SHOALHAVEN CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

To be held on Thursday, 21 June, 2012
Commencing at 5.45 pm.

19 June, 2012

Councillors,

NOTICE OF MEETING

You are hereby requested to attend a meeting of the Development Committee of the Council of the City of Shoalhaven, to be held in Council Chambers, City Administrative Centre, Bridge Road, Nowra on Thursday, 21 June, 2012 commencing at 5.45 pm for consideration of the following business.

R D Pigg
General Manager

Membership (Quorum – 5)

Clr Brumerskyj – Chairperson
All Councillors
General Manager or nominee (Assistant General Manager)

BUSINESS OF MEETING

1. Apologies
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Deputations
4. Report of the General Manager
   Strategic Planning & Infrastructure – Draft Shoalhaven LEP 2009
   Community Group and General Submissions – Remaining Issues
   Further report - Albatross Aviation Technology Park
   Further report - Moss Vale Road North Urban Release Area
   Further report - Former Waste Facility, Greenwell Point Road, Greenwell Point
5. Addendum Reports

Note: The attention of Councillors is drawn to the resolution MIN08.907 which states:

a) That in any circumstances where a DA is called-in by Council for determination, then as a matter of policy, Council include its reasons for doing so in the resolution.

b) That Council adopt as policy, that Councillor voting in Development Committee meeting be recorded in the minutes.

c) That Council adopt as policy that it will record the reasons for decisions involving applications for significant variations to Council policies, DCP’s or other development standards, whether the decision is either approval of the variation or refusal.

Note: The attention of Councillors is drawn to Section 451 of the Local Government Act and Regulations and Code of Conduct regarding the requirements to declare pecuniary and non-pecuniary Interest in matters before Council.
Cell Phones:
Council’s Code of Meeting Practice states that “All cell phones are to be turned off for the
duration of the meeting”.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1993

Chapter 3

Section 8(1) - The Council’s Charter

(1) The council has the following charter:

• to provide directly or on behalf of other levels of government, after due consultation,
adequate, equitable and appropriate services and facilities for the community and to
ensure that those services and facilities are managed efficiently and effectively

• to exercise community leadership

• to exercise its functions in a manner that is consistent with and actively promotes the
principles of multiculturalism

• to promote and to provide and plan for the needs of children

• to properly manage, develop, protect, restore, enhance and conserve the environment
of the area for which it is responsible, in a manner that is consistent with and promotes
the principles of ecologically sustainable development

• to have regard to the long term and cumulative effects of its decisions

• to bear in mind that it is the custodian and trustee of public assets and to effectively
account for and manage the assets for which it is responsible

• to facilitate the involvement of councillors, members of the public, users of facilities
and services and council staff in the development, improvement and co-ordination of
local government

• to raise funds for local purposes by the fair imposition of rates, charges and fees, by
income earned from investments and, when appropriate, by borrowings and grants

• to keep the local community and the State government (and through it, the wider
community) informed about its activities

• to ensure that, in the exercise of its regulatory functions, it acts consistently and
without bias, particularly where an activity of the council is affected

• to be a responsible employer.
REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - DRAFT LEP 2009

THURSDAY, 21 JUNE 2012

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE

1. Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 2009 - Community Group and General Submissions - Remaining Issues  File 33363E & 45262E (PDR)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To detail the remaining issues identified in the community group and general submissions during the exhibition period and to outline options to deal with these issues if needed in the finalisation of the plan.

RECOMMENDED that Council consider individual preferred options/changes to draft SLEP 2009 as set out in the body of this report via the successive recommendations.

The recommendations contained in the body of this report are consistent with Council’s resolution of 20 March 2012, being:

“Council consider each submission on its merits and if appropriate, amend the draft LEP accordingly, or add to a list of future projects to be considered following the completion of the draft LEP 2009.”

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN

Objective: 2.2 Population and urban settlement growth that is ecologically sustainable, carefully planned and managed to meet the needs of the community.

Strategy: 2.2.1 Develop and implement land use and related strategies for future growth of the City, based on the principles of connectivity, ecological sustainability, flexibility and accessibility.

DELIVERY PROGRAM

Activity: 2.2.1.9 Implement the Planning Works Program to complete planning policy and strategy initiatives.
OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Option 1:

Council consider the individual preferred options/ changes to draft SLEP 2009 as set out in the body of this report via the successive recommendations.

Implications:

This option is preferable because:

- The preferred options/ changes respond to issues, errors and anomalies identified by staff and represent good strategic planning outcomes that are consistent with the Standard LEP Instrument. The preferred options/ changes are consistent with the “ground rules” and the “best fit transfer” approach wherever possible.

- Re-exhibition of draft SLEP 2009 will provide a further opportunity for the community to consider how Council has addressed these issues, and make further comment if they wish.

Option 2:

Council adopt changes to the draft SLEP 2009, other than those suggested and justified in this report.

Implications:

This option is not recommended as there is a real risk of there being no strategic planning basis to making changes other than those outlined and recommended in the report.

REPORT DETAILS

Introduction:

This report details and addresses the remaining issues from the community group and general submissions that have not been dealt with at Special Development Committee meetings held to date. It is noted that the majority of issues raised in submissions have already been addressed by the Committee as either key issues or area specific issues.

Therefore the two items below relate to one off and clause related issues that are generally recommended to be received for information.

Key Issues:

Issue 1 – Remaining issues submissions to be received for information.
The following table outlines the remaining community group and general submissions that are essentially comments, compliments, non LEP related or issues that can be received for information. The staff comment is also included in the table.

