File No:	RZ13007 & 103/64
Attachments: 1 2	 Planning Proposal DCP Amendment Plans (under separate cover)
Responsible Officer:	Bernie Mortomore - Executive Manager Planning, Environment and Lifestyle David Simm - Manager Development & Environment Ian Shillington - Manager Urban Growth
Author:	Josh Ford - Strategic Town Planner Stephen Punch - Principal Planner
Maitland +10	Outcome 9. Our local rivers and floodplains
Council Objective:	9.2.1 To increase activity and utilisation of the flood plain, consistent with the flood risk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A planning proposal has been prepared in accordance with Section 55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, for proposed amendments to all Flood Planning Maps (FPMs) contained in the Maitland Local Environmental Plan 2011 (MLEP 2011). The need for the planning proposal is the result of inconsistencies between the Flood Planning Levels (FPLs) contained within the MLEP 2011 and the Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010 (herein referred to as the Flood Study 2010).

A Floodplain Risk Management Study has been prepared by WMA Water and presented to Council's Floodplain Management Committee for comment. Some of the key recommendations of that Study involved changes to the MLEP 2011 FPMs and Maitland Citywide Development Control Plan 2011 (MDCP 2011) chapter Hunter River Floodplain Management. Given that Council has been requested to exhibit the draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan under this same agenda, it is timely to seek Council's endorsement to exhibit the proposed amendments to both the MLEP 2011 and MDCP 2011.

The planning proposal applies to all land within the Maitland LGA that is within the 1:100 Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) flood extent defined in the 2010 Flood Study (plus 0.5m freeboard). The MLEP 2011 FPMs will be updated to reflect this flood extent, so as to be consistent with the definition of FPL included under Clause 7.3 (5) of the MLEP 2011, being a 1:100 ARI plus 0.5m freeboard. It should be noted that Clause 7.3(5) of the MLEP 2011 is a "Model Local Provision" administered in accordance with the provisions of the Standard Instrument LEP implemented statewide by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

THAT

- 1. Pursuant to Section 55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the planning proposal be submitted to the Department of Planning & Environment for a Gateway Determination.
- 2. Following receipt of the Gateway Determination, the planning proposal be exhibited concurrently with (i) the proposed amendments to MDCP 2011 chapter Hunter River Floodplain Management; and (ii) the draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan for a minimum period of fifty-six (56) days.
- 3. A further report be presented to Council following the public exhibition period, to demonstrate compliance with the Gateway Determination and to provide details of any submissions received throughout that process relating to the planning proposal and proposed DCP amendments.
- 4. A separate report be presented to Council following the public exhibition period, to respond solely to any submissions raised in relation to the draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan, as noted in the earlier agenda item.

BACKGROUND

A Floodplain Risk Management Study has been prepared by WMA Water and presented to Council's Floodplain Management Committee for comment. Some of the key recommendations of that Study involved changes to the MLEP 2011 Flood Planning Maps (FPM's) and the Maitland Citywide Development Control Plan 2011 (MDCP 2011) chapter Hunter River Floodplain Management. Given that Council is being requested to exhibit the draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan under this same agenda, it is appropriate to seek Council's endorsement to co-exhibit the proposed amendments to both the MLEP 2011 and MDCP 2011.

The planning proposal is required in order to update the current FPMs contained in the MLEP 2011 to align with the flood mapping contained within the Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010. This 2010 flood study was adopted by Council on 27 July 2010. The revised FPM's will be based on the modelled 1:100 ARI flood event extents contained in 2010 Flood Study with the addition of the 0.5m freeboard which together represent the FPL. The revised LEP FPM's will then be consistent with the wording of the flood planning controls outlined under Clause 7.3(5) of the MLEP 2011.

The Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010 employed a combination of hydrologic and hydraulic models to determine design flood levels resulting from various Hunter River flood event scenarios. The modelling took into consideration coincident inflows from tributaries such as Wallis Creek, Fishery Creek, Black Creek and part of the Paterson River. The possible effects of climate change induced increases in design rainfall intensities were also analysed. The flood study supersedes the previous flood study completed in two parts in 1990 and 1998.

The draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan (FRMP) is based on the findings of the 2010 Flood Study and is proposed to be placed on public exhibition concurrently with this planning proposal and the proposed amendments to DCP Chapter – Hunter River Floodplain Management, which are discussed later in this report.

The final stage of the flood management process is the implementation of the FRMP, which will follow the adoption of the FRMP. This includes construction of flood mitigation works to protect existing development, adoption and adherence to the proposed MLEP 2011 and MDCP 2011 amendments relating to flooding, and relevant policies to ensure that new development is compatible with the flood hazard. The planning proposal is therefore consistent with implementation of the 2010 Flood Study and Draft FRMP.

