

PLANNING PROPOSAL

for

WYNDHAM STREET PRECINCT, GRETA

PART 1 – OBJECTIVES & INTENDED OUTCOMES

Objective

To rezone land on the northern fringe of Greta for residential purposes, with the constrained residue area to remain undeveloped.

Additional investigations are required in order to determine the appropriate zone, lot sizes and number of lots to be created by the Planning Proposal.

Attachment 1 contains a Locality Plan for the Wyndham Street Precinct.

PART 2 – EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED LEP:

This Planning Proposal will amend Cessnock Local Environmental Plan 2010 (following its gazettal) by rezoning the subject land from the RU2 Rural Landscape Zone to allow residential development. Additional investigations are required to determine the most appropriate zone and minimum lot size for the site.

Part of the Wyndham Street Precinct was identified in the Citywide Settlement Strategy 2003 as suitable for Rural Residential development. The entire site was subsequently identified in the LHRs as suitable for residential development.

Council originally exhibited the proposal to rezone the land to R2 Low Density Residential Zone, with the creation of approximately 316 lots. Following an extensive exhibition period in which six written and 379 proforma letters of objection to the Wyndham Street Planning Proposal were received, Council resolved to reinvestigate the site and determine the most appropriate zoning for this land. This investigation will include consideration of the use of the R5 Large Lot Residential Zone, in order to be more consistent with the adjoining rural-residential development.

In addition, infrastructure considerations are being negotiated as part of a VPA for the site. These considerations include the impacts of additional traffic on the local and regional road network generated by future residential development, contributions to local open space and community facilities and drainage works.

Further investigations are therefore required with regard to outstanding matters associated with this spot rezoning. As such, at its meeting held on 23 June 2010, Council resolved to defer ongoing consideration of the Wyndham Street Precinct spot rezoning proposal until after the adoption of the comprehensive Local Environmental Plan.

PART 3 – JUSTIFICATION

Section A: Need for the planning proposal

1. Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

In December 2006, following the release of the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy, which identifies the Wyndham Street Precinct as a future urban area, Council received a rezoning request for the site. This submission was prepared following investigations into the suitability of the land for residential development and contains a number of site specific studies, including:

- Vegetation
- Traffic
- Impact on adjoining development
- Contamination

Following investigations, the Planning Proposal is likely to require amending, taking into consideration the constraints of the site, including:

A Voluntary Planning Agreement is being prepared for the site and will address infrastructure requirements for the development. These considerations include the impacts of additional traffic on the local and regional road network generated by future residential development, contributions to local open space and community facilities and drainage works.

However, during the exhibition period, significant concern was raised regarding the proposed development. In particular, traffic impact, noise from higher density residential development, the destruction of a well-balanced rural landscape, and lifestyle impacts. Council intends to further investigate the most suitable form of development for this precinct.

While a Net Community Benefit test has not been undertaken a social assessment was submitted which indicates a positive balance of impacts. In particular, the benefits associated with a larger population such as generation of infrastructure and services, retention of school enrolments and economic benefits through employment during construction stage and additional consumer base for the existing commercial premises. Adverse impacts such as increased traffic generation and amenity issues generally associated with increased residential densities were identified.

3. Is there a net community benefit?

Under the existing zoning controls in the Cessnock LEP 1989, the increased residential densities are not achievable. Therefore, a change to the zoning and minimum lot sizes is required to enable additional residential subdivision of the subject land and to implement the directions of the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy.

2. Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

A Concept Plan for the precinct was also prepared and illustrates how development may occur by including lot layout, road network and location of detention basins. The plan indicates lot sizes ranging from 607 square metres to 2783 square metres (with a residue lot of 7.28 hectares) the site would have a total lot yield of approximately 316 lots. A copy of the concept plan is included in the background studies provided in Attachment 2.

- Urban Capability Assessment;
- Stormwater Management Plan;
- Social and Community Impact Assessment;
- Flora and Fauna Assessment;
- Aboriginal Heritage Report;
- Traffic and Transport Assessment;
- Bushfire Threat Assessment; and
- Preliminary Servicing Assessment.

