

Rezone rural land to residential at Central Coast Hwy, Bakali Rd, Bellevue Rd, Forresters Beach Proposal Title : Rezone rural land to residential at Central Coast Hwy, Bakali Rd, Bellevue Rd, Forresters Beach The PP would rezone land currently zoned 1(c) Rural (Rural Purposes) in the Gosford Interim Proposal Summary : Development Order 122 to 2(a) Residential under the Gosford Planning Scheme Ordinance and 7(a) Conservation under the Interim Development Order 122. An existing 7(a) zoned portion within the site would remain zoned 7(a). Should the draft Gosford Standard Instrument LEP be finalised prior to completion of the PP then the PP would rezone the land to R2 Low Density Residential and E2 Conservation. The existing 7(a) zoned portion would be rezoned to E2. PP_2012_GOSFO_015_00 12/17315 Dop File No : PP Number : **Proposal Details** Date Planning 24-Oct-2012 LGA covered : Gosford Proposal Received : **Gosford City Council** RPA : Hunter Region : Section of the Act : TERRIGAL 55 - Planning Proposal State Electorate : LEP Type : Spot Rezoning Location Details Street : Central Coast Highway, Bakali Road & Bellevue Rd Suburb : **Forresters Beach** City : Postcode : 2260 Lot 600 DP 1099102, Lot 2 DP 706892, Lot 5 DP 1082979 and Lots 1 & 2 DP 1170047 Land Parcel : **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details** Contact Name : **Ben Holmes** 0243485003 Contact Number : ben.holmes@planning.nsw.gov.au Contact Email : **RPA Contact Details** Contact Name : **Bruce Ronan** Contact Number : 0243258176 Contact Email : Bruce.Ronan@gosford.nsw.gov.au **DoP Project Manager Contact Details** Contact Name : Contact Number : Contact Email :

Date L

Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Central Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy	Νο
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)	32.40	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	Residential
No. of Lots :	5	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 :			
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	Site description: The site is situated to the west of Forresters Beach, approximately north-east of Erina. Within the Fo residential strip generally bound Highway. The Central Coast High	8 km south of The Entrance a rresters Beach locality, the si by the beach/ Wamberal Lago	nd approximately 10 km te is adjacent to the coastal oon and the Central Coast
	To the north of the site is a small residential/ recreation, to the east and to the south is rural-residenti has been developed for residentia (nature reserve under the NPW Ac	t is low density residential, to al and a ribbon of land with fi al. Further to the south-west l	the west is rural-residential rontage to the highway that
	Uses of the site currently are as for - lots 1 and 2 DP 1170047 have be dual occupancy and dwelling how - lot 600 DP 1099102 is being deve approximately); and - lot 2 DP 706892 and lot 5 DP 108 and putt-putt golf. Council states not known whether this consent b	en developed for a swimming ise (1.2 ha approximately); eloped for the purposes of se 2979 is currently used for a g that it also has an approval fo	niors housing (21.7 ha olf course, golf driving range or seniors housing but it is
	Urban fringe review:		
	Council proposes a review of plar this review would include examini sites remain relevant, in light of d sites. This locality includes sites of	ing whether the existing zone evelopment that may have oc	es applying to urban fringe scurred on or around those

