

Proposal Title :	TOUKLEY, 200 Main Road - 'Bea	shoombar Site' Rezoning	
Froposal fille	I SUNLE I, 200 Mail Rudu - Dear	Shoomber She Rezoning	
Proposal Summary :	The proposal seeks to rezone land to enable a mixed use development comprising tourist and residential apartments with ground floor retail and commercial floor space.		
PP Number :	PP_2016_WYONG_001_00	Dop File No :	16/03707
Proposal Details			in the second
Date Planning Proposal Received :	25-Feb-2016	LGA covered	Wyong
Region :	Hunter	RPA :	Wyong Shire Council
State Electorate :	WYONG	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning		
Location Details			
Street : 200	Main Road		
	Ikley City :		Postcode :
	31 DP 805021 and Lot 32 DP 80502	1	i ostode .
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details		- · ·
Contact Name :	Glenn Hornal		
Contact Number :	0243485009		
Contact Email :	glenn.hornal@planning.nsw.gov.a	u	
RPA Contact Detai	ls		
Contact Name :	Peter Kavanagh		
Contact Number :	0243505537		
Contact Email :	peter.kavanagh@wyong.nsw.gov.a	au	
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :			
Contact Number :			
Contact Email :			
Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Nam e :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy	Central Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes

MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	
No. of Lots ;	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :			
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? ;	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	SITE CONTEXT The site is approximately 1.1 hectares adjoining Main Road and the southern shore of Lake Budgewoi approximately 350 metres to the west of Toukley town centre.		
	The site is currently zoned SP3 Tourist and contains a hotel (the Beachcomber), conference facilities, tourist accommodation and recreation facilities.		
	The site is bounded to the west by Medium Density Residential and t development also zoned R3. Direc Site' (see below). A planning prop site is nearing finalisation (PP_20	o the south by a mix of comm tly east is the Rustrum site w osal to enable a mixed use de	nercial and residential /hich is identified as a 'Key
	KEY (ICONIC DEVELOPMENT) SIT Wyong Shire Council has identifier revitalise centres and serve as car encourages the short term develor return for quality buildings which improvements and the provision a	ed a number of sites it conside talysts for economic growth. pment of sites by providing d also deliver public benefit (su and upgrade of certain commu	The Key Sites program levelopment bonuses in uch as public domain
	The scheme in summary includes	:	
	 identification of each site in Wyo common and site-specific require prepared in support of a develop 	ments that need to be addres	sed in a site-specific DCP
	- identification on the 'Key Sites N a maximum height that can be ach		6060
	- cl. 7.11 of WLEP 2013 (Developm plan (Key Sites)) allows a develop buildings map up to the height on a site-specific DCP addressing the	ment on a Key Site to exceed the Key Sites Map in return f	the height in the height of or, inter alia, preparation of
	Council's scheme creates the fran considered that address the comm and clause 7.11 of WLEP 2013. In	non and site-specific matters	in Chapter 6.1 of the DCP

the Key Sites Map. Instead, Council is responding to a request from the owner to have the site considered as a 'Key Site'. Council considers the Beachcomber site, given its proximity to the Rustrum site and Toukley town centre, is capable of delivering significant public benefit through the Key Sites provisions, if developed.

Key Sites were identified during the development of WLEP 2013. Council does not have published procedures for how additional Key Sites should be considered.

External Supporting Notes :

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The proposal seeks to alter existing planning controls and rezone land from SP3 Tourist to B4 Mixed Use to enable a mixed use development comprising of tourist and residential apartments and ground floor retail and commercial floor space.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment

Council proposes to achieve the objective by:

- rezoning the land from SP3 Tourist to B4 Mixed Use;
- increasing the floor space ratio from 1.5:1 to 1.7:1; and

- including the site on the Key Sites Map with a figure of 26m on the western part of the site and 36m on the eastern part of the site.

The figures on the Key Sites Map refer to the maximum building height that can be achieved for Key Sites in return for public benefit requirements.

A fundamental difference in this case is that while the Key Sites program typically provides a framework to encourage 'iconic' developments, in this case the planning proposal is responding to a conceptual design put forward by the proponent (included in pages 6-8 of the planning proposal). The design standards (height and FSR) being amended by the planning proposal will support an existing design rather than set key parameters for a future design.

Council proposes to develop a site specific DCP that will be concurrently exhibited with the planning proposal. As there are no site-specific provisions in DCP Clause 6.1 for the Beachcomber site, Council proposes that the site-specific provisions for the adjoining Rustrum site, already identified as a Key Site, provide guidance in determining matters to be considered in the site-specific DCP for the Beachcomber site such as bulk, scale and overshadowing. However there will still need to be 'Beachcomber specific' considerations and these will need to be identified by Council. An alternative would be a two-step DCP amendment where site-specific matters for consideration at the Beachcomber site were identified in a DCP amendment exhibited with the Planning Proposal with a subsequent site-specific DCP prepared and exhibited with a development application. The proposal needs to more clearly articulate the proposed steps in the process so the community can understand when it will have opportunities to comment on the proposal.