In support of some of the submissions in the table below it is also noted that Council received consistent feedback praising staff on the community consultation efforts, the website and the exhibition material throughout the draft SLEP 2009 process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Staff Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 (CCB)</td>
<td>Kangaroo Valley Community Association Inc. The association fully supports the SLEP 2009 review Groups submission, as does the Kangaroo Valley Environment Group.</td>
<td>Noted and the community group submissions have been addressed throughout relevant business papers to the SDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (CCB)</td>
<td>Lake Wollumboola Protection Association endorses the general recommendations of the SLEP 2009 Review Group submission dealing with general issues in the draft SLEP 2009.</td>
<td>Noted and the community group submissions have been addressed throughout relevant business papers to the SDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (CCB)</td>
<td>Ulladulla &amp; District Community Forum Forum would like to acknowledge and thank the Strategic Planning Staff for their advice, co-operation and support prior to and during the LEP exhibition period. In particular our thanks to Gordon Clark, Cinnamon Dunsford as well as Jessica Rippon and Marie-Louise Foley for making a presentation at our general meeting in September. The special website that was established to provide information has been particularly welcome and useful, especially the updates, Fact Sheets and the various map overlays – all were readily accessible and made it very easy to find information and do comparisons with 1985 document.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The community engagement process was extensive and it is noted that the regional office of DP&amp;I is using the Shoalhaven draft LEP community engagement process model as a good example for other Councils to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (CCB)</td>
<td>Basin Villages Forum Appreciation of Councils approach to community involvement and general preparation of the document. Would like to thank Council for the opportunity to comment and the assistance that has been given by staff throughout this project.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (CCB)</td>
<td>Jervis Bay Regional Alliance Supports the findings of the SLEP Group.</td>
<td>Comment noted and the community group submissions have been addressed throughout relevant business papers to the SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (CCB)</td>
<td>Shoalhaven Greens We endorse the recommendations from the CCB review group. Recognising the impact of climate change</td>
<td>Comment noted and the community group submissions have been addressed throughout relevant business papers to the SDC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28 (CCB) SLEP 2009 Review Group  
Provided a number of specific member submissions to support SLEP Review Group’s overall submission. 
Submissions include:  
- Cls 4.3 Height of Buildings – Christopher Grounds  
- Heritage Estates – Christopher Grounds  
- SLEP Land Uses Stephen Murphy  
- Ulladulla & Districts Community Forum Inc Submission  
- Lake Wollumboola Protection Association Inc Submission  
- Bawley Point Kioloa Progress Association Inc Submission  
- Red Head Villages Association (Inc) Submission  
- Hyams Beach Villagers Association (Inc) Submission  
- Vincentia Ratepayers and Residents Associations Inc  
Noted. All submissions were reported to relevant SDC meetings.

29 (CCB) Swan Lake Environment Protection Association Inc  
The Association wishes to acknowledge the advice and support offered by Council’s Strategic Planning Staff prior to and during the exhibition period, and is appreciative of their professional and helpful assistance through the series of information evenings and briefings held during the exhibition period.  
Comment noted.

28 & 29 SLEP Review Group & Swan Lake Environment Protection Association Inc  
The proposed zoning of B2 Lands Crown lands identified on Map 17 “Specified Land of high conservation value” in the South Coast Regional Conservation Plan as B2 lands, should be zoned “E1 National Park/Nature Reserve in the SLEP with “other Crown lands to be considered,” zoned either E1 or E2 in accordance with advice from the Office of Environment and Heritage.  
This submission recognizes that there is a tension between these ground rules, given that the existing SLEP was developed in 1985 and the South Coast Regional Strategy endorsed in 2007.  
This submission refers to Crown owned land identified in the South Coast Regional Conservation Plan (RCP) as high conservation value. The RCP states that potential reservation of these areas will be dealt with through the normal reserve referral process. It would be premature for Council to zone these lands as E1 at this point, without the support of Crown Lands. Should these lands become part of or be reserved for National Park, Council can then change the zone to E1 to reflect this.

