm Council agreement with proposed arrangements
	Noise - Confirm appropriateness of residential zones, introduce DCP controls as required
	Flooding, coastal and estuary management - consider and resolve 117 direction 2.2 and 4.3, consult with OEH, confirm appropriateness of proposed filling, evacuation plans and planning controls in flood affected areas
	Emergency Services - Consult with Fire, Ambulance, Police, SES
	Infrastructure providers - Consider the effect on provision of services to the current and future community. Consult with Health, Education, Ausgrid, Sydney Water, Transport for NSW, Hornsby Shire Council
	Easements - consult with Transgrid
	Landowners - consult with Crown Lands, RMS
	Aboriginal land claims - consult with Crown Lands
	Consult with Hornsby Shire Council, river user groups such as oyster growers, River Rescue and lower Hawkesbury community groups
	The Gateway determination has been conditioned so that these matters are considered. In most cases the process of agency consultation, consideration of 117 directions or SEPPs and resolution of related issues will be sufficient to ensure all relevant matters are addressed.
Assessment Process	

Proposal type :	Inconsistent	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	18 months	Delegation :	DDG
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Ambulance Service of NSW Department of Education and C Office of Environment and Herit NSW Department of Primary Ind Energy Australia Transport for NSW Office of Environment and Herit Fire and Rescue NSW Department of Health NSW Police Force NSW Rural Fire Service Transport for NSW - Sydney Tra Transport for NSW - Roads and State Emergency Service Sydney Water Adjoining LGAs	age ustries - Fishing and Aquacu age - NSW National Parks an	

Is Public Hearing by the I	PAC required?	Νο			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(b)) : Yes				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional stu	udies, if required. :				
	nen en anten a presidente de la construction de				
If Other, provide reasons	If Other, provide reasons :				
Identify any internal cons	ultations, if required :				
Residential Land Releas	se (MDP)				
Is the provision and fundi	ing of state infrastructur	re relevant to this plan? Yes			
If Yes, reasons :	Consultation with in	nfrastructure agencies should occur.			
	o "				
	Council proposes to	o prepare a VPA.			
	An Urban Release A	Area Map should be prepared for the site.			

Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
AAmended Planning Proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Amended Planning Proposal Supporting	Proposal	Yes
Documentation - 01 Strategic Assessment &		
Endorsement.pdf		
Amended Planning Proposal Supporting	Proposal	Yes
Documentation - 02 Land Use Provisions.pdf		
Amended Planning Proposal Supporting	Proposal	Yes
Documentation - 04 Mapping.pdf		
Appendix A1 - Aboriginal Heritage 2014_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
Mooney PP.pdf		
Appendix A2 - Aboriginal Heritage 2016_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
Mooney PP.pdf		
Appendix A3 - European Heritage 2014_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
Mooney PP.pdf		
Appendix A4 - European Heritage 2016_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
Mooney PP.pdf		
Appendix B - Urban Design Report_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
MooneyPP_Part1.pdf		
Appendix B - Urban Design Report_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
MooneyPP_Part2.pdf		
Appendix C - Community Needs	Proposal	Yes
Analysis_FINAL_Mooney Mooney PP.pdf		
Appendix D1 - Geotechnical Assessment 2014_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
Mooney PP.pdf		
Appendix D2 - Land Capability 2016_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
PP.pdf		
Appendix E - Survey_Mooney Mooney PP.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Appendix E - Survey_Mooney Mooney PP_Part1.pdf	Proposal	Yes

