

Proposal Title :	GOSFORD CITY CENTRE - CI	ause 8.9 Development Incen	tives			
Proposal Summary	The proposal seeks to correct an unintended drafting error relating to Gosford Local Environmental Plan 2014 (Amendment No 12), which extended the Gosford City Centre Clau 8.9 Development Incentive provisions for 12 months.					
PP Number	PP_2016_CCOAS_002_00	Dop File No :	16/14240			
oposal Details						
Date Planning Proposal Received	03-Nov-2016	LGA covered :	Central Coast			
Region :	Hunter	RPA :	Central Coast Council			
State Electorate :	GOSFORD	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal			
LEP Type :	Housekeeping					
ocation Details						
Street :						
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :			
	osford City Centre - Land to whick the Development Incentives Applica					
	ficer Contact Details					
Contact Name :	Louise Starkey					
Contact Number :	0243485010					
Contact Email :	Louise.Starkey@planning.nsw	.gov.au				
RPA Contact Det	ails					
Contact Name :	Peta James					
Contact Number :	000000000					
Contact Email :	peta.james@centralcoast.nsw.	gov.au				
DoP Project Man	ager Contact Details					
Contact Name :						
Contact Number :						
Contact Email :						
and Release Dat	ta					
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :				
Regional / Sub		Consistent with Strategy	<i>i</i> :			

GOSFORD CITY CENTRE - Clause 8.9 Development Incentives MDP Number : Date of Release : Area of Release (Ha) Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) : No. of Lots : 0 No. of Dwellings 0 (where relevant) : Gross Floor Area : 0 No of Jobs Created : 0 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 The planning proposal was considered adequate for assessment on 7 November 2016. Notes : External Supporting Council has advised of an unintended drafting error, that there was no savings provisions Notes : included, relating to Gosford Local Environmental Plan 2014 (Amendment No 12) which extended the Gosford City Centre Clause 8.9 Development Incentive provisions for 12 months. The proposal seeks to rectify the drafting error to ensure the clause operates as Council intended. Adequacy Assessment Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a) Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes Comment : The statement is adequate. Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b) Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes Comment : An explanation is provided. Council advises that the existing clause does not achieve Council's original intent for the provisions which was for clause 8.9 to apply to DAs lodged prior to 2 April 2016, irrespective of when the DAs were determined. The proposed drafting seeks to capture both determined and undetermined applications lodged prior to 2 April 2016. Council should ensure that future drafting of the clause achieves Council's intent prior to

GOSFORD CITY CENTRE - Clause 8.9 Development Incentives

Justification - s55 (2)(c)		
	y been agreed to by the I	Director General? No	
b) S.117 directions ident		1.1 Business and Industrial Zones	
* May need the Director		2.2 Coastal Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	
Is the Director Generation	al's agreement required?		
c) Consistent with Stand	ard Instrument (LEPs) O	rder 2006 : Yes	
d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?		SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development	
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	Additional S117 Dir Protection.	ections apply to the proposal, namely 4.4 Planning for Bushfire	
De considered .	The proposal is consistent with all relevant SEPPs and relevant section 117 Directions except in relation to s117 4.4. Consistency with this direction is established through consultation with NSW Rural Fire Service.		
	12). Given consulta there is no change	RFS raised no objections with the Gosford LEP 2014 (Amendment No tion has previously occurred with RFS under Amendment No 12 and to the intent of clause 8.9 or to bushfire risk, it is recommended that SW RFS is not required in this case. No further action is required in ction.	
Have inconsistencies wit	th items a), b) and d) beir	ng adequately justified? Yes	
If No, explain :			
Mapping Provided - s	s55(2)(d)		
Is mapping provided? No	0		
Comment :		s to the drafting in the instrument. No map changes are proposed.	
Community consulta	tion - \$55(2)(e)		
·			
Has community consulta	ition been proposed? No		
Comment :	planning proposal.	ted that the Gateway determination not require exhibition of the Council has provided a number of supporting reasons, however it is the proposal be subject to a minimum community consultation of 14	
Additional Director G	General's requireme	nts	
Are there any additional	Director General's requir	ements? Yes	
If Yes, reasons :	subject to commun that the Gateway de allow for communit finalise the amendii	E: or the planning proposal anticipates that the proposal would not be ity consultation and finalised in December 2016. It is recommended termination provide a time frame for completion of 6 months to y consultation. This timeframe is considered sufficient for Council to ng plan. Council can expedite the planning proposal and finalise it e terms of the Gateway determination are met.	
	sooner provided the		
	DELEGATED AUTH		

	requested authorisation to	o exercise delegation to make t	he plan.	
	In this instance it is consi making functions to Coun	dered appropriate to issue auth cil to make the Plan.	orisation and delegate plan	
verall adequacy o	f the proposal			
Does the proposal mee	et the adequacy criteria? Yes			
f No, comment :		for Gateway determination.		
oosal Assessment	attention for heading a	IN REPORT OF		
incipal LEP:				
Due Date :				
Comments in relation o Principal LEP :	The plan will amend Gosford LEP 2014.			
ssessment Criteria	a			
leed for planning proposal :	Council is concerned that the sunset provisions are drafted so as to have implications for development proposals relying on the incentive provisions. This concern relates to applications lodged prior to 2 April 2016, and in circumstances where determinations have been made after that date, and for applications not yet determined.			
	Council's original intent for the clause was that the clause would apply to applications lodged prior to 2 April 2016, irrespective of whether the applications were determined.			
Consistency with trategic planning ramework :	The proposal is consistent with the relevant strategic planning framework.			
Environmental social economic impacts :	Council considers the benefits of proceeding with the planning proposal outweigh any potential impacts and this assessment is supported.			
	_			
ssessment Proces	S			
	S Routine	Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
roposal type : ïmeframe to make		•	14 Days RPA	
Proposal type : Timeframe to make EP : Public Authority	Routine	Period :	and the second second second	
Proposal type : Timeframe to make EP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Routine 6 months	Period :	and the second second second	
Proposal type : Timeframe to make EP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Routine 6 months	Period :	and the second second second	
Proposal type : Proposal type : Timeframe to make EP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) S Public Hearing by the 2)(a) Should the matter	Routine 6 months	Period :	and the second second second	

Identify any additional stu	udies, if required. :		
If Other, provide reasons	3		
Identify any internal const	ultations, if required :		
Is the provision and fundi	ing of state infrastructure relevant to th	is plan? No	
If Yes, reasons :			
cuments			
Document File Name 1. Gateway request - Letter to DoPE requesting Gateway Determination.pdf Planning Proposal - CBD Clause 8.9_October 2016.pdf		DocumentType Name	Is Public Yes Yes
		Proposal Covering Letter	
		Proposal	
Additional Information :	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Trans 5.1 Implementation of Regional Stu 6.1 Approval and Referral Require The proposal should proceed subj	rategies ments	
	1. Community consultation is re- Days	quired under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 o	of the Act for 14
	2. No consultation is required with	th public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the Act.
	3. A public hearing is not require	ed to be held into the matter.	
	4. The timeframe for completing	the LEP is to be 6 months.	
	*		
Supporting Reasons			
Supporting Reasons :			
Supporting Reasons :	G Phofkin	2	

•