This may result in an alternate zoning for the site to the R2 Low Density Residential Zone as was exhibited.

Section B: Relationship to strategic planning framework

4. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions contained within the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies?)

The Planning Proposal is consistent with the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy as it is identified as a proposed urban area.

The proposal will implement the housing targets identified in the LHRs by providing additional housing opportunities through increased residential densities at Greta. However, during the exhibition period, significant concern was raised regarding the proposed development. In particular, traffic impact, noise from higher density residential development, the destruction of a well-balanced rural landscape, and lifestyle impacts. Council intends to further investigate the most suitable form of development for this precinct

5. Is the planning proposal consistent with the local council's Community Strategic Plan, or other local strategic plan?

In order to implement Ministerial Direction No. 5.1 – Implementation of Regional Strategies, the Wynndham Street Precinct is identified in the CWSS (2010) as a future urban area with a lot yield of approximately 316 lots.

Following exhibition of the proposal with the Comprehensive LEP, Council resolved to reinvestigate the site and determine the most appropriate zoning for this land. This investigation will include considering the use of the R5 Large Lot Residential Zone, in order to be more consistent with the adjoining rural-residential development.

While the LHRs and the CWSS (2010) is not generally supportive of rural-residential development due to the fragmentation of agricultural land, difficulty in servicing and the constraint it puts on further urban expansion, the adjoining R5 Zone is an existing constraint to higher density residential development of this site.

6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable state environmental planning policies?

NO.	SEPP Title	Consistency of Planning Proposal
55	Remediation of land	A preliminary contamination report concludes that past and present land use activities could have lead to partial contamination of the site. An area of the site was previously used for poultry farming activities which may have contaminated the site. Therefore, as recommended by the Urban Capability Assessment undertaken for the site by Coffey Geosciences Pty Ltd, a Phase 2 Contamination Assessment is required in identified areas of the site to assess the potential for soil contamination and determine the suitability of the site for residential land use.

60	Exempt and Complying Development	Consistent.
64	Advertising and Signage	Consistent
	SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004	The provisions of this SEPP will be considered in assessment of any future residential development upon part of the subject site.
	BASIX (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004	The provisions of this SEPP will be considered in assessment of any future residential development upon part of the subject site.
	Infrastructure 2007	Clause 104 of the SEPP requires developments of a certain size identified within Schedule 3 to be referred to the RTA. Council has undertaken consultation with the RTA who advised that they will rely on provisions in the LEP which ensure that satisfactory arrangements for the provision of State public infrastructure are made prior to the subdivision of land in an urban release area.
		Future development applications will be assessed in accordance with provisions of this SEPP.

7. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?

Review of consistency of the Planning Proposal with the relevant Ministerial Directions for LEPs under s. 117 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979:

1. Employment and Resources

No.	Title	Comment
1.2	Rural Zones	The Planning Proposal seeks to rezone rural land – currently zoned 1(a) – Rural “A” Zone to accommodate residential development.
		The Wyndham Street Precinct is identified for future urban development in the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and for this reason is considered to be consistent with this Direction.

2. Environment and Heritage

No.	Title	Comment
2.3	Heritage Conservation	The Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) found 26 Aboriginal artefacts on the site, including stone artefacts and one scarred tree. A number of the sites will not be disturbed as they are located within the area will remain in the RU2 Rural Landscape Zone. The remaining sites will be located within a drainage reserve, as indicated on the conceptual subdivision layout. However, should any sites be impacted on by the residential

No.	Title	Comment
3.1	Residential Zones	This Direction prescribes that a draft LEP shall contain a requirement that residential development is not permitted until land is adequately serviced (or arrangements satisfactory to the council, or other appropriate authority, have been made to service it), unless justified by a strategy which is approved by the Director-General of the Department of Planning. Provisions in the draft LEP 2010 ensures that satisfactory arrangements are made for the provision of designated State public infrastructure and public utility infrastructure before the subdivision of land in an urban release area to satisfy needs that arise from development on the land. Notwithstanding, the site is identified for future urban development in the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and, as such, it is considered to be consistent with this Direction.
3.2	Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates	Consistency with this Direction can not yet be established because additional investigations are required to determine the proposed zone. Should the site be zoned R2 Low Density Residential Zone, the proposal will not be consistent with this Direction as Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates are a prohibited use in this zone. However, should the site be zoned R5 Large Lot Residential, the proposal will be consistent as Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates are a permissible land use in the zone. Notwithstanding, any inconsistency with this Direction can be justified as the Wyndham Street Precinct is identified for future urban development in the LHR.

