APPENDIX 15: ZONING IN URBAN - RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK



Zoning In - Urban

Response to feedback

November 2020



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
Why are we Zoning In on our urban areas?1
ZONING IN CONSULTATION 2
FEEDBACK
How did we receive feedback? 3
How is the feedback considered?3
PART 1 – EMERGING THEMES 5
Housing Strategy5
a) Potential urban land5
b) Place-based planning 6
c) Caravan Parks6
d) Land Use Tables6
e) Urban footprint7
Employment Zones Review7
a) Maximum building heights8
b) Potential Employment Land8
Recreation Zones Review9
a) Private Recreation – maximum building height
b) Village assessment9
Infrastructure Zones Review 10

Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan10
a) Decreased building height - Florence Street to Browns Creek . 10
b) Key catalyst sites11
Urban Land Monitor11
Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis11
Height consolidation13
Local Aboriginal Land Council land12
PART 2 – SITE SPECIFIC14
Strategic Centres
Taree15
Forster 15
Tuncurry15
Coastal centres15
Harrington15
Old Bar16
Hallidays Point16
Pacific Palms16
Hawks Nest16
Tea Gardens16
Rural centres17
Gloucester
Wingham

Villages	. 17
Additional consultation - Pacific Palms and Harrington	. 18
PART 3 - STATE INTERESTS	. 19
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment	. 19
Planning section	. 19
Environment section	. 20
Local Land Services (LLS)	. 20
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	. 20
CONCLUSION	. 21

INTRODUCTION

This report documents feedback received during consultation on the Zoning In project in early 2020.

The Zoning In consultation involved community conversations on future planning controls that would apply to the urban areas of the MidCoast, being our towns and villages. We discussed changes to zones where we live, work, shop and play.

The Zoning In documents that formed the basis of the planning controls were:

- Housing Strategy
- Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan
- Employment Zones Review
- Recreation Zones Review
- Infrastructure Zones Review
- Urban Land Monitor
- Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis

In addition to the 378 submissions, we received a petition with 191 signatures, significant feedback from our discussions with the community at information sessions, over the phone or through emails; and State Government comments.

This report documents the feedback received, outlines how it was considered and identifies changes proposed to the Zoning In documents.

Why are we Zoning In on our urban areas?

We currently have three sets of planning controls – one for each of the three former regions – which can make planning inconsistent across the MidCoast. That's why we're working to develop a MidCoast-wide plan.

The Zoning In consultation on the urban areas involved checking in with the community to make sure that the planning foundations are right before we move to the next step – writing the plan.



ZONING IN CONSULTATION

Community consultation on the Zoning In project commenced on 5 February 2020 and was completed on 9 April 2020. The drop-in information sessions were completed by 19 March 2020, prior to the impact of Covid-19.

The Zoning In Engagement Outcomes Report provides details on the community engagement undertaken for the project and feedback received on the effectiveness of the consultation. Of the 83 participants surveyed at the consultation, 93% felt that they had the opportunity to have their say.

DO YOU FEEL YOU HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE YOUR SAY?

Yes = No = No Response



In summary, we engaged with the community through:

- eighteen information sessions in twelve locations (as listed in the flyer to the right) attended by around 1,000 people
- presentations to eight community groups
- phone/email enquiries
- 9,249 visits to our 'Know your Zone' project page on our website.



FEEDBACK

How did we receive feedback?

Feedback received during the consultation came from a number of sources, as outlined below.

a) Submissions

There were 378 submissions received during the consultation period. Submissions could be provided on a form completed on-line or at the information sessions, and by letters and emails.

b) Petition

A petition was received from the Pacific Palms community which contained 191 signatures.

c) Community conversations

During conversations with over 1,200 people at the information sessions, over the phone and via emails, we recorded issues raised by the community. It was recognised that not everyone would put in a submission. It was important to capture issues raised through these conversations to address people's concerns and improve the Zoning In documents



d) State Government

The NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) advised that the following State Government Departments be contacted to provide comments:

- Transport for NSW
- the Environment and Planning sections of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.

In addition to this consultation:

- the Local Land Services was consulted regarding the Recreation Zones Review
- Hunter New England Health was consulted for the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan given the Manning Base Hospital is a key stakeholder.

How is the feedback considered?

The feedback has been considered in three parts. The following provides a summary of how the feedback has been presented in this report.

PART 1 – Emerging themes

Common themes emerged from the issues identified for each town and village. Key themes were maximum building heights, place-based planning, potential urban lands, height consolidation and Local Aboriginal Land Council consultation.

These emerging themes are considered for each Zoning In document in Part 1, along with over-arching themes being the consolidation of heights and the Local Aboriginal Land Council consultation.

Appendix B is a summary of submissions that provided over-arching comments on the Zoning In documents and consultation.

PART 2 – Site specific

The majority of the feedback received was site specific – people discussed concerns or opportunities for their properties and their neighbourhoods. Appendix A provides a summary of the issues for each town and village.

PART 3 – State interests

This part outlines feedback from State Government agencies, which ensure that the State legislative requirements and interests are being adequately considered.

PART 1 – EMERGING THEMES

Common themes emerged from the issues identified for each town and village. The five key themes were maximum building heights, place-based planning, potential urban lands, height consolidation and Local Aboriginal Land Council consultation.

The following outlines how each Zoning In document will be amended to address the common themes that emerged from the feedback.

Housing Strategy

The suite of residential zones proposed for our towns and villages was generally accepted by the community.

The key changes proposed to the Housing Strategy are:

a) Potential urban land

The 'potential residential land' identified in the Housing Strategy is to be renamed 'potential urban land'. This reflects that the future use may not be restricted to a residential use.

The 'potential urban land' is identified in the Housing Strategy on the maps relating to each location (refer Section 4 - Our residential areas). The 'potential urban land' is predominately lands identified in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031 and local strategies.

Key changes are proposed to reflect:

 that additional studies have been undertaken that demonstrate that some sites identified as 'potential urban land' are constrained and development could not occur over the whole site. Where this has occurred, the extent of the 'potential urban land' has been reduced to reflect the identified constraints. These sites include 190 Cape Hawke Drive, Lot 3 The Lakes Way at Forster and Myall River Downs at Tea Gardens

- inclusion of three sites as 'potential urban land' being:
 - 333 Diamond Beach Road, Diamond Beach there has been an increased demand for housing in this location. This site has been the subject of numerous studies that have demonstrated how urban development can be considered for the site, while addressing concerns regarding environmental and access issues
 - Lot 1 and 50 Milligan Street, Taree this is an infill site, being one of the last remaining parcels of rural land in the Taree township
 - 13 Albert Street, Cundletown this site was identified for the future expansion of Cundletown, which has been partially developed as the Northern Gateway Transport Hub.

Details on each of these sites is provided in the summary of issues for their respective location (refer Appendix A).

The Housing Strategy will be amended to include a new Section 4.13 - Potential Urban Land. It will:

- reflect the intent of the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031
- outline the process to rezone these sites
- estimate the anticipated level of constraint for each site (high, medium and low)
- justify the removal or inclusion of additional sites not identified in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031.

b) Place-based planning

A common theme across the submissions was the importance of identifying, re-enforcing and building upon the local character of our towns and villages. The Zoning In project is currently focused on establishing a planning framework across the MidCoast, which is at a higher strategic level. This framework will form the basis for the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan and MidCoast Development Control Plan.

The next stage will focus on place-based planning – examining the character, growth and infrastructure needs of our towns and villages in partnership with the community. These actions are outlined in Section 6.4 and 6.5 of the Housing Strategy, and their importance was re-enforced through the feedback.

It should be noted that some of this work is underway with the development of local community plans. Examples include Wingham and Gloucester.

c) Caravan Parks

Section 5.1 of the Housing Strategy outlines the approach for caravan parks, being the use of Public Recreation zone and Private Recreation zone over caravan parks, depending on ownership. Two exceptions were identified (refer page 71) being the Oxley Anchorage Caravan Park at Harrington and the Twilight Caravan Park at Taree.

A review of these sites has found that they contribute to tourism and housing in Harrington and Taree and should be included in the Private Recreation zone. This ensures a consistent approach across the MidCoast.



d) Land Use Tables

The Housing Strategy discussed the use of the Tourism zone (SP3) across the MidCoast. The land use table for this zone needs to be included in Appendix A of the strategy to provide certainty for owners of land included in this zone.

Some minor adjustments are also proposed as outlined in Appendix B.

e) Urban footprint

The Housing Strategy refers to an 'urban settlement boundary' which shows the extent of the town or village (similar to the Growth Area Boundary used in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031). This boundary includes residential (existing and potential), employment, open space and environmental lands that are located within towns or villages but excludes Large Lot Residential zoned land.

A review of strategies for other councils has seen the term 'urban footprint' adopted, which provides an easily understood concept. It is proposed to rename 'urban settlement boundary' with 'urban footprint'.

f) Medium density residential

The aim of the Medium Density Residential zone is to encourage development with a higher density than most residential neighbourhoods. To achieve this, houses are proposed to be prohibited in the zone.

The exception will be where the housing is provided as integrated development. The Housing Strategy specifies that where it is integrated development, the minimum lot size will be 200m² and the maximum 450m². There is concern that the maximum lot size will not achieve a medium density outcome, as it is consistent with the lot size permitted in both the Low Density and General Residential zone. It is proposed to reduce the maximum lot size for integrated housing to be 300m².

Employment Zones Review

The suite of employment zones proposed in our towns and villages was generally accepted by the community. The key issue arising from consultation was the application of increased maximum building heights, particularly in the coastal centres (refer to the summary of location issues in Appendix A).



The key changes proposed to the Employment Zones Review are:

a) Maximum building heights

The Employment Zones Review had included a bonus clause for centres where good urban design outcomes could result in additional building heights. The maximum building heights (under the bonus clause) were exhibited. This raised concerns with the community, particularly in Pacific Palms and Harrington.

Based on community feedback, a review of the maximum building heights was undertaken for all centres. In many cases the maximum building height controls have changed to reflect the controls currently in place. Specific changes are identified for each centre in the summary of location issues (Appendix A).

b) Potential Employment Land

The Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031 and local strategies identified 'potential employment land' across the MidCoast. While many of these sites have developed, there are four remaining sites that need to be identified in the Employment Zones Review, being:

- The Bucketts Way, Taree South this land provides the western extension of the industry precinct which contains Yalawanyi Ganya, Saxbys Soft Drinks and the Holcim Australia's concrete batching plant
- South Cemetery Road, Gloucester this land provides the eastern extension of the industrial estate at Gloucester

- 60-146 Lansdowne Road, Cundletown this land fronts onto Lansdowne Road, backs onto the Taree Regional Airport and has a number of employment uses established on sites
- 1 Hoskins Street and 33 Clarkson Street, Nabiac this land adjoins the Pacific Highway and residential dwellings that front Clarkson Street.

Details of these 'potential employment lands' are provided in the summary of location issues (Appendix A).

c) 'Open' business zones

The business zones proposed in the Employment Zones Review are currently 'closed' zones. This means that the land use table is restrictive, making any use not listed in the table prohibited.

If the zones are 'open' it can allow more flexibility, permitting (with consent) a broad variety of land uses, unless the uses are specifically prohibited. A review of regional councils across NSW identified that the use of 'open' business zones was the preferred approach. It is proposed to amend the land use tables of the business zones to make them 'open' zones.

Recreation Zones Review

The suite of recreation zones was generally accepted by the community. The key issue arising from consultation was the application of an increased maximum height of buildings for the Private Recreation zone (refer to the summary of location issues in Appendix A).

The NSW Local Land Services reviewed the Recreation Zones Review and advised that more detailed consultation is required to review the proposed zones applied over Crown Land. This consultation will occur prior to the development of the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan. Additional changes may occur as a result of this ongoing consultation.

The key changes proposed to the Recreation Zones Review are:

a) Private Recreation – maximum building height

The current maximum building height in the Private Recreation zone varies across the MidCoast. A 12m height was proposed to cater for recreational infrastructure such as grandstands and clubhouses.

The overwhelming feedback from the community was to reduce the maximum building height to 8.5m. This would be consistent with the height of neighbouring residential properties, which are typically 8.5m.

Discussions with Council's Development Assessment planners confirmed that 8.5m would be suitable. If an applicant needed additional height they could apply for a variation, which would be considered on its merits. Issues like overlooking, noise and visual impacts would be considered in the assessment of the variation.

b) Village assessment

Since the development of the Recreation Zones Review, a more detailed assessment of Council owned land in villages has resulted in some sites being included in a recreation or environmental zone. These changes are identified in the villages section of the summary of location issues (refer Appendix A).



Infrastructure Zones Review

The Infrastructure zones apply mainly to government owned land like hospitals, roads, rail and sewerage treatment plants. Minor changes are proposed to the Infrastructure Zones Review and are identified in the summary of location issues (Appendix A).



Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan

The Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan is a location specific plan and has been considered under the location issues identified for Taree (refer to Appendix A). Overall, there was general support for the directions proposed in this Precinct Plan.



The key changes proposed to the Precinct Plan are:

a) Decreased building height - Florence Street to Browns Creek

Land fronting Victoria Street and River Street between Florence Street and Browns Creek was proposed to have a maximum building height of 26m. Based on submissions and reinvestigation of this area, it is proposed to reduce the maximum building height to 21m, which is consistent with the building height proposed for the majority of the Taree CBD.

b) Key catalyst sites

It is proposed to recognise two additional locations as 'key catalyst sites' in the Precinct Plan, being:

- the corner of Commerce and Victoria Streets. These shops are currently vacant and are on a prominent corner which provides entry into the Taree CBD
- 52-60 High Street and 41-45 Wynter Street. These sites are in a single ownership. Given the number of sites and location, they provide opportunities for a consolidated development.

Urban Land Monitor

Three submissions were lodged regarding the Urban Land Monitor which questioned the assumptions of the monitor. The detailed responses are outlined in the summary of location issues (Appendix A), specifically Issue 5 for Wingham and Issues 4-5 for Pacific Palms.

Amendments to the Urban Land Monitor are required to update the 'potential urban land' and 'urban footprint' terminology changes outlined for the Housing Strategy.

Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment provided feedback that Appendix A of the analysis needs to be updated to include all relevant Ministerial Directions. This amendment will be made to the analysist.



Local Aboriginal Land Council land

When examining the appropriate zone for land in our towns and villages, the environmental values were an important consideration. Where land was publicly owned, some sites were included in an environmental zone.

Since the Zoning In consultation, a number of sites are no longer publicly owned. This is generally as a result of a Native Title Claim being resolved. In these circumstances, the land has moved from public ownership to being owned by the relevant Local Aboriginal Land Council.

Given the change in ownership, the Local Aboriginal Land Councils have not had the opportunity to be consulted on the proposed zone changes.

These sites have been identified in the issue summary for each location (refer to Appendix A). The zone has been amended to reflect the current zoning. There may be additional sites not currently shown, but they will be identified through consultation with each Local Aboriginal Land Council.

Consultation with the Local Aboriginal Land Councils will be undertaken prior to the drafting of the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan. In accordance with recent guidelines on the Aboriginal Land State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 2019, it will be important to identify which lands may be included in this SEPP and the appropriate zone.



Height consolidation

Maximum building heights are proposed in the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review, Recreation Zones Review and the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. During consultation, some people had trouble identifying which height applied over their properties, given the extensive number of heights proposed.

A review of the height controls revealed that across the MidCoast, sixteen different height controls were proposed, with some differing by only half a metre. The maximum building heights have been consolidated to ten different heights. This resulted in minor changes to building heights in the centres in Taree, Tuncurry, Forster and Tea Gardens. These changes are detailed in the summary of location issues (refer to Appendix A).

PART 2 – SITE SPECIFIC

The majority of submissions received related to specific sites, typically where people lived. As shown in Figure 1, the 378 submissions were from across the MidCoast (Note: some submissions covered multiple areas).



Figure 1: Location of Submissions

In addition to the submissions; the petition and points raised through the community conversations are also location specific. For each town and village, this feedback was summarised into key issues, the points were considered and where appropriate, changes were recommended to the Zoning In documents (refer Appendix A).

Issues that are numbered (i.e. 1, 2, 3) originated from a submission, whereas issues with letters (i.e. A, B, C) originated from the community conversations.

The towns and villages have been grouped as follows:

- Strategic centres (Taree, Forster and Tuncurry)
- **Coastal centres** (Harrington, Old Bar, Hallidays Point, Pacific Palms, Hawks Nest and Tea Gardens)
- Rural centres (Gloucester and Wingham)
- Villages (Barrington, Brimbin, Bulahdelah, Coomba Park, Coolongolook, Crowdy Head, Green Point, Johns River, Krambach, Nerong, North Arm Cove, Pindimar, Seal Rocks, Tinonee and Wallabi Point)

For each town and village, a map is provided showing the urban zones. Surrounding rural and environmental zones are shaded grey as they will be considered in the Rural Strategy in 2021. The location of the key issues (shown as 1, 2, 3 or A, B, C) indicate where each issue is located. In the summary table, a map for each issue is also provided. Both maps show the proposed zones that were discussed in the Zoning In consultation.

In some locations, general comments were made regarding issues like the consultation process, bikeways, heritage or environmental concerns. These are noted as general comments and responses are provided.

The following provides an overview of the key changes proposed for each location. For more details, refer to Appendix A.

Strategic Centres

Taree

Taree is proposed to change from one residential zone to four. Based on the submissions, there are some minor changes proposed to the residential zone boundaries.

All rural lands in the urban settlement boundary were reviewed resulting in some zone changes (e.g. around West End Avenue and St Joseph's Primary School) and the identification of two 'potential urban lands' areas in Milligan Street and Cundletown.

The maximum building heights for local centres were reviewed, along with some of the building heights proposed in the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan.

Forster

Based on the submissions, changes were made to the proposed zone of properties around the Visitor Information Centre. The open space and environmental importance of the land was recognised through proposed changes to the zones.

Building heights in the Little Street shopping centre and Stockland Forster were reviewed as a result of the height consolidation review, and the reconsideration of heights proposed in the Employment Zones Review.

The extent of 'potential urban lands' was reduced for 190 Cape Hawke Drive based on studies that identified the environmental constraints of the land. In addition, the land use table for the Tourist zone (SP3) will also be included in the Housing Strategy to address proposed tourist sites in Forster.

Tuncurry

Tuncurry currently has a range of residential zones that apply, so minimal changes were proposed through the Zoning In consultation. A number of the submissions requested significant changes to zones and planning controls that have been in place for several years. No changes were recommended for these sites.

Building heights in the Tuncurry town centre are proposed to be increased from 20m to 21m as a result of the height consolidation review.

Coastal centres

Harrington

The original heights proposed for Harrington raised concerns for many the community. These heights were re-visited and recommended to be reduced to be consistent with the heights that currently apply to Harrington, which is predominately 8.5m.

Some minor zone changes are proposed to reflect the use of the land. In addition, large parcels of vacant residential land will be included in a General Residential zone, which is typically applied to sites not yet developed.

Old Bar

The key issue for Old Bar was the proposed building heights for the town centre. The maximum building heights in the Employment Zones Review were reconsidered and are proposed to be reduced from 15m to 12m.

Some minor changes to zones are proposed to vacant residential land close to the centre, and the environmental land along Racecourse Creek.

Hallidays Point

An issue for Hallidays Point was the proposed building heights for the local centres. The maximum building heights in the Employment Zones Review were reconsidered and are proposed to be reduced from 12-18m to 8.5m.

A number of landowners requested that rural land be considered for future development, which is generally outside of the scope of the Zoning In project. It is acknowledged that there is an increased demand for residential in Diamond Beach, which is generating the need for a Local Strategy to examine the future housing needs in this location.

Some submissions raised concerns about North Diamond Beach being included in a Medium Density Residential zone. This zone applies to sites that are already identified as part of a tourist precinct and is considered appropriate given the changing nature of tourist accommodation.

Pacific Palms

The original heights proposed for Pacific Palms raised concerns for many the community. These heights were re-visited and recommended to be reduced to be consistent with the heights that currently apply to Pacific Palms, which is predominately 8.5m for the residential land, with 12m applying to the centre and some residential land fronting Boomerang Drive.

Two landowners requested that rural land be considered for future development, which is generally outside of the scope of the Zoning In project.

Hawks Nest

Many submissions for Hawks Nest were concerned that the current Low Density Residential zone is proposed to be replaced with the General Residential zone. While these two zones are very similar zone, residents were unaware of the extent of development currently permitted in Hawks Nest. It is proposed to reduce some building heights, but the application of zones would remain.

There were a number of sites subject to Native Title Claims. Council is going to consult with the Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss the future of these sites.

A mapping error was identified for Lot 1 Eagle Avenue. The zone and planning controls will be amended to reflect the existing planning controls.

Tea Gardens

Concerns were raised that the planning controls around the main street would impact on the character of Tea Gardens. The building heights proposed in the Employment Zones Review were reconsidered. It is proposed to reduce the building heights to reflect the current heights which are predominately 12m in the centre. The building height proposed for the Myall Quays shopping centre was increased from 13m to 15m as a result of the height consolidation.

The extent of 'potential urban lands' were reduced for Myall River Downs based on studies that identified the environmental constraints of the land.

It was acknowledged that the Shearwater development may require changes to building heights and zones, to reflect the approved development. These changes should be considered when developing the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan.

Rural centres

Gloucester

Concerns were raised regarding the proposed zone changes to some of the employment areas around Gloucester. Zone changes are proposed to reflect the current use of the sites around the medical centre and Council building.

Building heights in the Gloucester town centre were reviewed as a result of the height consolidation, resulting in an increase from 11.5m to 12m.

The area included in the General Residential zone was extended south to Hay Street to increase the opportunity for housing diversity in this area.

Wingham

Concerns were raised that the Low Density Residential zone applied around the Wingham town centre was too extensive, and this limits housing choice close to the centre. It is recommended to change the zone to General Residential to provide the opportunity for housing diversity. It was acknowledged that a review of the heritage character is needed in this location to ensure the heritage values are maintained.

A landowner requested that 'potential urban land' located on the entry to Wingham from Taree, be included in a General Residential zone, while another landowner wanted their site to be considered for future development. Both requests fall outside of the scope of the Zoning In project.

Villages

There are fifteen villages identified where either a submission was lodged, or changes are proposed. The issues can be grouped as:

- people wanting to develop rural lands, particularly around North Arm Cove. Rural lands will be examined in the Rural Strategy which will be available for community comment in 2021
- requests for land to be either identified or continue to be identified as 'potential urban land'
- the zone of publicly owned land being in an inappropriate zone.

Additional consultation - Pacific Palms and Harrington

As indicated in Figure 1, 60% of submissions came from the Pacific Palms and Harrington communities. Height controls proposed in both the Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review raised concerns for these communities.

To ensure the issues raised by these communities would be adequately addressed by the changes to the building height controls; additional consultation was undertaken.

On 25 September 2020, revised height control and zone maps were sent to the Pacific Palms and Harrington submitters. An information session (by appointment only – due to Covid-19 restrictions) was offered on 12 October 2020 at Harrington and 13 October 2020 at Pacific Palms. In Harrington, the community publication 'Tell Everybody' also advised people on their Facebook page of the proposed changes.

In summary, the following feedback was received:

- Harrington nine people advised of their support for the changes and one person opposed the changes. An additional landowner recommended further changes which were reviewed and supported
- Pacific Palms we received feedback from three people, two sought clarification of a site that was to remain with a 12m height. It was explained that this site was rezoned in 2013, and the maximum building height had been in place since that time. One response provided general feedback regarding bushfire risks.

Based on discussions with community members, the general response was that people were satisfied with the proposed changes to the building heights.



We want to hear from you: REVISED PLANS FOR HARRINGTON



We received 85 submissions from the Harrington community following our Zoning In consultation earlier this year. The overwhelming message was about the importance of maintaining the character of Harrington, particularly with regard to the proposed increase of building heights.

After reviewing the submissions and reconsidering Harrington planning controls, we have revised the building heights. We now propose to retain the 8.5m maximum building height for the majority of Harrington, as shown in our revised height maps.

There are also some zone changes, shown on the revised zone map as inserts. A key change is the large site currently being developed with townhouses (east of Harrington Waters Shopping Centre) which is to be retained in a General Residential zone, rather than transition to the Low Density Residential zone

The revised maps can be viewed in the Harrington Library and on our website at www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/HYS.

If you have any questions, please call Council on 7955 7777 or email us at council@midcoast.nsw.gov.au. Our Land Use Planners will also be available at Harrington on Monday, 12 October 2020 to answer any questions. Given COVID-19 these sessions will be by appointment only. Contact us on 7955 7777 to make an appointment. We would like to hear from you by 16 October 2020.