206 Concerned that a lot of areas are being sterilised as park and environmental protection.  
Requests that Council does not rob future generations of areas for residential.  
Concern noted. The draft LEP is based on ‘best fit’ transfer of existing zones together with changes required by State Government including the SCRS and the Regional Conservation Plan.
| 254 | Viewed copy of draft Plan at Bay and Basin Leisure Centre but could not see what future plans are very clearly and left a lot to be desired. Did not appear to be any future planning for residential, industrial, tourism, sport, transport (particularly road works), water and sewerage and drainage - believes these need to be addressed together with planning the environment to take Shoalhaven forward for at least the next 50 years so that all ghastly mistakes made previously are not repeated. | Concern noted. The draft LEP is based on 'best fit' transfer of existing zones together with changes required by State Government including the SCRS and the Regional Conservation Plan. The upcoming Growth Management Strategy exhibition process and possible future review of the Jervis Bay Settlement Strategy will provide further opportunity for these issues to be addressed. |
| 293 | The presentation given at Callala Beach was very informative. | Comment noted. The community engagement process was extensive and it is noted that the regional office of DP&I is using the Shoalhaven draft LEP community engagement process model as a good example for other councils to follow. |
| 302 | Supports the LEP in full. | Comment noted. |
| 337 | Congratulate council on excellent website. | Comment noted. |
| 354 | Found the facts on the new LEP limited. Concerned that have not received adequate information and found the website difficult to navigate. | Very few people raised concern with the level of information provided. The level of information available was considered extensive and staff were available before, during and after the exhibition period to assist and provide further information to stakeholders. |
| 367 | Concerned with? Lack of clarity in Council descriptions leaving ratepayers without ability to make submissions I object to the lack of information about rates variation on each zone I object to the uncertainty of valuation or change thereof to our lands I object to the friction and uncertainty this has caused in the community. | Very few people raised concern with the level of information provided. The level of information available was considered extensive and staff were available before, during and after the exhibition period to assist and provide further information to stakeholders. Specific details in relation to rates and land valuations are not required to form part of an LEP exhibition. However, there was a general fact sheet that formed part of the exhibition material that addressed this issue. |
| 399 | Likes the work shops and information provided by SCC staff. | Comment noted. |
| 421 | Supports SLEP Review Group paper on "E" zone. Supports submissions by SLEP Review Group and Red Head Villages Association. | Comment noted. The community group submissions have been addressed throughout relevant business papers to the SDC. |
| 444 | A beneficial improvement to the local area would be to add a library, perhaps adjacent to the Bay & Basin Leisure centre, allowing a multi-use space as well as full library facility. Congratulations Council on the improvement of our path extensions and improvement along Collingwood beach. | The appreciation of the improvements at Collingwood Beach is noted. The comments regarding a library in the Vincentia area are noted. The draft SLEP 2009 does not identify sites for community facilities. The planning for a library in the Bay and Basin area is being carried out as a separate process. |
| 552 | Zoning of infrastructure Do not support the D&PI stand on giving infrastructure same zone as adjoining properties this could see loss of infrastructure. Need to address each site carefully prior to rezoning to adjacent zone. | It is a State Government direction that this is the approach to be taken to the zoning of infrastructure. Council will however seek to maintain SP2 zones over key infrastructure sites. |
| 560 | Likes being given the opportunity to have opinions heard. | Comment noted. |
| 575 | Likes:  
- that Council has left the area unchanged under draft LEP - current LEP works and allows different diverse villages within community.  
- that no facilities or current entitlements will be removed. | Support for aspects of the draft LEP noted. |
| 581 | Thanks the Council for the opportunity to make a submission and the work staff has done in producing and disseminating the SLEP. | Comment noted. |
| 591 | Praises use of maps and website. | Comment noted. |
| 639 | Likes the environmental and heritage listings provisions. | Comment noted. |
| 656 | Wishes to pay tribute to the helpful website and staff members. | Comment noted. |
| 433 | Likes that a number of deferred amendments and zones are being tidied up in the new LEP. | Comment noted. |
| 462 | Acknowledges there are some good changes. | Comment noted. |
| 501 | Congratulates Council on the level of access to view the draft LEP.  
Endorse the vision in Council's Vision 2020 in the Community Strategic Plan and ask Council to be mindful of these goals in their decision making. | Comment noted. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Liked interactive exhibition format and the clear directions on how to comment.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Matrix is very easy to use.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Is a result of the Standard LEP instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Supports this draft LEP.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>What I like - the simplification of zonings greater flexibility.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Is a result of the Standard LEP instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Likes the high standard of the draft LEP.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Is in full support of the LEP.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>SLEP does not address bush fire prevention.</td>
<td>This is unfortunately a result of the standard LEP Instrument failing to include bushfire provisions. It has been separately recommended that the bushfire mapping be added to the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Need to establish DCP as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Work on the draft Citywide DCP is well underway and the exhibition of this document will follow the re exhibition of the draft LEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Likes the clarity of zonings, restrictions and environmental issues brought together into one document.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Is a result of the Standard LEP instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Likes that the draft LEP will retain the area’s character.</td>
<td>Support for aspects of the draft LEP noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Comment regarding maintenance of council reserves/parks. Relates to reduced numbers of new homes being built – Enquiring about native veg removal and prosecution.</td>
<td>These issues are not LEP related and were forwarded to the appropriate department within Council for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Concerned that there was a letter from NSW government telling Council to start the exhibition ASAP but it was only released in June for comment with 15 weeks for the community to have their say. Believes that no one has any idea about it.</td>
<td>Time elapsed between the issuing of s65 certificates and exhibition commencing due to a number of factors, including extensive negotiation with DP&amp;I and preparing the comprehensive exhibition. Council wrote to all landowners advising of the exhibition as part of the 2011 rate mail out. Also extensive publicity was carried out during exhibition period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Threatened Biodiversity document has pages missing.</td>
<td>Point specific data was removed from the Threatened Species Assessment Report to protect the location of sensitive environmental features. This is required standard practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Concerned that schools, hospitals, churches and the public sites are zoned for residential - changes mean that Department of Education could slice off a school's playing field and sell it to a development without having to go through the public process of rezoning the land.</td>
<td>Concerns are noted but this is the direction of the State Government in relation to the zoning of infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In cross checking the remaining submissions, it was found that there were a small number of area specific submissions which were missed from the relevant area specific reports. These are shown in the table below.

| 245 | Concerned with the zoning of land to the rear of property (11 Cartwright Street, Myola shown in red on the map below) which is actually underwater. Would like the new LEP to recognise that the strip of land is underwater and has been for a long time. 6(c) or RE1 is not appropriate. Landowner applied for a pontoon at the rear of their property in 2007 and was rejected as the zoning did not allow the use on the 6(c) zoned land. | The strip of land in question is Crown land and part of this parcel does appear to be underwater when looking at aerial photos of the lot. However, as Council's cadastre shows the parcel as being land, it is general practice to give it a land based zone rather than a waterway one. This may be updated in the future if the land is surveyed to establish the mean high water mark. It appears that the submitter's main objection to the zone is due to it not permitting a pontoon structure. While the Open Space 6(c) (Proposed) zone does not permit pontoons and the like, the proposed RE1 Public Recreation zone allows ‘water recreation structures’ which would include a pontoon. The RE1 zone will be retained over the Crown land at this point in time. |

Draft Land Zoning Map (draft SLEP 2009 as exhibited) – 11 Cartwright Street, Myola

| 372 | Concerned that part of block is zoned E2. It has been underwater for 3 years while Lake Durras has been closed but is now above water as the Lake has been open. Has no vegetation and has been grazed in the past. (39 Runaway Lane East Lynne – outlined in red on the map below). | This property contains a SEPP 14 wetland. All SEPP 14 wetlands have been mapped as E2 Environmental Conservation under draft SLEP 2009, consistent with the SCRS. |
Believes Lot 1 DP 119779 (Alma Avenue, Fishermans Paradise – outlined in red on the map below) is zoned inappropriately and should be changed from RU2 to E2. Believes the property is a vital wildlife habitat area and is adjoining residential areas. Concerned that RU2 would permit hazardous and offensive industries, mining and other inappropriate land uses could be permitted close to adjoining residential land e.g. a smelly chicken farm or quarry would render the adjoining housing hazardous to health for human, birds and wildlife.

Concerned with the zoning of land adjoining the residential village of Fisherman’s Paradise. Believes the land uses permitted in the proposed zones compromise the objectives of a small rural village where the value of the village is the absence of billboards, destructive, extractive, noisy and offensive industries in an area of high ecological significance.