POLICY CONTEXT

The MLEP 2011 is Council's principal statutory planning instrument that governs land use planning decisions within the Maitland LGA, with support from the guidelines contained under the MDCP 2011. The subject planning proposal aims to amend all FPMs contained under the MLEP 2011, which means that land throughout the whole of the Maitland LGA that is currently identified as flood affected on the existing FPMs, and land that will be shown to be flood affected on the proposed FPMs, will be subject to the planning proposal.

Properties that are currently shown as flood affected, or partially flood affected, on the existing FPMs will illustrate that land as:

- (i) remaining completely flood affected; or
- (ii) no longer being shown as flood affected; or
- (iii) showing a greater extent of flood affectation; or
- (iv) showing a lesser extent of flood affectation.

Furthermore, there will be properties that will now be shown as flood affected on the proposed FPMs that are not shown on the existing FPMs, since the comprehensive mapping of the new Flood Planning Area will result in some properties being identified as flood affected, even though they are currently illustrated as being free of flooding on the existing FPMs.

DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN

The objective of the draft LEP is to amend the Flood Planning Maps in the MLEP 2011 to reflect the definition of Flood Planning Level included under Clause 7.3 (5) of the MLEP 2011 written instrument, being a 1:100 ARI plus 0.5m freeboard. The FPMs are provided in the planning proposal, which is included as **Attachment 1**.

Flood Planning Maps

The current FPMs contained in the MLEP 2011 illustrate a flood planning area derived from outdated flood mapping data that was the best data available to Council at the time of preparing the MLEP 2011. The MLEP 2011 FPM's can only be brought up to date to reflect the flood extent informed by data contained in the 2010 Flood Study through a planning proposal process which amends the current LEP. The

2010 flood data has been used as the basis for establishing the FPL which will be shown on the revised LEP FPM's.

Gateway Planning Process

If Council resolves to forward the planning proposal to the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE) seeking a Gateway Determination, the next step is for DPE to issue a Gateway Determination which will outline the requirements for community and government agency consultation. The outcomes of community and government agency consultation will be reported to Council as part of a future Council report.

MAITLAND CITYWIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN CHAPTER: HUNTER RIVER FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT (HRFM)

MDCP 2011 HRFM Chapter - Flood Mapping Amendments

The current version of the HRFM chapter of the Maitland DCP 2011 has remained largely unchanged since its initial adoption by Council in August 2000. The DCP mapping was initially based on flood modelling undertaken in 1998 (below the Oakhampton railway bridge). Flood level information for that part of the Hunter River upstream of the Oakhampton railway bridge was based on a compilation of anecdotal information collected over a series of flood events by Council and local landowners. Flood data for the part of the Paterson River catchment within the Maitland LGA had to be derived from flood modelling undertaken by Port Stephens Council. The flood maps originally contained in the DCP were removed in 2011 when the DCP was adopted in its revised 2011 'single document' format.

The Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010 represents the most extensive flood modelling for the Hunter River commissioned by Council to date extending from the LGA boundary in the west to Duckenfield in the east. When combined with flood extents mapping undertaken for the Paterson River and Hunter River (Millers Forest area) by Port Stephens Council, we now have the most comprehensive data on flooding as it affects the Maitland LGA.

In the same way as the FPM's contained within the Maitland LEP 2011 require amendment to align with the latest available flood data, it is now necessary to reintroduce mapping into the Maitland DCP 2011 to align the DCP with the information contained in the Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010. The DCP flood mapping however will include a greater level of detail than the Maitland LEP FPM's in order to better inform the community of the more specific characteristics of flooding at a particular site(s). Unlike the proposed LEP mapping which will illustrate the 'flood planning level' only, the DCP mapping will also show in addition to the FPL:

- Flood extents mapping for the 1:100 year ARI flood event
- Flood extents mapping for the 'probable maximum flood' (PMF)
- Depth of inundation (greater than or less than 0.5 metres) for the 1:100 year ARI flood event

- Floodwater velocity (greater than or less than 0.5metres per second) for the 1:100 year ARI flood event
- Hydraulic categories (flood storage, flood fringe and floodway) for the 1:100 year ARI flood event
- Hazard categories (high hazard or low hazard) for the 1:100 year ARI flood event

The proposed DCP incorporating the amendment maps are included within the draft DCP document provided to Council under separate cover.

As well as the addition of new flood maps to the DCP a number of amendments are also proposed to the wording of the DCP documents to reflect :

- Changes to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 which reinforce the status of DCP's as 'guideline' documents that cannot contain provisions more onerous than an LEP but must support and facilitate the LEP provisions;
- Ensuring conformity with the NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005;
- Updating provisions to align with more contemporary floodplain management practices;
- Recommendations, where appropriate, of Council's flood consultants.