PART 3 - STATE INTERESTS

Feedback was received from four State Government Departments which is summarised below. The responses are provided in Appendix C.

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Planning section

The following points were made by the Department. Council's response is provided for each point raised.

- 1. **Urban settlement boundary** support for the identification of the urban areas is noted.
- Proposed urban release areas there was a request for more information on where the identified 'potential urban land' varies to what was identified in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. The Housing Strategy changes identify the inclusion of a new Section 4.13 Potential Urban Land to address these concerns.
- 3. Anticipated future growth and monitoring of supply concern that the future growth rate in the Housing Strategy differs to the NSW Government projections. As a result, it is important to ensure supply and market demand analysis accompany any future rezoning applications. The Department also supports that the urban land monitor will be reviewed and examine development triggers. The Department provides suggestions for inclusion in the review.
- General Residential zone requested additional clarification regarding the application of the General Residential zone in undeveloped areas on the urban fringe. Additional clarification will be provided in the Housing Strategy.

- 5. Tourism approach suggestion that Council could examine how it supports tourism accommodation further, by identifying areas in high demand and review planning controls. An important element of this approach is understanding the different needs of each location. Through place-based planning we can work with communities to identify the tourist accommodation needs of each town and village. This is a preferred approach rather than undertaking a holistic approach for the MidCoast, which may not reflect a town's character and the community's vision.
- 6. **Rural residential development** support for Council's approach is noted.
- 7. **Precinct and spot rezoning** there is a request for additional information on each zone change to be documented in the Housing Strategy. The Housing Strategy provides a basis for the application of the zones in each location. Discussions will be held with the Department to determine the most appropriate approach to ensure adequate information is provided for the planning proposal for the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan.
- 8. **Development controls and character** support for Council to undertake detailed character assessments for the major urban areas is noted.
- 9. Ministerial Directions concern that some of the residential zones may reduce residential densities which may be inconsistent with Ministerial Directions 3.1 Residential Zones and 5.10 Implementation of Regional Plans. It is noted that any inconsistencies will be justified in the future planning proposal.

Environment section

The following points were made by the Department. Council's response is provided for each point raised.

- Flooding and flood risk the Department requests that any sea level rise and changes to flooding due to climate change are considered for all proposed residential rezoning. These areas are shown as 'potential urban lands' in the Housing Strategy. Issues regarding sea level rise and flooding are considered when the planning proposal is lodged for each site. To explain this process further, a new section is proposed to be included in the Housing Strategy.
- 2. Climate change policy it is suggested that Council develop and adopt a Sea level Rise Policy and Framework to guide future decision making around the land use. Council is currently developing a Climate Change Strategy which will be exhibited in 2021. This strategy includes a policy, adaptation plan, mitigation strategy and connection to a future sustainability framework. While this framework is being developed sea level rise is currently considered in Council's coastal and flood management programs.
- 3. Caravan parks it is suggested that climate change flood risks be considered in the development and operation of caravan parks. The Zoning In project examined applying a new suite of zones to caravan parks to provide a consistent approach for the MidCoast urban areas. The location of caravan parks will also be examined in the Rural Strategy being released in 2021. Flooding constraints are examined when development applications for caravan parks are lodged.
- 4. **Ministerial Directions** –Appendix A of the Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis needs to be updated to include all relevant Ministerial Directions. This amendment will be made.

Local Land Services (LLS)

LLS were requested to review the Recreation Zones Review given the many zone changes applied to publicly owned land being both Crown Land and Council owned land.

Feedback from LLS demonstrated that the Crown Land is bound by legislation and the nominated reserve purpose. It is acknowledged that Council needs to undertake additional consultation with LLS to discuss the proposed zone changes prior to the drafting of the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan. As a result of this consultation, some zone changes may occur.

Transport for NSW (TfNSW)

TfNSW raised no issues regarding the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review, Recreation Zones Review and Infrastructure Zones Review.

With regard to the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan, it was recognised that no State Roads form part of this study area. However, they suggested Council may want to consider the movement and place concepts and the 20-year vision and validate the approach. Also examine how vibrant streets and places can be achieved.

The Taree CBD Transport Study undertaken in 2012 formed the transport network basis for the Precinct Plan.

TfNSW also advised that they would like to provide input to the future Employment Lands Strategy.

CONCLUSION

The feedback received on the Zoning In project during the consultation was extensive. The submissions, petition, community conversations and State Government response, have all resulted in changes to all of the Zoning In documents. The proposed changes are outlined throughout this report and in Appendix A, B and C.

The feedback has assisted to refine and improve the Zoning In documents, making them more robust documents.

When amended the following Zoning In documents will be complete:

- Housing Strategy
- Employment Zones Review
- Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan
- Urban Land Monitor
- Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis

The Recreation Zones Review and Infrastructure Zones Review will remain draft. These reviews apply to both urban and rural lands and will be consulted on with the Rural Strategy in 2021.

This was the first stage of checking-in with the community. The next stage – the Rural Strategy, will be available in 2021 for community feedback. Once the Rural Strategy is complete, work will commence on writing the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan and MidCoast Development Control Plan. Consultation on these draft plans is anticipated to occur in 2022.



APPENDIX A

Summary of issues by location



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
STRATEGIC CENTRES
Taree (including Cundletown)2
Forster
Tuncurry
COASTAL CENTRES
Harrington
Old Bar 45
Hallidays Point 51
Pacific Palms
Hawks Nest 70
Tea Gardens
RURAL CENTRES
Gloucester
Wingham
VILLAGES
Barrington
Brimbin
Bulahdelah 100
Coomba Park102
Coolongolook
Crowdy Head 105

Elands	106
Green Point	107
Johns River	
Krambach	109
Nabiac	
Nerong	
North Arm Cove	
Pindimar	
Rainbow Flat	
Seal Rocks	
Tinonee	
Wallabi Point	

INTRODUCTION

The majority of submissions received related to specific sites, typically where people lived. As shown in Figure 1, the 378 submissions were from across the MidCoast (Note: some submissions covered multiple areas).



Figure 1: Location of Submissions

In addition to the submissions; the petition and points raised through the community conversations are also location specific. For each town and village, this feedback was summarised into key issues, and responses provided. In some cases, changes are recommended to the strategy, review or precinct plan to reflect the points raised by the community.

Issues that are numbered (i.e. 1, 2, 3) originated from a submission, whereas issues with letters (i.e. A, B, C) originated from the community conversations.

The towns and villages have been grouped as follows:

- Strategic centres (Taree, Forster and Tuncurry)
- **Coastal centres** (Harrington, Old Bar, Hallidays Point, Pacific Palms, Hawks Nest and Tea Gardens)
- Rural centres (Gloucester and Wingham)
- Villages (Barrington, Brimbin, Bulahdelah, Coomba Park, Coolongolook, Crowdy Head, Green Point, Johns River, Krambach, Nerong, North Arm Cove, Pindimar, Seal Rocks, Tinonee and Wallabi Point)

The following provides the summary table for each town and village. A map is provided showing the urban zones. Surrounding rural and environmental zones are shaded grey as they will be considered in the Rural Strategy in 2021. The location of the key issues (shown as 1, 2, 3 or A, B, C) indicate where each issue is located.

In the summary table, a map for each issue is also provided. Both maps show the proposed zones that were discussed in the Zoning In consultation. At the bottom of each page there is a zoning key, to assist with identifying the different zones.

In some locations, general comments were made with regard to issues like the consultation process, bikeways, heritage or environmental concerns. These are noted as general comments and responses are provided.

STRATEGIC CENTRES

Taree (including Cundletown)

The Taree consultation was held on 10-12 March 2020 in the Taree Central shopping centre, with an evening session on 12 March at the Council Chambers in Taree. Around 435 people attended over the three days. Many residents were seeking clarification on how the new residential zones would work. We received eighteen submissions for Taree. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below, and recommended changes



IN2 - Light Industrial

are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Taree and Cundletown.

Zoning In proposed zone	Issue and response
	 1. Change to Low Density Residential (Submission 36) This residential area is bound by Muldoon Street to the north, and Spence and Eric Streets to the south. One submitter requested that the zone be changed from General Residential to Low Density Residential as there are no townhouses or units in this area. There are a number of townhouses/villas located in this area that provide diversity of housing. These sites have developed due to the age of some of the housing and the larger lot sizes, which is expected to continue over time to provide housing diversity. This area has been in a General Residential zone for the last ten years which means many residents have moved into this area with the knowledge that townhouses may be developed in their neighbourhood or they may propose to develop their site. A change to the Low Density Residential zone is not warranted in this location. Recommendation: no change
14 DP239837 D	 2. Support the Low Density Residential Zone (Submission 170) The landowner provided support for this area around Napunyah Drive to be included in the Low Density Residential zone. Support for this zone is noted. Recommendation: no change

E2 - Environmental Conservation

B2 - Local Centre

B4 - Mixed Use

R1 - General Residential

R3 - Medium Density Residential

Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial

R2 - Low Density Residential

RE2 - Private Recreation





Zoning In proposed zone	Issue and response
23553 255553 25553 25553 25553 25553 255553 255553 255553 2555555 2555555 2555555 255555 255555 2555555	 5. Re-use of Council Building (Submissions 269, 271) Two submitters requested that the existing Council Administration Building in Taree should be repurposed for another government agency or a community hub to accommodate an enlarged library with archival storage, meeting rooms, exhibition space and meeting places. This would complement the surrounding community uses being Fotheringham Park, the War Memorial and Livvi's Place. Should Taree gain a university presence, this hub would be able to support the students. The re-use of the Council building falls outside the scope of the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. The Commercial Core zone enables these types of uses to be established. Recommendation: no change
150 TP235020 TP235002 TP235020 TP23500 TP235	 6. Extension of Commercial Core (Submission 323) These properties are currently in the General Residential zone. The Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan proposes that these sites be included in a Mixed Use zone to encourage a range of residential or commercial uses to support both the hospital and the CBD. The landowner of these properties has requested that these properties be included in the Commercial Core zone, being an extension to the CBD. The Taree CBD is considered large enough to cater for the Taree and the wider region now and into the future. The Mixed Use zone enables a mixture of support uses suitable for this location. Given there are a cluster of sites in one ownership, it is proposed to identify this site as a Key Catalyst site in the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. The number of sites and location provide opportunities for a consolidated development. Recommendation: no change to the proposed Mixed Use zone. Amend the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan to include this site as a Key Catalyst site



R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential

Key zones

R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential



tion IN2 - Light Industrial

Zoning In proposed zone	Issue and response
racture of the maximum of the c. Light industrial of the c. Light industria	 7. Support Medium Density Residential zone (Submission 167) The submitter owns two properties in this area. They have provided support for the use of the Medium Density Residential zone in this location. The support for this zone is noted. Issue G is outlined later in the table and covers part of this area. Recommendation: no change
RET: RET: Control of the second sec	 8. Heritage conservation (Submission 169) A landowner in this area would like to see a heritage conservation area extended over Boyce and Stevenson Streets given the older houses in this area. There is currently no heritage conservation area in this location, but it is recognised that there are some important heritage streetscapes, particularly fronting Boyce Street that need to be recognised. The difficulty in this area is that some unit developments in the 1970-1980s have impacted on the character of some streets in this area. The Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan provides a recommendation that supports the future review of the heritage conservation areas. Recommendation: no change



E2 - Environmental Conservation E3 - Environmental Management

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

Zoning In proposed zone



10

Issue and response

9. 68A-90 Victoria Street (Submission 271)

The submitter opposed the proposed change from the Mixed Use zone to part Commercial Core and High Density Residential. They have a preference for the Mixed Use zone given it provides more flexibility and allows more favourable uses. They proposed to limit the Commercial Core zone to the Victoria Street frontage of the lots closest to Macquarie Street. There was support for the proposed height and floor space ratio changes.

Both the Commercial Core zone and High Density Residential zones enable a mix of uses, for example shop-top housing is permitted with consent in the Commercial Core zone. This information was discussed with the submitter who thought that the commercial core zone would prohibit shop-top housing. The submitter advised that it was their intention to have commercial on the ground floor and residential above, which is consistent with the commercial core zone intent.

Recommendation: no change

10. Drury Lane (Submissions 385, 378)

This land is currently in the Enterprise Corridor zone. Through consultation on the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan changes were made to reflect the flood restrictions of this land and the landowners desire to only use the proposed private recreation zone area for gardens. Both landowners have provided submissions with concerns to the proposed zones being General Residential and Private Recreation, contrary to previous consultation.

After a review of this location it is proposed to retain this site in the Enterprise Corridor zone. While the flooding could impact on residential uses, solutions may be found for commercial activities on this site.

Recommendation: amend the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan to include these sites in the Enterprise Corridor zone



E2 - Environmental Conservation

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial

B4 - Mixed Use



R5 - Large Lot Residential



Zoning In proposed zone



Issue and response

11. Decrease building heights to four storeys (Submissions 212, 269)

The submitter notes that opening up of vistas to the Manning River is an important principle in the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. However, the proposal for a riverside stretch of Victoria Street to be High Density Residential with a height limit of eight storeys seems contrary to these observations. Activation of the waterfront should be achieved by an inclusive mix of uses, not by high density, high rise living which would be totally out of character and in direct conflict with the aim of visual connection to the river. This area should be reduced from eight storeys to four storeys to reduce the impacts on views of the river.

This location was identified as an opportunity to provide multi-storey residential in proximity to both the Taree CBD and recreation facilities available along the riverbank. The High Density Residential zone allows a range of uses that can support future residents such as neighbourhood shops, restaurants or cafes, or community facilities. The concept was to recognise the status of Taree as the regional hub of the MidCoast and hence significantly increase residential density in walking distance to the CBD in an area beside the river with great amenity.

It is acknowledged that the proposed height is a significant change to the character of Taree and that demand does not currently exist for such development in Taree. Therefore, it is proposed to amend the maximum building height to 21m to be consistent with the remainder of the majority of the CBD.

Recommendation: amend the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan to reduce the maximum building height for land to be included in the High Density Residential zone (between Victoria and River Streets) to 21m



12. Taree Bridge Club (Submission 302)

The Taree Bridge Club supports the proposed maximum building height being 18m.

There is currently no height limit applied to this site.

The support for this change is noted.

Recommendation: no change

B2 - Local Centre

E2 - Environmental Conservation

E3 - Environmental Management

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial

R5 - Large Lot Residential



RU1 - Primary Production

B4 - Mixed Use

Coning In proposed zone	Issue and response
DP31268	13. Taree South (Submission 372)
	The locality name was changed from being Glenthorne to Taree South over ten years ago by Council. No consultation was undertaken with residents. The name should be changed back to Glenthorne to reflect the heritage of the area. This change is supported by this community.
vays	The naming of suburbs falls outside the scope of the Zoning In project.
	Recommendation: no change
DP2#4242	
6 DP1254398 DP1254398	A. Kolodong residential
Designed and the second	This site was subject to a planning proposal and was recently included in a General Residential zone. The Housing Strategy should be amended to reflect this recent rezoning.
DP754459 DP75449 DP12864 DP12864 DP1286464 DP1286464	Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to reflect the extent of land rezoned to General Residential zone
SP2 DP75449 SP2 DP1522180 DP1252180 DP1252180 DP252284 DP252284 DP252284 DP252284	





R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial


Issue and response

B. Lots 7023-7023 and 33 Cedar Party Road

This site is currently in the General Residential zone. Given the site is well vegetated and publicly owned by the State Government it was proposed to be included in the Environmental Conservation zone.

Since the application of zones for the Zoning In project, a number of sites are no longer publicly owned as a Native Title Claim has been resolved. While this is not the case for this site, there are currently land claims being considered for this site. As a result, it is proposed to retain the General Residential zone over this land and consult with the Purfleet Taree Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether the ownership of this site is proposed to change, if the site is to be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Zoning In maps to retain this land in a General Residential zone. Consult with the Purfleet Taree Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone



C. 1 Rifle Range Road

This site is owned by the Department of Primary Industries and is currently in a residential, recreation and rural zone. Through the Zoning In work, the site was transitioned to similar zones. The site is heavily vegetated and has steep slopes.

A review of environmental corridors identified this site as contributing to Browns Creek, which is an important corridor through Taree to the Manning River. Given the importance of the vegetation and the environmental corridor, it is proposed to include this site in an Environmental Conservation zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and mapping to include the site in an Environmental Conservation zone



B4 - Mixed Use



R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial



R5 - Large Lot Residential



Issue and response

D. Lot 38 and 238 Bushland Drive and 16 Evaron Drive

This site is currently in the General Residential zone. Given the site is well vegetated and publicly owned by the State Government it was proposed to be included in the Environmental Conservation zone.

Since the application of zones for the Zoning In project, the northern lot is no longer publicly owned as a Native Title Claim has been resolved. The two southern lots are currently subject to land claims. As a result, it is proposed to retain the General Residential zone over this land and consult with the Purfleet Taree Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether the ownership of the southern lots is proposed to change, if the land is to be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Zoning In maps to retain this land in a General Residential zone. Consult with the Purfleet Taree Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether this land will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone



E. St Joseph's Primary School

St Joseph's Public School is currently in a rural zone. Land directly to the south is identified as 'potential urban land' and in the future will provide a residential neighbour to the school. The school site has been included in the urban footprint, which identifies the extent of the town in terms of urban uses, and includes recreation and environmental lands.

Typically, schools are included in the neighbouring zone, which is why it has remained in a rural zone. Given it adjoins 'potential urban land' it is proposed to recognise that the school is an urban use and include it in the General Residential zone, with the creek corridor and associated vegetation included in the Environmental Conservation zone.

This proposed zone does not change how the site operates, it just recognises that the site is used for an urban purpose, rather than a rural activity.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and mapping to include the site in a General Residential zone and Environmental Conservation zone along the creek corridor





R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones

R3 - Medium Density Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial

B4 - Mixed Use



R5 - Large Lot Residential





PZ - Infrastructure

Issue and response

E. Taree West shops and service station

The shops are currently included in the Neighbourhood Centre zone and the service station in the General Residential zone. The Employment Zone Review proposed extending the Neighbourhood Centre zone over the service station and 2 Spence Street to enable the future expansion of the centre. The maximum building height was also increased from 8.5m to 12m.

Based on submissions received on the Employment Zones Review, we have revisited all of the neighbourhood centres. The shopping centre and the service station continue to meet the needs of the residents and have capacity for growth if required. It is proposed to reduce the extent of the Neighbourhood Centre zone by including 2 Spence Street in the General Residential zone, as it is a well-established residential use. The maximum building height is also proposed to be reduced to 8.5m to reflect the character of the neighbourhood which is predominately single storey.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include 2 Spence Street in the General Residential zone and amend the Employment Zones Review to reduce the extent of the Neighbourhood Centre and reduce the maximum building height to 8.5m

F. Lot 1 and 50 Milligan Street

Land fronting Milligan Street is in a residential zone. Land to the south of the rail spur (shown as yellow) is one of the few remaining parcels of rural land within the urban footprint for Taree. The site has an area of approximately 8ha and is well vegetated and adjoins Browns Creek. The two lots have different ownership.

It is proposed to retain the rural zone over the land south of the rail spur, but identify it as 'potential urban land' in the Housing Strategy. This acknowledges that some form of urban development may occur over this part of the site. A planning proposal would need to be lodged by the landowners which examined the values and constraints of the site, and identified the future use of the developable land. Identifying the site as 'potential urban land' does not provide an indication that the whole site can be developed. The planning proposal process would determine which part of the site was suitable for development and would allocate zones accordingly.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this rural land as 'potential urban land'





Issue and response

G. Height consolidation - 17m: Precinct Plan

Maximum building heights are proposed in the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. During consultation, some people had trouble identifying which height applied over the properties, given the extensive number of heights proposed.

A review of the height controls revealed that across the MidCoast, sixteen different height controls were proposed, with some differing by only half a metre. The maximum building heights have been consolidated to ten different heights. In making this change the 17m maximum building height has been transitioned to 18m, as both allow for up to six storeys. This affects parts of the Taree town centre as shown.

Recommendation: amend the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan to replace the 17m maximum building height with 18m



G. Height consolidation - 17m: FIGTREES on the Manning

Maximum building heights are proposed in the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. During consultation, some people had trouble identifying which height applied over the properties, given the extensive number of heights proposed.

A review of the height controls revealed that across the MidCoast, sixteen different heights controls were proposed, with some differing by only half a metre. The maximum building heights have been consolidated to ten different heights. In making this change the 17m maximum building height has been transitioned to 18m, as both allow for up to six storeys. This affects parts of the FIGTREES on the Manning development as shown.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to replace the 17m maximum building height with 18m







21 DP611411 Conservation

Issue and response

H. 334 Victoria Street, 2-8 Christina Close and 14-22 West End Avenue

During consultation, a landowner questioned why part of their property fronting Christina Close (off West End Avenue) was proposed to be in the Low Density Residential zone and the remainder in the Primary Production zone.

This location was reviewed as it was retaining a rural zone (shown as grey in the map) within the urban settlement area of Taree. The land is constrained by flooding which appears to have provided the zone boundary line between the residential and rural zone.

Given the flooding constraints, the sites operate as Large Lot Residential sites, with the housing on the higher ground and large flood affected open ground to the rear of the properties. The application of the Large Lot Residential zone over these properties would reflect the use of these sites which are larger residential lots. A suitable lot size will be applied to these sites to reflect their large lot residential nature and ensure new allotments are not created on flood affected land.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include these sites in the Large Lot Residential zone

I. Corner of Commerce and Victoria Streets

The site on the corner of Victoria and Commerce Streets is a gateway site for the Taree CBD, and it recently became vacant. Given its location and size, it is proposed to identify this site as a Key Catalyst site in the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. This would highlight the importance and prominence of this site for future development.

Recommendation: identify this site as a Key Catalyst site in the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan

J. 60-146 Lansdowne Road

These sites front Lansdowne Road and have airport land (shown as yellow) at the rear of the properties. They are currently included in a rural zone, and have a mix of business activities, and houses with hangers with direct access to the Taree Regional Airport land. The draft Manning Valley Local Strategy 2016, identified the potential for employment activities in this location. Reflecting the intent of this strategy, it is proposed to identify these sites as 'potential employment lands' in the Employment Zones Review. This recognises that these sites could be subject to a rezoning in the future to an employment zone. Any rezoning application would examine the suitability of the zone in terms of strategic need, transport and any environmental issues.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to identify this site as 'potential employment land'





R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial

B4 - Mixed Use E3 - Environmental Management









Issue and response

K. 13 Albert Street, Cundletown

This site adjoins the Taree Regional Airport and the future Cundletown Bypass. In the Mid North Coast Regional Plan 2006-2031, this site formed part of the urban release area for Cundletown. While the area to the northeast will be developed as the Northern Gateway Transport Hub, this site remains in a rural zone. Given this site has the potential to be developed for an urban purpose, it needs to be shown as 'potential urban land' in the Housing Strategy. This acknowledges that some form of urban development may occur over this part of the site. A planning proposal would need to be lodged by the landowner which examined the values and constraints of the site, and identify the future use of the developable land. Identifying the site as 'potential urban land' does not provide an indication that the whole site can be developed. The planning proposal process would determine which part of the site was suitable for development and would allocate zones accordingly.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this rural land as 'potential urban land'

L. 32 Lansdowne Road. Cundletown

This parcel of land is owned by Council and forms part of the Taree Regional Airport. It is proposed to include this site in the Special Purpose zone to reflect the intended use of this site.

Recommendation: amend the Infrastructure Zones Review to include this site in the Special Purpose zone

M. Cundletown shops

The shops and service station are currently included in the Neighbourhood Centre zone. The Employment Zones Review proposed to increase the maximum building height from 8.5m to 12m.

Based on submissions received on the Employment Zones Review, we have revisited all of the neighbourhood centres. The shopping centre and the service station continue to meet the needs of the residents and have capacity for growth if required. It is proposed to reduce the maximum building height is to 8.5m to reflect the character of the neighbourhood which is predominately single storey.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to reduce the maximum building height of the Neighbourhood Centre to 8.5m

B2 - Local Centre



R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial

B4 - Mixed Use



R5 - Large Lot Residential

RE2 - Private Recreation



Issue and response

N. The Bucketts Way, Taree South

This land is currently in the Primary Production zone. It was identified as 'proposed employment land' in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. The Employment Zones Review needs to be amended to identify the 'proposed employment lands' that were identified in this Strategy. This recognises that these sites could be the subject of a rezoning in the future to expand the industrial zones along The Bucketts Way. Any rezoning application would examine the values of the property, including environmental.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to identify this site as 'potential employment land'

O. Twilight Caravan Park

The site is currently included in the Enterprise Corridor zone and was retained in this zone during the Zoning In consultation. Since exhibition it is proposed to ensure all caravan parks within urban areas be included in the Private Recreation zone where they are privately owned. It is proposed to change the zone to be consistent with this approach. This change will recognise the long-term existing use of the caravan park.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review to include this site in the Private Recreation zone



E2 - Environmental Conservation

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones



RU1 - Primary Production

B4 - Mixed Use



R5 - Large Lot Residential

Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan – general issues and response

Support the changes proposed in the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan (Submissions 212, 269)

Submitters supported the proposed changes in Taree CBD and surrounds. Support the town core having a mix of uses, including housing, so as to attract (and retain) a diverse population mix. There was also support for the proposed building height increase along Victoria Street as it will encourage housing closer to town.