This 4.88 ha property is privately owned and the proposed RU2 Rural Landscape zoning in draft SLEP 2009 is a ‘best fit’ transfer from the current Rural 1(d) (General) zoning in LEP 1985. The vegetated area of the site is also mapped a ‘habitat corridor’ in the NRS – Biodiversity overlay. Any future development must therefore consider Clause 7.5 – Biodiversity and would be subject to Section 79C Assessment. It is not considered appropriate to change the zoning of the land from RU2 to E2 in the draft LEP process. The ‘best fit’ transfer has also occurred for other land surrounding Fisherman’s Paradise.
Requests that the trees and native vegetation that line Fishermans Paradise Road and the adjoining Alma Ave, which have ecologically important purposes for the bird life in this village be zoned as E2.

The vegetation that lines Fisherman’s Paradise Road is mostly within Council’s Road Reserve. The vegetated areas to the north and south of Fisherman’s Paradise Road are located on privately owned land which is proposed to be zoned RU2 Rural Landscape. Some of the vegetated land is also mapped as ‘habitat corridor’ in the NRS – Biodiversity overlay. Any future development on land mapped in the NRS – Biodiversity overlay must consider Clause 7.5 – Biodiversity and would be subject to Section 79C Assessment. It is not considered appropriate to change the zoning of the vegetated areas from RU2 to E2 in the draft LEP process.

The NRS overlay map may appear to be on the property but is not the case, therefore no further action is required.

Recommendation 1:

That the remaining issues identified by Community groups and individuals in the tables above be received for information.

Issue 2 – Clauses in draft LEP 2009 & SLEP 1985

19 submissions were received that suggested specific changes to clauses in draft LEP 2009 that have not been previously considered by this Committee. The specific clauses and issues raised are individually outlined below:
Clauses 4.1, 4.1A, 4.1B & 4.1C and Clauses 4.2 & 4.2A

The abovementioned clauses relate to minimum lot sizes and 10 submissions suggested changes to these clauses. Some submissions requested removal of the 40ha minimum for rural land to allow a merit based assessment of each subdivision application and for variations to the current minimum lot sizes to be considered. Other submissions were concerned with the opportunity the clauses provide to subdivide to less than an agreed minimum in residential areas, with some submissions stating the minimum should be 600m² rather than 500m². There were also 2 submissions that were specifically concerned with the minimum lot size proposed for dual occupancy development.

Comment

The abovementioned clauses are consistent with the ‘best fit transfer’ from the existing approach to minimum lots sizes in existing SLEP 1985 and relevant DCPs. There is no strategic justification to support the requested changes. It is further noted that Clause 4.2 is mandated by the Standard LEP Instrument.

Clause 5.3 Development near zone boundaries

One submission suggested that the 20 metre distance included in this clause should be increased (or changed to a %) as it is unfair for 40ha parcels of land.

Comment

The abovementioned clause is consistent with the ‘best fit transfer’ from the existing approach to development near zone boundaries and is considered appropriate. It is also a Standard Instrument Control. There is no strategic justification to support the requested change top the distance included in the clause.

Clause 5.4 Controls relating to miscellaneous permissible uses

One submission suggested that bed & breakfast accommodation should consist of no more than 7 bedrooms instead of 5 bedrooms.

Comment

There is no strategic justification to support the requested change from 5 to 7 bedrooms included in the clause. Further, 5 bedrooms is generally consistent with other comparable Councils. Therefore the request is not supported.

Clause 5.5 Development in the coastal zone

Six submissions supported Clause 5.5 and requested an additional sub clause to prohibit development in “Sensitive Coastal Locations” within 100 metres of the bank of a coastal lake as defined in Schedule 1 of SEPP 71.

Comment

The abovementioned clause is a mandated compulsory clause in Shoalhaven under the Standard LEP Instrument and therefore the above request cannot be supported.
Clause 7.8 Flood planning land

Five submissions suggested that stronger protection be given to flood prone land through limiting the land uses that are permissible on land to which this clause related. Some of these submissions suggested the land uses only be limited in the RU1 and RU2 zones.

Comment

Listing prohibited land uses in local clauses rather than the land use tables is not currently possible under the Standard LEP Instrument template, therefore this request cannot be supported.

SLEP 1985 – Clause 13D Subdivision of dwelling houses – multiple occupancy

One submission from a landowner was concerned that Clause 13D in SLEP 1985 has not been transferred to draft LEP 2009. The landowner has a multiple occupancy that he may wish to subdivide in the future.

Comment

Although this is a savings clause and staff research concluded that the subdivision opportunities presented by the clause had been exhausted (at the time of preparing the draft LEP), this is a valid comment and it is appropriate for staff to discuss with DP&I how the intention of this Clause can be retained in draft LEP 2009 to ensure that no landowner loses an existing opportunity to lodged a subdivision application.

Recommendation 2:

(a) The submissions relating to specific clauses in draft LEP 2009 be received for information.
(b) Council take steps to retain the intention of Clause 13D in SLEP 1985 in draft LEP 2009 and resolve this matter with DP&I.

Resourcing Implications – Financial, Assets, Workforce:

To date, considerable staff (workforce) time has been, and will continue to be, prioritised on this project.

Community, Environment (ESD), Economic and Governance Impact:

The recommendations aim to consider and address the remaining issues raised in individual and community group submissions, recognising and respecting the “ground rules” and the Standard LEP Instrument, on which draft SLEP 2009 has been based. Should the recommendations be supported by Council, then this will reflect good governance, in the context of strategic planning.

The changes to draft SLEP 2009 supported by Council will also be re-exhibited as resolved by Council on 28 February 2012. This will allow further opportunity for the community to comment on these key issues.
CONCLUSION

The resolution of the issues as recommended in this report will ensure a more robust and accurate environmental planning instrument.