The key changes to the current DCP are:

- More succinctly identifies the matters that Council should take into consideration when assessing a development application in relation to 'risk to life' and 'risk to property';
- Provides more detailed guidelines in relation to development within or adjacent to floodways;
- Provides guidelines in relation to the filling of land;
- Permits the development of two storey buildings with habitable ground floor space below the flood planning level (FPL);
- Provides detailed requirements for design and construction for that part of a building below the FPL;
- Clarifies those circumstances where upgrading of existing dwellings to contemporary flood compatible design standards should be undertaken;
- Includes a provision requiring critical infrastructure such as hospitals to be located above the probable maximum flood (PMF);
- Introduces guidelines for basement car parks where they are to be located below the FPL;
- Provides that Council may consider alternative solutions to the DCP guidelines in certain circumstances and for certain types of development; and
- Updates the guidelines relating to flood aware design and construction.

Perhaps the most significant change to the DCP controls is the move towards allowing habitable floorspace in a dwelling to be located below the flood planning level (FPL). For the last 40 years or so the planning framework around Central Maitland has actively discouraged residential development. This changed somewhat with the coming into force of the Maitland LEP 2011 and has been promoted to an even greater extent through the recommendations of the adopted Central Maitland Structure Plan. This document recognises that growth in Central Maitland's residential population is key to the revitalisation of the city centre.

The amount of habitable floorspace permitted below the FPL will be limited to no more than 50 per cent of the total habitable floor area of the dwelling. Habitable floorspace would include bedrooms, living rooms, kitchen, bathrooms and laundry but would not include garages and balconies, verandahs, terraces or other outdoor entertaining spaces.

The DCP includes a table which sets out a comprehensive range of requirements for the design and construction of dwellings on flood liable land. In the case of two storey dwellings with habitable floorspace below the FPL, the type of construction required and the design components that would need to be included are generally:

- Concrete slab to ground floor either infill slab or slab with deepened edge beam
- Masonry walls either cavity brick or solid masonry
- Ground floor finishes to be either polished concrete, tile or removable carpet
- Minimising built-in cabinetry on the ground floor eg: no kitchen to ground floor
- Provide good access opportunity to first floor to allow for relocation of furniture and personal belongings wide stairway to be of steel or solid timber construction
- Separation of ground floor and first floor electrical circuits with earth leakage protection
- Provision of first floor balconies or terraces with gate to serve as evacuation point

The aim of the above standards is to minimise the costs associated with flood inundation by mitigating or reducing flood damage to the building itself and also to furniture and belongings. Flood warning times for major flood scenarios are likely to be sufficient to enable residents to relocate furniture and belongings to the first floor and to evacuate the building. Post flood clean-up is made easier and damage to the building itself likely to be significantly reduced if the ground floor is essentially masonry construction.

The DCP provides guidance on 'how' residential buildings are to be constructed on flood liable land only where the LEP permits residential buildings in the first instance. In this regard the DCP can only support and facilitate the outcomes sought by the LEP. Allowing habitable floorspace below the FPL subject to the incorporation of 'flood aware' design elements and construction materials is an appropriate planning response to the flood constraint in Central Maitland and an approach that has been informed by the document entitled "*Reducing Vulnerability of Buildings to Flood*

Damage - Guidance on Building in Flood Prone Areas" prepared by the NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change, CSIRO and others in 2007 for the Hawkesbury-Nepean Floodplain Management Steering Committee.

The NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005 (FPDM) does not expressly require that a Council must adopt the 1:100 ARI flood level as its flood standard but recommends that FPL's be based on this flood event scenario. Nor does the manual prevent the Council from permitting the development of habitable floorspace below the FPL. Rather, the Manual aims to provide a flexible merit based approach to be followed by Council's when dealing with development or redevelopment of flood prone land. The Manual supports the NSW Government's Flood Prone Land Policy in providing development of sustainable strategies for managing human occupation and use of the floodplain taking into account a range of risk management principles. The analysis of risk and the assessment of risk management options is undertaken in the context of the carrying out of detailed flood modelling to properly understand the extent and characteristics of flooding in a particular area and also through the undertaking of a 'floodplain risk management plan'.

It should be noted that Council's flood consultants have a preference that habitable floorspace not be permitted below the FPL. This view is not so much based on a concern that people will be exposed to an increased level of risk (noting that the current Maitland LEP and DCP facilitates new residential on flood prone land provided habitable floor levels are at or above the FPL) but rather that the costs associated with property damage and post flood clean-up are likely to be higher.