This support for the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan is noted.

Recommendation: no change

General comments (Submissions 176, 194, 212, 323)

- a) there is an opportunity to create a more pedestrian friendly and inviting public realm, particularly by the provision of street trees (to reduce hot street temperatures), traffic calming devices, and attractive streets and laneways. A pedestrian overbridge linking the railway station with existing residential areas, together with a shuttlebus accessing frequently utilized services around the CBD (including the TAFE site and Council's new offices), would benefit all residents and contribute to a more sustainable lifestyle. In addition, need to consider privacy and overshadowing issues
- Taree must rise to the challenge of a more regionally focused economy making provision for locally sourced products and services, especially food production. b) Tourism can no longer be seen as a primary source of income, nor long supply chains for the provision of goods. Council should work with State and Federal governments to devise and promote a series of regional employment incentives – tax breaks, payroll tax exemptions and stamp duty concessions etc. to secure and ensure a business future for Taree. Need to focus on revamping the CBD area to be more attractive to entice investors and developers to replace the infrastructure and employment opportunities that are no longer on offer
- c) the Mixed Use zone can result in vacant office space/retail being provided on ground floor. Possibly a more targeted use of the Mixed Use zone should be considered
- removal of the FSR may reduce the availability for developers of Seniors Housing (under the SEPP) to secure sites. Other bonuses may need to be considered d)
- more incentives for developing catalyst sites should be considered e)

In response:

- a) while the Precinct Plan is primarily a document to inform future planning controls, it also provides recommendations around streetscape improvements, parking changes, pedestrian crossings and pedestrian/cycleways that will be up to Council and the State government to consider separately. There are also concepts including in the Precinct Plan, such as the proposed shuttlebus, which could be an initiative taken up by the business community or other groups or individuals. The DCP controls will examine issues regarding overshadowing and privacy
- the Precinct Plan provides planning recommendations which can be implemented via the new MidCoast LEP and DCP and seeks to acknowledge and support the b) medical precinct around the hospital while encouraging complementary business and residential opportunities in the mixed use zone around the CBD, supporting the commercial core zone. It also supports an increase in residential density near the CBD to provide a great diversity for housing in Taree and further support the economic viability of the CBD. Economic initiatives continue to be explored by the Chamber of Commerce working in partnership with Council
- there has been a misconception that the mixed use zone means mixed use in a single building it does not. The zone allows a mix of residential and commercial uses to be permitted where it is used. While a landowner could choose to have a mix of uses in a single building or development, likewise they could use to have a single

Key zones



E2 - Environmental Conservation



R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential





IN2 - Light Industrial

Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan – general issues and response

residential, commercial or medical use

- d) considering that Seniors Housing is effectively a form of medium density housing, it is difficult to see how removing the FSR would impact such development. In the area covered by the Precinct Plan, due to the already developed nature of the area, the only form of Seniors Housing likely to occur is 'vertical' retirement villages. The provisions proposed in the Precinct Plan support this outcome
- e) the Precinct Plan identifies Key Catalyst sites which have the potential to effect and influence the overall functioning and urban character of the CBD, and act as a catalyst and precedent to positive change. The plan recommends that DCP controls be prepared and provide specific controls for these sites to elicit the built form desired. Through the recommendations of the Precinct Plan, the planning controls enable increased development opportunities for these sites, as a result no further incentives are required

Recommendation: no change

Taree – general issues and response

General comments (Submissions 176, 177, 179, 194, 212)

- would like to see more aged care facilities located closer to town a)
- b) need more family play equipment (e.g. water park, bike track) that attracts people to area. Outdoor areas for shop workers to have lunch is needed
- need to maintain public areas better to attract people. c)
- reduce commercial rent, which may encourage more jobs. There is a need for more variety in shops d)
- operating a business from home should not be permitted without a development consent e)
- public transport is extremely poor needs improvement in terms of busses being mobility friendly, increase bus shelters, signage, electronic timetables, bus services f) and ferry (between Wingham and Harrington). Increase train services with reduced fares
- Manning River Drive accessing the Pacific Highway should be double lanes. Martin Bridge increased to four lanes. The Lakes Way needs to be double lanes including the bridge
- h) increase width of paths in town to enable access for pedestrians, mobility scooters and wheelchairs. Increase paths to key locations in Taree (e.g. TAFE, schools, airport, major clubs). Increase lighting along Taree foreshore and install security cameras to improve safety
- disability keys need to be available and parks accessible for everyone i)
- need more domestic flights to key centres. Increase capacity of Taree Regional Airport for larger planes i)
- k) free public Wi-Fi in CBDs. Improve mobile network to 5G
- I) provide a place to accept household waste, oils, smoke detectors, etc. in the CBD given the distance to the tips
- m) there is no housing for people with disabilities

	B2 -	Local	Cen
--	------	-------	-----



Key zones





IN2 - Light Industrial

RU1 - Primary Production

B4 - Mixed Use



R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential

R5 - Large Lot Residential





Taree – general issues and response

- n) ensure Council offices in Forster and Gloucester have staff available in libraries to undertake Council functions
- homeless shelter with showers is needed o)
- poo bags for dogs along Manning River p)
- a solution to shopping trolleys is needed. a)

In response:

- a) having aged care facilities close to the Taree town centre benefit residents, as they are close to services and facilities needed when people age. The problem is that these areas have been subdivided and developed since Taree first settled. Aged care centres prefer larger sites to meet their needs which are typically further from the town centre. In Forster we have seen some new aged care centres develop as multi-storey facilities that are closer to town. Opportunities exist in Taree for this type of development close to town, particularly with the new planning controls proposed in the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan
- b) Livvi's Place has provided new play facilities in town which are being widely used by the community. There is opportunity to expand on this playground as funding opportunities become available. New seating in the main street provides more places for people to sit and eat
- maintenance of parks falls outside the scope of the Zoning In project c)
- d) shop rentals and the variety of shops falls outside the scope of the Zoning In project. Please note that through the Vibrant Spaces program, Council has made it easier for shops to use the footpaths and encourage more vibrancy in the town centres
- the planning controls applied across NSW have a standard format which requires some uses to be mandatory. For example, in the General Residential and Low e) Density Residential zones a Home Occupation must be listed as a use that is 'permitted without consent'. Other uses like home business and home industry are only permitted with consent, requiring a development application. Council's cannot over-ride these planning controls, so it is not possible to make all businesses operating from home to lodge a development application
- f) public transport falls outside the scope of the Zoning In project. It is acknowledged that public transport in regional areas is difficult in terms of providing a service that meets the needs of all residents and which is viable to operate. We will continue to work with the NSW Government to explore new options to improve public transport in regional areas
- there are a number of transport plans that examine future options for both Taree and Forster to meet the increased demands on our roads and bridges. These g) studies often suggest that the roads still have capacity and with changes to traffic movements, improvements can be made. It is acknowledged, however, that the bridge linking Forster with Tuncurry becomes very busy during peak holiday periods. This, however, is a State government asset and outside Council's control.
- h) the Pedestrian Access Mobility Plan (PAMP), and Bike Plan is currently on exhibition and feedback is being sought. The submitter is encouraged to get involved and provide comments on this plan, whether about the desire for more paths or lighting of existing ones. Information is available on Council's website at https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Part-of-your-every-day/Council-Works/Planning-ahead-for-Pedestrian-Mobility-Access-and-Cycleways
- across NSW there are arrangements in place regarding obtaining access to the key that opens disability toilets. This falls outside the scope of the Zoning In project i)
- the domestic flights service provided at Taree Regional Airport is dependent on the use. Additional services will be considered if the demand increases. There are i) currently no plans to extend the runway at the airport
- free Wi-Fi is available at Council Libraries. Many businesses provide free Wi-Fi in-store and some provide this service in the outside areas. There are also opportunities for groups of businesses or business chambers to consider offering free Wi-Fi in public areas as part of initiatives to make their towns more vibrant and

Key zones





E3 - Environmental Management





IN2 - Light Industrial

B4 - Mixed Use



R1 - General Residential

R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential



Taree – general issues and response

user-friendly

- I) there are a range of waste services available visit Council's website at <u>https://www.midcoast.nsw.gov.au/Environment/Bins-and-Waste/Recycling-and-Disposal</u> to find out more
- m) NSW State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Housing Rental) 2009 enables housing for people with disabilities (e.g. Group homes) to be established without requiring consent. This ensures that a range of housing can be provided by service providers to cater for the needs of some of our most vulnerable community
- n) Council will continue to provide customer service points in Forster, Gloucester, Stroud and Tea Gardens where enquiries can be made. Please note that these are often in different locations to the Libraries
- o) NSW Government and community service providers across the MidCoast provide access to services and facilities for our homeless community
- p) collecting dog faeces remains the responsibility of the owner of the dog. To assist, Council has provided access to bags in parks across the MidCoast. Community groups assist with replacing bags when dispensers are empty
- q) the 'stray' shopping trolleys remain the responsibility of the shopping centres to collect.

Recommendation: no change

Taree – heritage issues and response

Heritage protection (Submissions 212, 269)

- a) heritage items including the three pubs, Beehive Building should be conserved so their character is protected
- b) need to respect Taree's heritage, and to draw on its historical context as a river port to create an interesting and vibrant town with special character

In response:

- a) these buildings are currently heritage listed in the Greater Taree Local Environmental Plan 2010. Any development of these buildings must demonstrate how the heritage values are maintained
- b) the extent of heritage protection in Taree in terms of heritage listings and heritage conservation areas demonstrates that it is an important planning consideration. It is acknowledged that heritage positively contributes to the character of Taree. It is important to continue to promote heritage not only though the built form, but also in our public spaces. This has been achieved with projects like the photograph at the former Taree pool (now called Harry Bennett Park), the re-instatement of the Martin Bridge wheels along the riverside path (which were used raise a section of the Martin Bridge to allow tall boats to pass on the past) and use of historic photographs on the toilets near the rowing club and Rotary park.



Forster

The Forster consultation was run from a Tuncurry shopfront over three days (17-19 March 2020), with a night time session at the Council Chambers in Forster. Seventy-three people attended. Given Forster already uses a range of residential zones; limited concerns were raised at these sessions. We received six submissions for Forster. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Forster.







Issue and response

A. Height consolidation - 13m: Forster shopping centre

Maximum building heights are proposed in the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. During consultation, some people had trouble identifying which height applied over the properties, given the extensive number of heights proposed.

A review of the height controls revealed that across the MidCoast, sixteen different heights controls were proposed, some differing by only half a metre. The maximum building heights have been consolidated to ten different heights. In making this change we have replaced the 13m maximum building height with 15m. This affected parts of the Forster town centre and some lots fronting Little Street as shown.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to replace the 13m maximum building height with 15m



B. Police Station

The police station is currently in the Special Purpose (Infrastructure) zone and was proposed to be included in a Mixed Use zone. It is appropriate to include the police station in the Local Centre zone, consistent with the properties to the north and west.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to include the police station in the Local Centre zone





E3 - Environmental Management

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial



Issue and response

1. CWA – Little Street (Submissions 195, 318)

The three sites are currently in the Special Purpose (Infrastructure) zone and were proposed to be included in a Mixed Use zone, with the exception of the park which is proposed to be included in a Public Recreation zone. The CWA are located south of the Visitor Information Centre and are concerned that the Mixed Use zone will increase pressure to close their offices. They propose that the land is 'community land' and should remain in a recreation zone. It also provides a pocket park close to the town centre and tourist facilities and is used for markets.

It is agreed that this land provides a community open space, being publicly owned land. It is proposed to include this land in the Public Recreation zone.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review and Infrastructure Zones Review to include this site in the Public Recreation zone

C. Education office

The Department of Education office is currently in the Mixed Use zone and was proposed to be included in the Medium Density Residential zone. Based on changes recommended in Issue 1 above and discussions with the community, it is appropriate to have this site transition to the Local Centre zone consistent with the properties to the north and west.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and Infrastructure Zones Review to include the education office in the Local Centre zone

D. Creek corridor

This creek corridor and road reserve is currently included in the Medium Density Residential zone. This land is an important environmental corridor. Based on the review for Issue 1 and surrounding lands, it is proposed to include this land in the Environmental Management zone to reflect the environmental values

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and Infrastructure Zones Review to include the environmental corridor in the Environmental Management zone

B2 - Local Centre B4 - Mixed Use

E2 - Environmental Conservation E3 - Environmental Management R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial





Issue and response

2. 6-16 Lake Street (Submission 316)

This area is being removed from a Medium Density Residential zone and included in the High Density Residential zone. The submission provided support for the application of the High Density zone over these sites. It should be noted that there is a current planning proposal over the site to rezone the land to the High Density Residential zone.

The support for this zone change is noted.

Recommendation: no change

E. Height consolidation - 13m: Stocklands and 4-12 Breese Parade

Maximum building heights are proposed in the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. During consultation, some people had trouble identifying which height applied over the properties, given the extensive number of heights proposed. Also, there were concerns about some building height increases in centres.

Stocklands was proposed to increase from 13m to 21m. After reviewing this increase, it was proposed to retain the existing height of 13m.

In addition, across the studies there were sixteen different heights proposed, some differing by only half a metre. We reviewed the maximum building heights and consolidated them to ten different heights. In making this change we have replaced the 13m maximum building height with 15m. This affected these two sites.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to replace the 13m maximum building height with 15m over Stocklands and 4-12 Breese Parade





E3 - Environmental Management

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial





Issue and response

F. Forster Keys shopping centre

The shops are currently included in the Neighbourhood Centre zone with a maximum building height of 12m. The Employment Zones Review proposed extending the Neighbourhood Centre zone over the adjoining house at 21 Allen Avenue, to enable the future expansion of the centre.

Based on submissions received on the Employment Zones Review, we have revisited the neighbourhood centres. The shopping centre can continue to meet the needs of the residents and have capacity for growth if required. It is proposed to reduce the extent of the Neighbourhood Centre zone by including the adjoining house in the Low Density Residential zone, as it is a well-established residential use. The maximum building height of this property is also proposed to be reduced to 8.5m to reflect the character of the neighbourhood.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review to include 21 Allen Avenue Spence Street in the Low Density Residential zone

3. Southern Parkway (Submission 261)

There was general support for the zones being applied to this site, except for:

- the Neighbourhood Centre zone they feel it is not warranted given the proximity to Stocklands and Forster Keys and propose a General Residential zone
- the Medium Density Residential zone they propose to undertake integrated housing which appears inconsistent with the zone as houses are prohibited. As such, they propose the use of a General Residential zone.

The zones proposed for this site are consistent with the zones that currently apply over the site, in particular:

- the Neighbourhood Centre zone was originally applied to this site to provide access to shops and facilities for this area, which will continue to grow in population as development occurs. Based on the original rezoning and expectation of residents that these services will be provided, it is not appropriate to remove this business zone
- the proposed Medium Density Residential zone will enable integrated housing as outlined in the Housing Strategy. This zone will be consistent with the intended development and the current zone.

Recommendation: no change



E2 - Environmental Conservation

E3 - Environmental Management

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential

Key zones

R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial



Issue and response

F. Potential Urban Land – Cape Hawke Drive

This site is currently in a rural zone and identified in the Housing Strategy as 'potential urban land'. This reflects the land being identified as a 'proposed urban area' in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031.

Changing the site from a rural zone to an urban use occurs through a rezoning process where the values of the land are considered. This site has important ecological values that would mean that large portions of the site would probably be unsuitable for residential development and placed in an appropriate environmental zone. Council has acquired parts of this property for environmental management and drainage purposes. It is proposed to reduce the extent of the area identified as 'potential urban land'.

In addition, a new section is proposed in the Housing Strategy to provide more details on the 'potential urban land'.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to exclude portions of the site purchased by Council and include a new section which provides more details on the 'potential urban land'

R i = General Resident 40 DP773088 7144 DE1107992

4. 16 Tea Tree Road (Submission 270)

Concern that the proposed zones will compromise the development approval that applies over the site for 'Caravan Parks', 'Tourist and Visitor Accommodation' and 'Residential Accommodation'. The submitter would like zones to be used that reflect these uses, maximise development options and allows the transition between consistent uses.

During consultation it was evident that there were no land use tables provided for the for the Tourist zone in the Housing Strategy. This provides a level of uncertainty for this site. In addition, the notation on the Housing Strategy for this site (Note 2) which mentions the retention of the 12m building height is shown on the wrong property, however the Zoning In mapping showed the correct building heights.

The Tourist zone land use table will be incorporated into the Housing Strategy which will enable caravan parks and tourist and visitor accommodation. These uses and residential accommodation are all permitted in the General Residential zone. The notation in the Housing Strategy will also be amended.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include the land use table for the Tourist zone and show the correct notation for this site





E3 - Environmental Management

E2 - Environmental Cons

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential



Key zones

R3 - Medium Density Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial



Issue and response

5. Lots 1-7 DP249361 (Submission 282)

Request that the whole site be included as 'potential urban land' in the Housing Strategy rather than the front 3 lots, consistent with the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031.

The South Forster Structure Plan 2006 identified significant constraints for Lots 4-7 on DP249361. As a result, only the front portion of the site was identified as having potential to be developed for residential purposes. The Housing Strategy reflects this work undertaken.

Recommendation: no change

Issue and response

General comment (Submission 39)

Support the work undertaken to consolidate the zones and the mapping provided. Would like more information about the Environmental Management zone being applied around Lakes Estate.

The support is noted. More details on the environmental zones in terms of objectives and land use tables will be provided in the Rural Strategy which will be available for community feedback in 2021.



Tuncurry

B4 - Mixed Use

The Tuncurry consultation was held in conjunction with the Forster consultation from 17-19 March 2020 in a shopfront with an evening session on 19 March at the Council Chambers in Forster. Around seventy-three people attended. Given Tuncurry already uses a range of residential zones; limited concerns were raised at these sessions. We received nine submissions for Tuncurry. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Tuncurry.



R2 - Low Density Residential

E3 - Environmental Management



R5 - Large Lot Residential





Issue and response

1. North Tuncurry (Submission 252)

Landcom support MidCoast applying for an exemption from the Hunter State Infrastructure Charging (SIC).

Landcom note that North Tuncurry will be considered under a State Environmental Planning Policy which will apply specific controls. Provisions propose enabling lots less than 250m² where detailed designs aim to increase affordability by decreasing costs (stamp duty and holding costs).

An updated master plan will be provided for inclusion in the Housing Strategy and noted that consultation had previously occurred with the community

It is acknowledged that this site will proceed through the State Government approval process, separate to the Local Environmental Plan. Council will continue to contribute to this process, providing advice on local constraints and opportunities.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to reflect the most recent version of the Master Plan

2. Racecourse Road (Submissions 232, 233)

This area is included in the Large Lot Residential zone with a minimum lot size of 10,000m². The proposed planning controls are consistent with those existing over this area. Given that these lots have access to water and sewerage, two landowners requested that the minimum lot size be reduced to 4,000m² consistent with sewered areas elsewhere in the MidCoast.

The subdivision of properties relies not only on the availability of water and sewerage, but also the achievement of an orderly development. Where the minimum lot size has been reduced in these types of estates, the result has been the development of battle-axe blocks which impact on traffic movement, waste management and the character of the estate. Many people buy into an estate with the expectation that the subdivision layout and character will not change.

The appropriate means to reduce the minimum lot size in this location is to work with landowners in the estate and develop a subdivision plan which will provide an orderly development and meet their expectations. Once achieved, a planning proposal can be submitted to Council to amend the Local Environmental Plan to achieve a reduced minimum lot size. The landowners will need to pay for the application and any associated reports needed to address impacts.





Issue and response

3. Change to a residential zone (Submission 292)

Lot 12 DP816473 in Grey Gum Road is proposed to be retained in the Light Industrial zone. Given there is no demand for industrial land in Tuncurry, the landowner requests that a residential zone would be more appropriate for the majority of the site to meet the housing demand. Adequate services are available for housing.

Changing from an industrial to a residential zone requires consideration of impacts and how the residential could be developed in an orderly manner and not be impacted by the existing industrial land. An updated land use audit and economic impact assessment would also be required to demonstrate the existing supply and demand for industrial land within the Forster-Tuncurry strategic centre. This should be undertaken through a rezoning application to consider all aspects of the change. As such, no change to the zones is recommended and the owner is encouraged to undertake a planning proposal to justify the change.

Recommendation: no change

A CONSTRAINT OF THE STREET

A. North Street

This site is currently in the Medium Density Residential zone with a maximum building height of 12m. It was proposed the site remain in the Medium Density Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m. There was an error in this location, as the proposed height would typically be applied to land included in the General Residential zone. This zone is considered appropriate given the existing pattern of subdivision and the recent, predominantly single and two storey developments within this area.

The General Residential zone and reduced height of building will provide a suitable transition between the existing residential development and adjoining dog park and sports fields.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this site in a General Residential zone and 8.5m height



4. 1 Rockpool Road (Submission 174)

The landowner identified that the residential zone does not apply over their whole property. The zone needs to be amended to include the whole property in the Medium Density Residential zone.

This is a mapping error and will be amended to include the whole site in the Medium Density Residential zone.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In map to ensure both Lot 15 DP238006 and Lot 269 DP753207 are included in the Medium Density Residential zone





R1 - General Residential

Key zones

R3 - Medium Density Residential

R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial RU1 - Primary Production

B4 - Mixed Use



R2 - Low Density Residential



Issue and response

B. Height consolidation - 21m: Tuncurry shopping centre

Maximum building heights are proposed in the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. During consultation, some people had trouble identifying which height applied over the properties, given the extensive number of heights proposed.

A review of the height controls revealed that across the MidCoast, sixteen different heights controls were proposed, some differing by only half a metre. The maximum building heights have been consolidated to ten different heights. In making this change the 20m maximum building height has been replaced with 21m. This affected parts of the Tuncurry town centre as shown.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to replace the 20m maximum building height with 21m

5. Catherine and Peel Street (Submission 210)

The landowner provided support for their properties having a maximum building height of 12m. The building height is proposed to be reduced from 18m to 12m.

Support for this new building height is noted.





Issue and response

6. High Density Residential concerns (Submissions 48, 50)

Concerns raised that the High Density Residential zone is inappropriate and out of character for Tuncurry. Future development will overshadow surrounding homes and create environmental, infrastructure and social issues. There is sufficient land to cater for future growth. Development of townhouses on this site would be more appropriate.

These sites are currently in the High Density Residential zone with a maximum building height of 30m. Three residential flat buildings in excess of nine storeys also already exist within this location.

The Housing Strategy proposes no change to these sites. Given the planning for these sites have been in place for a number of years, it is not appropriate to change the zone.

Recommendation: no change



B. Christina Close

It is proposed that this site remain in a Low Density Residential zone. During consultation it was mentioned that this site has an established industrial use, being JR Richards. It was questioned whether this site should be included in an industrial zone.

The development of this site is historical. If it were to be developed in the future, a residential use would be more appropriate given the surrounding residential uses.





Issue and response

7. Point Road Development (Submission 362)

Currently the site is included in the High Density Residential zone with the eastern portion of the site included in the Low Density Residential zone, with a maximum building height of 18m over the whole site. The Housing Strategy proposes that the Medium Density Residential zone be applied to the whole site and the height remain at 18m, with the eastern portion restricted to 12m.

Concern was raised that the current residential development proposed is over-development for this site in terms of the site and infrastructure. The proposed 382 apartments are excessive given the population forecast is 1,676 residences over three years. This will provide a housing surplus, reduce property prices/rental returns and impact on the local community and environment. The submitter states that there is a need to scale down this development

The current development application has been considered against the current planning controls. The Housing Strategy is proposing future residential zones and controls that are likely to come into effect after the development proposal has been determined.

The proposed zones and controls are generally consistent with those already applying to the site, within the context of the Housing Strategy scope of applying clear and consistent zones and controls across the residential areas of the MidCoast.