The Key Sites scheme does not automatically require a planning proposal to be submitted for each site. In this case a planning proposal is required because:

- the zone is being changed to allow different uses than currently permitted;
- the floor space ratio is being amended; and
- the site is being added to the Key Sites Map.

Zone

The amendment to the B4 zone is proposed to allow a broader and more flexible range of uses than is permitted under the existing SP3 Tourist zone. The adjoining Rustrum site is

in the process of being rezoned B4.

FSR

The site is subject to an FSR bonus in clause 4.4(2B) of WLEP 2013 to encourage site amalgamation. In this case the site is already larger than the 4000 m2 maximum site area for the bonus. The effect of this is that while it is proposed to change the mapped FSR from 1.5:1 to 1.7:1, clause 4.4(2B) will allow a 20% bonus above the mapped FSR. Given this site already exceeds the maximum site area in the bonus table a simpler approach may be to map the actual FSR allowed by the plan and remove the site from the operation of the bonus provisions. In either case, the planning proposal should clearly describe what is proposed to facilitate community understanding.

Heights

The increase in height proposed for the eastern half of the site Key Sites map is said to reflect the adjoining Rustrum site (also 36 metres) with the 26 metres on the western half providing for a 'stepping' effect.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

- 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
- 2.2 Coastal Protection
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates
- 3.3 Home Occupations
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
- 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land
- 4.3 Flood Prone Land
- 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
- 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies
- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

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

d) Which SEPPs have the	e RPA identified? SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land) SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection	
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land) Schedule 1 of SEPP 32 identifies land to which the policy does not apply and includes Coastal Protection land. Given the land is located in the Coastal Zone and identified under SEPP 71 Coastal Protection as a sensitive coastal location, SEPP 32 is unlikely to apply.	
	SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land Council has advised it does not anticipate site contamination to be a significant issue however proposes to conduct an Initial Contamination Assessment post Gateway. Council will need to satisfy itself the land is suitable for the land use proposed under the requirements of the SEPP and information regarding land contamination should be included in the public exhibition.	
	SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection The land is located within the coastal zone and is also identified as a sensitive coastal location. The SEPP requires Council to take into account the matters for consideration in clause 8 when it prepares a draft LEP. Council has provided some general comment however relies on these issues to be resolved through a future DCP and VPA. Council	

should update the planning proposal to include consideration of all clause 8 matters.

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No

If No, explain :

S117 DIRECTIONS

The planning proposal is consistent with all S117 Directions or they are not applicable except where discussed below:

1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries

The land subject to the planning proposal is underlain by coal resources. Council should consult with Trade & Investment - Resources and Energy to ensure the potential development of coal resources are not restricted by land uses that are likely to be incompatible with such development before consistency with the direction can be determined.

2.2 Coastal Protection

The direction requires consistency with the NSW Coastal Policy and Coastal Design Guidelines both of which seek to promote public access to the foreshore and the planning proposal. Council advise there is no public access to the foreshore in this locality and lots to the east and west have frontage to the high water mark. The proposal should give further consideration to this direction, particular to the Coastal Design Guidelines, and seek the Secretary's agreement to any inconsistency under the terms of the direction.

3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates

The rezoning from SP3 to B4 will prohibit caravan parks on the land. The direction requires the proposal to retain provisions that permit development for caravan parks. Any inconsistency is of minor significance as caravan parks are permissible in a number of zones in WLEP 2013 (i.e. R1, R3, SP3, RE1 and RE2).

4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils

The site is located on land with a probability of containing acid sulfate soils and is identified in Council's Acid Sulfate Soils Map (Class 5 and adjacent to Class 1). WLEP 2013 contains provisions to regulate development on land containing acid sulfate soils and these matters can be addressed at the development application stage. The Secretary could agree any inconsistency with the direction is of minor significance.

4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land

The land is identified in the Swansea North Entrance Mine Subsidence District therefore consultation with the Mine Subsidence Board will need to occur before consistency with the direction can be determined.

4.3 Flood Prone Land

Council has advised part of the land is classified as Flood Prone. The proposal seeks to rezone land from a Special Purpose zone to a Business Zone and is inconsistent with the terms of the direction. Council has advised no habitable rooms or structures are proposed in the flood prone area and sufficient controls are in place in WLEP 2013 to ensure appropriate environmental assessment will occur before any consent is issued for development on the land. Council has not demonstrated whether the proposal is in accordance with a floodplain risk management plan or of minor significance. Further information on flooding matters and consultation with OEH is required and Council should seek the agreement of the Secretary for any inconsistency prior to the plan being made.