It needs to be acknowledged however that the FPDM provides councils with a framework for implementing the policy that considers the costs and benefits of floodplain occupation in full recognition that associated management decisions need to consider broader issues in an integrated approach. In this regard, decisions regarding the establishment of a proportion of a dwellings habitable floorspace below the FPL should also be considered in the context of other planning imperatives that are relevant to an area. In this regard the permitting of habitable floorspace below the flood standard has the following advantages:

- Will provide a further incentive to residential occupation of Central Maitland (an aim of the Central Maitland Structure Plan);
- Will provide for improved architectural and streetscape outcomes particularly in Central Maitland where the majority of the available land is contained within a heritage conservation area;
- Provides for a reduction in building footprint, scale and bulk given that habitable floorspace does not need to be spread over a single level and elevated high above ground level;
- Provides, theoretically, for an increase in residential densities given that building footprints can be reduced.

The draft HRFM chapter of the Maitland DCP 2011 will be exhibited in conjunction with the planning proposal discussed earlier in this report. The exhibition period will occur after the Department of Planning and Environment issue its gateway determination for the amendment to the Maitland LEP that will include the revised

flood mapping. The draft DCP will be referred specifically to the Council's Floodplain Management Committee and the Insurance Council of Australia as part of this exhibition/consultation process.

It should be noted however that increased residential occupation within Central Maitland needs also to have regard to the recommendations contained within the Floodplain Risk Management Plan which have been the subject of a separate report to Council.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This matter has no direct financial impact upon Council's adopted budget or forward estimates.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This matter has no specific policy implications for Council.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

There are no statutory implications under the Local Government Act 1993 with this matter.

CONCLUSION

The planning proposal is for the purpose of amending FPMs contained under the MLEP 2011, and does not involve the rezoning of any land. The amendment of FPMs in the MLEP 2011 will provide a FPL based on comprehensive flood mapping across the whole of the LGA, which will be consistent with Clause 7.3(5) of the MLEP 2011 written instrument that defines the FPL.

The proposed amendments to the Maitland DCP 2011 are an appropriate and contemporary response to the management of flood liable land within the Maitland LGA having regard to a range of other broader planning considerations. The draft DCP will require exhibition in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000 and will be reported again to Council at the conclusion of the exhibition/notification process.

Planning, Environment and Lifestyle Reports

AMENDMENTS TO MAITLAND LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2011 FLOOD PLANNING MAPS & AMENDMENTS TO MAITLAND CITYWIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN 2011 CHAPTER -HUNTER RIVER FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

Planning Proposal

Meeting Date: 9 September 2014

Attachment No: 1

Number of Pages: 27





AMENDMENT TO THE MAITLAND LEP 2011

Amendments to Flood Planning Maps Version 1.0 28/08/2014

CONTENTS

INTRODUC	ETION
PART 1:	OBJECTIVES OR INTENDED OUTCOMES
PART 2:	EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS2
PART 3:	JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED REZONING2
SECTION	A – NEED FOR THE PLANNING PROPOSAL
SECTION	N B – RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK
SECTION	NC – ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT
SECTION	ND – STATE AND COMMONWEALTH INTERESTS
PART 4:	DRAFT LEP MAPS
PART 5:	COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
PART 6:	TIMEFRAMES

Version 1.0 - 25.07.2014 (For Section 55 Council Report)

Tables

Table 1: Relevant State Environmental Planning Policies	5
Table 2: s117 Directions,	5

p i | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

INTRODUCTION

This planning proposal has been prepared in accordance with Section 55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. It explains the intended effect of, and justification for the proposed amendment to Maitland Local Environmental Plan 2011 (MLEP 2011) to update all Flood Planning Maps (FPMs) contained in the MLEP 2011.

This planning proposal is the result of inconsistencies between the Flood Planning Levels (FPLs) contained within the MLEP 2011 and the Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010 (herein referred to as the Flood Study 2010).

The planning proposal applies to all land within the Maitland LGA that is flood affected, as per the 1:100 Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) flood extent defined in the Flood Study 2010 (plus 0.5m freeboard). The MLEP 2011 FPMs will be updated to reflect this flood extent, so as to be consistent with the definition of Flood Planning Level included under Clause 7.3 (5) of the MLEP 2011, being a 1:100 ARI plus 0.5m freeboard.

p1 |Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

PART 1: OBJECTIVES OR INTENDED OUTCOMES

The objectives of the proposal are;

1. To amend the Flood Planning Maps in the MLEP 2011 to reflect the definition of Flood Planning Level included under Clause 7.3 (5) of the MLEP 2011, which is 1:100 ARI plus 0.5m freeboard.

PART 2: EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

The planning proposal seeks to amend all Flood Planning Maps (FPMs) contained within the Maitland LEP 2011 to reflect the Flood Planning Level (FPL) informed by the *Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010* and other supporting flood studies from adjoining LGAs which, collectively, map the 1:100 ARI plus 0.5m freeboard FPL.