COASTAL CENTRES

Harrington

The Harrington consultation was held on 24 February 2020 and was attended by around 200 people. Many residents were concerned about the proposed building height increases for Harrington. We received eighty-five submissions for Harrington. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Harrington.





Issue and response

1. Increased building heights and impact on the character of Harrington

Fifty-seven submissions and a large number of attendees at the Harington consultation raised concern with regard to the building heights proposed for Harrington (Submissions 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31 40, 41, 57, 60, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 78, 79, 80, 91, 92, 94, 96, 101, 104, 131, 148, 160, 166, 171, 172, 173, 189, 198, 200, 201, 214, 240, 242, 249, 279, 286, 288, 290, 293, 303, 334, 345, 346, 353, 368, 373, 379).

In summary the concerns can be grouped as:

- the 'village' character of Harrington will be impacted upon. Residents and visitors come to Harrington to enjoy the relaxed, coastal character. Submitters felt that the increase in height predominately 12m and 15m (over the Harrington Waters Shopping Centre) would result in high rise development which would detrimentally impact on what people enjoy about Harrington and was considered over-development. There was also concern that the increased building heights would block views and coastal breezes, cause overshadowing and overlooking and decrease the value of the neighbouring properties
- the infrastructure in Harrington is not sufficient to cater for the increased population growth, including the road network, highway access, parking, public transport, stormwater capacity, water and power supply, electricity, internet, police, medical and educational services
- there is no need to make these changes. There is sufficient residential land to accommodate the future growth of Harrington and there is no economic need to increase the building heights in the business zones
- increasing the population in Harrington should not occur given the potential impacts of bushfire, flooding, coastal erosion and climate change
- caravan parks heights should remain at 8.5m to be in keeping with the surrounding residential
- private recreation concern that a 12m height will apply to the golf course given it adjoins residential which generally has a maximum building height of 8.5m

While many people objected to the proposed height changes, we received sixteen submissions who supported the proposed zone and height changes (Submissions 6, 12, 19, 29, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 64, 99, 121, 137, 145, 198, 263) given they would provide opportunities to:

- increase the population of Harrington and enable improved services and infrastructure for Harrington
- increase tourism and economic development. This may increase business activity throughout the year, rather than just during the holidays
- rejuvenate the area around the Beach Street shops

In response, we re-visited Harrington and have reviewed the proposed heights and zones. It is proposed to retain the existing height controls that apply to Harrington being 8.5m for all residential and employment lands. In addition, the Private Recreation zone was amended to be 8.5m. The exceptions are:

- the land around the Harrington Waters Golf Club and Harrigan's Irish Pub where the height is currently 14.5m, but will be increased to 15m as part of the program to rationalise height controls across the MidCoast. This is discussed in more detail in Issue 3
- the Light Industrial zone land which will have a maximum height of 10m (currently no height limit applies)

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review, Housing Strategy and Zoning In maps to reflect the maximum building heights as shown in the map below







Issue and response

2. 716 Harrington Road (Submission 111)

This land is currently in the Primary Production zone. This owner requests that this site be included in the Private Recreation zone as it forms part of the adjoining caravan park. This is evident from development approvals that include this site in the consent approvals.

This site is in the same ownership and is a logical extension of the caravan park

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include 716 Harrington Road in the Private Recreation zone



3. Medium Density adjoining Harrington Waters Golf Club (also raised in Issue 1 and submission 361)

A number of the submissions under Issue 1 raised concerns about the building height proposed for this site. The building heights formed part of the Harrington Waters master planning. The aim was to provide units in close proximity to both the golf club and Harrigan's Irish Pub.

A submission was received from the landowner requesting:

- the inclusion of Lot 4122 DP1065326 (shown as lighter pink being Low Density Residential) in the Medium Density Residential zone as the property was consolidated into the development application for units. Otherwise this land will remain isolated from the development
- the increase in building height from 14.5m to 16.5m. Evidence was provided that the acid sulfate soils, groundwater levels and flooding prevent a 4 storey outcome being achieved on this site, which was the intended use. An increase to 16.5m will achieve a four storey outcome.

In response:

- this lot will be included in the General Residential zone to enable unit development, but the maximum building height will remain at 8.5m to enable transition to the adjoining residential neighbourhood
- the maximum building height will be increased to 15m as part of the consolidation of heights proposed across the MidCoast. We are reducing the number of height controls from sixteen to ten to improve consistency. An increase of 0.5m will have a minimal impact on this location

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include Lot 4122 in the General Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m and increase the building height for the Medium Density Residential land to 15m



B2 - Local Centre



R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential

Key zones

RU1 - Primary Production

IN2 - Light Industrial

Page | 39

Zoning In proposed zone



Issue and response

4. 36 Baruah Parade (Submission 168)

The landowner provided support for their property to be included in the Low Density Residential zone. The support for the use of this zone in this location is noted.

Recommendation: no change

Partie Course and a second and



A. Beach Street and Faith Court

These sites are currently included in the General Residential zone and were proposed to be included in the Low Density Residential zone. A review of the residential zones was undertaken and it was identified that there are large areas of land (as identified) that have not yet been developed or are currently being developed as townhouses. The landowner confirmed that this is the intent for these lands.

As a result, it is proposed that this land be retained in a General Residential zone, rather than transition to the Low Density Residential zone. The General Residential zone has been typically applied to large tracts of vacant residential land across the MidCoast and townhouse developments are consistent with the Masterplan for this site.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this land in the General Residential zone

5. Glacken Street (Submission 361)

The landowner supported the inclusion of this site as 'potential urban land' in the Housing Strategy.

The Housing Strategy recognises land identified in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2016 as having potential urban development, which includes this site. However, as identified in a rezoning application over ten years ago, this site is constrained and limits the development potential. Studies will be needed to demonstrate how these constraints can be addressed. At this point in time it remains as potential urban land.

Recommendation: no change





R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential

Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential

RE1 - Public Recreation

IN2 - Light Industrial



Issue and response

B. 71-83 Beach Street

The site is currently included in the General Residential zone and was retained in this zone during the Zoning In consultation. Since exhibition it is proposed to ensure all caravan parks within urban areas be included in the Private Recreation zone where they are privately owned, in accordance with the recommendations of the Recreation Zone Review. It is proposed to change the zone to be consistent with this approach. This change will recognise the long-term existing use of the caravan park.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Zoning In maps to include this site in the Private Recreation zone



6. 37 Beach Street (Submission 22)

This site is currently in a General Residential zone and is proposed to remain in this zone. The landowner has requested the site be in a Mixed Use zone as it is a shop with two residential units.

The Housing Strategy proposes no changes to this property. The existing uses are permitted with consent in the General Residential zone and can continue to operate in this zone. The site is also separate from the existing centre. It is not appropriate to undertake a spot zoning over one site for a specific use. As such, no change is recommended.





Issue and response

7. Granter Street (Submission 97)

This site is currently in a General Residential zone and it was proposed during the consultation to retain the land in this zone. A landowner requested that this location be included in a Low Density Residential zone to be consistent with the other lots on the northern side of Granter Street.

This location is developed with houses and backs onto bushland. It is appropriate to include these sites in the Low Density Residential zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this location in the Low Density Residential zone

C. Environmental lands

On inspection of Issue 7 above, it was evident that there is important bushland at the rear of these properties. It is currently in a Public Recreation zone and it was proposed during the consultation to retain the land in this zone. After inspection it is proposed to include the bushland in an Environmental Management zone

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include bushland in the Environmental Management zone

8. 27 Church Street (Submission 189)

The landowner requested that this property be included in the Low Density Residential zone to reflect the use of their property.

When applying zones, we need to look at the appropriate zone for a neighbourhood, rather than one property. Examining this neighbourhood, there are some units and there is potential for more to be developed, which warrants the General Residential zone. Please note that this doesn't mean every site will be developed for units. All of Harrington has been in the General Residential zone for the last ten years and not many residents have taken the opportunity to develop.





Issue and response

9. Church Street and Granter Street (Submission 344)

A landowner objects to being included in the General Residential zone and requested that this property be included in the Low Density Residential zone to maintain the character of their neighbourhood.

This end of Church Street slopes down to Crowdy Street. Many of the blocks have established houses on them. The change to a Low Density Residential zone in this location is warranted.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this location in the Low Density Residential zone

Consultation - issues and response

General comments about the consultation process (Submissions 131, 198, 242, 353)

A number of issues were raised with regard to the consultation process:

- a) some people felt that the maps provided in the Harrington Library were misleading
- b) people questioned whether the discussions held at the consultation were representative of the whole community. People in support of the proposed zoning felt they were unable to voice their support
- c) the Harrington community are seeking consultation prior to a decision being made

In response:

- a) the maps were changed at the Harrington Library to improve the interpretation of the building heights. We acknowledge that it was difficult to see which colour represented the height. We used labels on the maps to provide better clarity
- b) we received submissions from people in support of the proposed zone changes, but these were still not as significant as the number of people who did not support the changes. During consultation we offer a range of ways for people to have their say to receive a representative view on changes
- c) given Covid-19, it was not possible to run an event in the same format as occurred in February 2020. To inform the Harrington community of changes prior to the report being presented to Council, an email was sent to all submitters outlining the proposed changes and the Tell Everybody Facebook page outlined the changes. A display was also set up in the Harrington Library. The response received was that the community generally supported these changes.



Recommendation: no change

General comments - issues and response

General comments (Submissions 131, 290, 334, 345, 353)

The following general comments were made through submissions:

- a) we need a bike path between Crowdy Head and Harrington, viewing platforms, recreational facilities, cinema, art gallery and a hydrotherapy pool
- b) land included in the Environmental Conservation zone (far east of the village) appears to have a 12m height
- c) the Large Lot Residential land opposite the industrial area shows a blue colour for height not represented in the legend
- d) concern that the aged care facility will not proceed for Harrington
- e) preference for Harrington to be included in a Village zone
- f) all units over two storeys should be required to provide a lift
- g) consider increased building heights and expansion of the business zone on the northern edge of town opposite the caravan park
- h) the Zoning In process needs to occur in a shorter timeframe
- i) consider increasing housing opportunities in surrounding villages
- j) need economic and social studies to support any changes
- k) consider staging the zone changes so that development is incremental
- I) the Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan should be released prior to the next consultation

In response:

- a) provision of these services and facilities are often achieved through communities determining their local priorities and working toward achieving these outcomes.
 As a community, funding can be sought and outcomes achieved on the ground. It is important to work with local community groups such as the Chamber of Commerce to firstly establish the priorities and work towards achieving them
- b) both the Environmental Conservation and Environmental Management zones have a minimum building height of 8.5m
- c) the only Large Lot Residential land is located south of Manor Road, which has a maximum building height of 8.5m. Land opposite the industrial estate is included in the Primary Production zone which does not have a maximum building height. These sites would need to be rezoned to be included in a residential zone. At that time a maximum building height would be allocated
- d) the development of an aged care facility for Harrington is beyond the scope of the Zoning In project. The site has been included in a General Residential zone which would enable an aged care facility
- e) while we refer to many of our coastal towns as villages, the Village zone in planning legislation has a different context. Smaller locations like Johns River and Coopernook have the Village zone applied. This enables a mixture of uses to occur in the village dependant on the needs. The Village zone allows most uses, which means you can have an industrial building next to a house. In larger towns, we use a range of zones to show clear separation of where people live, employment lands and recreation areas. This is the approach used for the majority of our coastal towns including Harrington



- f) the planning controls cannot mandate lifts in two storey buildings, they are at the discretion of the developer
- g) the community provided a clear indication that they would not support increased building heights. As a result, the residential land opposite the caravan park is proposed to remain with a maximum building height of 8.5m
- h) the Zoning In process involves significant changes to our zones across the MidCoast, and as a result the process does take time
- i) the villages are being considered through the Zoning In process. Many of the villages are not connected to sewer, so any expansion needs to be undertaken as Large Lot Residential development to have an adequate lot size to cater for on-site sewerage treatment. A rezoning process would have to be undertaken to demonstrate that there is a need for additional lots and to ensure the site and environmental issues are considered
- the Zoning In project is examining how we can apply our planning controls across the MidCoast. It is recognised that the strategies and planning work undertaken in locations like Harrington are almost twenty years old and the Urban Land Monitor provides our first snapshot of supply and demand requirements across the MidCoast. Once the planning controls are established for the whole MidCoast, we will embark on undertaking location based planning that examines issues of growth, services and infrastructure
- k) given the overwhelming response from the community, staging height increases was not considered an acceptable solution
- I) feedback received on the strategies and plans through the Zoning In consultation will assist with the development of the new MidCoast Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan. Once we have consulted on the Rural Strategy we will commence drafting these documents with the aim to consult on both documents at the same time. The Zoning In consultation on the urban zones and rural zones, will influence how they will be drafted.



Old Bar

The Old Bar consultation was held on 4 March 2020 during the day on the main street, and then an evening session at Club Old Bar. The Old Bar consultation was attended by eighty-one people. Many residents were seeking clarification on how the new residential zones would work. We received eighteen submissions for Old Bar. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Old Bar.




Issue and response

1. Red Gum Road (Submissions 136, 141, 157, 331, 244)

The Housing Strategy proposed extending the 'potential urban land' to include all lots to the east of Red Gum Road and two lots to the south of Old Bar Road. The aim being to consider existing uses and provide a logical edge of the Old Bar township being Red Gum Road and Saltwater Road.

We received five submissions, four in support of this change and one opposing.

In support, the submitters believed it is a logical extension of the residential area to the east given the size of the lots. They also believed that a residential use is more appropriate as it would facilitate improvements to Red Gum Road, ensure environmental corridors are achieved and support the future business centre.

In opposition, one landowner would like to see Red Gum Road remain rural.

Recommendation: no change

2. 23 Forest Lane (Submission 150)

The landowner states that development to the east has led to the sterilisation of this property. They request a minimum lot size of 1,000m² would be suitable on this land and consistent with the adjoining development. They also support the provision of a 20m ecological corridor through the site.

This site provides a transition between the new residential areas of Old Bar and the bushland to the west, which is why the Large Lot Residential zone and minimum lot size of 4,000m² is appropriate for this site. The minimum lot size of 4,000m² will generally be applied to land across the MidCoast that is included in the Large Lot Residential zone and has a connection to sewer. Given the recent bushfires, encouraging more residents in this location would not be appropriate.







Issue and response

3. 86-92 Old Bar Road (Submission 138)

This site is currently in the General Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m. The Housing Strategy recommends no change for this property.

The landowner requested the site be included in a Medium Density Residential zone enabling up to six storeys. They feel the site is suitably located close to the beach and centres, has a number of street access points, is currently undeveloped, large in size and has views to the coast.

When reviewing zones for Old Bar, the aim was to encourage more growth between the town centre and the beach. The Medium Density Residential zone with a maximum building height of 12m (typically three storeys) was applied to these areas.

Given this site is to the west of the town centre and surrounding development to the east of the site is predominately single storey, the maximum building height of 8.5m is considered appropriate. The General Residential zone will enable townhouse or unit development to be established. The request for six storeys on this site is considered out of context.

Recommendation: no change

A.9 Sheppard Street

This is a large vacant residential lot which is in close proximity to the Old Bar Centre. It is proposed to be included in the Low Density Residential zone. The General Residential zone should be applied over this property to encourage diversity of housing in proximity to the centre.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this section of 9 Sheppard Street in the General Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m





Issue and response

4. 3-9 Sheppard Street (Submission 14)

The site is proposed to be included in a Low Density Residential zone. The four landowners were concerned that the increased building heights proposed on the nearby properties for the Business zone (15m) and Medium Density Residential (12m) could lead to overshadowing and overlooking issues, which could reduce property values. They proposed the extension of the Medium Density Residential zone over their properties, given the proximity to the shopping centre.

A review of the building heights in the centre has resulted in the maximum building height being reduced to 12m, reducing the impact of overlooking (Issue 5). To address the landowners concerns it is proposed to include these properties in the General Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m. This height is consistent with adjoining residential properties. The General Residential zone enables development of townhouses or units close to the town centre, or the ability to remain as houses.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include these properties in the General Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m

5. and B. Old Bar Shopping Centre (Submission 143)

The submitter thought that the building height of 15m was too high and should be restricted to three storeys (12m). This was consistent with feedback received during the consultation session at Old Bar. The community felt more comfortable with a 12m maximum building height, which would reduce impacts on adjoining neighbours and be consistent with the Medium Density Residential zone proposed over adjoining properties.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to reduce the maximum building height over the Business zone to 12m







Issue and response

6. Racecourse Creek (Submission 188)

This creek corridor is an important ecological corridor. The Zoning In maps show it in a Low Density Residential zone. An Environmental Management zone would be more appropriate and would be consistent with Lot 30 DP249011.

This site is not identified in a lot as it is a road reserve. As a result, it took on the zone of the adjoining properties. It is agreed that this is important environmental land and should be included in the Environmental Management zone

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to remove this site from a residential zone and include it is an Environmental Management zone



General comments - issue and response

General comments (Submissions 14, 32, 132, 139, 140, 142, 146, 188, 244)

The following points were raised with regard to Old Bar:

- a) we need to keep the small coastal village feel for Old Bar
- b) many residents felt that Old Bar Road would need to be improved to cater for the increased population
- c) the Saltwater Road intersection needs to be improved through either a right-hand turn or roundabout
- d) Old Bar Road through the shopping centre needs to be improved as there is minimal room when cars are parked on both sides
- e) we need to provide more facilities and services for the community such as businesses, medical, educational and aged care facilities, and ensure adequate water and sewer services
- f) the proposed golf course should provide wildlife corridors and enable pedestrian connections through the site, which would contribute to the walking track from Old Bar to Wallabi Point
- g) support the development of Precinct 2B. Support the proposed changes the documentation was professional/well-articulated. It was appreciated that consultation occurred prior to adopting the plans
- h) support the introduction of the Low Density Residential zone. Would like to see the Medium Residential zone expanded
- i) concern about coastal impacts

In response:

- a) Old Bar has been subject to change over the last twenty years, which has changed the character of Old Bar. The proposed changes build upon those changes
- b) Old Bar Road will continue to be subject to a program of upgrades and improvements. These changes are undertaken in stages as funds become available
- c) recent works have been undertaken at this intersection to provide a turning lane onto Saltwater Road
- d) the parking and build-outs in the town centre assist to slow vehicles and increase safety
- e) future planning for Old Bar undertaken over ten years ago included the development of a second centre. A site was included in the Local Centre zone and will enable the establishment of additional facilities as Old Bar grows. Consideration of water and sewerage services formed part of this future planning for Old Bar
- f) the golf course land is in private ownership, which restricts public access. The pedestrian/cycle path between Old Bar and Wallabi Point can be accessed via the road network
- g) support for Precinct 2B and the Zoning In consultation at Old Bar is noted
- h) support for the Low Density Residential zone is noted. Expansion of the Medium Density zone is not considered appropriate at this time
- i) the Housing Strategy aims to apply a new suite of residential zones across the MidCoast. For Old Bar this meant moving from one residential zone to three. The application of zones that increased residential opportunities was applied to areas outside of the current coastal hazards.



Hallidays Point

The Hallidays Point consultation was held on 25 February 2020 attended by thirty-three people. Many residents were seeking clarification on how the new residential zones would work, particularly in regard to manufactured home estates. We received twenty-five submissions for Hallidays Point. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Hallidays Point.







Issue and response

1. North Diamond Beach (Submissions 35, 191, 208, 215, 367)

These sites are currently in the Tourist zone and are proposed to be included in a Medium Density Residential zone. The building height will be increased from 8.5m and 11.5m to 12m for all sites.

Concerns relate to:

- the intensity of development being out of character with the coastal character, particularly with a 12m building height. Larger lots with sustainable housing would have less impact
- potential environmental impacts
- lack of infrastructure (e.g. paths, parks/playgrounds, road upgrades, public transport, beach patrols)
- not being close to a town centre
- increased residents in a bushfire area
- no justification for the change
- would encourage development of lots to the west.

In response:

• North Diamond Beach has been identified and predominately zoned for tourist uses which have an intensity of development similar to that of the Medium Density Residential zone. The proposed zone change reflects the changing nature of tourist accommodation, moving from resorts to self-contained units. Large residential lots in this location would reduce the availability of tourist accommodation.

The southern sites had a maximum building height of 11.5m. This was based on a visual analysis that demonstrated minimal impacts from a 11.5m height. With the consolidation of building heights across the MidCoast, the 12m building height will be used for this location. The 12m building height was extended over sites further north given they are further removed from existing residential, and it will provide consistent planning controls for this location as it is developed.

- the Medium Density Residential zone is being applied over sites already included in the Tourist zone. When these sites were included in this zone, the environmental impacts were assessed. In response, a number of these sites are partially included in the Environmental Conservation zone
- a requirement of moving into the Medium Density Residential zone is that they will be required to undertake a master plan process to determine what infrastructure may be needed for future residents. Patrolled beaches would fall outside the scope of this planning
- access to shops would be a consideration in the master plan
- these sites have been developing as a tourist precinct for a number of years. Bushfire management has been a consideration in this development



Zoning In proposed zone	Issue and response
	 owners of these properties have discussed issues with the Tourist zone for over eight years. Changes to this location were identified in the draft Manning Valley Local Strategy released in 2016. There has been a need and intention to review the use of the Tourist zone in this location for a number of years the Housing Strategy examined how a new suite of residential zones can be applied across the MidCoast. The strategy also identifies 'potential urban land' that has been identified through strategies and plans. Land to the west has not been identified as potential urban land, but some of these sites may have pre-existing approvals that could be enacted upon.
	In addition, 391 Diamond Beach Road was recently rezoned to be included in the Tourist zone. The Housing Strategy needs to be amended to reflect this zone change
	Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include 391 Diamond Beach Road in the Medium Density Residential zone
	2. 333 Diamond Beach Road, Diamond Beach (Submission 217)
Distant Distant Chill - Printery Production	The site is included in the Primary Production zone. The landowner requests that the land be included in the Housing Strategy as 'potential urban land' given previous studies undertaken, the need for more residential land in this location and the suitability of the site. They propose that a residential zone would be appropriate for the site. The Housing Strategy examined how a new suite of residential zones can be applied across the MidCoast. The netantial urban land a new suite of residential zones can be applied across the MidCoast.
PP1242083	potential urban lands were reviewed to ensure a consistent approach across the MidCoast. Through this review this site was identified as having strategic merit. Currently, there is a need for more available residential land in Diamond Beach, demonstrated by the uptake of land for nearby 310 Diamond Beach Road which has been significant. Numerous studies and applications have been undertaken for this site addressing concerns regarding environmental and access issues.
DRIVE	A Local Strategy for Hallidays Point is proposed to review the provision of 'potential urban land', but given the current workload of Strategic Planning this would take over two years to be developed. Given the analysis undertaken of this site to-date, and the current demand for residential in this location, it is proposed to include this site in the Housing Strategy as 'potential urban land'. Any application for rezoning will need to clearly identify the strategic need, address the environmental values of the lands (including the riparian zone and wetlands adjoining Khappinghat National Park) and access given recent bushfires. The community's feedback would be considered through this rezoning process.
	Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to identify this site as 'potential urban land'
Key zones	
B2 - Local Centre E2 - Environmental Conservation	R1 - General Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential RE1 - Public Recreation IN2 - Light Industrial
B4 - Mixed Use E3 - Environmental Management	R2 - Low Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential RE2 - Private Recreation RU1 - Primary Production



Issue and response

3. 515-539 Old Soldiers Road, Diamond Beach (Submission 268)

The site is included in the Primary Production zone. The submission notes that the land was identified as part of the Diamond Beach tourist precinct in the Greater Taree Conservation and Development Strategy 2005. The site contains developable areas and existing conservation areas under a registered agreement (Native Vegetation Conservation Act 1997). Given the surrounding land uses (existing and proposed) this site could be identified as residential land (Large Lot Residential or General Residential) as there is a need for more residential land demonstrated by the uptake and demand for this type of development.

The Housing Strategy examined how a new suite of residential zones can be applied across the MidCoast. The 'potential urban land' was reviewed to ensure a consistent approach across the MidCoast. Apart from this review, identifying new locations for future residential development was not part of the scope of the Housing Strategy.

Please note that the site in Issue 2 was reviewed through this process and was considered as having strategic merit as outlined above. It is proposed to undertake a Local Strategy for Hallidays Point to review the provision of potential urban land. This site would form part of that review. Consideration would be given to the environmental constraints over this land.