each		
	Dwelling yield and lots:	
	Council has not identified	d how many dwellings may result from the PP.
	housing) or alternative re	on whether the land is developed for the approved uses (seniors esidential uses. Council advise that 12 lots/ ha is generally the rate residential within the LGA.
	Gateway Determination d	lelegation:
	staff (ie DG/ DDG). Deleg rural land that is not iden longer being used for rur	ly delegated Gateway Determinations to Departmental executive ation does not however extend to proposals which 'would release tified for that purpose in a regional strategy'. While this site is no al purposes, it is however rural zoned and not identified for al Strategy. On this basis, determination by the Minister is
	Documentation provided	by Council:
	requested that the Planni	ered by the LEP Panel on 29 November 2012. The LEP Panel ing Proposal be resubmitted to the Panel following revisions to 't to make it clear what land is affected by the Planning Proposal.
		be noted that the Council Report contains a draft Planning nt to the Planning Proposal formally submitted by Council for eway.
		It suggested that other documents provided by Council not be
		el on resubmission. This includes a proponent-prepared 'planning ecology study which refers to different land.
External Supporting Notes :		
Notes :	proposal' and associated	
Notes : dequacy Assessme	proposal' and associated	
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c	proposal' and associated	
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c	proposal' and associated ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes	ecology study which refers to different land.
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c Is a statement of the Comment :	proposal' and associated ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives	ecology study which refers to different land.
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the of Is a statement of the Comment : Explanation of pro	proposal' and associated ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives preparing planning pro	ecology study which refers to different land.
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the of Is a statement of the Comment : Explanation of pro	proposal' and associated ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objec preparing planning pro- provisions provided - s55(provisions provided? Yes While there is substan	ecology study which refers to different land. ctives is generally consistent with the Department's "A guide to oposals". 2)(b) tial detail on lot specific constraints and the current uses occurring ation of provisions is generally consistent with the Department's "A
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c Is a statement of the Comment : Explanation of pro- Is an explanation of pro-	proposal' and associated ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objec preparing planning pro ovisions provided - s55(provisions provided - s55(orovisions provided? Yes While there is substan on the site, the explan- guide to preparing pla This section should ho	ecology study which refers to different land. ctives is generally consistent with the Department's "A guide to oposals". 2)(b) tial detail on lot specific constraints and the current uses occurring ation of provisions is generally consistent with the Department's "A
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c Is a statement of the Comment : Explanation of pro- Is an explanation of pro-	ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objec preparing planning pro- ovisions provided - s55(provisions provided? Yes While there is substan on the site, the explan- guide to preparing pla This section should he be proposed if the PP	ecology study which refers to different land. ctives is generally consistent with the Department's "A guide to oposals". 2)(b) tial detail on lot specific constraints and the current uses occurring ation of provisions is generally consistent with the Department's "A nning proposals". owever be updated to also make reference to the zones that would
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c Is a statement of the Comment : Explanation of pro- Is an explanation of pro- Comment : Justification - s55	ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objec preparing planning pro- ovisions provided - s55(provisions provided? Yes While there is substan on the site, the explan- guide to preparing pla This section should he be proposed if the PP	ecology study which refers to different land. ctives is generally consistent with the Department's "A guide to oposals". 2)(b) tial detail on lot specific constraints and the current uses occurring ation of provisions is generally consistent with the Department's "A nning proposals". owever be updated to also make reference to the zones that would amends the finalised Gosford SI LEP.
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c Is a statement of the Comment : Explanation of pro- Is an explanation of pro- Comment : Justification - s55	proposal' and associated ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives preparing planning provided - s55(provisions provided - s55(provisions provided? Yes While there is substant on the site, the explant guide to preparing pla This section should he be proposed if the PP (2)(c) tegy been agreed to by the Direction	ecology study which refers to different land. ctives is generally consistent with the Department's "A guide to oposals". 2)(b) tial detail on lot specific constraints and the current uses occurring ation of provisions is generally consistent with the Department's "A nning proposals". owever be updated to also make reference to the zones that would amends the finalised Gosford SI LEP.
Notes : dequacy Assessme Statement of the c Is a statement of the Comment : Explanation of pro- Is an explanation of pro- Comment : Justification - s55 a) Has Council's strate b) S.117 directions id	proposal' and associated ent objectives - s55(2)(a) objectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives provided? Yes The statement of objectives preparing planning provided - s55(provisions provided - s55(provisions provided? Yes While there is substant on the site, the explant guide to preparing pla This section should he be proposed if the PP (2)(c) tegy been agreed to by the Direction	ecology study which refers to different land. ctives is generally consistent with the Department's "A guide to oposals". 2)(b) tial detail on lot specific constraints and the current uses occurring ation of provisions is generally consistent with the Department's "A nning proposals". owever be updated to also make reference to the zones that would amends the finalised Gosford SI LEP. rector General? No