	Appendix E - Survey_Mooney Mooney PP_Part2.pdf	Proposal	Yes
	Appendix F - Proposed LEP Maps.pdf	Proposal	Yes
	Appendix G1 - Phase 1 Environmental Site Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part1.pdf		1 (2) (2) (2) (3) (3)
	Appendix G1 - Phase 1 Environmental Site Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part2.pdf		
	Appendix G1 - Phase 1 Environmental Site Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part3.pdf		
	Appendix G1 - Phase 1 Environmental Site Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP Part4.pdf		
	Appendix G1 - Phase 1 Environmental Site Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part5.pdf	Topooul	100
	Appendix G1 - Phase 1 Environmental Site Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part6.pdf	Toposal	165
	Appendix G1 - Phase 1 Environmental Site Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part7.pdf	Floposal	165
	Appendix G2 - Service Station Contamination	Proposal	Yes
		Floposal	res
	Investigation 2014_Mooney Mooney PP.pdf	Deserved	Ver
	Appendix G3 - Hazardous Materials Assessment	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part1.pdf	Sector Sector Sector	
	Appendix G3 - Hazardous Materials Assessment	Proposal	Yes
	2014_Mooney Mooney PP_Part2.pdf	the second s	
	Appendix G4 - Contamination Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2016_Mooney Mooney PP_Part1.pdf	Constant with the Constant of	
	Appendix G4 - Contamination Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2016_Mooney Mooney PP_Part2.pdf		
	Appendix G4 - Contamination Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2016_Mooney Mooney PP_Part3.pdf		2010 C
	Appendix G4 - Contamination Investigation	Proposal	Yes
	2016_Mooney Mooney PP_Part4.pdf		
	Appendix H1 - Flora&Fauna (Eastern) 2014_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	Mooney PP.pdf		
	Appendix H2 - Flora&Fauna (Western) 2014_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	Mooney PP.pdf		
	Appendix H3 - Ecological Review 2016_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP_Part1.pdf		
	Appendix H3 - Ecological Review 2016_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP_Part2.pdf		34 - Y 626-2
	Appendix I - Flooding and Watercycle_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP_Part1.pdf	service and the service of the servi	3.0.0
	Appendix I - Flooding and Watercycle_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP_Part2.pdf		
	Appendix J - Acoustic_Mooney Mooney PP.pdf	Proposal	Yes
	Appendix K - Bushfire_Mooney Mooney PP.pdf	Proposal	Yes
	Appendix L - Visual Impact_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP Part1.pdf	Toposul	103
	Appendix L - Visual Impact_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP_Part2.pdf	Toposal	163
		Proposal	Vaa
	Appendix L - Visual Impact_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP_Part3.pdf	Proposal	Vaa
	Appendix L - Visual Impact_Mooney Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	PP_Part4.pdf	Deserves	N
	Appendix M - Traffic & Transport Review_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	Mooney PP_Part1.pdf	-	
	Appendix M - Traffic & Transport Review_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
	Mooney PP_Part2.pdf	-	
19	Appendix N - Marina_Mooney Mooney PP.pdf	Proposal	Yes

Appendix O - Economic Statement Oct 2016_Mooney	Proposal	Yes
Mooney PP.pdf		
Appendix P - Community Consultation Report	Proposal	Yes
2014 Mooney Mooney PP.pdf		

Planning Team Recommendation

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

S.117 directions:

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones

1.4 Oyster Aquaculture

- 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
- 2.2 Coastal Protection
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.3 Home Occupations
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 4.3 Flood Prone Land

4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 5.10 Implementation of Regional Plans

Additional Information :

The planning proposal should proceed subject to the following conditions:

- Amend the planning proposal to refer to the applicant-submitted information where appropriate and include 'Urban Design Report' in referenced supporting documentation.

- Remove reference to Singleton Mill heritage item as this is not located at this site.

- Confirm lots and include a map clearly showing the land the subject of the planning proposal with lot numbers shown.

- Consider alternatives to the proposed additional permitted use provisions such as permitting those uses across the zone or finding an alternative zone where those uses are permitted.

- Discuss the need for updated heritage schedules, if appropriate.

- After agency consultation and resolution of issues, confirm proposed planning provisions (zones, zone boundaries, development standards, additional permitted uses) and prepare a complete set of maps clearly showing the amendments intended by the planning proposal.

- Council is to forward the amended planning proposal to the Department for review prior to community consultation.

- Update the planning proposal to include consideration of relevant matters in:

SEPP 19 (cl. 10(b)) SEPP 55 SEPP 71 SREP 20 (wetlands) draft Coastal Management SEPP

- Update the planning proposal's consistency with the following Section 117 Directions

8	once supporting information has been obtained and following agency consultations:
	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
	1.4 Oyster Aquaculture
	2.1 Environment Protection Zones
	2.2 Coastal Protection
	2.3 Heritage Conservation
	3.1 Residential Zones
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
	5.10 Implementation of Regional Plans
	6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
	6.3 Site Specific Provisions
	- Consultation is required with:
	Office of Environment and Heritage
	NSW Department of Primary Industries - Fisheries
	Transport for NSW
	Office of Environment and Heritage - NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service
	Darkinjung Local Aboriginal Land Council
	Guringai Tribal Link
	Fire and Rescue NSW
	Ambulance Service of NSW
	NSW Police Force
	NSW Rural Fire Service
	Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services State Emergency Service
	Department of Primary Industries - Water
	Hornsby Shire Council
	NSW Health
	NSW Education and Communities
	Crown Lands
	Ausgrid
	Transgrid
	River user and industry groups (eg. River Rescue, local Oyster Grower Association)
	Local community groups
	The planning proposal must be made publicly available for 28 days.
	A public hearing is not required.
	The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 18 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.
	Plan making delegation should be retained.
Supporting Reasons :	*
Signature:	AMofland
Printed Name:	GP HOPKINS Date: 14/7/2017