Recommendation: no change proposed

4. 96-126 Old Soldiers Road, Rainbow Flat (Submission 319)

The site is included in the Primary Production zone. It was identified in the Hallidays Point Development Strategy 2000 as a future growth area for rural residential. Developed land to the west allows connection to a future rural residential estate over this land. Rural residential land has a high uptake and there is a need for this type of development. Given it has been identified in past studies, the submitter believes that no future investigations are required and it should be identified in the Housing Strategy.

Potential urban land was identified through the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. This State Government strategy superseded many of the local strategies in terms of land that had potential to be developed for residential purposes. This site was not included in the Regional Strategy.

The Housing Strategy examined how a new suite of residential zones can be applied across the MidCoast. Identifying new locations for future residential development was not part of the scope of this strategy.

Recommendation: no change proposed







R1 - General Residential

Key zones R3 - Medium Density Residential

R5 - Large Lot Residential

RU1 - Primary Production

IN2 - Light Industrial



Issue and response

A. Diamond Beach shops

During community consultation, concerns were raised with regard to proposed heights in the centres. In this case the maximum building height for the centre was being increased from 8.5m to 15m. This would result in a significant change in the built form. After review of this centre it is proposed to maintain the building height of 8.5m to be in keeping with the surrounding residential area.

Recommendation: that the Employment Zones Review be amended to reduce the maximum building height to 8.5m





5. 210 Diamond Beach Road, Diamond Beach (Submissions 89, 291)

The western section of this area is currently in a Tourist zone and is to be included in a General Residential zone. As mentioned in Issue 1, this change reflects the changing nature of tourist accommodation.

A submission requested this land to be included in an environmental or recreation zone given the coastal environment and inundation within this location.

It is noted that the rezoning of this site was undertaken over ten years ago when large areas of the site were included in an environmental or recreation zone. The review of the extent of urban zoning over this site is outside of the scope of the Housing Strategy.

There was also a submission supporting the change to a General Residential zone.

Recommendation: no change

6. 72 Cottesloe Circuit, Red Head

The site is currently in the Environmental Management zone and is proposed to be included in a Low Density Residential zone to reflect the current use, being a house. The Zoning In maps reflected this change, but it was incorrectly shown in the Housing Strategy.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this site in a Low Density Residential zone





R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential

R5 - Large Lot Residential

Key zones

RE2 - Private Recreation



RU1 - Primary Production



Issue and response

7. 14 Red Head Road, Red Head (Submissions 126, 375)

This site is currently included in a Primary Production zone. The neighbouring properties are currently in a residential zone. The submission supported the inclusion of this site as 'potential urban land' given it may also be suitable for a mix of residential development, and drainage and wildlife connections.

Given this site is surrounded by residential; it is an infill development site. A rezoning application would have to be lodged to ensure the environmental values of the property are considered and protected.

There was a previous request from the landowner that land fronting Waitpinga Court be considered to be included in a residential zone to meet housing demand. Advice provided to the landowner remains the same; Council's preference is to consider the whole site to ensure that the appropriate environmental, recreation and residential outcomes are achieved.

Recommendation: no change



8. Headland Drive, Hallidays Point (Submission 112)

These three sites are partially included in the Large Lot Residential zone with the Environmental Conservation zone at the rear of the property. One landowner has requested that the Large Lot Residential zone be extended for these properties to the tree line as this land is cleared and no environmental values are evident. This would enable the subdivision of the property.

The expectation from adjoining landowners is that the zone and layout of the subdivision will not change. Any change to the zone boundary would require a rezoning application that would enable the environmental values to be considered, and all landowners in this neighbourhood to participate in the process.





Issue and response

9. Lot 45 Blackhead Road, Black Head (Submission 277)

The bushland on this Council owned land is currently included in a Public Recreation zone and is proposed to be included in an Environmental Management zone to reflect the environmental values of this part of the site. The submission questions whether the land remains 'community land' and has concerns that it is overgrown with shrubs and weeds and needs to be maintained.

The change of zone is proposed to reflect that there is significant bushland on the property. It does not change the land classification or the maintenance requirements. If the submitter has concerns about the maintenance of Council reserves, they are encouraged to contact Council's Parks section and outline their concerns.

Recommendation: no change



10. and B. Black Head shops (Submissions 284, 365)

Two submissions and feedback from the community at the information session at Black Head raised concerns about the proposed maximum building height for the shopping centre. The maximum building height of 18m was opposed given the current height is 8.5m, that it would detract from the character of the shopping village and surrounding residential development, and would require significant redevelopment of the centre.

The shopping centre has a distinct village character which would be significantly impacted upon by increasing the heights significantly. It is proposed to retain the building height of 8.5m, which would enable the character to remain and shop-top housing to be established if the need arose.

There was also a request for more commercial land. Currently there is vacant land in the Local Centre zone across the road from the shopping centre. Identifying more commercial land will require a rezoning application and potentially a supply and demand analysis report to support any proposed extension. Expanding the Local Centre zone falls outside the scope of the Employment Zones Review, which examined a consistent approach to employment zones and planning controls.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to decrease the maximum building height to 8.5m





Issue and response

11. 52 High Street, Black Head (Submission 284)

The landowner provided the following comments:

- support the Local Centre, General Residential (west of shopping centre) and Environmental Conservation zones
- General Residential south of shopping centre noting the opportunity for town centre expansion. Concern
 that the site is more suitable as residential land with some expansion of the local centre over Lot 210 DP
 1098493 on the western side of High Street or lands on the northern side of Blackhead Road
- Environmental Management zone land is mostly cleared with no environmental constraints the General Residential zone would be more appropriate. Note 4 in the Strategy could be expanded onto these lands
- Primary Production land more suitable as General Residential. Support Note 4 in the strategy as a long term expansion area

In response:

- support for these zones is noted
- the site provides opportunities for either centre or residential expansion. Given the owners request that it remain in a residential zone, it is proposed to include it in a General Residential zone. However, a note identifying the opportunity for centre expansion will be made on both the Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review
- The Environmental Management zone was applied after assessment of the zoning approach for the adjoin land that was subject to a rezoning application. The approval required landscaping of this area. As a result, it is proposed to retain the Environmental Management zone over this land
- The note will remain over the remainder of the property in the Primary Production zone, however the zone will not be changed. A rezoning application is required to ensure that the values of the property are identified and maintained

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review to change the Local Centre zone to General Residential that applies over Lot 214 DP 1098493 and note that there is potential for this site to be developed for centre expansion





Issue and response

12. 303 Blackhead Road, Tallwoods (Submissions 268, 314)

Concern that the proposed manufactured home estate is out of character, there is no public transport available, there are potential economic and social impacts, increased traffic and crime and lower rates income. The use needs to be better defined, it is currently too open.

The Manufactured Home Estate is currently subject to a Court Appeal and will be resolved through this process. Council is also in the process of amending the current Local Environmental Plans to provide more consistency and clarity with regard to Manufactured Home Estates in the MidCoast.

Recommendation: no change

13. Tallwoods Golf Course (Submission 299)

The site is proposed to be remain in the Private Recreation and Neighbourhood Centre zones. The Tallwoods landowner has been working on a Masterplan involving the sites numbered 13. They have requested that the Neighbourhood Centre zone be extended to the north, and the southern sites be considered for a General Residential zone.

These changes can result in significant changes to the Tallwoods estate and need to be considered through appropriate processes that will seek feedback from the community. Once the Masterplan is complete it is recommended that a rezoning application be submitted for consideration.

Recommendation: no change

C. Tallwoods Centre

During community consultation concerns were raised with regard to proposed heights in the centres. In this case the maximum building height for the centre was being increased from 8.5m to 15m. This would result in a significant change in the built form. After review of this centre it is proposed to retain the building height of 8.5m

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to retain the maximum building height of 8.5m



Page | 60

Zoning In proposed zone



Issue and response

13. Tallwoods west (Submission 309)

The landowner has requested that the land be included in a residential zone given it has three road accesses, would provide bushfire protection for Tallwoods, the environmental attributes can be accommodated, services are nearby and the land is in one ownership. The landowner is prepared to undertake necessary studies.

The land is not currently identified as 'potential urban land' in any adopted local or regional strategy.

The Housing Strategy examined how a new suite of residential zones can be applied across the MidCoast. Identifying new locations for future residential development was not part of the scope of the Housing Strategy. **Recommendation:** no change



General comments - issue and response

General comments (Submissions 144, 165, 268, 277, 326, 365)

The following points were raised with regard to Hallidays Point:

- a) more information is needed on what it allowed and prohibited in each zone, particularly with regard to manufactured home estates
- b) limit the building height to two storeys in Diamond Beach, Red Head and Hallidays Point
- c) need to examine how developments in Hallidays Point interact with each other, the broader aged care sector and the required services within Halliday Point. Explain how any project might deliver regional benefits e.g. population growth, increasing services (transport, doctors, dentists), provide accessible facilities (shopping centres, recreational facilities), support employment, encourage economic growth and provide evidence on how the project will have greater flow-on effects within the region (economically and socially)
- d) the height for buildings should be increased to three storeys to allow more diversity in residential, more growth and mixed use buildings
- e) opposed to any change to housing density, and height regulation will affect the character and have an environmental impact on an already depleted wildlife decimated by the recent bushfires
- f) oppose the caravan parks in the Private Recreation zone having a building height on 12m. Cannot understand why heights have changed from 10m to 8m.

In response:

- a) each Strategy and Plan outlined the proposed land use table for each zone. The difficulty with manufactured home estates is that they are not specifically defined in the relevant planning legislation. Council continues to request that the State Government make the relevant changes to clearly define this use. A proposed amendment to the existing Local Environmental Plans to improve clarity with regard to manufactured home estates is also nearing completion.
- b) as outlined above, changes are proposed to the building height applied to the shopping centres and Private Recreation zone. The shopping centre and Private Recreation building heights have been reduced to be similar to the existing heights. The tourist precinct will remain with a 12m height (refer Issue 1)
- c) the Zoning In project is examining how we can apply our planning controls across the MidCoast. It is recognised that the strategies and planning work undertaken in locations like Hallidays Point are almost twenty years old. Once the planning controls are established for the whole MidCoast, we will embark on undertaking location based plans to re-examine these issues of growth, services and infrastructure
- d) the building heights will generally reflect the current heights. Any increase will need to be undertaken through more consultation with local communities in planning for the future of their area (plans mentioned in the above point)
- e) as mentioned in the above points, the building heights will generally reflect existing heights. This is similar with the provisions relating to residential density, as previously the only residential zone that applied was the General Residential zone. The recent bushfires had a significant impact on this community and the wildlife. Any future rezoning for residential development will need to consider the environmental values of the site and bushfire protection
- f) as mentioned above, it is proposed to reduce the maximum building height of the Private Recreation zone to 8.5m. The heights of 8m remain over the Seascape development which is consistent with their approval, where significant analysis was undertaken to retain views.



Pacific Palms

The Pacific Palms consultation was undertaken on 20 February 2020 attended by twenty-six people. While the residents were familiar with having a range of residential zones, and there were concerns about the proposed building heights. We received 145 submissions for Pacific Palms and a petition with 191 signatures. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Pacific Palms.





Issue and response

Impact on the character of Pacific Palms (Submissions 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49,52, 56, 61, 62, 63, 74, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 84, 85, 87, 90, 93, 95, 98, 100, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135, 147, 149, 151, 152, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159, 162, 164, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 190, 192, 193, 196, 197, 199, 202, 203, 204, 205, 209, 211, 213, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 229, 230, 231, 234, 236, 246, 248, 250, 251, 253, 254, 255, 257, 258, 259, 260, 266, 267, 274, 287, 295, 296, 297, 298, 300, 304, 305, 306, 307, 311, 312, 313, 321, 324, 327, 328, 332, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 342, 348, 351, 355, 356, 357 and a petition with 191 signatures)

The key issue was opposition to the increased maximum building heights in and around the Blueys Beach shops and the caravan park; and the change in the centre zone from Neighbourhood Centre to Local Centre zone. In summary the concerns can be grouped as:

- the 'village' character of Pacific Palms will be impacted upon. Residents and visitors come to Pacific Palms to enjoy the relaxed and coastal character. Submitters felt that the increase in height predominately 12m, 15m and 18m (over the Blueys Beach shops) would result in high rise development that would dominate the landscape, detrimentally impact on what people enjoy about Pacific Palms and was considered over-development. There was also concern that the increased building heights would block views and coastal breezes, cause overshadowing and overlooking, increase noise and light pollution and decrease the value of the neighbouring properties
- the infrastructure in Pacific Palms is not sufficient to cater for the increased population growth, including the road network, parking, public transport, pedestrian movements and water supply and waste services
- there is no economic need to increase commercial facilities in this location. The Charlotte Bay and Forster shops provide access to any additional shops and services needed by residents and visitors. One submitter proposed extending the centre area rather than increasing height
- there is no need to increase tourist accommodation in this location
- the current heights were developed after extensive consultation with the community they should not be changed without extensive consultation
- increasing the population in Pacific Palms should not occur given the potential impacts of bushfire, flooding, coastal erosion and climate change and increased pressure on environmental lands and beaches
- caravan parks heights should remain at 8.5m to be in keeping with the surrounding residential
- the use of the Local Centre zone in this location given the expected population in the catchment for these shops. There was general support for the principles of the Employment Zones Review

In response, site inspections of Pacific Palms were undertaken and the building heights were reviewed. It is proposed to retain the current building heights for Pacific Palms being 8.5m maximum building height for the majority of Pacific Palms, and the 12m building height for the shopping centre and 216-218 Boomerang Drive. Maps showing the revised building heights are provided below.

It is proposed to retain the Local Centre zone over the shopping centre as it serves a large community, having a larger catchment then a typical centre included in the Neighbourhood Centre zone. The exhibited zones are not subject to any changes based on the above issues.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review and Housing Strategy to reflect the maximum building heights as shown in the map below.









Issue and response

2. 3-9 Croll Street and 4/184 Boomerang Drive (Submissions 116, 224)

These sites are currently in the Low Density Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m The Housing Strategy proposed a General Residential zone with the maximum building height increased to 12m (shown as Note 4 on the Pacific Palms map). Given the changes to the building heights in the shopping centre (refer Issue 1), it is proposed to retain the maximum building height of 8.5m.

Concern was raised that the General Residential zone would result in higher density development that would impact on the streetscape and amenity, and add to the drainage issues in the street. With the height reduced to 8.5m and the planning controls of the General Residential zone being the same as the current Low Density Residential zone, there will be no increase in development potential for these sites.

Another submitter proposes increasing heights in this location. Given the concerns raised in Issue 1, the maximum building height will remain at 8.5m in keeping with the neighbouring residential areas.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to remove Note 4 from the Pacific Palms map

PP73710 1 - General Residential 14 DP793710 DP793710 DP793710 PP793710 PP793710

3. 217 Boomerang Drive (Submission 224)

The submitter noted that this site was not in the mapping and suggested it be a zone appropriate for its environmental values.

The Zoning In consultation covered the land use zones that occur in our urban areas, being our towns and villages. Large tracts of environmental or rural zoned lands on the outskirts of towns will be examined in the Rural Strategy which is anticipated to be available for community comment early in 2020.

This site is currently in an environmental zone and it will remain in an environmental zone.





Issue and response

4. Blueys Estate (Submission 352)

This submission related to Blueys Estate which is currently in a rural zone. The submission notes that:

- Charlotte Bay urban release area should be clearly shown in the Urban Land Monitor (ULM), Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review
- previous strategies recognised the need for additional land to meet future housing and employment needs in Pacific Palms and Smith Lakes. A planning proposal was lodged in 2007 and 2014 to meet these needs and achieve environmental outcomes
- the ULM appears to over-estimate supply of residential land. Based on independent estimates the supply is less than ten to fifteen years
- there is a need to undertake a place-based planning for this area to ensure the supply of land will meet the demand, to investigate generating employment uses independent of Forster and provide suitable infrastructure.

The 'potential urban land' identified in the Housing Strategy includes land identified in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. These sites were not included in this Strategy. While work was undertaken to investigate opportunities for this site, the environmental outcomes could not be resolved and the planning proposal was withdrawn. Identifying this site as 'potential urban land' is therefore not supported at this time.

The Urban Land Monitor examined vacant residential land and determined there was sufficient supply to meet the residential demand. It is understood that there are concerns with the projections used in the monitor, however it does provide a snapshot of residential land across the MidCoast. The Urban Land Monitor projections and assumptions will be reviewed over the next 2-3 years.

It is agreed that place-based planning is needed for our towns and villages to refine the character and identify the future needs of each community. Currently, establishing clear and consistent planning controls for the whole MidCoast is a priority.

This land falls outside the urban areas and will be considered in the Rural Strategy which is anticipated to be available for community consultation in early 2021.





Issue and response

5. Pacific Palms-Smiths Lake Properties (Submission 350)

Lot 3 DP 859640, Lot 1 DP 397504 and Lot 11 DP 793101 are currently in rural and environmental zones that fall outside the existing urban areas. The submission notes that:

- the Housing Strategy does not provide a robust basis for long term planning for this popular location
- an audit of tourist/visitor accommodation capacity should be undertaken to inform the Housing Strategy
- future housing opportunities should include reference to eco-villages and facilities that can offer naturebased experiences, facilitating connections between the villages (e.g. coastal trail network) and mechanisms to address hazards
- consider a range of recreational uses in the proposed environmental zones
- a place-based planning is needed for this area to ensure the supply of land will meet the demand, investigate employment uses independent of Forster and provide suitable infrastructure.

The 'potential urban land' in the Housing Strategy includes land identified in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. The Urban Land Monitor estimated residential outcomes for both the potential urban land and vacant residential land, and determined sufficient supply to meet the current demand.

The aim of the Housing Strategy is to develop a suite of residential zones that could apply across the MidCoast.

Tourist/visitor accommodation was examined in the Housing Strategy, looking at trends and challenges. This information was considered sufficient for the establishment of zones/planning controls for the MidCoast.

This land falls outside the urban areas and will be considered in the Rural Strategy which is anticipated to be available for community consultation in early 2021. The issues raised regarding nature-based activities and recreational uses in environmental zones will be considered in this strategy.

It is agreed that place-based planning is needed for our towns and villages to refine the character and identify the future needs of each community. Currently, establishing clear and consistent planning controls for the whole MidCoast is a priority.



Page | 68

Zoning In proposed zone



Issue and response

A. Lot 52 Macwood Road

This site was recently purchased by Council. Given the environmental value of the property, it is proposed to include the site in a suitable environmental zone

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this site in an environmental zone



General comments - issue and response

General comments (Submissions 7, 44, 46, 342, 356)

The following general comments were made through submissions:

- a) there was a lack of advertising for the drop-in session
- b) the website was difficult to navigate
- c) any zone changes should require postal notification to landowners
- d) Covid-19 impacted on the community's ability to get involved
- e) concern that increasing development at Smiths Lakes doesn't consider the need for better infrastructure, public amenities, more parking, a better water supply, and consideration of risks like bushfires
- f) support the move to one set of MidCoast planning controls
- g) there is a need for a dog-off leash area for dogs on the beaches and better clarification of the rules

In response:

- a) we used a range of ways to inform people about the Zoning In consultation. There were advertisements in local papers, an article in the Focus Magazine, radio interviews, Facebook posts and displays in our Council offices and posters in the libraries. We had posters advertising the Pacific Palms drop-in sessions placed in shops and community meeting places. We also kept people informed who are on our mailing list (over 800 people). Information on the Council's website assisted people who were unable to attend the drop-in session
- b) we had significant numbers of people visit the Zoning In page on the Council website. Feedback was predominately positive, but we will endeavour to improve for future consultation
- c) we used a range of mechanisms to inform people to find out about the future zone of their property, including information in the rates notice. We will examine this option for consultation on the new MidCoast Local Environmental Plan
- d) the drop-in sessions were completed prior to the health restrictions around Covid-19. People could notify Council by phone or email to find out more information
- e) Smiths Lake is currently included in a Village zone and is proposed to be included in a Low Density Residential zone. This zone change will not increase development potential. Any development will have to demonstrate that services can be provided to the site and that bushfire protection measures are in place
- f) support for one set of MidCoast planning controls is noted
- g) the submitter is encouraged to contact Council and discuss their concerns around regulations for dogs



Hawks Nest

The Hawks Nest/Tea Gardens consultation was undertaken on 11 February 2020 attended by twenty-six people. While the residents were familiar with having a range of residential zones, there were concerns that many residents were moving from a Low Density Residential zone to a General Residential zone. We received twenty-two submissions for Hawks Nest and Tea Gardens. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Hawks Nest. Note the general issues are combined with Tea Gardens as many submitters addressed both locations.







Issue and response

1. Oppose General Residential zone (Submissions 26, 72, 153, 227, 228, 237, 238, 239, 241, 243, 247, 256, 315) There was concern about the application of the General Residential zone is this location, given:

- the 'village' and 'green' character of this area would be impacted upon. This area also has significant trees which supports wildlife such as Koalas
- there is no demand for increased residences in this location (only 40% of dwellings are occupied)
- the permitted minimum lot size and allowance for integrated housing will result in subdivisions with smaller lot sizes and less trees
- having no floor space ratio could result in over development of the site
- the land with 12m maximum building height (previously in the Medium Density Residential zone) could be set a precedent enabling the increased use of this height in the future

Submitters propose that:

- only the locations currently in the Medium Density Residential zone be included in the General Residential zone
- the remainder of this area be included in a Low Density Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m.

In response, this location is currently in a Low Density Residential zone and is proposed to be included in a General Residential zone, which is a very similar zone in its application. The new Low Density Residential zone operates very differently to the existing Low Density Residential zone in the Great Lakes Local Environmental Plan 2014. The maximum building heights are also the same as those that currently apply.

The provisions have been reviewed with our Natural Systems team given the environmental concerns. Given the current lot size for lots fronting Booner and Morang Streets between Toula and Margaret Streets, it is proposed to reduce the maximum building height from 12m to 8.5m. Apart from this location, the 12m building heights will remain as they have been in place for a number of years. It cannot be assumed that they will set a precedent for people to seek increased heights in Hawks Nest.

With regard to the zones, minimal changes are proposed in terms of the range of residential uses permitted and the planning controls. As a result, no change is recommended at this stage. The removal of the floor space ratio is becoming common in many Council planning controls and is not anticipated to result in over-development of a site.





Issue and response

It is recognised that the Hawks Nest has an important natural setting and strategies and planning work undertaken in this area are over ten years old. Once the planning controls are established for the whole MidCoast, we will embark on undertaking location based plans to re-examine these issues of growth, environmental values, services and infrastructure.

It needs to be noted that the 40% vacant dwellings predominately relates to people owning holiday homes and should not be linked to demand. The continued development and uptake of land demonstrates that there is a demand for more housing in this area

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to reduce the maximum building height from 12m to 8.5m for



the lots fronting Booner and Morang Streets between Toula and Margaret Streets as shown below





Issue and response

2. Lot 1 Eagle Avenue (Submissions 33, 72, 153, 227, 228, 237, 238, 239, 241, 256, 308)

Submitters advised that there appears to be an error with the proposed zones. Given the Court decision for this property the Medium Density Residential zone should be applied with a maximum building height of 12m to the land fronting Moira Street and the General Residential zone be applied to the land directly behind, with a maximum building height of 8.5m.

There was concern that the proposed 15m height would have an impact on the flying fox colony.

A submission was received from the owners requesting the reconsideration of the Medium Density Residential zone over the site fronting Moira Parade. They support the retention of the Medium Density Residential zone over the middle portion of the site to enable the site to be developed as a gateway site.

A review of the existing planning controls recommends that there was an error in the mapping for this site and changes need to be made to reflect the current approvals. This would reduce the concerns about the flying fox colony.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to have the Medium Density Residential zone apply with a maximum building height of 12m to the land fronting Moira Street and the General Residential zone be applied to the land directly behind, with a maximum building height of 8.5m



3. Lot 1 Sanderling Avenue (Submissions 72, 153, 227, 228, 237, 238, 239, 241, 256)

Submitters were concerned that there is a planning proposal which proposes that the site be included in a Medium Density Residential zone with a four storey (15m) height limit. They believe the site should be included in a General Residential zone with a 12m height limit in keeping with the character of the area and considering it is within the coastal zone.

The site is subject to a planning proposal. The maximum building height proposed is 12m. Community consultation on this planning proposal is currently underway. The community are encouraged to review the planning proposal and lodge a submission of they have any concerns.





Issue and response

4. Yamba and Boona Street shops (Submissions 72, 216)

The residential zone in this precinct is currently included in a Medium Density Residential zone with a maximum building height of 12m. The Housing Strategy proposes that the site be included in a General Residential zone with the maximum building height remaining at 12m.

A submitter was concerned that this precinct is currently in the Medium Density Residential zone but has a note in the Housing Strategy saying that it has a 12m maximum building height. As mentioned above the site currently has a maximum building height of 12m.