3. Housing, Infrastructure and Urban Development

		development, the AHIA recommends that the objects should be salvaged and kept with the appropriate group, subject to permit being obtained. Both DECCW and the Mindaribba Local Aboriginal Land Council support this recommendation. The site does not contain any items of European Heritage. The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction.
--	--	--

No.	5.1	Implementation of Regional Strategies	The proposal implements directions contained within the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy, which identifies the Precinct as a proposed urban area. The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction.
Title			Comment

5. Regional Planning

No.	4.4	Planning for Bushfire Protection	This Direction requires consultation with the NSW Rural Fire Service if a draft LEP affects land mapped as bushfire prone land. The subject land is mapped as Bushfire Prone Land and a Bushfire Planning Assessment was prepared for the site. Comments received from the RFS during the section 62 consultation confirm that future development requires bushfire safety authorities to be issued by the RFS to enable the land to be developed. Detailed bushfire controls will need to be submitted and assessed at the development application stage to ensure compliance with Planning for Bushfire Protection Guidelines and Rural Fires Act 1997.
No.	4.3	Flood Prone Land	The site is dissected by several intermittent waterways. However, these areas are not identified as flood liable lands. Suitable treatment of the waterways including stormwater drainage requirements will be determined at the DA stage, when the lot layout is finalised
Title			Comment

4. Hazard and Risk

No.	3.3	Home Occupations	Home occupations are permitted without consent in the proposed zone. The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction.
No.	3.4	Integrating Land Use and Transport	Clause 6.1 of the LEP 2010 ensures that satisfactory arrangements for the provision of State public infrastructure are made prior to the subdivision of land in an urban release area. The site is identified in the LHRS for future urban development.

6. Local Plan Making

No.	Title	Comment
6.1	Approval and Referral Requirements	The Planning Proposal does not include concurrence, consultation or referral provisions and does not identify any development as designated development. The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction.

Section C: Environmental, social and economic impact

8. Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

A flora and fauna assessment was undertaken on the site in November 2006 by Harper Somers O'Sullivan where it was established that:

The site contains three (3) vegetation communities, namely:

- Central Hunter Ironbark – Spotted Gum – Grey Box Forest (CHISGGBF)
- Managed / Regenerating Vegetation
- Disturbed Lands

The CHISGGBF is not listed as an Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) in the Threatened Species Conservation Act, 1995.

The site contains four (4) threatened species as listed in the TSC Act, 1995, being:

- Pomatostomus temporalis (Grey-crowned Babbler)
- Petaurus norfolcensis (Squirrel Glider)
- Miniopterus australis (Little Bent-wing Bat)
- Miniopterus schreibersii (Large Bent-wing Bat)

This site was subject to a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the land holder, the Department of Planning and the Department of Environment and Climate Change regarding the environmental offsets. However, following decisions in the Land and Environment Court, the MoU was declared invalid. As a result, further investigations and negotiations are required to offset vegetation removal on the site.

9. Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposals and how are they proposed to be managed?

Servicing

A reticulated water strategy and a reticulated sewerage strategy is required to be provided at the subdivision stage.

Flooding

Final subdivision design will need to take into consideration the intermittent waterways that traverse the site and appropriate stormwater controls will need to be determined at the development application stage.

The provisions of Clause 6.1 and Clause 6.2 of the draft LEP 2010 will apply to the Precinct. These clauses ensure that satisfactory arrangements are made for the provision of designated State public infrastructure and public utility infrastructure before the subdivision of land in an urban release area to satisfy needs that arise from development on the land.

11. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

Section D: State and Commonwealth interests

A Voluntary Planning Agreement is being prepared for the site and will address infrastructure requirements for the development. These considerations include the impacts of additional traffic on the local and regional road network generated by future residential development, contributions to local open space and community facilities and drainage works.