2. Further Report – Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 2009 – Albatross Aviation Technology Park

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide further detail on the possible change of zoning of land owned by the Nowra Aboriginal Land Council (Nowra LALC) adjacent to the Albatross Aviation Technology Park, consistent with the resolution of 15 May 2012 that:

*In regard to Albatross Aviation Technology Park the matter be deferred to allow staff to seek comment from the Nowra LALC with regard to SP2 or B7 zones over this parcel of land.*

RECOMMENDED that the zoning of Lot 2 DP 880423 and part of Lot 1 DP 1029723 Braidwood Road, Yerriyong be retained as exhibited (SP2 Infrastructure (Airfield Purposes)) pending formal written advice from the Nowra Aboriginal Land Council (owner) regarding a potential change to the B7 Business Park zone.

COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN

**Objective:** 2.2  
Population and urban settlement growth that is ecologically sustainable, carefully planned and managed to meet the needs of the community.

**Strategy:** 2.2.1  
Develop and implement land use and related strategies for future growth of the City, based on the principles of connectivity, ecological sustainability, flexibility and accessibility.

DELIVERY PROGRAM

**Activity:** 2.2.1.9  
Implement the Planning Works Program to complete planning policy and strategy initiatives.

OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

**Option 1:**

Retain the SP2 Infrastructure (Airfield Purposes) zoning at this point of Lot 2 DP 880423 and part of Lot 1 DP 1029723 Braidwood Road, Yerriyong as exhibited pending a formal position from the Nowra LALC regarding a potential change to the B7 Business Park zone.
Implications:

The request to change the zoning of the land was received from an internal section of Council. As no formal written response or position has been received from the Nowra Local Aboriginal Land (owner) as to their desire or otherwise for the zoning of the land to change from SP2 Infrastructure (Airfield Purposes) to B7 Business Park, the zone should be retained as exhibited at this point. The Nowra LALC is able to make submission on the zoning of this land as part of the re-exhibition of the draft SLEP 2009 should they wish to. Council staff will continue to attempt to have a dialogue with the Nowra LALC in this regard in the meantime. The issue will be brought back for reconsideration after the re-exhibition.

Option 2:

Change the zoning of SP2 Infrastructure (Airfield Purposes) zoning of Lot 2 DP 880423 and part of Lot 1 DP 1029723 Braidwood Road, Yerriyong to the B7 Business Park zone and advise the Nowra LALC as part of the re-exhibition process.

Implications:

This option is not supported given the lack of formal written advice from the Nowra LALC as owner regarding the change of zoning of the site. This would also be inconsistent with the need for this decision to be made in open consultation with the Nowra LALC.

REPORT DETAILS

Introduction:

The request to rezone Lot 2 DP 880423 and part of Lot 1 DP 1029723 Braidwood Road, Yerriyong to form part of an extension to the Aviation Technology Park was considered by the Special Development Committee on 18 April 2012. The section of the Special Development Committee meeting report relating to this matter is provided as Attachment ‘A’. The item was deferred for a further report to allow for the Nowra LALC (as the landowner) to provide comment. This recommendation was ratified at the Ordinary meeting on 15 May 2012. This report provides the further information that was requested.

Background:

The land in question (shown outlined in black on the map below) was exhibited in the draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 2009 as zone SP2 Airfield Purposes with a clause that also allows for ‘development for the purposes of car parks, horticulture, landscape and garden supplies and light industry’.
An internal Council submission was received from the Economic Development Unit during the exhibition of the draft SLEP 2009 requesting a change to a B7 Business Park zoning in the vicinity of the land in question. It also requested an extension of the zone into the area between New Braidwood Road, Aviation Technology Park and the Airfield overshoot area to provide for airside industrial zoned land for the next 20-50 years. The submission indicated that the Nowra LALC had been consulted and agreed with the rezoning request. When the matter was reported, it was resolved that a decision on the matter be deferred to allow staff to obtain comment from the Nowra LALC with regard to SP2 Airfield Purposes or B7 Business Park zones over this parcel of land.

**Key Issues:**

As per Council’s resolution, the Nowra LALC was contacted and a meeting arranged with Council’s Economic Development unit. The outcome of this meeting was that the Nowra LALC were requested to send Council an email with further questions on the potential B7 Business Park zoning prior to providing a formal response on the Land Council’s position on the zoning of the land. Given the need to report this issue back to the Special Development Committee prior to the completion of the meetings on the draft SLEP 2009, and without a formal response from the Land Council to date, it is recommended that the exhibited zoning of SP2 Infrastructure (Airfield Purposes) be retained over the land for the time being. The Nowra LALC is able to make submission on the zoning of this land as part of the re-exhibition of the draft SLEP 2009 should they wish to.
Resourcing Implications – Financial, Assets, Workforce:

To date, considerable staff (workforce) time has been, and will continue to be, prioritised on this project.

Community, Environment (ESD), Economic and Governance Impact:

The recommendations aim to consider and if appropriate address community concern, whilst also recognising and respecting the “ground rules” and the Standard LEP Instrument, on which draft SLEP 2009 has been based. Should the recommendations be supported by Council, then this will reflect good governance, in the context of strategic planning.

The changes to draft SLEP 2009 supported by Council will also be re-exhibited as resolved by Council on 28 February 2012. This will allow further opportunity for the community to comment on these key issues.

CONCLUSION

The rezoning request should not be supported at this stage given the lack of a formal position from the Nowra LALC as the landowner.

3. Further Report - Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan - Moss Vale Road North Urban Release Area File 33363E & 45262E (PDR)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide further detail on 220 Moss Vale Road, Cambewarra in the context of the Moss Vale Road North Urban Release Area, in response to the resolution of 15 May 2012 that:

Council defer the matter of Recommendation 1 (Moss Vale Road North URA) from the meeting of the Special Development Committee held on 12 April 2012 for approximately two weeks.

RECOMMENDED that:

a) Remove the SP2 – School zone and change the subject area to R1 General Residential, after discussions and agreement from DEC & DP&I.

b) Retain the RE1 zone.

c) Reduce the E3 zone setback between Moss Vale Road and the URA boundary from 150 metres to 75 metres, and maintain a 200 metre width from the apex of the north west corner of the site.
COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN

Objective: 2.2  Population and urban settlement growth that is ecologically sustainable, carefully planned and managed to meet the needs of the community.

Strategy: 2.2.1  Develop and implement land use and related strategies for future growth of the City, based on the principles of connectivity, ecological sustainability, flexibility and accessibility.

