

Proposal Title :	Housekeeping Amendment to clarifies development requiren realignments		nmental Plan 2010 - Eco-tourist facili Imental zones and boundary	lies,
Proposal Summary :			ities	
PP Number :	PP_2016_MCOAS_001_00	Dop File No :	16/10806	

Proposal Details

	ate Planning oposal Received :	12-Aug-2016	LGA covered :	Mid-Coast
Re	egion :	Hunter	RPA :	Mid-Coast Council
St	ate Electorate :	UPPER HUNTER	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LE	ЕР Туре :	Housekeeping		

Location Details

Street :	All land covered by the				
Suburb :	Gloucester	City :	LEP 2010	Postcode :	2422
Land Parcel :					

DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

Contact Name :	Susan Blake
Contact Number :	0249042720
Contact Email :	susan.blake@planning.nsw.gov.au

RPA Contact Details

Contact Name :	Aaron Kelly		
Contact Number :	0265385232		
Contact Email :	Aaron.Kelly@MidCoast.nsw.gov.au	2	
DoP Project Mana	ger Contact Details		

Contact Name :

Contact Number :

Contact Email :

Land Release Data

Lanu Release Data			
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	N/A	Consistent with Strategy :	N/A
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :	0.00	Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		.4i
If No, comment :			
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal is the res Council resolved at its Ordinary undertake these amendments. T in mid August 2016.	Meetings held on 20 April 20	16 and 13 July 2016 to
External Supporting Notes :	The proclamation of 12 May 2010 into MidCoast Council.	6 merged Gloucester Shire, G	Greater Taree and Great Lakes
	Council advises that the plannin Great Lakes Local Environmenta 2010. The adoption of similar loc consolidated local environmenta	al Plan 2014 and Greater Tare cal clauses should assist Mid	e Local Environmental Plan
	The Department is also preparin Policy (Exempt and Complying (Should this amendment proceed this component of the planning	Codes) 2008 in relation to mir d, Council should decide whe	nor boundary realignments.

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The statement of objectives adequately outlines the intent of the planning proposal to amend the Gloucester Local Environmental Plan 2010 to permit eco-tourist facilities in the rural zone; amend provisions relating to development for purposes of residential accommodation, tourist and visitor accommodation, and eco-tourist facilities; and permit boundary adjustments between undersized lots within certain zones.

n

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The planning proposal explains the objective of the amendments to the Gloucester Local Environmental Plan 2010 to:

1. Permit with consent eco-tourist facilities in Zone RU1 Primary Production by: inserting the term 'eco-tourist facility' into the RU1 Primary Production Land Use Table; and inserting a new 'local provision' which provides objectives and development assessment requirements for an eco-tourist facility. This is consistent with the Standard Instrument Order.

2. Clarifies that development for purposes of residential accommodation, tourist and visitor accommodation or eco-tourist facilities in Zone RU1 Primary Production and Zone E3 Environmental Management is permitted but only where development consent for the erection of a dwelling house on that land may be granted, in accordance with clause 4.2A of the LEP. The amendment will not effect camping grounds or caravan parks as these land use terms are outside the tourist and visitor accommodation group term under the standard instrument.

3. Permit boundary adjustments between undersized lots in either RU1 Primary Production, and E3 Environmental Management zones, where one or more resultant lots do not meet the the minimum lot size. The proposed LEP clause provides that the subdivision will not create additional lots or the opportunity for additional dwellings, and will not create increased land use conflicts or affect the agricultural viability of the land.

The explanation of provisions is supported.

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

- 1.2 Rural Zones 1.5 Rural Lands
- 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
- 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.3 Flood Prone Land
- 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
- 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

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

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? N/A

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 :

As this planning proposal relates to policy matters, mapping is not required. It will amend the Gloucester Local Environmental Plan 2010 instrument only.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

Council proposes a 28 day public consultation period. The planning proposal is considered 'low impact' and only requires a 14 day consultation period in accordance with the Department's Guidelines.