A developer of this site proposes that the site remain in a Medium Density Residential zone to enable the land to be developed for the purposes of medium density residential. It has previously been agreed that the development can have zero setbacks to side boundaries, 2m setbacks to the front and rear boundaries and it achieved the density targets for the Medium Density Residential zone. This form of development was associated with the inclusion of parcels of land in the Environmental Conservation zone.

It was envisaged that the use of the General Residential zone would provide more flexibility, while maintaining similar uses that are currently permitted in the Medium Density Residential zone. As a result, the General Residential zone is appropriate for this site. The assessment of setbacks and other planning controls will be undertaken through the development application process and assessed on its merits. The Housing Strategy cannot set specific controls for a development.







Issue and response

5. and A Lot 140 Tuloa Avenue (Submission 241)

This site is currently in the Low Density Residential zone and was proposed to be included in the Environmental Conservation zone to reflect that the land was publicly owned and contained important vegetation. A submission supported the inclusion of this site in the Environmental Conservation zone.

Since the application of zones for the Zoning In project, a number of sites are no longer publicly owned, including part of this site. A Native Title Claim has been resolved over the southern lot, resulting in the land now being owned by the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council. The northern lot remains subject to a Native Title Claim.

It is important to consult with the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council prior to changing the zone of these properties, to discuss whether the ownership of this site is proposed to change, if the site is to be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Zoning In maps to retain this land in Low Density Residential zone. Consult with the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone

B. Lot 2 Sanderling Avenue

This site is currently in the Public Recreation zone and was proposed to be included in the Environmental Conservation zone to reflect that the coastal vegetation/protection areas and that the land is publicly owned.

This site is subject to a Native Title Claim, which could result in the land being owned by the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council. It is important to consult with the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council prior to changing the zone of these properties, to discuss whether the ownership of this site is proposed to change, if the site is to be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to retain this land in the Public Recreation zone. Consult with the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone

B2 - Local Centre B4 - Mixed Use



R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential

Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential

IN2 - Light Industrial

RU1 - Primary Production



Issue and response

C. Lot 25 Mungo Brush

This site is currently included in the Low Density Residential zone and Public Recreation zone. The Public Recreation zone was changed to reflect that the land was in private ownership and has important environmental values. This land is owned by the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council. It is important to consult with the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council prior to changing the zone of these properties, to discuss if the site is to be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to retain the Public Recreation zone around the Low Density Residential zone. Consult with the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss if this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone



Tea Gardens

The Hawks Nest/Tea Gardens consultation was undertaken on 11 February 2020 attended by twenty-six people. While the residents were familiar with having a range of residential zones, there were concerns that many residents were moving from a Low Density Residential zone to a General Residential zone. We received twenty-two submissions for Hawks Nest and Tea Gardens. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Tea Gardens. Note the Hawks Nest general issues are combined with Tea Gardens as many submitters addressed both locations.







Issue and response

1. North Shearwater (Submission 363)

The developer of the estate identified that there are some minor zone boundary inconsistencies that need to be reconciled and height controls, particularly with regard to 7 Petrel Place, where buildings have been approved with a maximum building height of 11.5m. In addition, the developer requested that land around the local centre should be at least 12m in height to allow for increased density in proximity to services and facilities.

The proposed zones and planning controls are based on the current planning controls that apply over the land. It is acknowledged that there may be a need to revisit these controls as the development progresses to reflect the approvals and the zone boundaries. It is recommended that we undertake this more detailed review during development of the MidCoast LEP.

With regard to land around the centre, there is currently a 12m height proposed over the land included in the Mixed Use zone which provides for both commercial and residential development. Without appropriate studies and justification, it is not appropriate to increase height beyond this location. The developer can undertake a planning proposal to investigate increased building heights in this location, if they feel it is warranted.

Recommendation: no change

2. and A. Shopping Centre (Submission 363)

The developer supported both the increased building height proposed over the centre and the 'unstructured centres local provision' in the Employment Zones Review, which enabled consideration of the building height up to 18m. The existing building height is 13m.

During community consultation, concerns were raised with regard to proposed heights in the centres. In this case the maximum building height for the centre was being increased from 13m to 18m. This would result in a significant change in the built form. After review of this centre it is proposed to reduce the building height to the original height of 13m to be in keeping with the surrounding mixed use area.

However, a review of the building heights proposed across all strategies/plans also found sixteen different heights were existing/proposed, some differing by only half a metre. The maximum building heights were consolidated into ten different heights. In making this change we have replaced the 13m maximum building height with 15m. This affected the Tea Gardens shopping centre.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to replace the 18m maximum building height with 15m





R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential

Key zones

R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential RE1 - Public Recreation RE2 - Private Recreation IN2 - Light Industrial

RU1 - Primary Production

Page | 79

Zoning In proposed zone

ironmental Conservation



onal Waterways

Issue and response

3. Myall Quays (Submission 301)

The submitter opposes Myall Quays being removed from a Low Density Residential zone and included in a General Residential zone allowing development up to four storeys in height.

The controls relating to the new General Residential zone are very similar to those that currently apply in the Low Density Residential zone. As a result, there is no significant change. The height will also remain at 8.5m. **Recommendation:** no change

4. Heritage in Tea Gardens (Submissions 241, 247, 315)

Concerns regarding the older section around Copeland Avenue to the Bridge between Marine Drive and Witt Street being included in Medium Density, General Residential and Local Centre zones with building heights up to 15m. This will impact on the heritage character in this area.

We have revisited the controls proposed for this location as outlined in Issues B, C and D below. We have amended the zones and controls to reflect those currently applied over the Tea Gardens shopping area.

Recommendation: make the changes as outlined in Issue B, C and D outlined below







Issue and response

5. 2A Engel Street (Submission 34)

The site is proposed to be included in the Low Density Residential zone. The owner has requested to be included in the Medium Density Residential zone consistent with the neighbouring property to the north.

A review of this site determined that given the size of the property a General Residential zone could apply to this site, which would act as a transition between the land included in the Medium Density Residential and neighbouring properties in the Low Density Residential zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this property in the General Residential zone with a maximum building height of 8.5m

B. Myall Street residential building heights

Both of these locations have a maximum building height of 8.5m. It was proposed to increase these heights to 12m in the Housing Strategy.

These locations were inspected and it is proposed to retain the maximum building height at 8.5m, to be consistent with neighbouring properties.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to retain a maximum building height of 8.5m

C. Myall Street shopping centre building heights

During community consultation, concerns were raised with regard to proposed heights in the centres. In this case the maximum building height for the centre was being increased from 12m to 15m. This would result in a significant change in the built form. After review of this centre it is proposed to retain the original height of 12m.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones review to retain a maximum building height of 12m

D. Witt Street zone

This site is currently included in the Medium Density Residential zone and was proposed to remain in this zone. The new Medium Density Residential zone prohibits houses, requiring apartments or townhouses to be established on the sites. This change may restrict development of these properties. As a result, it is proposed to include the site in the surrounding General Residential zone which provides greater flexibility.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this site in the General Residential zone and retain the 12m maximum building height





R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential

Key zones

IN2 - Light Industrial

RU1 - Primary Production

y Production



Issue and response

E. Potential urban land

The extent of the 'potential urban land' identified for this location was reviewed with regard to the southern extent. Given the environmental constraints of the land to the south, the 'potential urban land' boundary is to be moved north to the location shown in the map below.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to move the southern boundary of the 'potential urban land' in line with the map below




Hawks Nest/Tea Gardens general comments - issue and response

General comments (Submissions 26, 53, 72, 153, 161, 227, 228, 239, 243, 247, 256, 376)

The following general comments were made through submissions:

- a) manufactured home estates should not be permitted in rural zones
- b) the caravan parks at Winda Woppa and Mungo Brush Road (approved for a caravan park) were not shown on the mapping
- c) Medium Density residential zone controls were not well explained why do they have different heights? Will the 10% additional height provisions apply
- d) the exceptions applied to Tea Gardens where will they apply in Hawks Nest?
- e) the Housing Strategy needs to consider the endangered Koala population in this area. Need to reduce the removal of trees and consider pets and traffic to protect Koalas. Need to plant Koala feed trees, require Koala friendly fencing and educate the community
- f) where the maximum building height is 12m, a 4m setback from the street should be applied
- g) concerns that the changing of zones is unnecessary and has resulted in a simplification of zones that do not represent the character of an area. Concerned that the changes will result in more people, traffic, pollution, degradation of our natural environment and increased bushfire risk. An alternative access road is needed along with improvements to the Pacific Highway interchange and the bridge. There has been a lack of planning in this area. Structure planning is needed to protect biodiversity, amenity, scenic, rural and community character
- h) need to ensure development doesn't impact on groundwater which feeds into the Tea Gardens aquifer
- i) concerns about the approach being undertaken by the developer of Shearwater.

In response:

- a) the rural zones will be examined in the Rural Strategy which is anticipated to be available for community feedback early in 2021
- b) these caravan parks lie outside the urban areas and will be considered in the Rural Strategy which is anticipated to be available in early 2021
- c) there were fact sheets available on the different residential zones and staff available to answer any questions. Some of the residential zones do have differing heights which are typically due to site considerations
- d) any exceptions are noted on the maps included in the Housing Strategy. There were notes shown on both the Tea Gardens and Hawks Nest maps
- e) the Housing Strategy examined which zone would be appropriate from the suite of residential zones proposed for the MidCoast LEP. It is recognised that there are important local characteristics in our towns and villages across the MidCoast which need to be considered and will form part of our future planning work
- f) the relevant setbacks for each zone will be determined in the MidCoast Development Control Plan which is anticipated to be drafted by 2022
- g) the changing of zones is necessary to ensure that we apply our zones consistently across the MidCoast. The proposed zones typically have similar planning controls to what currently exists, as a result there is generally minimal increase in development potential. While there has been significant planning undertaken in this area over the last twenty years, it is agreed that place-based planning is needed for our towns and villages to refine the character and identify the future needs of each community. Currently, we need to progress the planning controls for the whole MidCoast prior to undertaking these more detailed plans
- h) the Rural Strategy is examining the Tea Gardens aquifer as an important water supply for this area. The Rural Strategy is anticipated to be available in early 2021
- i) each development application seeks community feedback. You are encouraged to provide feedback on these development applications with any concerns

RURAL CENTRES

Gloucester

The Gloucester consultation was held on 18 February 2020 attended by twenty people. Given Gloucester's residential and employment zones were significantly changing, many of the submissions and discussions focussed on these changes. The loss of development potential was a common issue. We received 10 submissions for Gloucester and 1 outside of the Gloucester town. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Gloucester.







Issue and response

A. Lot 1 DP 807280

This is a privately owned lot that is included in the Special Purpose (Infrastructure) zone. It is proposed to include this lot in a Low Density Residential zone to reflect its ownership and use, consistent with nearby residential properties.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Infrastructure Zone Review to include this lot in a Low Density Residential zone

Environmental Management Environmental Management Bordenze presserve pres

B. Church Street Sewage Reticulation System

The site was proposed to remain in the Special Purpose (Infrastructure) zone. To ensure consistency across the MidCoast, it is proposed that smaller sewage infrastructure such as this sewage reticulation system be included in the adjoining zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Infrastructure Zones Review to include this site in a Low Density Residential zone

1. King-Denison Street (Submissions 73, 178, 294)

Key zones

The proposed change was to remove this area from a Mixed Use zone and include it in a General Residential zone. Three of the business operating from this site expressed concerns that the residential zone would limit the use of the land and decrease property values. The businesses are well established and request that the current Mixed Use zone remain over the site as there is no need for more residential land in this location.

Based on the submissions, it is evident that there is no intention to change the use of the land in this location. We re-examined this location and agree that the substantial infrastructure on-site warrants the retention of the Mixed Use zone. The Mixed Use zone provides the opportunity to develop the land in the future for either residential or employment uses.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review and Housing Strategy to retain this land in the Mixed Use zone and extend the zone as shown:

- along Denison Street to capture the land proposed as an extension to the existing medical facility
- along King Street to include the whole Council administration building site.







R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential RE1 - Public Recreation RE2 - Private Recreation IN2 - Light Industrial

RU1 - Primary Production



Issue and response

2. 7 Market Street (Submissions 206, 235)

The proposed change is to exclude the site from a Medium Density Residential zone and include it in a General Residential zone. The site has been used as commercial premises since 1997. The owner was unaware that in 2010 the site was included in a residential zone and requests that the site be included in a business zone to enable commercial uses to continue and not devalue the property.

The Housing Strategy proposed changing from one residential zone to another. The removal of the site from a business zone occurred over 10 years ago and has had no impact on the operation of the site. The owner can continue to operate in this zone and undertake improvements as an extension to an existing use.

It is not appropriate to undertake a spot zoning over one site for a specific use, when planning controls are in place that recognise the existing use.

Recommendation: no change



3. 45 Denison Street (Submission 289)

The proposed change is to exclude the site from the Local Centre zone and include it in the General Residential zone. The landowner in 1982 was made to include commercial premises on his property when building a house. They are concerned that they will be unable to continue the business use. They also noted that there are a number of business uses being included in the residential zone.

This was part of a larger zone change to consolidate the town centre. The area included in the business zone was extensive and limited the development of residential uses in close proximity to the centre. A detailed assessment of uses was undertaken to determine where the extent of the business zone should be. As shown in the image to the left, there are a number of houses in this street that warranted the change of this location to a residential zone.

The owner of the property will have existing use rights to continue to operate a business from this site. If the existing use rights cease, the area can be converted back to a residential space. The General Residential zone will continue to allow for a range of low scale commercial activities including a home business or home industry, medical centre or neighbourhood shop.

It is not appropriate to undertake a spot zoning over one site for a specific use, when planning controls are in place that recognise the existing use.





Issue and response

C. Height consolidation – 11.5m: Gloucester town centre

Maximum building heights are proposed in the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and the Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan. During consultation, some people had trouble identifying which height applied over the properties, given the extensive number of heights proposed

The building heights were reviewed and across the studies, 16 different heights were proposed, some differing by only half a metre. We reviewed the maximum building heights and consolidated them to 10 different heights. In making this change we have removed the 11.5m maximum building height that applied over the Gloucester town centre (shown as blue). The 12m maximum building height was considered appropriate.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to replace the 11.5m maximum building height for the Gloucester town centre with 12m



4. Church and King Street (Submission 86)

The properties are proposed to remain in the Environmental Management zone, while properties to the east were included in a Light Industrial zone. The owner of these sites proposes that the Light Industrial zone be extended over the land indicated (to the left) given the proximity to town, the proposed zone changes to adjoining properties, and the potential for the gully to be established to improve water flows and form part of the walking trails.

The Light Industrial zone has been applied to land to the east of this location to reflect the existing uses. Both sites have structures, hard stand areas and parking areas. They have operated as industries for a number of years. Whereas, this land is constrained by flooding and currently not occupied. The constraints limit development potential and therefore the change of the zone, and should remain in the Environmental Management zone





Issue and response

5. 5 Phillip Street (Submission 265)

The proposed change is to exclude the site from the Mixed Use zone and include it in the Business Development zone. This site currently operates as a produce store.

The owner has requested a General Residential zone be applied as their long term intent is to develop the land as residential, given the adjoining residential uses and the proximity to services and facilities. The current operation can continue to operate in a residential zone given their existing use rights. This zone change is warranted as in the long term the site will transition to a residential use.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zone Review and Housing Strategy to include this land in the General Residential zone



D. Extension of General Residential zone

During consultation it was raised that there are some existing units between Philip Street and Hay Street. To acknowledge these uses and provide increased opportunity for housing diversity, it is proposed to extend the General Residential zone in this location. Residents in this location will have the opportunity to have their say on this change when the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan is exhibited.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include land between Philip and Hay Street in the General Residential zone



E. Hospital land

The strip of land to the south of the hospital (shown as yellow) forms part of the hospital land and should be included in the Special Purpose (Infrastructure) zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Infrastructure Zone Review to include this lot in the Special Purpose (Infrastructure) zone



F. Oak Street

This land is currently in a residential zone and was proposed to be included in the Low Density Residential zone. This land is owned by Council and is currently used as park.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include this land in the Public Recreation zone



E2 -	Environmental	Cons
E3 -	Environmental	Mana

ervation

cemen

R1 - General Residential R2 - Low Density Residential R3 - Medium Density Residential

Key zones

R5 - Large Lot Residential



IN2 - Light Industrial

RU1 - Primary Production



Issue and response

G. Gloucester Saleyard

The Gloucester saleyard was proposed to be removed from the General Industrial zone and included in a Light Industrial zone to act as a buffer to the land to the north. During consultation it was discussed as to whether this zone may limit the use of the land and whether it was warranted given the extended time frame that it has operated from the site.

It is proposed to amend the zone to include it in the General Industrial zone.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zone Review to retain this land in the General Industrial zone

H. Cemetery Road Water Reservoir

The site was proposed to remain in the Special Purpose (Infrastructure) zone. To ensure consistency across the MidCoast, it is proposed that smaller water supply infrastructure be included in the surrounding zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Infrastructure Zones Review to include this site in the Environmental Conservation zone

I. Cemetery Road

These sites are included in a rural zone and have industrial uses to the west and south and the cemetery to the east. These sites provide land for the future expansion of the industrial estate. To reflect this future intent, it is proposed to identify these sites as 'potential employment land' in the Employment Zones Review. This recognises that these sites could be the subject of a rezoning in the future to an employment zone. Any rezoning application would examine the suitability of the zone in terms of strategic need, transport and any environmental issues.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zone Review to identify this site as 'potential employment land'



E2 - Environmental Conservation

E3 - Environmental Management

B2 - Local Centre

B4 - Mixed Use



R2 - Low Density Residential

R3 - Medium Density Residential R5 - Large Lot Residential IN2 - Light Industrial

RU1 - Primary Production



Issue and response

6. 367 The Bucketts Way (Submission 349)

The owner proposes changes to allow the site to be used for tourist activities (e.g. Boutique brewery) and/or allow the subdivision of the land.

This site falls outside the urban area (being our towns and villages) which was the area were consulting on. The rural zones and uses are currently being reviewed through the Rural Strategy which will be available for community consultation in 2021.



Issue and response

General comments (Submission 37, 322)

The following points were raised regarding Gloucester:

- a) there needs to be a mix of zones applied and flexibility to enable social hubs, business cottage models, and housing diversity
- b) there needs to increased access to public transport, in terms of both services and bus stops
- c) need a diverse economy, the restriction/removal of zones limits business opportunities. We need to use dual zones (residential/commercial) enables flexibility
- d) there is a need for more medical facilities in Gloucester do not change zones that may limit this use
- e) services are insufficient for example The Bucketts Way needs more overtaking lanes, mobile phone service, NBN and the water supply are inadequate
- f) the transport of cattle is expensive need a local boutique processing facility in Gloucester
- g) through the consultation it would be ideal to see the community's comments and be able to agree/disagree with them.

In response:

- a) the zones proposed for Gloucester aim to provide flexibility. We propose a number of employment zones that provide for a variety of industrial or commercial activities. The residential zones encourage more housing diversity close to the town centre, while providing certainty in the outer areas about the type of residential development you can expect in your neighbourhood
- b) public transport is a problem in all regional areas. We will continue to work with Transport for NSW to explore public transport options for the MidCoast
- c) some business zone changes raised concerns, particularly in King Street. We propose to re-establish the Mixed Use zone in this location to increase flexibility of uses
- d) medical facilities can be established in many of the business zones and the General Residential zone, providing many locations for them to be established
- e) MidCoast Council continues to undertake improvements to The Bucketts Way and are working on securing a better water supply for Gloucester
- f) boutique processing facilities could be located in the industrial estate. There is sufficient land to accommodate such a use
- g) we are always looking for ways to improve our consultation and could explore these types of consultation tools in the future



Wingham

The Wingham consultation was held on 3 March 2020 in the Wingham Memorial Town Hall, and was attended by twenty-two people. Many residents were seeking clarification on how the new residential zones would work. We received eleven submissions for Wingham. The issues raised from submissions and consultation are summarised in tables below and recommended changes are provided. This map shows the location of issues across Wingham.







Issue and response

1. Residential around centre (Submissions 207, 317, 341, 370)

Concerns were raised that given Wingham has an ageing population, people need to live close to shops and doctors. The area proposed for General Residential zone (to the east of the town centre) is limited and would hamper the future development of Wingham. Submitters felt that there was a need for more options for town houses/apartments close to the town centre (to the west) where lots are over 1,000m². This can be done while maintaining the heritage value. It was also suggested that some commercial land could be changed to a residential zone.

This location was inspected and it was agreed that there are opportunities for increased residential in this location, and it can be achieved in a manner that maintains the important heritage value of Wingham. The zone needs to be applied in conjunction with a review of the heritage conservation areas to identify and protect the heritage values of Wingham.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include the land in the Low Density Residential zone in the General Residential zone.

PROAD Paso766 11 2 2 3 5 ROAD B DP449000 B DP449000 COUNTRY CUBIORIVE COUNTRY CUBIORIUM COUNTR

2. Wingham Golf Club (Submission 369)

Landowners propose to develop the unused portion of site as aged care. There was support for the proposed zone change to the Private Recreation zone, land use table, height of building and floor space ratio amendments. Concerns related to the proposed minimum lot size of 20ha, in terms of impacting on the future development of the property for aged care. They requested either no minimum lot size or provide a local clause for enabling a reduced lot size for this type of residential use. If it is not possible to change the minimum lot size the landowner proposes a site specific clause be developed to address this concern.

The Private Recreation zone applies to the golf course and the remainder of the site will remain in a rural zone. The minimum lot size of 20ha for the Private Recreation zone is appropriate for recreational uses, which is the primary purpose of the zone. If a residential use is established on the site, the zone will have to be examined at that time to determine whether the zone and planning controls need to be changed. Having a local clause for site or zone specific issues can reduce the transparency of the Local Environmental Plan. The aim will be to minimise the use of local provisions to priority issues.





Issue and response

3. Wingham Beef (Submission 272)

The site is currently included in a rural zone. The Employment Zone Review proposes the application of the General and Light Industrial zones over the site to reflect the long-term operations of Wingham Beef, which is an industrial use.

Wingham Beef generally support the changes, but have concerns regarding:

- limitations of the Light Industrial zone (e.g. height) which may restrict some uses in the east of the site
- the General Industrial zone should be extended over Lot B DP 449000 to ensure the business can be sustainable in terms of expanding operations
- extending the General Industrial zone over Lot 2 DP 607154 as it forms part of the Wingham Beef property (recently purchased)

In response:

- the proposed height of 10m over the Light Industrial zoned land is appropriate given the site adjoins residential development in this location. There are provisions to apply for an increased height through a development application process where all impacts can be considered
- Lot B DP 449000 is currently used as a car park which can operate from the rural zone. Given this lot is opposite a residential area, any future development of this land should be considered through a rezoning application where the proposed use and potential impacts can be assessed. The General Industrial zone is to be extended over Lot 3 DP 247394 as a building is located on this site
- the General Industrial zone will be extended over Lot 2 DP 607154 to reflect the ownership and use.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to include Lot 3 DP 247394 and Lot 2 DP 607154 in the General Industrial zone





Issue and response

4. 55 Farquhar Street (Submission 374)

This site is currently included in the Light Industrial zone and was intended to remain in this zone. The landowner proposes a Mixed Use zone given the mix of uses that are present on the site and that it has operated as a shop. The submitter states that adjoining neighbours at 10-14 Dennes Street also support the change for their property.

The Mixed Use zone is generally applied to larger areas, not an individual site. The Mixed Use zone enables a broad mix of uses, some of which may be inappropriate in a residential neighbourhood. It is understood that this site has been used as a shop, café and health centre. The General Residential zone (proposed adjoining zone – refer Issue 1) would enable a range of uses that would support the neighbourhood, such as neighbourhood shops, restaurants or cafes, or community facilities. Given the flexibility offered in this zone it is proposed to include the site in a General Residential zone.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review to include this site in a General Residential zone





Issue and response

5. Lot 11 Wingham Road (Submission 320)

This site (967 Wingham Road) is currently in a rural zone and has been identified as potential urban land. The landowner requests rezoning of this land given the population is decreasing, median house prices are increasing, the vacancy rate is 1% and over half of Wingham's workforce live outside of Wingham. In addition, the site could provide a suitable pool relocation site. The landowner requests that the potential urban land be included in the General Residential zone and the remainder be included in Large Lot Residential zone. This would create new housing and increase growth.