DELIVERY PROGRAM

Activity: 2.2.1.9  Implement the Planning Works Program to complete planning policy and strategy initiatives.

OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Option 1:

a) Remove the SP2 - School zone and change the subject area to R1, after discussions and agreement from DEC & DP&I.
b) Retain the RE1 zone.
c) Retain the E3 zone setback between the Moss Vale Road and the URA boundary.

Implications:

Option 1 is consistent with the recommendation included in the Special Development Committee report dated 12 April 2012. This option is not supported as it does not effectively respond to the additional information submitted by the landowner, specifically in relation to the width of the E3 zoned buffer on the subject site.

Option 2:

a) Remove the SP2 - School zone and change the subject area to R1 General Residential, after discussions and agreement from DEC & DP&I.
b) Retain the RE1 zone.
c) Reduce the E3 zone setback between Moss Vale Road and the URA boundary from 150 metres to 75 metres, and maintain a 200 metre width from the apex of the north west corner of the site.

Implications:

Option 2 is preferred as it is generally consistent with the recommendation included in the Special Development Committee report dated 12 April 2012, whilst responding in part to the additional landowner submission that relates to the E3 zoning of the land. The additional information sufficiently supports a change to the zone in this location whilst ensuring consistency with the NBSP and SCRS, as required by the Section 117 direction.
REPORT DETAILS

Introduction:

The draft LEP submissions on the Nowra Bomaderry Urban Release Areas (URAs) were the subject of a report to the Special Development Committee on 12 April 2012. The report included a discussion of each URA in relation to the submissions received. In the case of the Moss Vale Road North URA the relevant excerpt from the report (in italics) is included below:

**Issue: Moss Vale Road North URA**

Structure Plan Living Area 1 – The NBSP identifies Moss Vale Road North as being 108 ha in area with a potential development capacity of 1300 dwellings at 12 dwellings/ha. The NBSP detailed a desired future character for this area of principally residential development with conservation areas and open space networks. Housing will consist of a majority of detached houses with a component of medium density housing. This subdivision area is subject to future studies, focussing on bushfire management, agricultural land and flora and fauna studies which could alter the residential capacity.

The boundary of the Moss Vale Road North URA is shown below.

Excerpt from draft SLEP 2009 as exhibited

The following comments were received regarding the Moss Vale Road North URA.
General Submissions

Three general submissions were received from the community/landowners with the following comments:

- **Likes the R1 zoning near Bells Lane as this is not productive farming land.**
- **Supports proposed zoning of Bells Lane, Meroo Meadow.**
- **Objects to the E3 setback of 100m between Moss Vale Road and the URA. Requests that the 100m setback and 250m setback from the apex at the boundary with Abermethys Lane in the North West corner of the property should be reduced to be consistent with the 30m setback identified from Bells Lane to the crossover of the Western Bypass.**
- **Concerned with the location of the SP2 Education Establishment zone and the RE1 Public Recreation zone in the URA. The land use proposed for this section of the subject land is hampered by inadequate access and the location of a large dam on the property which will be incorporated as a major feature on the proposed development of the subject land.**
- **Believes that the proposed SP2 Educational Establishment zone in the Moss Vale Road North URA should be co-located with the SP2 zone on the southern side of Moss Vale Road as it is a better location and will allow a primary and secondary school to be co-located.**

Comment

The setbacks shown in the draft SLEP 2009 via intended zoning are consistent with the NBSP. The proposed setbacks were identified and established for a range of reasons under this strategic process e.g. setting this future development back along this key entry to maintain existing trees and a softer, landscaped entry into the Nowra-Bomaderry urban area. Further, this setback assists with the transitioning from rural to urban land. The reduced setback inside the future bypass is in place as the bypass is considered to form the future urban edge.

The NBSP identified a future local primary school (SP2 Education Establishment zone) and an active recreation area (RE1 Public Recreation zone) so that the future Moss Vale Road North community will have access to some local services without needing to cross the future western bypass and Moss Vale Road. The Department of Education and Communities (DEC) did not specifically comment on this future public school site, however DEC requested that its educational facilities have the same land use zoning as adjoining properties as stipulated in DP&I’s LEP Practice Note PN10-001. PN10-001 specifies that when zoning a new land release area, it is unnecessary to set aside land to be zoned ‘special use’ for a new public school. Public schools are automatically permitted within residential and business zones under the State Environmental Planning Policy 2007 (Infrastructure) (Infrastructure SEPP). If in the future the State Government provides further comment on the location of their future schools, the LEP can be amended accordingly.

It is noted that some government agency submissions related to land to which the NBSP applies, but not expressly the URAs. These issues will be addressed in the “area specific” reports yet to be considered by this Committee.
Option 1:

a) Remove the SP2 zone and change the subject area to R1, after discussions and agreement from DEC and DP&I.
b) Retain the RE1 zone.
c) Retain the E3 zone setback between the Moss Vale Road and the URA boundary.

Implications

Option 1(a) is consistent with the DP&I’s LEP Practice Note PN10-001. Educational establishments are permissible in the R1 zone via the SEPP Infrastructure so the removal of the SP2 zone will not prevent the construction of a school within the URA. However, the removal of the SP2 zone may reduce certainty that a school will be constructed in the URA and does not represent good strategic planning, consistent with NBSP. Option 1(a) is subject to discussions with NSW Department of Education and Communities. In this regard, Council and DP&I staff are pursuing a inter agency group to address urban release area matters including infrastructure.

Option 1(b) is supported as it will ensure the future Moss Vale Road North community will have access to public recreation areas.

Option 1(c) is supported as the E3 zone setback is consistent with NBSP to set the future development back from Moss Vale Road to maintain existing trees and a softer, landscaped entry into the Nowra-Bomaderry urban area.

Option 2:

a) Retain the SP2 zone.
b) Remove the RE1 zone.
c) Reduce the E3 zone setback between the Moss Vale Road and the URA boundary.