However, during the exhibition period, significant concern was raised regarding the proposed development. In particular, traffic impact, noise from higher density residential development, the destruction of a well-balanced rural landscape, and lifestyle impacts. Council intends to further investigate the most suitable form of development for this precinct.

A social assessment was submitted which indicates a positive balance of impacts. In particular, the benefits associated with a larger population such as generation of infrastructure and services, retention of school enrolments and economic benefits through employment during construction stage and additional consumer base for the existing commercial premises. Adverse impacts such as increased traffic generation and amenity issues generally associated with increased residential densities were identified.

10. How has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

The preparation of a Voluntary Planning Agreement for local infrastructure considerations (including the impacts of additional traffic on the local road network generated by future residential development, contributions to local open space and community facilities and drainage works) will be undertaken during the assessment of the proposal.

Local Infrastructure

Bushfire risk assessment will be required at the development application stage to address requirements under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and the Rural Fires Act 1997.

As recommended by the Urban Capability Assessment undertaken for the site by Coffey Geosciences Pty Ltd, a Phase 2 Contamination Assessment is required in identified areas of the site to assess the potential for soil contamination and determine the suitability of the site for residential land use.

Contamination

Stormwater and Flooding Considerations

The site is dissected by several intermittent waterways. The DNR have been consulted with and recommend that the two minor streams on the site have their riparian vegetation maintained and rehabilitated. DNR also provides comments on stormwater management, buffer zones near wetlands, farm dams and APZs for bushfire management.

DNR makes recommendations about the location of stormwater capture and treatment works and the like, which will need to be considered in detailed design plans. DNR state that the stormwater management must maintain environmental flows and inundation patterns in the watercourses.

Suitable treatment of the waterways including stormwater drainage requirements will be determined at the DA stage, when the lot layout is finalised.

Traffic and Road Works

During the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, significant concern was raised regarding the impact that the proposal will have on local and regional road network.

The preparation of a VPA or s94 Plan will be used to address the impact of the addition traffic generated by the development on the local road network. Clause 6.1 of the Cessnock LEP 2010 requires satisfactory arrangements to be made for the provision of designated State public infrastructure before the subdivision of land in an urban release area to satisfy needs that arise from development on the land, but only if the land is developed intensively for urban purposes.

Further investigations regarding the inclusions in the VPA are required.

Reticulated Water and Reticulated Waste Water Servicing Strategies

HWC advised that there were some deficiencies in the system to cater for the proposed development. However, augmentation work can be undertaken to ensure the proposal can be adequately serviced. Notwithstanding, Clause 6.2 of the Cessnock LEP 2010 states that development consent must not be granted for development on land in an urban release area unless the Council is satisfied that any public utility infrastructure that is essential for the proposed development is available or that adequate arrangements have been made to make that infrastructure available when required.

12. What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination?

Council received authorisation from the Department of Planning on 22 February 2007. Consultation with relevant Government Agencies was subsequently undertaken from 9 March 2007. A summary of the responses and comments are provided below.

Department of Environment and Climate Change (now DECCW)

At the time of consultation, DECCW advised that vegetation offsets have been addressed over the site by a signed MoU between DECC, the Department of Planning and the landholder which also addresses vegetation offset considerations in relation to Lot 2, DP 808354, not subject to the MoU.

Comment: Since this time and following decisions in the Land and Environment Court, the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the land holder, the Department of Planning and the Department of Environment and Climate Change regarding the environmental offsets was declared invalid. As a result, further investigations and negotiations are required to offset vegetation removal on the site prior to proceeding with this proposal.

DECC further advised that the Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA) would require evidence that the Mindaribba Local Aboriginal Land Council (MLALC) were consulted during the AHIA assessment and preparation. The proponent has provided Council with this evidence.

Comment: The AHIA states that members from the MLALC were present during the field survey and participated in formulating the assessment, while the Lower Hunter Wonnarua Council Inc. participated in the field survey. Comments made by those consulted have been incorporated into the recommendations of the consultants. In addition, to ensure that adequate consultation was undertaken, an advertisement was placed in the Maitland Mercury on 11th September 2007. No additional individuals or groups responded.