e) List any other matters that need to be considered : Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No If No, explain : Further discussion on consistency with SEPPs ar this report. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrument The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : Proposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to I provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned	llevue Rd, Forresters	
c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : No d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 19—Bushland in SEPP No 55—Remediation SEPP No 55—Remediation SEPP No 71—Coastal Proti SEPP (Housing for Seniors e) List any other matters that need to be considered : Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No If No, explain : Further discussion on consistency with SEPPs ar this report. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrument The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : roposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to 1 to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to 1 need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned	gional Strategies I Requirements	
d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 19—Bushland in SEPP No 44—Koala Habita SEPP No 55—Remediation SEPP No 71—Coastal Prote SEPP No 71—Coast Proteide With a PC endorsed version of the draft SI LEP is servently with the Department to 1 provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI LEP is a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
SEPP No 44—Koala Habita SEPP No 55—Remediation SEPP No 71—Coastal Proti SEPP (Housing for Seniors e) List any other matters that need to be considered : Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No If No, explain : Further discussion on consistency with SEPPs ar this report. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrumen The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal		
matters that need to be considered : Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No If No, explain : Further discussion on consistency with SEPPs ar this report. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrument The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : provided vith a PC endorsed version of the draft SI LEP Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to to a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned	at Protection of Land	
If No, explain : Further discussion on consistency with SEPPs ar this report. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrument The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : opposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to to provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
this report. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrument The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : roposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Mediational Condensed version of the draft SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
Is mapping provided? Yes Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrument The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to It oprincipal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : De	nd s117 directions is provided later in	
Comment : A map showing the proposed standard instrument The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to b provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post-or a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
The site could also be better identified on each of adequate for community consultation. Community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation Comments		
Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation Director 2012 Comments in relation	A map showing the proposed standard instrument zones for the site should be included. The site could also be better identified on each of the maps. The maps are otherwise	
Comment : 28 days has been proposed. This is supported. Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Diveral LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Under the draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to b provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post-ca a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
Additional Director General's requirements Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : Oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 Comments in		
Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to b provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to b provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
If Yes, reasons : Overall adequacy of the proposal Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : Oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to b provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post-e a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to b provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post-e a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to be provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI LEP in light of several poster a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
If No, comment : oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to be provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI LEP in light of several poster a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
oposal Assessment Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to the provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI LEP in light of several post-endorsed to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post-endorsed to react the draft SI LEP in light of several post-endorsed to react the dr		
Principal LEP: Due Date : December 2012 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Due Date : December 2012 The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to the provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post-endorsed a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :The draft SI LEP is currently with the Department to b provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands.Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
to Principal LEP : provided with a PC endorsed version of the draft SI L need to re-exhibit the SI LEP in light of several post- a biodiversity overlay, a new E zone (SI Order amend lands. Under the draft SI LEP, the existing 1(c) Rural zoned		
	LEP, Council will then consider the exhibition changes such as introducing	
Environmental Management and the existing 7(a) Conzernation 2018 Zoned E2. However Council resolved to defer all 7(a)	nservation zoned portion was to be	

5

×	including this site, from the draft SI LEP. Therefore, if the Gosford SI LEP is finalised as currently proposed, the site would be zoned part E3 under the Gosford SI LEP and part 7(a) under the Interim Development Order 122.
	This PP seeks to rezone the 1(c) zoned land to low density residential ie R2 Low Density Residential under the SI LEP. This zone is suitable given that adjacent residential areas would also be zoned R2. Council's other residential zone is R1 General Residential and this is less appropriate because it is oriented towards promoting increased densities around established centres, not urban fringe sites such as this one.
	The PP also seeks to rezone some 1(c) land and a 7(a) portion for conservation ie E2 Conservation under the SI LEP. The use of this zone is supported given the ecological value that Council attributes to it, and that Council states that previous LEC issued consents for seniors development sought to prohibit development in those areas.
	The PP does not specify height, floor space ratio or minimum lot sizes for the land. Under the draft SI LEP R2 generally has limits of 8.5 m height, 0.5:1 FSR and 550 m2 minimum lot size. The E2 has a 40 ha minimum lot size (no height or FSR limit). Council should consider the need to introduce these controls for this site, and update the PP (Objectives, Explanation of Provisions, maps) accordingly.
Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	This PP applies to the following land (outlined bold black on TAG A): - lots 1 and 2 DP 1170047 (developed for a swimming school, child care centre, dual occupancy and dwelling house); - lot 600 DP 1099102 (being developed for the purposes of seniors housing); and - lot 2 DP 706892 and lot 5 DP 1082979 (currently used for a golf course, golf driving range and putt-putt golf; Council states that it also has an approval for seniors housing but it is not known whether this LEC consent has lapsed).
	The need for rezoning this land appears to have originated at the request of the landowner(s). It does not result from a strategic study or report. Rezoning the land would effectively remove what appears to be anomalous zoning.