Implications

The removal of the RE1 zone and a reduction of the E3 zone setback are inconsistent with NBSP. The E3 zone setback provides a buffer from Moss Vale Road and the URA allowing existing trees to continue to soften the entry into the Nowra-Bomaderry urban area. The RE1 zone ensures the future URA community will have access to public recreation areas.

The retention of the SP2 zone is consistent with NBSP to ensure certainty that a school will be constructed in the URA, which represents good strategic planning, however advice from DP&I and DEC has indicated a preference for existing and future educational establishment sites to be zoned as per the adjoining zone.

Recommendation 1:

a) Remove the SP2 zone and change the subject area to R1, after discussions and agreement from DEC & DP&I.
b) Retain the RE1 zone.
c) Retain the E3 zone setback between the Moss Vale Road and the URA boundary.
Following the Special Development Committee meeting on 12 April 2012, to which the landowners representative Mr Stephen Nall gave a deputation, the landowner of 220 Moss Vale Road and their consultants presented a “Green Star Community” development proposal to staff and some Councillors at a meeting on 27 April 2012. At the conclusion of the presentation the landowner was invited to submit further information for Council’s consideration in relation to draft LEP 2009 and their submission. This additional submission was received by Council staff on 31 May 2012, is included as Attachment ‘A’ and forms the basis for this report.

It is noted that the landowner did make a submission to draft LEP 2009 during the exhibition period and this was included in the report to this Committee on 12 April 2012 (as detailed in the excerpt above).

**Key Issues:**

The additional submission requests the following zone changes to draft LEP 2009 for the subject land with the reasons being outlined in Attachment ‘A’:

1. Change the SP2 (Education) zone to the RE1 zone;
2. Change the RE1 zone to the B1 zone;
3. Change the R1 zone to the B7 zone in the triangular area of the subject site excised by the SP2 (Road) zone (the proposed Western By-pass); and
4. Reduce the E3 zone between Moss Vale Road and the R1 zone to 30m along the entire boundary of the subject site and 200metres from the apex at the north western corner of the site.

The above areas are shown on the landowner’s map which forms part of their submission – see Attachment ‘A’.

**Comment**

Generally, the additional information submitted by the landowner does not provide sufficient strategic justification to deviate from the Council adopted and State endorsed NBSP. The NBSP is further endorsed by the SCRS which is specifically required to be implemented in the LEP via a Section 117 direction. The development proposal presented as part of the landowner submission may have merit but has failed to consider the context of the proposal in relation to overall viability of the NBSP, which forms the fundamental basis for the inter-relationship between URAs, specifically in relation to LEP zones and infrastructure provision. Ideally a submission of this nature should have been provided at the draft Structure Plan stage, so it could have been further evaluated, rather than at a relatively late stage in the LEP process.

A comment on each of the four zone changes requested by the landowner is included below:
1. As the creation of additional recreational areas/ open space is permissible in the recommended R1 General Residential zone, it is not necessary to change the SP2 Infrastructure (School) zone to RE1. Rather the SP2 zone, should it be removed, should go to a R1 zone. Any future development proposal could include ‘recreation areas’ as they are a defined land use that is permissible in the R1 zone and therefore a change in the zone is not required.

2. The creation of additional business zoned land in such close proximity to a proposed business zone requires a thorough economic feasibility analysis that has not been undertaken. The viability of local business zones is an important consideration and in this case the request is inconsistent with the NBSP, that provided a strong background study to support the location of the nearby business zone in the Moss Vale Road South URA. Further, the R1 zone in the URA, that forms the majority of the zoning of the subject land, permits neighbourhood shops and therefore a change in the zone is not required to allow some limited business uses as part of a future development proposal. The proposed RE1 zone is consistent with the NBSP and is centrally located within the URA.

3. The creation of additional business zoned land (B7 Business Park) has not been justified at this point and requires a thorough economic feasibility analysis that has not been undertaken. The viability of local business zones is an important consideration and in this case the request is inconsistent with the NBSP, that provided a strong background study to support the location of the nearby business zone in the Moss Vale Road South URA. The B7 zone has only been used in draft SLEP2009 for the Aviation Technology Park with the Land Use table being tailored to this area. It would not be appropriate to use the B7 zone in this locality. Further, the R1 zone in the URA, that forms the majority of the zoning of the subject land, permits neighbourhood shops and therefore a change in the zone is not required to allow some limited business uses as part of a future development proposal. The intention of the R1 General Residential zone, south of the Western bypass, is to achieve NBSP and SCRS endorsed densities in close proximity to the services and facilities of Nowra/ Bomaderry major regional centre.

4. A reduction in the E3 zone is considered to have merit based upon the landowner details included in the landowner submission, but not the reduction from 150 metres to 30 metres along the Moss Vale Road boundary as requested by the landowner. It is agreed that the north facing land in this location presents itself as appropriate residential zoned land. For this reason, the R1 zone should be maximised but not to the extent of undermining the importance of a treed and visual buffer at this important rural/ urban interface. Further, a reduction is consistent with the NBSP and SCRS and future controls can be included in a future DCP for the URA, as required by Part 6 of draft LEP 2009. It is considered that a 75 metre wide E3 buffer in this location would still provide sufficient width for established trees to be planted and maintain a visual buffer along an important rural/ urban road corridor. The 30 metre width requested however has limited basis, with the exception of it being consistent with an historic subdivision located to the east of the site.
**Resourcing Implications – Financial, Assets, Workforce:**

To date, considerable staff (workforce) time has been, and will continue to be, prioritised on this project.

**Community, Environment (ESD), Economic and Governance Impact:**

The recommendations aim to consider and if appropriate address community concern, whilst also recognising and respecting the “ground rules” and the Standard LEP Instrument, on which draft SLEP 2009 has been based. Should the recommendations be supported by Council, then this will reflect good governance, in the context of strategic planning.

The changes to draft SLEP 2009 supported by Council will also be re-exhibited as resolved by Council on 28 February 2012. This will allow further opportunity for the community to comment on these key issues.

**CONCLUSION**

The resolution of the issues as recommended in this report will ensure a robust environmental planning instrument that is consistent with the NBSP and SCRS.