Department of Natural Resources

The Department supports the rezoning subject to a number of issues being considered: DNR recommends that the two minor streams on the site have their riparian vegetation maintained and rehabilitated. DNR also provides comments on stormwater management, buffer zones near wetlands, farm dams and APZs for bushfire management.

DNR makes recommendations about the location of stormwater capture and treatment works and the like, which will need to be considered in detailed design plans. DNR state that the stormwater management must maintain environmental flows and inundation patterns in the watercourses.

Any groundwater issues, including any groundwater dependant ecosystems and any potential degradation issues, must be identified and considered during the rezoning process.

Comment: Issues raised by DNR can be addressed during the development stage. In particular, a comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan will be considered in the preparation of a detailed subdivision design. There are no groundwater issues associated with the site.

Alinta Asset Management

Natural gas is available in the vicinity and could be extended to supply the site. It is Alinta's policy to extend gas mains to all developments where possible, depending upon economic viability.

Energy Australia

Advised that while there are no works proposed for this site, there are no major constraints to providing the required infrastructure.

Hunter Water Corporation

Water Supply: The development is located in the Matland North Rothbury Water Supply System which currently has insufficient pressure to service the proposed development. HWC has plans for regional augmentations in the area including 905m of 250mm watermain between Nelson Street and West Street along the New England HWY. This is due to be completed in 2008/09. The development may be required to connect to this main to meet minimum pressure requirements and security of supply will need to be satisfied when development commences.

Wastewater Transportation: The development site drains to Branxton No.3 WWPS. Sections of the downstream gravity system need upgrading to handle theoretical loads. These are expected to be complete by 2011/12. Branxton No.3 WWPS is currently deficient to service theoretical loads and upgrades are scheduled for competition in 2010/11.

Wastewater Treatment: The proposed development is located within the Branxton WWTW catchment. This WWTW does not currently have sufficient capacity to service this and other proposed developments in Branxton catchment area. However, HWC is currently in the planning phase for a wastewater treatment plant upgrade, which should be commissioned in 2010 -2012. Due to uncertainties associated with the size and timing of land developments with the Branxton area and approval requirements for treatment upgrades, HWC cannot make any firm commitment as to when treatment capacity will be available. The developer should liaise with HWC re the proposed size and timing of this development to ensure capacity is available.

Comment: A servicing strategy has been undertaken by the proponents in consultation with HWC. The assessment identifies some current deficiencies in the Greta/Branxton area. However the assessment concludes that the Wynndham St Precinct can be economically serviced with sewer and water. The proponent further sought comments from HWC under S50 and the proponent has made amendments to reflect the recommendations; the amended proposal has been forwarded by the proponent to HWC.

Clause 6.2 in the LEP 2010 requires that development consent must not be granted for development on land in an urban release area unless the Council is satisfied that any public utility infrastructure that is essential for the proposed development is available or that adequate arrangements have been made to make that infrastructure available when required.

Mindaribba Local Aboriginal Land Council (MLALC)

MLALC does not have any objection to the proposed rezoning so long as an appropriate Aboriginal Heritage or Archaeological Assessment is undertaken in consultation with MLALC.

Comment: The Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment states that MLALC were present during the field surveys and participated in formulating the assessment. Evidence of such consultation is contained within the AHIA.

NSW Rural Fire Service

The RFS does not object to the proposal but notes that future residential and potential Special Fire Protection Purpose developments will be required to comply with Section 79BA of the EPA Act and Section 100B of the *Rural Fires Act 1997*. It is noted that APZ to be provided in accordance with Planning for Bushfire Protection Act 2006. Further, provision for water for fire fighting and construction requirements in addition to on site provisions will need to be addressed at the appropriate stage of the development.

Roads and Traffic Authority

The Authority will rely on Clause 66 of the LEP 1989 "Public Infrastructure in Urban Release Areas" which requires the developer to enter into a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) / Deed Containing Agreement before development commences.

Comment: Similarly to Clause 66 of LEP 1989, under the draft LEP 2010, the provisions of Clause 6.1 ensures that satisfactory arrangements for the provision of State public infrastructure are made prior to the subdivision of land in an urban release area.