The submitter had concerns regarding:

- the growth predictions for Wingham in the Urban Land Monitor given Wingham would decline from being the 3rd to 7th largest centre by 2036 - more needs to be done to increase opportunities. Council needs to adopt a population growth for Wingham reflective of the area
- Wingham's growth should not exclusively rely on infill development
- land ownership is dominated by one group. Rezoning this land would provide more opportunity
- user-pays lodgement fees for a rezoning blocks development
- statements that the supply of vacant residential is sufficient to meet demand and that this site may be more suitable for Large Lot Residential should be removed.

The Housing Strategy examined how the existing urban areas should be zoned and identified 'potential urban land' (including this site) based on approved strategies. Rezoning of the potential urban areas falls outside the scope of this strategy. A planning proposal needs to be lodged where issues like strategic merit and need can be considered. With regard to proposing Large Lot Residential on the remaining land, the strategic need for this type of development and consideration of site constraints would have to be undertaken in the planning proposal. It should be noted that the Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis determined that there are currently over 200 Large Lot Residential sites to be developed in the Wingham area, which will meet the future need.

The Urban Land Monitor examined vacant residential land and determined there was sufficient supply to meet the residential demand. It is understood that there are concerns with the projections used in the monitor, but it was the best mechanism available to examine our supply of residential land across the MidCoast. For Wingham it is evident that there is sufficient land available to meet the current demands or even a high growth scenario if it occurred. As a result, it is not appropriate to remove the statement that there is sufficient vacant residential land to meet demand.

What became clear was that the growth of our coastal regions is very high in comparison to our inland towns. This is more about the lifestyle people are choosing rather than the development opportunities provided in



Issue and response

these towns. Council is undertaking projects in Wingham to assist with encouraging people to visit and live in Wingham.

The monitor will be reviewed over the next couple of years when the Census is undertaken and data released.

Since the Urban Land Monitor was written, the landowners intent for this site has been made clear. As a result, it is appropriate to remove the statement that large lot residential may be more appropriate for this site

Recommendation: amend the Urban Land Monitor to remove the last dot point on page 36 with regard to the statement that large lot residential may be more appropriate for this site

RUI - Primary Production R2 - Los Dagsliy, Residentian Monan B2 - Los Dagsliy, Residentian Monan B2 - Infrastructure SP2 - Infrastructure

6. 1059 Wingham Road (Submission 283)

This site is currently in a rural zone and lies outside the urban area. The site will be considered in the Rural Strategy.

The landowner proposes a Light Industrial zone over this property to create a high quality, master planned Arts and Industry Estate. This would build upon the arts, cultural, historical and festival character of Wingham, providing an economic boost to Wingham, with the potential to become a creative industries hub. These types of estates can attract artists, film-makers, craft brewers, designers, fashion houses, wellness experiences and niche nurseries, with innovative boutique industries and start-ups.

Letters of support have been provided. It was suggested that adjoining Lot 5 should be included in this precinct to provide sufficient area (owner supports inclusion) and potentially support a railway siding.

The Housing Strategy and Employment Zones Review (subject of the consultation) examined how the existing urban areas should be zoned. Identifying new locations for future industrial development was not part of the scope of this strategy or review. If the landowner would like to examine an industrial zone over their property they would need to lodge a planning proposal. It would be important to demonstrate the need for more industrial land in Wingham and address all impacts.



Issue and response

General issues (Submission 329)

The following general comments were made:

- a) Wingham has a low growth rate due to the cost to develop a block is higher than coastal areas, but has a lower return. This has decreased development potential (e.g. Former Boral site)
- b) there is demand for rural residential close to town
- c) concerned that the undeveloped areas remain General Residential

In response:

- a) there are a number of factors that can impact on the growth of our towns and villages. The provision of zones over Wingham will ensure that uses are in the appropriate zone and neighbourhoods can develop with more certainty about the type of development that can occur. Having an adequate supply of suitable land to develop is also important. Currently there are large areas of residential land available to be developed as housing
- b) the Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis determined that there are over 200 Large Lot Residential sites to be developed in this area. This is sufficient to meet the current demand for this type of development
- c) the General Residential zone enables flexibility in terms of the type of development that can be undertaken. This is important to ensure that the housing needs are met in Wingham.



VILLAGES

Barrington

One submission was received for Barrington as outlined below.



Issue and response

1. 31 Skye Road (Submission 38)

Lots fronting Skye Road (western side) are included in the Large Lot Residential zone with a minimum lot size of 8,000m². The rear of the lots is included in a rural zone. An owner has requested that the minimum lot size on the western side of Skye Road be decreased as it would reduce the impact on the adjoining agricultural activities.

This lot size is below the recommendation provided in the Housing Strategy, being 1.5ha for sites not connected to sewer. It is proposed to retain the current lot size given these controls have been in place for a number of years. As such, there is no justification to enable a smaller lot size in this location.

The adjoining rural lands will be examined in the Rural Strategy to be released for consultation in 2021. **Recommendation:** no change



Brimbin

One submission was received for Brimbin covering three issues as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

1. Brimbin Masterplan (Submission 361)

Roche Group advised that a Masterplan is being developed which may result in changes to some zone boundaries. Given the Masterplan refines the zones, it would be appropriate to align the zones accordingly. Additionally, given there will be a main street, they feel a business zone may be more appropriate.

It is agreed that the Masterplan process may result in some minor changes to the zone boundaries and zones, as the character of the new suburb is developed. These changes will need to be discussed with Council at that time to determine the appropriate means to make any changes.

Recommendation: no change

2. General Residential zone (Submission 361)

Roche Group support the use of the General Residential zone over Brimbin as it will allow a range of uses consistent with their vision.

Support for the General Residential zone at Brimbin is noted.

Recommendation: no change

3. Lansdowne Rod Large Lot (Submission 361)

Given this site is the gateway entry to Brimbin, Roche Group suggests that a 2,000m² minimum lot size would be appropriate. This would provide a transition between rural and residential land. It would also provide suitable housing close to the services and facilities offered at Brimbin.

It is considered that the current lot size of 4,000m² offers a suitable transition between the rural and residential locations. The minimum lot size of 4,000m² will be applied to land across the MidCoast that is included in the Large Lot Residential zone, has a connection to sewer and no significant environmental constraints. Given the recent bushfires, encouraging more residents in this location would not be appropriate.



Bulahdelah

There were four issues arise during consultation that have resulted in changes in Bulahdelah as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

A. 57 Stroud Street

This site is currently in the Village zone. A principle of the Recreation Zones Review is to include privately owned caravan parks in urban areas in a Private Recreation zone. A caravan park was recently established on part of this site and should be included in the Private Recreation zone.

Recommendation: amend Zoning In maps to include this part of the site in a Private Recreation zone



B. Residential land in east Bulahdelah

East of the Pacific Highway and south of the golf course, there are lands included in the Low Density Residential zone. Given the constraints of the site, the minimum lot size applied to these lands was 700m². The Zoning In maps exhibited showed this minimum lot size, but it was not identified as an exception in the Housing Strategy under Section 3.1 where the planning controls for each zone is outlined.

Recommendation: amend Section 3.1 of the Housing Strategy to identify an exception to the minimum lot size for the Low Density Residential zone being 700m² in this area of Bulahdelah



E2 - Environmental Conservation

E3 - Environmental Management

RU2 - Rural Landscape RU5 - Village

Key zones R1 - General Residential

eral Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential

RE1 - Public Recreation

IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

Proposed zone



Issue and response

C. 36-40 Bulahdelah Way and Lot 7328 Blanch Street

This land was proposed to be included in the Village zone. A review of land in Bulahdelah identified these sites as having important vegetation that provides a buffer to the Pacific Highway. The land is owned by the State Government.

Given the existing vegetation on the site and the proximity to the Pacific Highway, it was proposed to include this site in an Environmental Management zone. However, it is acknowledged that this site is currently subject to a Native Title Claim and the ownership may change. Prior to drafting the MidCoast LEP, consultation will be undertaken with the Karuah Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether the ownership of this site is proposed to change and it will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP

Recommendation: consult with the Karuah Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss the ownership of the land, whether this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone



D. Lot 19 Meade Street

This land is included in a rural zone, but lies within the urban settlement boundary of Bulahdelah. The land is currently owned by the State Government, acquired during the development of the Pacific Highway bypass of Bulahdelah.

A review of land in Bulahdelah identified these sites as having important vegetation that provides a buffer to the Pacific Highway.

Given the existing vegetation on the site and the proximity to the Pacific Highway, it is proposed to include this land in an Environmental Management zone.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this site in the Environmental Management zone

B2 - Local Centre

B4 - Mixed Use

E2 - Environmental Conservation

RU2 - Rural Landscape RU5 - Village

R1 - General Residential

Key zones

R2 - Low Density Residential

IN2 - Light Industrial

E3 - Environmental Management

Coomba Park

Three submissions were received for Coomba Park as outlined below, one of which relates to Coomba Bay (further to south).

Proposed zone	Issue and response
	1. Large Lot Residential (Submissions 318, 330)
ng	Two residents requested that the land around Coomba Park should be included in a Large Lot Residential zone, in keeping with the original plans for this area. This would provide lifestyle lots that would be supported by the village, and be in accordance with the Coomba Park Local Community Plan 2019.
2 11504 14 DP26347 1 DP26347 1 DP26347 1 DP26347 2 3 DP26347 2 3 DP26347 2 3 DP26347 2 3 DP26347 2 3 DP26347 2 DP26 DP26 DP26 DP26 DP26 DP26 DP26 DP	The Housing Strategy examined the existing residential zones, with the aim of identifying a suite of residential zones that could be applied across the MidCoast. Identifying new locations for future residential development was not part of the scope of this strategy. However, it recognised that it is difficult for our villages to expand, particularly if there is no connection to sewer. The Housing Strategy states that "some existing villages not connected to sewer also seek expansion opportunities. Given the need for on-site waste disposal, only large lot residential development could be considered where there was a demonstrated need, the location was suitable and constraints addressed. This would be subject to a rezoning application." We are working with the State Government regarding this approach. The zones around the village will be examined in the Rural Strategy to be released for consultation in 2021 Recommendation: no change
23 DP253663	2. Lot 13 Moorooba Road (Submission 318)
COOMBA BARK	This site is proposed to be included in an Environmental Management zone given extent of bushland on the site. It has been requested that this site be retained in a Public Recreation zone as it has a dog-off leash area and the skate park needs to be resolved.
DP852893 DP852893 COOMBAIR	The proposed environmental zone recognises the environmental values of the property. The current uses can continue to operate in this zone and it will be maintained to the same level.
DP222756 7008	Recommendation: no change
DP1075608	3. 48 Tallawalla Road (Submission 318)
	Council should acquire this site to extend the Civic Precinct as identified in the Coomba Park Local Community Plan 2019. This request falls outside the scope of the Zoning In project, as it does not involve land acquisition.
	Recommendation: no change



RU2 - Rural Landscape RU5 - Village



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

Proposed zone



Issue and response

4. Access to Coomba Bay reserve (Submission 310)

Coomba Bay public reserve – the submitter advises that there is no access for residents on the southern side of Coomba Rd. There is a right of carriageway over Lot 4 which runs between Coomba Road and the public reserve giving direct access to the foreshore. This has been used and maintained by residents. Recently the easement has been padlocked and access denied to the wider community by the landholder.

The submitter feels an error occurred in the deposited plans in 1978 which unfortunately permits this to occur. So the reserve is landlocked, meaning Council has a public reserve with no access. The right of carriageway needs to be resolved to enable public access.

This request falls outside the scope of the Zoning In project. The submitter is advised to contact Council's Parks section to discuss this access issue.

Recommendation: no change



E2 - Environmental Conservation

RU5 - Village

RU2 - Rural Landscape

Key zones R1 - Gener

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential

RE1 - Public Recreation

IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

B4 - Mixed Use E3

E3 - Environmental Management

Coolongolook

Two submissions were received for Coolongolook requesting the village of Coolongolook be expanded as outlined below.



Key zones



E2 - Environmental Conservation E3 - Environmental Management

RU5 - Village

RU2 - Rural Landscape





IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

Crowdy Head

One submission was received for Crowdy Head, as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

1. 540 Crowdy Head Road (Submission 361)

The site is currently in the Environmental Conservation zone and falls outside the urban area. The zoning of this property will be considered through the Rural Strategy.

The owner requested this property be considered as 'potential urban land' in the Housing Strategy, given:

- there is no land identified for the expansion of Crowdy Head
- it was identified as 'potential village expansion' in the Draft Manning Valley Local Strategy 2016
- the site has been approved for forty-five single and two storey villas
- the site is well serviced to support residential growth
- the land is cleared and contains little environmental value.

The Housing Strategy examined the existing residential zones, with the aim of identifying a suite of residential zones that could be applied across the MidCoast. Identifying new locations for future residential development was not part of the scope of this strategy. However, it recognised that it is difficult for our villages to expand and provides guidance for the expansion of existing villages not connected to sewer. Villages with connection to sewer were addressed in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. This strategy identified 'potential urban land' for the majority of sewered villages; Crowdy Head was an exception.

It is acknowledged that expansion of Crowdy Head may need to be revisited in the future through a local strategy. This would be undertaken in consultation with the community and would examine issues such as the need for additional housing, the environmental value of the land and bushfire risk. Given the current priority is to establish planning controls across the MidCoast, a local strategy for this area in not planned at this point of time.



Elands

There is one issue identified for Elands as outlined below.





Green Point

One submission was received for Green Point as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

1. Potential Urban Land (Submission 285)

The submitter supports the inclusion of 1 Bottlebrush Close, 6 Waratah Close and 5 Camellia Place as 'potential urban land' in the Housing Strategy. Given a number of applications and studies have been undertaken for this property and no constraints have been identified, the submitter requests that the site be included in the Village zone as advocated by Council in the recent court case.

The Housing Strategy examined how the existing urban areas should be zoned and identified 'potential urban land' (including this site) based on approved strategies. Rezoning of the potential urban areas falls outside the scope of this strategy. A planning proposal needs to be lodged where issues like strategic merit and environmental constraints.



Johns River

One submission was received for Johns River as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

1. Tourist and visitor accommodation (Submission 83)

A request was made for the Village zone to enable Tourist and Visitor Accommodation. The Village zone land use table in Housing Strategy permits Tourist and Visitor Accommodation as a permitted with consent use.

The Village zone enables a diverse mix of uses to occur. Some villages have shops, industrial areas and a range of residential uses. Each development application is assessed on their merits.

Recommendation: no change

A. East of Pacific Highway

This site is currently in the Large Lot Residential zone and is publicly owned. A principle of the Recreation Zones Review is to include publicly owned land in a zone reflective of the use. This site acts as a buffer to the Pacific Highway limiting the development potential of the site. It is proposed to include this site in the Environmental Management zone.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this part of the site in the Environmental Management zone

B. South Johns River

This site is currently in the Village zone, is publicly owned and has important environmental values. A principle of the Recreation Zones Review is to include publicly owned land in a zone reflective of the use or environmental values. Given the site has environmental values it is proposed to include it in the Environmental Conservation zone.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this part of the site in the Environmental Conservation zone



B4 - Mixed Use



E3 - Environmental Management

RU2 - Rural Landscape RU5 - Village

Key zones

R1 - General Residential

RE1 - Public Recreation

IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

Krambach

There were three issues identified for Krambach, which have resulted in changes as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

A. Krambach Community Hall

This site is currently in the Village zone, contains the community hall and war memorial and is publicly owned land. It is proposed to include these sites in the Public Recreation zone to reflect the use and ownership of the land.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this part of the site in a Public Recreation zone

B. Access to recreation facilities

This land is in the road reserve and provides access to the tennis courts and pool. It is proposed to include the road reserve in the Public Recreation zone to reflect the use and ownership of the land.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this part of the site in a Public Recreation zone

C. 8-12 Fire Station Road

These sites are currently in the Village zone and contain the fire station and vacant public land, which is well vegetated. Given a past use of this land there is an issue with contamination. It is proposed to include these sites in the Environmental Management zone to reflect the use (existing and past), vegetation and ownership of the land.

However, it is acknowledged that the site with the Fire Station is currently subject to a Native Title Claim and the ownership may change. Prior to drafting the MidCoast LEP, consultation will be undertaken with the Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether the ownership of this site is proposed to change and be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include 10-12 Fire Station Road in the Environmental Management zone. Consult with the Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether 8 Fire Station Road this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP



Nabiac

One issue was considered for Nabiac as outlined below.



Issue and response

A. 1 Hoskins Street and 33 Clarkson Street

This strip of land is currently in the rural zone. It was identified as 'proposed employment land' in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. The Employment Zones Review needs to be amended to identify the 'proposed employment lands' that were identified in this Strategy. This recognises that these sites could be the subject of a rezoning in the future to expand village uses. Any rezoning application would examine the values of the property, including environmental constraints.

Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to identify this site as 'potential employment land'



B4 - Mixed Use

E2 - Environmental Conservation

E3 - Environmental Management RU5 - Village

Key zones

R1 - General Residential

RE1 - Public Recreation

IN2 - Light Industrial

Village

RU2 - Rural Landscape

R2 - Low Density Residential

Nerong

One issue was considered for Nerong as outlined below.

Proposed zone	Issue and response
Deside D	 A. Whimbrell Drive This strip of land is currently in the Village zone, is owned by Council for a drainage reserve, and provides public access to the lake. Given the use and ownership of the site it is proposed to include it in an Environmental Management zone. Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this part of the site in an Environmental Management zone



North Arm Cove

Ten submissions were received for North Arm Cove as outlined below.

Proposed zone	Issue and response	
	1. Solution for North Arm Cove (Submissions 17, 163, 264, 275, 276, 278, 325, 359, 364, 366)	
The second	The request is being made to resolve the 'paper subdivision' issues around North Arm Cove. The concerns relate to:	
Rev Agent St.	 landowners wanting to establish a residential use on their land. Landowners felt that it should have been considered in the Housing Strategy as it offers the opportunity to accommodate growth in an area of lower risk (e.g. coastal erosion and climate change) 	
Contraction of the second	 the length of time that the issue has been unresolved 	
	 seeking community consultation to be kept informed 	
	 provides an opportunity for new businesses, schools and housing based on sustainable, self-sufficient, off the grid communities 	
	The Zoning In consultation involved our urban lands, being our towns and villages. The rural lands in North Arm Cove will be examined in the Rural Strategy. Work is underway on the Rural Strategy and it is anticipated to be available for community comment in 2021.	
NORTHARMCOVE	Any submitters that requested to be kept informed of the Zoning In project have been included on our mailing list. We keep people on the mailing list informed of the status of our key strategies and plans including exhibition of the Rural Strategy in 2021.	
BOD SOUL	Recommendation: no change	
2		
24		

B2 - Local Centre B4 - Mixed Use

RU5 - Village

RU2 - Rural Landscape



Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

Pindimar

One submission was received for Pindimar as outlined below.

Proposed zor	ne		
1	5 T DP8287		DP8
S DP8287 2 S DP8287	100	1001 STINO	
3 S DP8287 287 5 3	and the second s	and a second sec	
S DP8287	DP787342		7
Silter	REESTREET	RU5 - Village	
Rural Landscape	KOREE STREET	NOJ- Village	
	KOR		
	W	ARRUSTREET	5
MANDO STREET	There		
2 2 6 8287	KOREE STREET		
		1 DP531087	No.

Issue and response

1. Solution for Pindimar (Submission 281)

The request is to change the zoning of land in Koree Street (south of the village) from a rural zone to a residential zone as it will bring prosperity to the area.

The Zoning In consultation involved our urban lands, being our towns and villages. The rural lands around the Pindimar village will be examined in the Rural Strategy. Work is underway on the Rural Strategy and it is anticipated to be available for community comment in 2021.

Any submitters that requested to be kept informed of the Zoning In project have been included on our mailing list. We keep people on the mailing list informed of the status of our key strategies and plans including exhibition of the Rural Strategy in 2021.



Rainbow Flat

There is one issue identified for Rainbow Flat as outlined below.

Proposed zone

Issue and response

A. 11 Khappinghat Close

This site is currently in the Village zone and is public land. It is a well vegetated site that contributes to the local ecology. It is proposed to include this site in the Environmental Conservation zone to reflect the environmental values of the site.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this site in the Environmental Conservation zone



Seal Rocks

There were two issues identified for Seal Rocks, which have resulted in changes as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

A. Lot 1 and 457-458 Thomas Road

These sites are currently included in the Public Recreation zone which is typically applied to land in public ownership. The major landowner is the Forster Local Aboriginal Land Council and a smaller site is publicly owned and subject to a Native Title Claim. The land is heavily vegetated and contributes to the adjoining National Park.

Given the majority of land is no longer in public ownership the zone needs to be changed to reflect the values and use of the land. Prior to making these changes consultation will be undertaken with the Forster Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP

Recommendation: consult with the Forster Local Aboriginal Land Council to discuss whether this site will be included in the Aboriginal Land Council SEPP and the appropriate zone



B. Lot 42 Kinka Road

This site is currently included in the Village zone, provides public access to a reserve and is publicly owned. Given the use and ownership of the site it is proposed to include it in an Environmental Management zone.

Recommendation: amend the Zoning In maps to include this part of the site in an Environmental Management zone







Key zones

R1 - General Residential

R2 - Low Density Residential

RE1 - Public Recreation

IN2 - Light Industrial

RE2 - Private Recreation

Tinonee

Three submissions were received for Tinonee requesting that lands on the outskirts of the village be included in the Large Lot Residential zone.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

1. 31 Alpine Drive (Submission 3)

The zones proposed for this site are consistent with the existing zones being partially included in the Large Lot Residential zone and the remainder of the site in a rural zone (to be determined by the Rural Strategy).

The owner requested that the whole lot be included in Large Lot Residential zone with an environmental zone applied around the creek to protect Koala habitat. The aim of the Zoning In project is to consistently apply a suite of residential zones across the MidCoast. The project does not involve expanding residential areas to provide new growth. This should be undertaken through the planning proposal process where all the values of the property and potential impacts can be assessed in detail. Recommendation: no change

2. 108 Coffee Street (Submissions 175, 218)

This site lies in a rural zone. The owner recalls that twenty years ago it was identified as suitable for urban expansion, but no longer is identified as having residential potential. They suggest that the site has potential to be developed as Large Lot Residential as it has access to all services and sporting fields.

While the Housing Strategy supports the potential for Large Lot Residential development for properties fronting The Bucketts Way, this site lies beyond the identified area

Recommendation: no change



E2 - Environmental Conservation

RU2 - Rural Landscape

R1 - General Residential

Key zones



IN2 - Light Industrial

B4 - Mixed Use



RU5 - Village

Wallabi Point

Three submissions were received for Wallabi Point as outlined below.

Proposed zone



Issue and response

1. 236 Saltwater Road (Submission 71)

The site is currently in a rural zone. The landowner has requested that the site be considered as Large Lot Residential as it is a popular place for professionals to live and should be encouraged. A Large Lot Residential zone would provide development to meet this demand. They also feel that after the bushfires, it is now appropriate to separate wildlife and settlement areas.

The aim of the Zoning In project is to consistently apply a suite of residential zones across the MidCoast. The project does not involve expanding residential areas to provide new growth. This should be undertaken through the planning proposal process where all the values of the property and potential impacts can be assessed in detail. It is noted that this site has important ecological values that contribute to the coastal landscape and ecology. Given these values and bushfire risks, the site has not been identified in the Housing Strategy as a potential urban area.

Recommendation: no change

2. Lot 59 Shantull Drive (Submission 371)

Potions of this lot are currently in the Low Density Residential zone, with the remainder included in a rural zone. Given the land has not yet been developed, it has been requested that the land be included in a General Residential zone. This is consistent with residential land not yet developed.

It was requested that the 'potential urban land' be extended to be consistent with the Old Bar/Wallabi Point Development Strategy (Option A). The Housing Strategy identifies 'potential urban land' that was identified in the Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031. As a result, no change is proposed.

Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy to include the vacant land currently in the Low Density Residential zone in a General Residential zone. No change is proposed to the boundary of the 'potential urban land'


Issue and response

3. General comment (Submissions 71, 146)

Issues were raised with regard to:

- identifying, protect and promote Aboriginal spaces have them clearly defined and clarify which spaces are publicly available
- careful planning is required to retain the small coastal village character

In response:

- planning controls proposed through the Zoning In process cannot clearly identify Aboriginal land or outline whether spaces are publicly available
- the character of Wallabi Point has changed, particularly over the last ten years with new residential neighbourhoods created, and new buildings being proposed in the older areas of Wallabi Point. The proposed planning controls remain similar to what has been in place since 2010. Retaining the 8.5m maximum building height will continue to keep development at two storeys or less.