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 :

Comments in relation The comprehensive Gloucester LEP 2010 was published on 11 June 2010. to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :

The planning proposal is not the result of a strategic study or report, but provides greater planning flexibility between undersized lots, and resolves a potential anomaly in relation to the permissibly of development of residential accommodation, tourist and visitor accommodation and provides greater economic opportunities by permitting eco-tourist facilities in the rural and environmental zones.

Consistency with	UPPER HUNTER STRATEGIC REGIONAL LAND USE PLAN
strategic planning framework :	The planning proposal is considered consistent with the Upper Hunter Strategic Regional Land Use Plan.
	UPPER HUNTER ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION REPORT
	The proposal is considered consistent with the outcomes of this report which builds upon
	the strengths of existing industries, such as tourism to increase investment and diversify
	the regional economy and employment.
<i>K</i>	GLOUCESTER SHIRE COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN 2014-2024
	The planning proposal is consistent with the the key direction and objectives of the Plan,
	which are to maintain core infrastructure, protect the environment, create a strong
	economy, an engaged and supportive community, provide governance and partnership.
	SECTION 117 PLANNING DIRECTIONS
	1.2 Rural Zones
	Comment: The planning proposal is consistent with this S.117 Direction because it does no
	increase the permissible density of land within a rural zone. The proposal clarifies where
	residential accommodation, tourist and visitor accommodation or eco-tourist facilities is
	permitted in the rural zone and permits boundary adjustments between undersized
	allotments where it does not create additional dwelling entItlements or potential land use
	conflicts.
	1.5 Rural Lands
	Comment: The planning proposal is inconsistent with this S.117 Direction because it
	permits boundary realignments between undersized rural and environmental allotments.
	The proposal may not be justified by a strategy which gives consideration of this Direction
	but Council justifies the need for boundary adjustments in the RU1 Primary Production an
	E3 Environmental Management zones, where one or more resultant lots do not meet the
	minimum lot size.
	It is recommended that the Secretary's delegate approves this inconsistency as minor
	significance because it does not create additional lots or the opportunity for additional
	dwellings; there is no increased land use conflict, and the agricultural viability of the land
	is not affected.
	2.1 Environmental Protection Zones
	Comment: The planning proposal is consistent with this S.117 Direction. Any potential
	impacts within the environmental zone as a result of development for residential and
	tourism purposes, can be adequately addressed under existing provisions within the
	Gloucester LEP 2010, Council's Development Control Plan and policies which provide
	environmental protection standards to land within the local government area.
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	Comment: The planning proposal is inconsistent with this S.117 Direction because it
	potentially permits the development of eco-tourist facilities on flood prone land.
	It is recommended that the Secretary's delegate approves this inconsistency as minor
	significance because future development on floor prone land can be appropriately
	assessed in accordance with existing provisions within the Gloucester LEP 2010, Council
	Development Control Plan and policies.
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
	As the planning proposal affects the whole local government area including bushfire
	prone land, consultation is required with NSW rural Fire Services to determine consistency
	with the S.117 Direction. Council needs to undertake this consultation before commencing
	community consultation to satisfy the requirements of S.117 Direction Planning for Bushfi
	Protection.