6.3 Site Specific Provisions

The proposal seeks to amend an existing height specific development standard on the Key Sites Map to enable the development and is therefore inconsistent with the direction. The inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance as the Key Sites clause (clause 7.11) was included in the approval of WLEP 2013 by the former Director General.

s55(2)(d)			
Is mapping provided? Yes			
The mapping provided is sufficient for assessment. Council will need to prepare proposed Zoning, Key Sites and Floor Space Ratio maps for exhibition.			
ation - s55(2)(e)			
ation been proposed? Yes			
Council has proposed a 28 day exhibition period. This is supported.			
Additional Director General's requirements			
Director General's requirements? Yes			
Delegations Council has identified it owns the smaller of the two land parcels (Lot 31 DP 805021) which contains a sewer pump station and is located within the boundaries of Lot 32 DP 805021. Council resolved to seek delegations and given the planning proposal is of local significance and the component of Council land is minor it is recommended Council be granted delegations to make the plan.			
Timeline Council anticipates the LEP will be made in January 2017. A 12 month time-frame is considered sufficient time to make the plan.			
the proposal			
Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes			
This planning proposal seeks to amend WLEP 2013.			
The planning proposal is the result of a Council resolution to identify the site as a Key Site and facilitate "iconic" (re)development on the land through clause 7.11 of WLEP 2013. Council has advised including the site in the Key Site program will enable the delivery of significant public benefit contributions for improvements to the public domain.			
Council has advised the proposal exceeds the current controls that apply to the land and the current zoning of SP3 does not permit 'residential flat buildings'. Council seeks to rezone the site to B4 to permit residential flat buildings, increase the floor space ratio and map two 'Key Sites' building heights on the Key Sites Map to enable the development.			

Consistency with	CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL STRATEGY (CCRS)
strategic planning	Council has identified the following as applicable to the planning proposal:
framework :	- Action 4.2 and 4.4: The proposal will assist in providing for a mix of housing types,
	adjacent to centres; - Action 4.22: The proposal will assist in addressing State Plan priority E5 'jobs closer to
	home';
	- Action 5.1: The proposal will contribute to economic and employment growth and the
	principle of 'self-containment' on the Central Coast;
	- Action 6.18: The proposal will improve the provision of local open space;
	- Action 6.21: The proposal will enable tourism facilities to be appropriately managed to
	minimise impacts on natural resources and the natural environment.
	Generally the proposal is consistent with the broad goals and actions of the CCRS and will
	assist in meeting regional dwelling and employment targets.
	TOUKLEY PLANNING STRATEGY AND MASTERPLAN
	Council's Toukley Planning Strategy was given effect in Council's Settlement Strategy
	which was in turn endorsed by the Director-General as part of the finalisation of WLEP
	2013. The Toukley Planning Strategy envisages 3-4 storey development at this site
	screened from Budgewoi Lake by vegetation. The planning proposal should include consideration of the proposal against the Toukley Planning Strategy and identify the
	significance of any inconsistencies.
	COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN (CSP)
	Council has reviewed the planning proposal against eight priority objectives in its CSP and
	it is generally consistent with the relevant objectives.
	DRAFT CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL PLAN (dCCRP)
	The dCCRP was released in November 2015 and includes an action which is relevant to
	the proposal:
	• Action 1.5.1 Support delivery of greater housing choice in and near centres with existing
	services
	The land is located near Toukley town centre on the foreshore of Budgewoi Lake. The
	proposal seeks to provide for additional housing near an existing centre. The proposal is
	generally consistent with this action in the dCCRP.
Environmental social	ENVIRONMENTAL
economic impacts :	Council has advised there are no threatened species, EECs or their habitats that will be adversely affected by the proposal. The site is located in a sensitive coastal location and
	Council should consult with the Office of Environment and Heritage on flooding and
	coastal impacts given the proximity to Budgewoi Lake and the flood prone land on the
	site.
	HERITAGE
	The Beachcomber site appears to be fully developed for a hotel/motel complex and
	Council has advised there are no known relics of Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal heritage on
	the site. Council seeks to consult with Darkinjung Local Aboriginal Land Council and the Guringai Tribal Link as part of its due diligence. There is no objection to this consultation.
	SOCIAL
	Council anticipates the public domain improvements associated with the development will
	provide quality public access and spaces and positively contribute to the Toukley community.
	ECONOMIC
	Council considers the effects of the new residential development will create additional
	demand for services and jobs as well as multiplier effects from the additional population.
	INFRASTRUCTURE
	Council has advised the site is located on Main Road and is well serviced by a privately

operated bus and taxi services as well as having a footpath connection to the Toukley town centre. Given the potential increase in traffic as a result of the development consultation should occur with the Transport NSW - Roads and Maritime Service.