APPENDIX B

Submissions on Zoning In projects



Zoning In projects

The following issues were raised in submissions from the community. They relate specifically to the Housing Strategy, Employment Zones Review and Recreation Zones Review. In addition, one submission provided general feedback. The relevant number of each submission is provided.

Housing Strategy issues	Response
 Housing Strategy approach (Submission 262) The consultation was well conducted. Support proposed changes in Taree, Halliday's Point, Old Bar, Harrington and in the Taree as they increase housing diversity 	Support for the consultation approach and the proposed zones is noted. Recommendation: no change
 2. Residential zones (Submission 245) There is no need to have separate Low Density Residential and General Residential zones as it limits housing choice. Not permitting caravan parks in the Low Density Residential zone will limit the use in many suburbs, which typically have good infrastructure and transport. The trend is for better quality housing to be provided in caravan parks for permanent residents. The assessment of affordable housing has little substance. 	To provide the greatest level of flexibility and respond to our diverse housing character across the MidCoast, the full range of residential zones was applied. It is appropriate to have a residential zone that is specifically for low density housing. In many cases, manufactured home estates involve a higher density and would be considered out if character in a low density neighbourhood. These uses should be located close to town centres and services, which is the aim of the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones. It should be noted that the General Residentia zone has also been applied to vacant residential land to provide flexibility in the housing established on these sites. Recommendation: no change

Housing Strategy issues	Response
 3. Manufactured home estates (Submissions 245, 360, 361) Concerns for manufactured home estates (MHEs) were raised as follows: limiting MHEs to General Residential and Medium Density Residential zone is contrary to SEPP 36 – Manufactured Home Estates and SEPP 21 Caravan Parks. Either remove the Low Density Residential zone or permit MHEs in this zone to provide housing choice close to infrastructure and public transport Manufactured homes provide affordable housing and a choice of retirement living for the aged, which is in demand (due to development costs and government constraints). Limiting this type of housing to areas remote from services is not good planning seek clarification that the Liable Housing Design Guidelines will not apply to caravan parks and MHEs the minimum lot size applied to Public and Private Recreation zones should be the same. Restricting the lot size of Private Recreation to 20ha will prohibit smaller developments Council should lobby the State Government to progress the Discussion Paper on Manufactured Home Estates in 2015, in particular the suggested definitions for caravan parks 	It is recognised that manufactured home estates provide important housing that can be affordable and suitable for our aging community. The Housing Strategy does not limit their development, but instead encourages them to be appropriately located. To provide the greatest level of flexibility and respond to our diverse housing character across th MidCoast, the full range of residential zones was applied. It is appropriate to have a residential zone that is specifically for low density housing. In many cases, manufactured home estates involve a higher density and would be considered out if character in a low density neighbourhoo. We will address the requirements of the Ministerial directions in the planning proposal for the MidCoast Local Environmental Plan MHEs should be located close to town centres and services, which is the aim of the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones. Often developers of this form of housing are looking for larger vacant sites which preclude them from locating close to centres. It should be noted that the General Residential zone has been applied to vacant residential land to provide flexibility in the housing established on these sites. Private Recreation zone sites are typically large sites used for activities like golf courses and sporting activities. Many of these sites are surrounded by residential and there is an expectation that the large scale nature of the recreation use will continue. If there is a need to subdivide these sites further for a use like a MHE, an amendment can be made to the minimum lot size through a planning proposal. This will enable Council and the community to assess the proposed development and potential impacts. Council continues to lobby the State Government on the issue of MHEs to improve the approach Recommendation: no change

Housing Strategy issues	Response
4. Affordable housing (Submission 3) Affordable Housing - the cost to produce a standard residential lot in the MidCoast is restricting development. Power, water, sewer and Council contributions may be in line with other areas but are out of tune for the Taree, Wingham and Tinonee areas. We have recently completed feasibility studies on seven sites in the Taree and Wingham areas and cannot make any of them stack up	The issue of the costs associated with developing residential lots in the MidCoast was raised during the development of the Housing Strategy. Under section 5.3 – Making housing affordable, there are actions to review Council fees and charges to address this issue. Recommendation: no change
5. Group homes (Submission 28) Group homes will not be permitted in the Low Density, General Residential and Large Lot Residential zones	 The State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2019 contains provisions that enable group housing to be developed in a range of zones. This legislation outlines circumstances where group homes can be established and criteria to be considered. This legislation over-rides the Council's planning controls. To clarify this issue, an amendment can be made to the Housing Strategy. Recommendation: amend the Housing Strategy (Section 5.4 – Social and community housing) to make reference to the application of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2019
 6. Support for Housing Strategy (Submissions 361, 363) Support was provided for: the General Residential zone, its vision and permitted uses, and the provisions for integrated housing and caravan parks in this zone actions outlined in section 5.3 – Making Housing Affordable removal of the floor space ratio across the MidCoast It was raised that uses such as Environmental Protection Works and Home Based Child Care should be permitted with consent uses 	Support for the Housing Strategy is noted. With regard to Environmental Protection Works, this use was not listed as a permitted with use as it will typically occur as an ancillary activity for another use, for example these works may be undertaken associated with the development of a house units. Home Based Child Care is included in the group term Early Education and Care facility, which is proposed to be permitted with consent in the General residential zone. It is acknowledged that some of the uses in this group term are specifically mentioned in the land use table, which can make it confusing. A review of the group terms in the land use table for the residential zones will be undertaken to improve the clarity. Recommendation: amend the land use tables in Appendix A of the Housing Strategy to improve clarity around the group terms

Employment Zones Review issues	Response
1. Mixed Use zone (Submission 361) The land use table for the Mixed Use zone should enable Attached Dwellings which is an important form of medium density development	The Mixed Use zone is currently applied across the MidCoast and the use is not permitted in the zone. Residential uses like Multi-Dwelling Housing and Residential Flat Buildings are permitted with consent. Typically, the Mixed Use zone is aiming to achieve higher density development given its proximity to services and facilities. Attached Dwellings would be a lower density form of residential development. As a result, it is considered appropriate that Attached Dwellings are not permitted in the Mixed Use zone. Recommendation: no change
2. Business zones (Submission 363) Concern that the business zones are proposed to be 'closed' meaning that if a use is not specified as 'permitted with consent', it	Based on this submission we have reviewed the business zones approach for a number of council in NSW. Having the business zones 'open' was a consistent approach to provide increased flexibility. It is proposed to 'open' the business zones.
will be prohibited. Alternate pathways for establishing uses, such as the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, is not explained. An Employment Land Strategy should be undertaken to further explore uses in employment zones.	The unstructured centres clause has been reviewed and will be removed. The additional heights raised concerns for neighbours to the centres and reduced certainty. The approach is to encourage good urban design for all centre developments to improve the vibrancy of the centres
There was also support for the 'unstructured centres clause' which provided a bonus where urban design objectives were achieved.	Recommendation: amend the Employment Zones Review to 'open' the business zones and remove the unstructured centres clause

Recreation Zones Review issues	Response
1. Land uses in recreation zones (Submission 363)	The support is noted.
Support was provided for the range of uses proposed to be permitted in the recreation zones.	Recommendation: no change

General issues	Response
 General comments (Submission 10) There a range of things we should consider in our future planning: encourage clean businesses and energy. Reduce industry and freight impacts and improve the airport assist wildlife with a sanctuary and provide assistance to carers assist Aboriginal community to share their culture attract employment/business opportunities. Have farmer's markets 7 days/week and a business expo once a month upgrade the pound and animal services don't increase densities Zone changes don't make the town flourish, increase sustainable opportunities. Take the lead 	The Zoning In project is aimed at providing a suite of zones that can be applied across the MidCoast. Many of the issues raised fall outside the scope of this project, but there are projects that Council is undertaking to address many of these points. For example, Councils Economic Development Department work with Chambers of Commerce and businesses and to encourage business and tourists to the MidCoast; and the Natural Systems Department examines ways to protect and maintain our natural environment. The Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan has examined how more residents can be encouraged to live in the Taree CBD. While this is increasing densities, it also promotes sustainable development, by having more people living close the services and facilities offered in the Taree CBD. Recommendation: no change



APPENDIX C

State Government Feedback





IRF20/3976

Mr Adrian Panuccio General Manager MidCoast Council PO Box 450 FORSTER NSW 2428

Dear Mr Panuccio

Feedback on the MidCoast Council draft Housing Strategy

I refer to the draft Housing Strategy exhibited earlier this year and congratulate MidCoast Council on the work done to date. Consolidating the planning controls from three former local government areas is a challenging task. Completion of the draft Housing Strategy will be an important step forward towards providing the MidCoast with a consistent planning framework for managing future growth.

I note the draft strategy is to be largely implemented as part of Council's new comprehensive local environmental plan. This will be commenced by Council submitting a planning proposal to the Department for consideration. To assist Council as it finalises the strategy and prepares the planning proposal, the following comments are provided for Council to consider (Attachment A).

For those proposed actions that will not be implemented by the new comprehensive local environmental plan, Council is encouraged to expand the detail regarding implementation and develop measures for monitoring progress. This will assist with prioritising projects and allocating resources.

Given the extent of work that will be involved in development of the new comprehensive local environmental plan, I encourage Council to engage with the Department on a draft planning proposal, including specific provisions, this will allow for more detailed feedback to be provided. We look forward to working closely with Council on this in the future.

Should you have any further enquiries about this matter, I have arranged for Ms Caitlin Elliott, Manager, Central Coast and Hunter Region to assist you. Ms Elliott can be contacted on 4904 2712.

Yours sincerely

19/08/2020 Dan Simpkins Director Regions, Central Coast and Hunter Planning and Assessment

Encl: Attachment A



Attachment A - Comments on the MidCoast draft Housing Strategy

Urban settlement boundary and proposed urban release areas

The mapping of the urban settlement boundary and identification of potential future housing sites is supported. Identifying these lands will assist in providing stakeholders with certainty regarding where future greenfield housing supply is to be provided across the MidCoast LGA.

The boundary and sites generally align with the growth area boundaries shown in the *Mid North Coast Regional Strategy 2006-2031*. However there are variations and these should be explained (e.g. Old Bar, Hallidays Point, Hawks Nest). The Department notes that circumstances may have changed since the growth area boundaries were first released in 2006 and acknowledge that their review may be appropriate as part of Council's local strategic work.

Anticipated future growth and monitoring of supply

There is substantial difference between the two sets of population growth projections included in the draft strategy, which impacts upon the forecast demand for dwellings over the next 20 years.

The NSW Government is required to make decisions based on the NSW Government's population projections. If Council intends to use other information for land use planning, it is important that decisions regarding whether to rezone additional land is based on supply and market demand analysis. The strategy's recommended action to monitor land release and to develop triggers for identifying new rezonings/ interventions is strongly supported.

While there are various examples of how this might occur, Council could consider elements of the *Branxton Sub Regional Land Use Strategy 2016* (jointly prepared by Cessnock and Singleton Councils) when identifying potential triggers and interventions.

The Strategy is available here <u>https://www.cessnock.nsw.gov.au/Forms-</u>documents/Plans-strategies/Branxton-Sub-Regional-Strategy.

This strategy establishes a framework for managing supply, including parameters for rezoning sites not identified in the strategy. It also considers the sequencing of sites which may be relevant for parts of the MidCoast, such as the Hallidays Point area where multiple sites (including a new long-term site) are identified.

Council could also consider looking at supply and demand in terms of larger catchments to align with possible housing market demand. For example, although Harrington may not be able to provide enough supply based on current demand, it

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Central Coast and Hunter Region | Level 2, 26 Honeysuckle Drive, Newcastle | PO Box 1226 Newcastle 2300 |T 02 4904 2700 | www.planning.nsw.gov.au

may indicate that this demand could be met in another coastal location in this part of the LGA.

The strategy recognises the importance of infill development in providing housing supply, particularly for an aging population. Council may want to consider monitoring infill development in areas targeted for infill growth or areas where greenfield is constrained as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of Council's planning controls.

Land proposed for the R1 General Residential zone

The R1 General Residential zone enables integrated development and low rise medium density development, such as terraces, manor homes and manufactured homes. It is a means of providing additional dwellings, smaller dwellings and housing choice in several settlements where the alternative is the R2 Low Density Residential zone.

While sometimes applied to land close to existing centres and services, the R1 General Residential zone is commonly proposed to apply to undeveloped areas on the urban fringe and the reasoning for this should be explained in more detail.

Unlike the R2 Low Density Residential zone, the R1 General Residential zone is also targeted by the strategy for providing smaller housing types and adaptable housing, both of which the strategy recognises are priorities for the aging population.

With residents often seeking to age in place and with their mobility decreasing with age, the R1 General Residential zone initially appears better suited for more central and accessible locations than on the urban fringe.

Approach to tourism accommodation

The strategy recognises that the nature of tourism accommodation is changing, moving away from resorts to private dwellings through platforms like Airbnb. It notes that while the SP3 zone has been used for six sites in the LGA, tourism development has only occurred at North Diamond Beach. The strategy states that this site is now being considered for rezoning to R3 Medium Density Residential.

Given the changing circumstances of tourism accommodation and the limited effectiveness of the SP3 zone in facilitating tourism development, Council could consider examining how it supports tourism accommodation further. If this has not already occurred in a separate document, Council could identify areas that are in high demand for tourism accommodation and evaluate whether its planning controls are appropriate. This review could consider the value of retaining the SP3 zone and other options that may support diverse opportunities for tourism accommodation and permanent residents.

Rural residential development

The proposed approach to rural residential development is supported. Understanding the costs and benefits of this type of residential development would be beneficial in

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Central Coast and Hunter Region | Level 2, 26 Honeysuckle Drive, Newcastle | PO Box 1226 Newcastle 2300 |T 02 4904 2700 | www.planning.nsw.gov.au

Council determining a policy position. Should Council look to provide further opportunities for lifestyle housing, then preferred areas should be identified in Council's housing strategy in consultation with the Department.

Precinct and spot rezoning

The housing strategy proposes several precinct and spot rezoning where zones or building heights would vary from the general planning control framework set out by the strategy. Examples include Gloucester R3 to R1, Forster R3 to R4, Diamond Beach SP3 to R3, Tuncurry and Harrington heights, etc.

The reasoning for these changes should be detailed within the strategy.

Notwithstanding, any change from the general framework will need to be identified as part of the planning proposal package and suitable justification/ studies provided where relevant. Early discussion with the Central Coast and Hunter Region Branch regarding these sites is recommended.

Development controls and character

The strategy indicates that Council intends to change its approach to managing built form in some of Council's higher growth areas by removing FSR requirements. The new approach would see building envelopes managed through a combination of height controls in the LEP and through character objectives, local character statements and development control plan provisions.

We note that Council intends to undertake a detailed character assessment of its major urban areas and this is supported so that certainty can be provided for future development and inform this amendment to planning controls.

Section 9.1 Ministerial directions

Several of the changes proposed by the housing strategy reduce residential densities and housing choice (e.g. no integrated development for parts of Forster) and so may be inconsistent with Ministerial directions 3.1 Residential Zones and 5.10 Implementation of Regional Plans.

Any inconsistencies would need to be justified as part of a future planning proposal. Similarly, if any employment land is to be rezoned to residential, then this may be inconsistent with section 9.1 Ministerial direction 1.1 Business and Industrial zones and justification would be required.

Central Coast and Hunter Region | Level 2, 26 Honeysuckle Drive, Newcastle | PO Box 1226 Newcastle 2300 |T 02 4904 2700 | www.planning.nsw.gov.au



Our ref: DOC20/179848-11

Sue Calvin

Senior Strategic Planner MidCoast Council sue.calvin@midcoast.nsw.gov.au

via email

Dear Ms Calvin

Re: Housing Strategy and Zone Review consultation

Thank you for your request to comment on the MidCoast Housing Strategy and associated documents, which we received via email on 2 March 2020.

Biodiversity and Conservation Division's (BCD) recommendations are provided in **Attachment A** and detailed comments are provided in **Attachment B**. BCD has not provided biodiversity or Aboriginal cultural heritage comments at this time. This does not represent BCD support for biodiversity and Aboriginal cultural heritage components of the strategy.

If you require any further information regarding this matter, please contact Richard Murphy, Senior Natural Resources Officer, on 4927 3144 or via email at rog.hcc@environment.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely

duas genobies

LUCAS GRENADIER Acting Director Hunter Central Coast Branch Biodiversity and Conservation Division

Date: 9 April 2020

Enclosure: Attachments A and B

BCD's recommendations

MidCoast Council Housing Strategy and Zone Review

- 1. Council should ensure that any sea level rise and changes to flooding due to climate change are considered for all proposed residential rezoning areas.
- 2. Council should develop and adopt a Sea Level Rise Policy and Framework to guide future decision making around land use.
- 3. Council should consider climate change flood risks when developing guidelines for the development and operation of caravan parks.
- 4. The Ministerial Directions listed in Appendix A of the large lot residential supply and demand analysis should include all relevant directions issued under Section 9.1(2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

BCD's detailed comments

MidCoast Council Housing Strategy and Zone Review

Flooding and flood risk

1. Some of the proposed residential rezoning areas may be at risk of inundation from sea level rise.

It appears that proposed residential rezoning areas referred to in the housing strategy have been developed based on existing 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood information. Some of the proposed residential areas are low-lying and are vulnerable to climate change impacts, including increased frequency, duration and height of flooding and that may result in property or infrastructure damage.

Council is encouraged to exercise the 'precautionary principle' and consider climate change for these areas. Intensification or changes to residential land use in known future flood risk areas should be avoided. Otherwise, in the future Council may be required to protect flood prone areas or to down-zone them. An example is shown below of the difference between current and future flood extents is shown for a proposed rezoning location at Forster.



Proposed rezoning Forster



2010 flood extents



2100 flood extents

Recommendation 1

Council should ensure that any sea level rise and changes to flooding due to climate change are considered for all proposed residential rezoning areas.

2. Council does not have a climate change policy to inform residential rezoning decisions

Council does not have an adopted policy on sea level rise projections or a Climate Change Adaption Plan. This would assist Council to manage current and emerging climate change inundation risks to low-lying areas from rising sea levels.

Recommendation 2

Council should develop and adopt a Sea Level Rise Policy and Framework to guide future decision making around land use.

3. Intensifying development of caravan parks may increase flood risk and liability to Council

The housing strategy notes that there is a trend towards more permanent residents in noncoastal caravan parks, which is creating more affordable housing. The strategy also notes that there is a trend to replace temporary occupation areas for camping with higher quality cabins.

There are caravan parks within the MidCoast Local Government Area that are in high risk flood areas, such as at Bulahdelah and Gloucester. This flood risk is likely to increase due to climate change. Intensification of development in known flood risk areas may lead to an increase in flood damages and risk to life. Caravan parks are typically difficult to evacuate, and flood managers are not well equipped to respond to issues in Caravan Parks. Gloucester Caravan park is a low flood island that has no evacuation route when inundated.

Increasing permanent occupation of caravan parks may increase Council's flood liability and protection measures such as levees, warning systems and high-level evacuation routes may be required.

Recommendation 3

Council should consider climate change flood risks when developing guidelines for the development and operation of caravan parks.

4. The large lot residential supply and demand analysis document should acknowledge all directions issues by the Minister for Planning

Section 2 (Policy Context) of the Large Lot Residential Supply and Appendix A of the Large Lot Residential Supply and Demand Analysis states that relevant Ministerial Directions issued under Section 9.1(2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* are provided in Appendix A. Appendix A only details directions 1.2, 1.5 and 3.1. Other relevant Ministerial Directions, such as 4.3 Flood Prone Lands, should be included.

Recommendation 4

The Ministerial Directions listed in Appendix A of the large lot residential supply and demand analysis should include all relevant directions issued under Section 9.1(2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* 1979.

Tue 19/05/2020 8:13 AM

Development hunter <Development.hunter@rms.nsw.gov.au>

TRIM: Transport for NSW Comments - MidCoast Council Housing Strategy and Zone Review consultation

To Sue Calvin

(1) Click here to download pictures. To help protect your privacy, Outlook prevented automatic download of some pictures in this message.

Good morning Sue,

I refer to your email seeking feedback from Transport for NSW (TfNSW) for MidCoast Council's Housing Strategy and Zone Review documents and my apologise for providing a late response. TfNSW reviewed the documents and would like to provide following comments:

- TfNSW understands most of the strategies are to align the three previous Council's strategies into the one MidCoast Coast Coast Council. Therefore, generally we don't have much to comment on.
- The Employment zone review does not propose significant additions/reduction to quantity of employment land.
- It was noted that a Employment Land Strategy would be developed later and this is something that TfNSW would be happy to provide some feedback or look at in terms of any impacts on State corridors. .
- MidCoast Housing Strategy identified North Tuncurry as a major development housing areas which TfNSW were aware of and considered through our consultation process for The Lakes Way Corridor Strategy.
- Manning Health/Taree CBD Precinct Plan although has no State Roads as part of this study area. Council may wish to consider the movement and place concepts and the 20 year vision and validate approach; where Council would want the vibrant streets and places within study area in the future and how Council can achieve this, from the Future Transport Plan 2056. .
- It is noted that MidCoast Infrastructure Zones Review recommends that the SP2 Infrastructure Zone continue to be used for significant Infrastructure (including railways, and significant state roads such as the Pacific Highway), that is unlikely to be used for a different purpose in the future. .

If you require further information or any clarification, please contact me on 0429 037 333 or by emailing development.hunter@rms.nsw.gov.au.

Kind regards

Kumar Kuruppu Development Assessment Officer Land Use Assessment Hunter Regional and Outer Metropolitan Transport for NSW T 02 4908 7683 Level 8, 266 King Street Newcastle NSW 2300



Use public transport... plan your trip at transportnsw.info



General Manager MidCoast Council PO Box 450 Forster NSW 2428 Our ref: DOC20/096410 Your ref: File: 20/02737

22 May 2020

Attention: Michael Griffith

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Proposed zone changes in the MidCoast Council LGA

The Department of Planning Industry and Environment – Crown Lands (the department) is writing to you in response to "Agency consultation: Proposed zone changes in the MidCoast Council LGA" dated 25 March 2020. Thank you for an extension to provide comment. The department has reviewed the proposal, with particular focus on recreation zones (as suggested by Council), and provides the following general comments:

- The application of land use zonings to Crown land should not compromise the principles of Crown land management as per the *Crown Lands Management Act 2016*.
- Zoning should be considerate of the potential future use of Crown land including development capacity and continued access to appropriate public land.
- The LEP should acknowledge the potential for development opportunities on Crown land to deliver balanced social, environmental and economic outcomes.
- Zoning of Crown Reserves should be consistent with the public purpose of the reserve. For example, reserves with the purpose of public recreation should be zoned RE1 Public Recreation. Infrastructure or buffer zones to service new development should not be located on Crown land. This includes drainage infrastructure, utilities and services, access and bush fire asset protection zones.
- The department's procedures state that Crown land with multiple purpose reservations or dedications should be zoned to allow the highest use envisaged by that reservation/dedication. Eg. a reservation for public recreation and coastal environmental protection should be zoned 'RE1 Public Recreation' (which permits recreational activities as well as environmental protection works).
- Exceptions to zoning and reserve purpose consistency need to be assessed on a case by case basis.
- The department does not favour the use of Zone RE2 (Private Recreation) over Crown land, as public land. The current use of Crown land (for example for a bowling club/registered club) should not determine the zone, but rather, follow the principle that if it is Crown land it should be zoned for its public purpose, with public recreation reserves being RE1.
- Regarding rezoning recreation zones to environmental zones, again the departments policy is that land zoning should generally be consistent with the reserve purpose and exceptions to this need to be assessed on a case by case basis.
- In the RE1 Land Uses table (page 17 and Appendix C of the Draft Recreation Zone Review document), the activities permitted with consent require further consideration. Additional uses such as telecommunication facilities should be permitted. In contrast, some of the land uses proposed in the RE1 Public Recreation zone may be incompatible with a Crown



land public purpose of public recreation. This could include backpacker's accommodation, electricity generating works and serviced apartments and the like.

• Due regard should be made to the *NSW Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* and Commonwealth *Native Title Act 1993* and the impact of Native Title and Aboriginal Land Claims on the proposed LEP zonings.

For Crown land reserved for public recreation, it is requested that Council

- assess each parcel and justify any variation to a RE1 zone.
- provide the department with the relevant zoning maps for any parcels not zoned RE1, with Council's justification for the variation,
- provide the department with commentary on any variations in the land use table to the department for consideration.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. Should you wish to discuss this matter further please contact Jaimee Vlastuin on 02 6591 3586 or jaimee.vlastuin@crownland.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely,

Hereel

Tim Deverell Area Manager – Hunter