Telstra

Telstra have advised Council that they have an obligation to provide services to developments and are generally able to provide the services given enough lead time to plan, design and construct the network.

Hunter – Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority

The CMA stated that proposals involving clearing of vegetation are automatic "red lights" when they involve an EEC in "better than low condition". It therefore objected to clearing of the on the site. It also stated that clearing of EECs (in better than low condition) cannot be offset.

Comment: This advice is contradictory to that from the DECCW. Following decisions in the Land and Environment Court, the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the land holder, the Department of Planning and the Department of Environment and Climate Change regarding the environmental offsets was declared invalid. As a result, further investigations and negotiations between DECCW and the proponent are required to offset vegetation removal on the site prior to proceeding with this Planning Proposal.

Part 4 – COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The Wynndham Street Precinct spot rezoning proposal was exhibited in conjunction with the Comprehensive LEP.

The public exhibition of the draft LEP, draft CWSS and draft DCP was initially undertaken for an eleven (11) week period from 27 July 2009 to 12 October 2009. This period was extended for a further nine (9) weeks until 11 December 2009.

The exhibition material was available for viewing on Council's website, at Council's Administration Building, Cessnock and Kurri Kurri Libraries, the Visitor Information Centre at Pokolbin, the Branxton and Vineyard Real Estate at Branxton and the

General Store at Wollombi. In addition, a dedicated computer terminal in the Administrative building and computers at the Cessnock and Kurri Kurri Libraries were available for electronic on-line viewing of the exhibition material and for making a submission.

Given the level of interest surrounding the Wyncham Street Precinct proposal, a community briefing session on the proposal was held on 7 September 2009. During this exhibition period, six (6) written and 379 proforma letters of objection to the Planning Proposal were received. Additional investigation is required to determine the most appropriate zone for this site.

Upon completion of the additional investigations, it is anticipated that an additional exhibition period will be undertaken. Due to the size of the proposal, and in accordance with Council's Public Notification Policy, it is anticipated that this Planning Proposal will be exhibited for an additional period of twenty eight (28) days.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of outstanding investigations that are required in order to determine the how the site should be developed. The following table provides an overview of these outstanding matters, a recommended course of action and the proposed action to be undertaken to proceed with the proposal.

OUTSTANDING MATTER	RECOMMENDATION	ACTION
Traffic	Undertake investigations for road network improvements to be included in the VPA for the site.	Continue the preparation of a VPA for the site in consultation with Council's Infrastructure department. Include provisions in the VPA for local road network improvements.
VPA	Prepare a VPA to provide for infrastructure considerations for the site. These considerations include the impacts of additional traffic on the local and regional road network generated by future residential development, contributions to local open space and community facilities and drainage works.	Continue negotiations with proponent and in consultation with Council's Community and Infrastructure Departments.
Contamination	That a Phase 2 Contamination Assessment, as recommended by the Urban Capability Assessment undertaken for the site by Coffey Geosciences Pty Ltd, is prepared for those identified areas of the site to assess the potential for soil	Council request a Phase 2 Contamination Assessment from the proponent in order to satisfy the requirements of SEPP 55.

	contamination and determine the suitability of the site for residential land use in accordance with SEPP 55.	
Vegetation	That a Vegetation Offsets Package be negotiated between the proponent and DECCW to compensate for any vegetation loss resulting from the proposal.	Council continue to facilitate discussions between DECCW and the proponent for a suitable vegetation offsets package for the site.
Zoning	That the impact of the development on traffic, noise, rural landscape and lifestyle be further investigated to determine the most suitable form of development for this precinct.	Council continue to investigate the outstanding issues to determine the most suitable zoning for the Precinct.
Exhibition	That Council re-exhibit the Planning Proposal upon completion of the further investigations.	Due to the size of the proposal, and in accordance with Council's Public Notification Policy, it is anticipated that this Planning Proposal will be exhibited for an additional period of twenty eight (28) days

ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT 1: Locality Plan

ATTACHMENT 2: CD containing BACKGROUND REPORT and STUDIES