Council has identified the land is serviced with electricity, telephone, water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure which can be augmented to accommodate the development. Council proposes to consult with Ausgrid should the proposal progress.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The proposal has arisen from a wish to redevelop the site combined with the catalyst of the adjoining Rustrum site. As discussed above, neither site was identified for development of this scale when the Toukley Planning Strategy was prepared. The planning proposal should consider potential cumulative impacts of the two proposals in terms of their relationship with the Lake, adjoining development and the Toukley town centre.

REVIEW OF KEY SITES PROGRAM

Council first endorsed the identification of Key Sites on 24 November 2010. The program was intended to offer incentives for short term development of identified sites.

This proposal raises two issues not considered in the program viz. how new Key Sites should be added and particularly how to deal with the cumulative effects of new Key Site proposals arising adjacent to existing Key Sites. Given it is over 5 years since the program commenced, Council should consider reviewing the effectiveness of the program and whether any changes are required (including the need to update the material supporting the Key Sites program to include a process for adding new sites).

Assessment Process

Proposal type:	Routine		Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	12 months		Delegation :	RPA
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environmen NSW Department of P Transport for NSW - F Other	Primary Ind	lustries - Minerals and Petrol	eum
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
If no, provide reasons :				
Resubmission - s56(2)(l	o) : No			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional st	tudies, if required. :			
If Other, provide reason	S			
Identify any internal con	sultations, if required :			
No internal consultatio	n required			

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No

If Yes, reasons :

Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
Council Report - Proposed Rezoning of Beachcomber Hotel Motel Site - 27012016.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Minutes of Council Meeting 27012016.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Planning Proposal to Gateway_Beachcomber Site.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Covering letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Land Use Tables - Wyong Local Environmental Plan 2013.pdf	Proposal	Yes
State Environmental Planning Policy Assessment - RZ_6_2015.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Applicant's concepts.pdf	Drawing	No

Planning Team Recommendation

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

	S.117 directions:	2.1 Environment Protection Zones
		2.2 Coastal Protection
		2.3 Heritage Conservation
		3.1 Residential Zones
		3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates
		3.3 Home Occupations
		3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
		4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
		4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land
		4.3 Flood Prone Land
		4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
		5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies
		6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
		6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
		6.3 Site Specific Provisions
	Additional Information :	The Planning Proposal should proceed subject to the following conditions:
		1. Council update the planning proposal prior to community consultation to:
		 more clearly articulate the proposed steps in the proposed Planning
		Proposal/VPA/DCP and DA process so the community can understand when it will have
		opportunities to comment on the proposal;
		• consider option to map the actual FSR and remove the site from the operation of the
		FSR bonus and/or clearly describe how the FSR for teh site is derived to facilitate
		community understanding;
		 include consideration of the proposal against the Toukley Planning Strategy and
		identify the significance of any inconsistencies;
		• consider potential cumulative impacts of this and the adjoining Key Site proposal in
		terms of their relationship with the Lake, adjacent development and the Toukley town
		centre.
		2. The Secretary agrees the planning proposal's inconsistencies with s.117 Directions 3.2
		Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates and 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils and 6.3 Site
		Specific Provisions are of minor significance.
		3. Council is to update the planning proposal to include sufficient information to
		adequately demonstrate consistency or justify any inconsistency with the following S117
		Directions:
		 1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries
_		

TOUKLEY, 200 Main Road - 'Beachcomber Site' Rezoning		
	 2.2 Coastal Protection 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land 4.3 Flood Prone Land 	
	4. Council is to update the planning proposal to include the relevant matters for consideration as set out in clause 8 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) No. 71 Coastal Protection.	
	5. Council is to satisfy the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 55 - Remediation of Land and demonstrate the site is suitable for rezoning.	
	6. The planning proposal be made publicly available for a minimum of 28 days.	
	 7. Consultation with: Office of Environment and Heritage NSW Trade and Investment - Resources and Energy Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services Mine Subsidence Board Darkinjung Local Aboriginal Land Council Guringai Tribal Link 	
	8. 12 months timeframe to make the plan.	
Supporting Reasons :	 9. Plan-making delegation should be delegated to Council for this planning proposal. * 	
	G PMofkins	
Signature:	\mathcal{O}	
Printed Name:	GPHOPKINS Date: 15 March 2016	

54