Beach	
Consistency with	Central Coast Regional Strategy (CCRS):
strategic planning framework :	The PP is consistent with the CCRS because it would potentially provide additional dwellings and would protect land attributed as having conservation values, both broad goals of the Strategy.
	However, as this site is on the urban fringe, it could be considered to be greenfield residential development and so an assessment against the CCRS sustainability criteria would be needed before consistency can be fully determined. Council's assessment concludes that the proposal has merit, subject to the findings of certain studies (traffic, bushfire, flooding, groundwater).
	Council's approach is supported. While it is less relevant to lots 1 & 2 DP 1170047 and lot 600 DP 1099102 (as they have largely been developed or are being developed for urban/ residential purposes currently), lot 2 DP 706892 and Lot 5 DP 1082979 are yet to be developed. Consistency with the CCRS can be determined following Council's investigations.
	Local strategies:
	Council states that the PP is consistent with its Community Strategic Plan, Biodiversity Strategy and the draft Residential Strategy.
	State Environmental Planning Policies:
	SEPP 19 Bushland in Urban Areas - requires Council to give priority to retaining bushland in urban areas. Council has sought to implement the SEPP by rezoning certain 1(c) zoned areas and the existing 7(a) zoned area to 7(a)/ E2 based on their ecological value. Council should update the SEPP 19 assessment to also refer to those areas situated on lot 2 DP 706892 and lot 5 DP 1082979 that it is seeking to conserve.
	SEPP 55 Remediation of Land - Council is satisfied that a contaminated land study is not necessary given the uses already occuring on the site and the approved uses (seniors housing). This conclusion is supported.
	SEPP 71 Coastal Protection - applies to the site as it is located within the coastal zone. Council has identified applicable matters that need to be considered in particular and would be informed by proposed flooding and groundwater studies as well as an understanding of water quality/ hydrology. Council should update its SEPP 71 assessment against the matters for consideration set out in the SEPP following these investigations.
	The PP is otherwise consistent with the relevant SEPPs.
	s117 directions:
	The PP is consistent with the relevant s117 directions except the following which require further discussion. Should the further work or consultation identified below identify an inconsistency, Council should seek the DG's agreement to the inconsistency per the terms of that direction.
	1.2 Rural Zones - as the PP would rezone land from rural to residential, the PP is inconsistent with this direction. Given the uses already occurring on the land (child care centre, swimming school, seniors housing, golf driving range, putt putt golf, etc), the loss of rural land in this instance could not be considered significant.
	Notwithstanding this, given that the Minister will determine this PP because it rezones land from rural to residential, consultation with DPI (Agriculture) should occur.
	1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries - the 1(c) rural zone permits agriculture which in turn permits extractive industry and open-cut mining by way of the

Mining SEPP. Rezoning the land to residential would prohibit agriculture and therefore make extractive industry and open-cut mining prohibited. Consultation with DPI should occur before consistency with this direction is determined. The PP should be updated accordingly.

2.1 Environment Protection Zones: this direction is not discussed by Council despite the PP potentially affecting environmentally sensitive areas such as the EECs (on site) and the Wamberal Lagoon Nature Reserve (off-site).

Council reports that the LEC considered a 'comprehensive joint expert report' regarding impacts on Wamberal Lagoon due to a proposed seniors housing development on part of this site (refer PP page 13). Council should confirm that the proposed development that would be made permissible by this PP would also be unlikely to result in an adverse impact on Wamberal Lagoon and associated ecosystems, as was reportedly found by the 'comprehensive joint expert report'. Consultation with OEH, NPWS and the CMA may inform this assessment.

Consultation with OEH may also be necessary to satisfy s.34A of the EP&A Act (Special consultation procedures regarding ecological communities). As with SEPP 19, clarifying the relevance/ function of the ecology report would assist.

2.2 Coastal Protection: given the studies that Council intends to undertake to determine the impact on the Wamberal Lagoon, consistency with this direction cannot be determined at this time. Council should update its consistency assessment with this direction following these studies.

3.1 Residential Zones: as the site would increase development on the urban fringe, the PP could be considered to be inconsistent with this direction. However, it is noted that parts of the site have already been developed or are currently being developed for urban/ residential purposes. As with consistency with the CCRS sustainability criteria, Council should reassess consistency with this direction once it has completed the relevant studies.