	The planning proposal is considered consistent with all other relevant S.117 Direction	S.
	STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICIES (SEPPs)	
	Council has not identified any State Environmental Planning Policies.	
	SEPP No 44 — Koala Habitat Protection	
	The planning proposal is considered consistent with this SEPP.	
	SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007	
	The planning proposal is considered consistent with this SEPP.	
	SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008	
	The planning proposal is considered consistent with this SEPP. Although the boundar realignment clause provides some flexibility by allowing subdivision of lots under the	
	minimum lot size in rural areas, this will not result in any additional lots or dwelling entitlements. The planning proposal is consistent with the rural planning principles.	
	SEPP (Exempt and Complying Codes) 2008	
	The Department is presently preparing an amendment to the State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Codes) 2008 In relation to minor boundary	
	realignments. Should this amendment proceed, Council should decide whether it wan proceed with this component of the planning proposal.	ts to
	Planning Practice Note PN09-006	
	The planning proposal is also consistent with Planning Practice Note PN09-006 Provis for Tourism in Standard Template LEP's.	sion
	Agency Consultation	
	The Department agrees with Council's recommendation that consultation with NSW Department of Primary Industries (Agriculture) and Office of Environment and Heritag not required in this instance. The Department has previously undertaken consultation these agencies in terms of permitting boundary adjustments on undersized lots in rur and environmental zones. The Department has considered these agency responses, a subsequently supported the inclusion of these clauses in adjoining local environment plans. Therefore re-consultation with these agencies is not considered necessary.	n witi ral and
Environmental social	Council has considered the environmental, social, and economic outcomes of the pla	nnin
economic impacts :	proposal, and is satisfied that the proposed amendments will create a net community benefit.	
Assessment Proces	SS	

Timeframe to make LEP :	0 months	Delegation :	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	NSW Rural Fire Service		
			- G.

00	undary realignments			×	
	Is Public Hearing by the F	PAC required?	No		
	(2)(a) Should the matter p	proceed ?	Yes		
	lf no, provide reasons :				
	Resubmission - s56(2)(b)	. No			
	If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional stu	dias if required			
	Identity any additional stu	idies, il required.			
	If Other, provide reasons	1			
	Identify any internal cons	ultations, if required	:		
	No internal consultation	required		9 W	
	Is the provision and fundi	no of state infrastrue	cture relevant to this	plan? No	
	If Yes, reasons :				
_					
20	ocuments				
	Document File Name			DocumentType Name	Is Public
	Cover_Letter_requestin Amendment_No.4_Plan			Proposal Covering Letter Proposal	Yes Yes
= 2	anning Team Recomn	nendation			
	Preparation of the planni	ng proposal support	ed at this stage:Re	ecommended with Conditions	
	S.117 directions:	1.2 Rural Zones	(*)		
		1.5 Rural Lands			
			Protection Zones	d Hama Estates	
			ts and Manufacture and Use and Trans		
		4.3 Flood Prone			
		-	Bushfire Protection		
		-	on of Regional Stra		
	Additional Information :	The planning pro	oposal should proc	eed subject to the following conditio	ns:
		-		red under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of ("EP&A Act") as follows:	the Environmental
			& Infrastructure 20	ed as low impact as described in A G 13) and must be made publicly availa	
				nust comply with the notice requiren	nents for public
		exhibition of pla	nning proposals ar	id the specifications for material that	must be made
		publicly availabl		ng proposals as identified in section	
		2. Consultation i	s required with the	NSW Rural Fire Service under section	on 56(2)(d) of the
				vice is to be provided with a copy of t	
		proposal and an	y relevant supporti	ng material, and given at least 21 day	ys to comment on

the proposal.

	 A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the EP&A Act. This does not discharge Council from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a submission or if reclassifying land). The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 6 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.
	5. Council exercise their plan making delegations under section 59 of the EP&A Act.
Supporting Reasons :	MidCoast Council has identified the need for this amendment to meet its operational needs. The planning proposal provides flexibility for boundary realignments where it does not create any additional dwelling entitlement or result in an increased land use conflict, and clarifies Council's requirements for residential accommodation, tourist and visitor accommodation or ecotourist facilities in rural and environmental zones. Council nominates the planning proposal completion date by January 2017, being a 5 month timeframe. A 6 month timeframe is considered suitable to enable Council to consult with agencies, and there could be slight delays over the Christmas and New year period.
	The Minister delegated his plan making powers to Councils in October 2012. Council has accepted this delegation. The proposal is of local significance, and it is recommended that Council use their delegations to make the plan.
Signature:	Ri
Printed Name:	Robert Hodylains. Date: 2.9.2016.