PART 3: JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED REZONING

In accordance with the Department of Planning's 'Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals', this section provides a response to the following issues:

- Section A: Need for the planning proposal;
- Section B: Relationship to strategic planning framework;
- Section C: Environmental, social and economic impact; and
- Section D: State and Commonwealth interests,

SECTION A - NEED FOR THE PLANNING PROPOSAL

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

The planning proposal is a result of mapping inconsistencies being noted between the current FPMs contained in the MLEP 2011 and information contained within the *Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010.* The current FPMs contained in the MLEP 2011 reflect outdated flood mapping from before the Flood Study 2010 was adopted by Council. This mapping anomaly requires a planning proposal to amend the current maps to reflect the flood extent informed by data contained in the 2010 Flood Study and flood studies from adjoining LGAs, which will also reflect consistency with the definition of Flood Planning Level as outlined under Clause 7.3(5) of the MLEP 2011.

The Hunter River (Branxton to Green Rocks) Flood Study was completed in December 2010. A combination of hydrologic and hydraulic models were used in that study to determine design flood levels resulting from modelled Hunter River flood events. The modelling took into consideration coincident inflows from tributaries such as Wallis Creek, Fishery Creek, Black Creek and part of the Paterson River. The possible effects of climate change induced increases in design rainfall intensities were also analysed. The flood study supersedes the previous flood study completed in two parts in 1990 and 1998.

p2 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

Based on the findings of the 2010 Flood Study, the Draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan (FRMP) has recently been prepared, which is proposed to be placed on public exhibition concurrent with the this planning proposal and the proposed Draft DCP Chapter – Hunter River Floodplain Management.

The final stage of the flood management process is the implementation of the FRMP, which will follow the adoption of the FRMP. This includes construction of flood mitigation works to protect existing development, adoption and adherence to the proposed MLEP 2011 and MDCP 2011 amendments relating to flooding, and relevant policies to ensure that new development is compatible with the flood hazard. The planning proposal is therefore consistent with implementation of the 2010 Flood Study and Draft FRMP.

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

This mapping anomaly requires a planning proposal to amend the current flood extent shown in the MLEP 2011 FPMs to reflect the 2010 Flood Study data and Clause 7.3(5) of the MLEP 2011. There is no better way, or alternative way, to achieve this objective.

NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005

The NSW Floodplain Development Manual (FDM) 2005 identifies the need for local Councils to "...Incorporate appropriate planning provisions of Floodplain Risk Management Plans into LEPs, DCPs and development control policies." (FDM 2005:11). Given that Council has access to the flood extent information (ie 1:100 ARI extent) outlined under the Flood Study 2010, Council is complying with the FDM 2005 principles relating to LEP amendments by mapping the 1:100 ARI extent in its proposed FPL maps under the Maitland LEP 2011. While the Draft FRMP has not yet been adopted by Council, the *Hunter River: Branxton to Green Rocks Flood Study 2010* was adopted by Council on 27 July 2010. The action to update the Maitland LEP 2011 FPMs is seen to be consistent with the FDM 2005 and the adopted 2010 Flood Study.

3. Is there a net community benefit?

No net community benefit test has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal. While land use planning, development and flood data requests are currently assessed by reference to the Flood Study 2010 (meaning that the most up to date flood information is available), the formalisation of this data into the MLEP 2011 is considered to be of significant community benefit. This will also benefit Council staff in their operational duties, by simplifying the process for the distribution and assessment of flood levels and mapping, by providing one centralised statutory location for referencing flood extent information relating to land within the Maitland LGA.

p3 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

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?

Lower Hunter Regional Strategy (NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure) 2006

Page 38 of the LHRS discusses the issue of flooding as a natural hazard. The most pertinent comments in the LHRS are:

"Appropriate planning provisions will be incorporated in Local Environmental Plans consistent with the Floodplain Development Manual and Council's risk management plan to minimise risk from flooding." (LHRS, 2006:38); and

"Local Environmental Plans will zone areas subject to high hazard to reflect the limitations of the land." (LHRS 2006:39).

These outcomes and actions clearly demonstrate the importance of maintaining up to date flood extent mapping in the MLEP 2011. The planning proposal is consistent with the relevant provisions of the LHRS 2006.

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

Maitland +10 (Community Strategic Plan)

The proposal supports the following objectives of the Council's community strategic plan (Maitland +10);

Our Built Space

• Our infrastructure is well-planned, integrated and timely, meeting community needs now and into the future.

Our natural environment

- The potential impacts of our growing community on the environment and our natural resources are actively managed.
- 6. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable state environmental planning policies?

An assessment of the planning proposal against the relevant SEPPs is provided in the table below.

p4 | Planning Proposal - Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

Table 1: Relevant State Environmental Planning Policies.