4.3 Flood Prone Land: Council proposes to undertake a flood assessment as part of the site is flood prone. Consistency with this direction can be determined following the investigation and the PP updated.

4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection: the site is bushfire prone. Consultation with RFS needs to occur before consistency with this direction can be determined. The PP should be updated once this advice is received.

5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies: as discussed, the PP is inconsistent with the CCRS at this stage. Council should reassess consistency with the sustainability criteria and this direction following completion of the relevant studies.

Environmental social C economic impacts : u

Council has identified the need for traffic, bushfire, flooding, groundwater studies to be undertaken. As discussed regarding s117 direction 2.1, further information may also be needed regarding hydrology/ water quality in order to determine impacts on Wamberal Lagoon.

These studies, combined with consultation with the relevant agencies (RFS, OEH, NPWS, CMA, RMS, Wyong Council - its LGA borders part of the site) will inform Council's support for the PP or identify the need for it to be modified.

Social and economic benefits may result in the form of additional housing choice/ supply and an increase in construction related employment resulting from future DAs for the land.

Assessment Process Inconsistent Community Consultation 28 Days Proposal type : Period : Minister Timeframe to make 12 Month Delegation : LEP : Hunter - Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority Public Authority Office of Environment and Heritage Consultation - 56(2)(d) NSW Department of Primary Industries - Agriculture 8 NSW Department of Primary Industries - Minerals and Petroleum Office of Environment and Heritage - NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service **NSW Rural Fire Service** Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services Adjoining LGAs No Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? Yes (2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? If no, provide reasons : Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. : Other - provide details below If Other, provide reasons : Assessment to demonstrate no adverse impact on downstream Wamberal Lagoon Nature Reserve. Identify any internal consultations, if required : No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No Advice from the Department's Infrastructure team has been provided regarding the need If Yes, reasons : for State Infrastructure Contributions. Documents DocumentType Name Is Public **Document File Name**

Council_Covering_Letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Council_Resolution.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Planning Proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Infrastructure_Team_Advice.pdf	Study	No
Council Report.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
TAG A.pdf	Мар	Yes

Planning Team Recommendation

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

S.117 directions:

1.2 Rural Zones
 2.2 Coastal Protection
 3.1 Residential Zones
 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport

seach	
	 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
Additional Information :	The following conditions are recommended in order to progress the PP: - detail the standard instruments zones that are proposed for the site should the PP amend the finalised Gosford SI LEP; - include a map showing the standard instrument zones proposed for the site; - clearly identify the subject site on each of the maps provided; - include height (8.5 m), FSR (0.5:1) and minimum lot size (550 m2) limits for the proposed R2 land in the PP and prepare relevant maps; - include minimum lot size (40 ha) limit for the proposed E2 land and prepare relevant maps; - update the SEPP 19 assessment to refer to those areas situated on lot 2 DP 706892 and lot 5 DP 1082979; - update the SEPP 71 assessment against the matters for consideration set out in the SEPP following the groundwater/ flooding/ hydrology/ water quality investigations; - consult with DPI (Agriculture) to inform inconsistency justification for s117 direction 1.2; - consult with DPI (Minerals) to satisfy s117 direction 1.3 and update consistency with this direction; - consider consistency with s117 direction 2.1, confirming that the proposed development that would be made permissible by this PP would be unlikely to result in an adverse impact on Wamberal Lagoon and associated ecosystems, as was reportedly found by the 'comprehensive joint expert report' (PP, page 13). Consultation with OEH (to satisfy s.34A of the EP&A Act also), NPWS and the CMA may inform this assessment. - update consistency with s117 direction 2.2 following flooding/ groundwater/ hydrology/ water quality studies to determine the impact on the Wamberal Lagoon; - reassess consistency with s117 direction 4.3 following the flooding investigation; - reassess consistency with s117 direction 5.1. Council should reassess consistency with the sustainability criteria and this direction 5.1. Council should reassess consistency with the sustainability criteria and this direction following completion of the relevant studies; - in addition to the agencies already listed ab
Supporting Reasons :	*
Signature:	CHOPKINS Date: 4.12.2012
Printed Name:	GARRY HOPKINS Date: 4.12.2012