4. **Further Report - Draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan 2009 - Former Waste Facility, Greenwell Point Road, Greenwell Point**

**PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

To provide further detail on the possible rezoning of land at Greenwell Point, for industrial purposes. Consistent with the resolution of 15 May 2012 that:

“A further report be submitted regarding the possibility of zoning some of the land in the vicinity of the fire station for industrial purposes.”

Note: In this case the land in the vicinity of the fire station has been interpreted to include 7 & 8 Section L DP 4071, Lots 11 & 12 DP 22340 and Lot 2 DP616477 which are currently zoned SP2 or R2 in draft LEP 2009.

**RECOMMENDED** that Council change the zoning of Lot 8 Section L DP 4071 to RU1 Primary Production and Lot 7 Section L DP 4071, Lots 11 & 12 DP 22340, Lot 2 DP 616477 and rear of Lot 1 DP 616477 to IN2 Light Industrial.

**COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Objective:** 2.2 Population and urban settlement growth that is ecologically sustainable, carefully planned and managed to meet the needs of the community.
**Strategy:** 2.2.1  Develop and implement land use and related strategies for future growth of the City, based on the principles of connectivity, ecological sustainability, flexibility and accessibility.

**DELIVERY PROGRAM**

**Activity:** 2.2.1.9  Implement the Planning Works Program to complete planning policy and strategy initiatives.

**OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

**Option 1:**

Retain the zoning of the subject land SP2 and R2 zones as exhibited in draft SLEP 2009.

**Implications:**

It is likely that the SP2 zones in various locations (not just this one) such as schools, fire stations churches etc will be changed by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure to the primary adjoining zone when the new Section 65 certificate is issued consistent with their direction on zoning of infrastructure. Further, not all the SP2 zoned land is proposed to be used for that purpose into the future. However a detailed investigation into an appropriate zone, rather than SP2 has not been undertaken and doing so could delay the LEP process.

**Option 2:**

Change the zoning of Lot 8 & 7 Section L DP 4071 to RU1 Primary Production and Lot 11 & 12 DP 22340 to R2 Low Density Residential, in line with primary adjacent or adjoining zones.

**Implications:**

This is consistent with the request contained in the internal submission from the Property Unit, the Department of Planning and Infrastructure advice and the surrounding zoning (generally) – however a detailed investigation into possible site constraints on the proposed RU1 Primary Production and R2 Low Density Residential zones has not been carried out but could include flooding and land contamination as a minimum. This would also not respond to the Council resolution regarding future industrial land.

**Option 3:**

Change the zoning of Lot 8 Section L DP 4071 to RU1 Primary Production and Lot 7 Section L DP 4071, Lots 11 & 12 DP 22340, Lot 2 DP 616477 and rear of Lot 1 DP 616477 to IN2 Light Industrial.
**Implications:**

This option responds to the resolution of Council and the internal submission from Economic Development Unit, who support the retention of local industrial zones. The Council owned land surrounding the fire station could be given an IN2 Light Industrial zone – this could encompass Lot 7 Section L DP 4071, Lot 11 & 12 DP 22340 and Lot 2 DP 616477. The rear of Lot 1 DP 616477 should also be given an IN2 zone consistent with its existing zone. The largely flood prone land (Lot 8) would be given an RU1 zone.

---

**REPORT DETAILS**

**Introduction:**

# The request to rezone Lots 7 & 8 Section L DP 4071 and Lots 11 & 12 DP 22340 Greenwell Point Road, Greenwell Point was considered by the Special Development Committee on 18 April 2012. The section of the Special Development Committee report relating to this matter is provided as Attachment ‘A’. The item was deferred for a further report to provide investigation into the rezoning of some of the land in the vicinity of the fire station for industrial purposes. This recommendation was ratified at the Ordinary Meeting on 15 May 2012. This report provides the further information that was requested.

**Background:**

The land in question (shown outlined in black on the map below) was exhibited in the draft Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (SLEP) 2009 as SP2 Infrastructure – Waste Facilities. It is currently vacant Council owned land, but was a former waste facility, with access from Lots 7 & 8 Section L DP 4071 Greenwell Point Road to the existing bushfire station. The bushfire station is located on the adjoining Lot 2 DP 616477 – this lot currently has an existing Industrial 4(b) zoning but was exhibited as R2 Low Density residential.
Key Issues:

To respond to the Council resolution in a timely manner a desk top analysis has been undertaken to investigate the potential for the subject land to be rezoned for industrial purposes.

Lot 7 & 8 Section L DP 4071 are subject to the Flood Planning Area overlay map as indicated below. Given that Lot 8 is essentially covered by the overlay map it would appear that the proposed RU1 Primary Production zone would be a more appropriate zone for this land (as requested by the Property Unit). Lot 7 has the potential to be zoned IN2 Light Industrial and provide a future industrial zone for the village.
Lots 11 & 12 DP 22340 front Greenwell Point Road and currently provide access to the Bushfire Station. As indicated by the aerial photograph below the land is vacant and adjoins other non residential uses. Therefore zoning Lot 12 IN2 Light Industrial has merit and will provide an extension to the industrial zoned land and maintain access to Greenwell Point Road. Further the current use of the land will continue to be permissible if the land is zoned IN2. However it is likely that any future use of the subject land would need to consider possible land contamination issues.

**Resourcing Implications – Financial, Assets, Workforce:**

To date, considerable staff (workforce) time has been, and will continue to be, prioritised on this project.

**Community, Environment (ESD), Economic and Governance Impact:**

The recommendations aim to consider and if appropriate address community concern, whilst also recognising and respecting the “ground rules” and the Standard LEP Instrument, on which draft SLEP 2009 has been based. Should the recommendations be supported by Council, then this will reflect good governance, in the context of strategic planning.

The changes to draft SLEP 2009 supported by Council will also be re-exhibited as resolved by Council on 28 February 2012. This will allow further opportunity for the community to comment on these key issues.
CONCLUSION

The report presents a number of options for Council to consider regarding the zoning of the subject land.

Peter Adams
DIRECTOR, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE

R.D. Pigg
GENERAL MANAGER