RELEVANCE	CONSISTENCY AND IMPLICATIONS
SEPP (INFRASTRUCTURE) 2007	CONSISTENT
Provides a consistent approach for infrastructure and the provision of services across NSW, and to support greater efficiency in the location of infrastructure and service facilities.	While some of the provisions of this SEPP relate to flooding, the planning proposal does not have the purpose of amending zonings or altering the uses within any zone that the FPMs apply to. Therefore, nothing in this planning proposal affects the aims and provisions of this SEPP.

7. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions for Local Plan making?

Table 2: s117 Directions.

\$117 DIRECTIONS	CONSISTENCY AND IMPLICATIONS
1. EMPLOYMENT AND RESOURCES	
1.1 Business and Industrial zones	Consistent
The objective of this direction is to protect employment land, encourage employment growth and support the viability of centres.	While the planning proposal does affect land within existing business and industrial zones (by virtue of the revised FPL extent), the planning proposal does not involve rezoning business or industrial zoned land. In any case, the planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study.
1.2 Rural Zones	Consistent
The objective of this direction is to protect the agricultural production value of rural land.	While the planning proposal does affect land within existing rural zones (by virtue of the revised FPL extent), the planning proposal does not involve rezoning rural zoned land. In any case, the planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study.
1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries	Not applicable
The objective of this direction is to ensure that the future extraction of State or regionally significant reserves of coal, other minerals, petroleum and extractive materials are not compromised by inappropriate development.	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land or creating planning provisions that would facilitate inappropriate development, as defined in this direction. In any case, the planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study.

p5 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

s117 DIRECTIONS	CONSISTENCY AND IMPLICATIONS
1.4 Oyster Aquaculture	Not applicable
The objectives of this direction are to ensure that Priority Oyster Aquaculture Areas and other oyster aquaculture areas, and any adverse impacts on these areas, are considered when preparing a planning proposal.	This planning proposal does not involve land within a Priority Oyster Aquaculture Area or land subject to the NSW Oyster Industry Sustainable Aquaculture Strategy 2006.
1.5 Rural Lands	Consistent
The objectives of this direction are to protect the agricultural production value of rural land and to facilitate the orderly and economic development of rural lands for rural and related purposes.	While the planning proposal does affect land within existing rural and environmental protection zones (by virtue of the revised FPL extent), the planning proposal does not involve rezoning rural or environmental zoned land. In any case, the planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study.
2. ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE	
2.1 Environment Protection Zones	Consistent
The objective of this direction is to protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas.	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land. In any case, the planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study.
2.2 Coastal Protection	Not applicable
The objective of this direction is to implement the principles in the NSW Coastal Policy.	This planning proposal does not involve land within the coastal zone.
2.3 Heritage Conservation	Consistent
The objective of this direction is to conserve tems, areas, objects and places of environmental heritage significance and ndigenous heritage significance. This planning proposal does not involve rezoning of land and will not affect the conservation of any heritage items. The planning proposal is supported by an flood study.	
2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas	Consistent
The objective of this direction is to protect sensitive land or land with significant conservation values from adverse impacts from recreation vehicles.	The subject planning proposal will not enable land to be developed for the purpose of a recreation area.
3. HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND URBAN D	DEVELOPMENT
3.1 Residential Zones	Consistent
Encourage a variety and choice of housing, minimise the impact of residential development on the environmental and	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land. The planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study, which

p6 | Planning Proposal - Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

s117 DIRECTIONS	CONSISTENCY AND IMPLICATIONS
resource lands and make efficient use of infrastructure and services.	provides information on revised FPL extents.
3.2 Caravan Parks & Manufactured Home Estates	Consistent
To provide a variety of housing types and to provide for caravan parks and manufactured home estates.	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land. The planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study.
3.3 Home Occupations	Consistent
To encourage the carrying out of low-impact small businesses in dwelling houses.	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land or creating planning provisions that would prohibit home occupations to be carried out in dwelling houses without the need for development consent.
3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport	Not applicable
The objectives relate to the location of urban land and its proximity to public transport infrastructure and road networks, and improving access to housing, employment and services by methods other than private vehicles.	This planning proposal does not involve creating, altering or removing a zone or provision relating to urban land. However, the planning proposal will result in some properties being affected by flooding that wer previously unaffected by flood mapping on th FPL maps currently contained in the MLEP 2011. The planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study, which provides information on revised FPL extents.
3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	Not applicable
The objectives relate to the safe operation of aerodromes, as well as mitigating against obstruction, flight hazard and aircraft noise.	This planning proposal does not involve creating, altering or removing a zone or provision relating to land in the vicinity of a licensed aerodrome. In any case, the planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study.
3.6 Shooting ranges	Not applicable
The objectives relate to safety and planning associated with shooting ranges.	This planning proposal does not involve creating, altering or removing a zone or provision relating to land in the vicinity of a shooting range.
4. HAZARD and RISK	
4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils	Consistent
The objective of this direction is to avoid significant adverse environmental impacts from the use of land that has a probability of containing acid sulfate soils.	The Maitland LEP 2011 includes ASS maps for the entire Maitland LGA, which are to be interpreted in conjunction with Clause 7.1 – Acid Sulfate Soils of the Maitland LEP 2011. In any case, the planning proposal is supported

s117 DIRECTIONS	CONSISTENCY AND IMPLICATIONS
	by an adopted flood study.
4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	Consistent
The objective of this direction is to prevent damage to life, property and the environment on land identified as unstable or potentially subject to mine subsidence.	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land, however, the flood extent will be amended, including land within a Mine Subsidence District. The planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study, which provides information on revised FPL extents.
4.3 Flood Prone Land	Consistent
 The objectives of this direction are: (a) to ensure that development of flood prone land is consistent with the NSW Government's Flood Prone Land Policy and the principles of the Floodplain Development Manual 2005, and (b) (b) to ensure that the provisions of an LEP on flood prone land is commensurate with flood hazard and includes consideration of the potential flood impacts both on and off the subject land. 	The subject planning proposal does not involve rezoning land. However, the proposal is consistent with this direction since it is supported by an adopted flood study, which provides information on revised FPL extents. The adopted flood study has been prepared in accordance with the NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005, to assist with informing the proposed Draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan. The planning proposal fully satisfies the provisions of this 117 Direction, most notably parts (6)(a) – (8).
4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	Consistent
 The objectives of this direction are: (a) to protect life, property and the environment from bush fire hazards, by discouraging the establishment of incompatible land uses in bush fire prone areas, and (b) to encourage sound management of bush fire prone areas. 	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land or creating planning provisions that would result in increased hazard or risk to life or property from bushfire. The planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study, which provides information on revised FPL extents.
5. REGIONAL PLANNING	
5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies	Consistent
This direction requires a draft amendment to be consistent with relevant state strategies that apply to the LGA.	The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy as it addresses the relevant outcomes and actions that relate to flooding.
5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchment	Not applicable
The objective of this direction is to protect water quality in the Sydney drinking water catchment.	The planning proposal does not affect land within the Sydney drinking water catchment.

p8 | Planning Proposal - Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

s117 DIRECTIONS	CONSISTENCY AND IMPLICATIONS
5.3 Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast	Not applicable
This direction aims to protect the best agricultural land for current and future generations by providing certainty over long term use, and in doing so, minimising land use conflicts.	This s117 Direction does not apply to the Maitland LGA.
5.4 Commercial and Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast	Not applicable
This direction aims to manage commercial and retail development along the Pacific Highway between Port Stephens and Tweed Shire Councils.	This s117 Direction does not apply to the Maitland LGA.
5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgery's Creek	Not applicable
This direction aims to avoid incompatible development in the vicinity of any future second Sydney Airport at Badgery's Creek.	This s117 Direction does not apply to the Maitland LGA.
5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy	Not applicable
This direction aims to promote transit-oriented development around the train stations of the NWRL and ensure development adheres to the NWRL Corridor Strategy and precinct Structure Plans.	This s117 Direction does not apply to the Maitland LGA.
6. LOCAL PLAN MAKING	
6.1 Approval and Referral	Consistent
The direction aims to ensure that LEP provisions encourage the efficient and appropriate assessment of development.	This planning proposal does not involve rezoning land, however, the amendments to Council's FPMs will assist in ensuring that development is assessed in an efficient and appropriate manner.
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes	Consistent
The direction aims to facilitate (i) the provision of public services and facilitles by reserving land for public purposes; and (ii) removal of reservations of land for public purposes where land is no longer required for acquisition.	This planning proposal does not result in any change to the amount of land identified as being reserved for public purposes,
6.3 Site Specific Provisions	Not applicable
The objective of this direction is to discourage unnecessarily restrictive site specific planning controls.	This planning proposal does not have the purpose of allowing a particular development to be carried out.

p9 |Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

s117 DIRECTIONS	CONSISTENCY AND IMPLICATIONS
7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036	Not applicable
The objective of this direction is to give legal effect to the vision, transport and land use strategy, policies, outcomes and actions contained in the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036.	This s117 Direction does not apply to the Maitland LGA.

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?

Not applicable. The planning proposal is for the purpose of amending FPMs, and does not involve the rezoning of any land. The planning proposal is supported by an adopted flood study, which provides information on revised FPL extents.

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

Not applicable. The planning proposal is for the purpose of amending FPMs, and does not involve the rezoning of any land or site specific development.

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

The planning proposal is for the purpose of amending FPMs contained under the MLEP 2011, and does not involve the rezoning of any land. However, the amendment of FPMs in the LEP will provide up to date flood planning levels based on comprehensive flood mapping across the whole of the LGA. The proposal also achieves consistency between LEP mapping and the updated flood planning levels across the City.

Council has an obligation to ensure that the Flood Planning Level is mapped, and that involves undertaking flood studies over time to note any changes in flood extent or levels. While the latest flood data may result in some properties being tagged as flood affected that were not previously tagged under the Maitland LEP 2011 FPMs, Council is obliged to map the flood extent based on the most up to date information available to Council. The positive social effect will be that the most up to date flood extent will be incorporated into Council's statutory planning instrument, allowing the community to identify whether their property is flood affected, and assisting Council staff in the assessment and distribution of flood extent and flood level information. The Flood Study 2010 was prepared to inform the Draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan that has been prepared, prior to public exhibition.

The proposed amended FPMs will be supported by proposed amendments to the Development Control Plan (DCP) 2011 including additional planning guidelines for future development affected

p10 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

by flooding and supporting maps showing flood extents, depths, hazard, velocities and hydraulic categories which will provide additional information for the community relating to management of flood affected lands in the City.

SECTION D - STATE AND COMMONWEALTH INTERESTS

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

The planning proposal is for the purpose of amending FPMs under the Maitland LEP 2011, and does not involve the rezoning of any land. The proposal is consistent with SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007. Any public infrastructure requirements related to flooding would be highlighted in association with the forthcoming Draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan, which is proposed to be exhibited concurrently with the proposed LEP and DCP changes.

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

Consultation has been undertaken with Council's Flood Management Committee (FMC) relating to the proposed changes to LEP flood mapping and proposed changes to the DCP 2011, in addition to the Draft Floodplain Risk Management Plan. State agencies on the FMC include the Floodplain Management branch of the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), State Emergency Service (SES) and Hunter-Central Rivers Catchment Management Authority (CMA), as well as community and business representatives are members of the FMC.

No other formal consultation with State and Commonwealth public authorities has been undertaken at this stage. Consultation will occur in accordance with the Gateway Determination resulting from this planning proposal. It is anticipated that OEH (Floodplain Management), SES, CMA and RMS would be consulted in relation to this planning proposal. Emergency services such as NSW Police, NSW Fire Brigades and NSW Ambulance Service should also be consulted.

PART 4: DRAFT LEP MAPS

The following Draft LEP maps support the proposal:

p12 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps



p13 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps



p14 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps





p16 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps







p19 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps



p20 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps



p21 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps





p23 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

PART 5: COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

In accordance with Section 57(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, community consultation must be undertaken by the local authority prior to approval of the planning proposal.

In accordance with Council's adopted Community Engagement Strategy (March 2009), consultation on the proposed rezoning will be to inform and receive feedback from interested stakeholders. To engage the local community the following will be undertaken:

- Consultation with the Floodplain Management Committee;
- Notice in the Hunter Post newspaper;
- Exhibition material and relevant consultation documents to be made available at all Council Libraries and Council's Administration Building;
- Consultation documents to be made available on Council's website;
- Notices published on Council's social media applications, for public comment.

At the close of the consultation process, Council officers will consider all submissions received and present a report to Council for their endorsement of the planning proposal before proceeding to finalisation of the amendment.

The consultation process, as outlined above, does not prevent any additional consultation measures that may be determined appropriate as part of the Gateway Determination process.

p24 | Planning Proposal – Amendments to Flood Planning Maps

ORDINARY MEETING AGENDA

AMENDMENTS TO MAITLAND LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2011 FLOOD PLANNING MAPS & AMENDMENTS TO MAITLAND CITYWIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN 2011 CHAPTER - HUNTER RIVER FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT (Cont.)

PART 6: TIMEFRAMES

PROJECT TIMELINE	DATE
Anticipated commencement date (date of Gateway determination)	3 October 2014
Anticipated timeframe for the completion of required studies	N/A
Timeframe for government agency consultation (pre and post exhibition as required by Gateway Determination) (21 days)	5 December 2014
Commencement and completion dates for public exhibition period	15 October 2014 – 10 December 2014
Dates for public hearing (if required)	N/A
Timeframe for consideration of submissions	6 February 2015
Timeframe for the consideration of a proposal post exhibition	24 February 2015
Anticipated date RPA will forward the plan to the department to be made (if not delegated)	27 February 2015
Anticipated date RPA will make the plan (if delegated)	10 April 2015
Anticipated date RPA will forward to the department for notification (if delegated)	10 April 2015

Planning, Environment and Lifestyle Reports

AMENDMENTS TO MAITLAND LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2011 FLOOD PLANNING MAPS & AMENDMENTS TO MAITLAND CITYWIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN 2011 CHAPTER - HUNTER RIVER FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

DCP Amendment Plans (under separate cover)

Meeting Date: 9 September 2014

Attachment No: 2

Number of Pages: