

## NSW Coastal Policy 1997

### Compliance Checklist for the Preparation of Development Proposals

#### Lot 3 DP 568613 and Lot 384 DP 755952 George Evans Road and Jonsson Road, Mundamia

Strategic Action	Provision		Indicate how the Development Proposal is consistent/inconsistent with the Policy
<b>Protect, rehabilitate and improve the natural environment</b>			
1.1.2	Does the site have areas with land and/or marine and estuarine conservation values? If so, are these to be dedicated?	Yes	Ecological assessment has been undertaken which has identified that area having greatest ecological significance is along the eastern and northern edges of the property. These lands are proposed to be conserved within public reserve system and dedicated to SCC. Refer Section 5.6 of EA and ecological assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting as <b>Annexure 3</b> .
1.1.3	If the land is Crown land (submerged or otherwise), has it been assessed for dedication/reservation under appropriate Acts (eg. MPA, NPWS, NSWFW)?	N/A	
	If foreshore Crown land, will public access be maintained and/or appropriately zoned?	N/A	
1.1.5	If open space land, is it to be classified 'community land' under the Local Government Act?	Yes	The land will be dedicated to SCC for inclusion in its public open space network and given the nature of the land it is likely to be classified 'community land'.
1.1.6	Is a voluntary conservation agreement required to be negotiated?	N/A	
1.1.7	Will seagrass, mangrove, saltmarsh or other wetland associated species be affected by proposal? How will they be conserved/managed?	N/A	The site contains no aquatic habitat or vegetation. Refer ecological assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting as <b>Annexure 3</b> .
1.1.8	Do SEPP 14/SEPP 26 apply to site?	No	
1.1.9	Does the land have recognised conservation values? If so, what zones and/or other provisions are proposed?	Yes	A portion of the site has ecological significance as identified in the assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting, and this is to be conserved to ensure the preservation of vegetation.
1.1.10	Is the land adjacent to a Marine Park? If so, what provisions are included which will give effect to the Marine Park zoning and operational plans?	No	

1.1.11	Does the plan enable the natural habitats of the site to form part of a regional open space corridor (including water areas)? If so, how?	N/A	The area is not the subject of a regional open space corridor however the proposal includes substantial areas of open space which will link with vegetated areas of adjoining sites.
<b>Strategic Action</b>	<b>Provision</b>		<b>Indicate how the Development Proposal is consistent/inconsistent with the Policy</b>
1.2.1	Does the proposal affect the distribution, diversity/condition of native plants and animal habitats?	No	The proposal provides for the conservation of significant ecological habitat identified in ecological assessments that have been undertaken. Refer ecological assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting ( <b>Annexure 3</b> ).
1.2.3	Is the proposal likely to affect fish habitats and/or utilisation by fish populations/communities?	No	Refer Section 5.6 of EA and ecological assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting as <b>Annexure 3</b> .
1.3.7	Is the site included in a catchment management plan?	No	
	Have water quality objectives been established? If so, in what form (ie. instrument/strategy)?	Yes	Water quality objectives have been established by the DECC and these have been addressed in the report prepared by Storm Consulting ( <b>Annexure 7</b> ).
	Is ongoing water monitoring proposed?	No	
	Does the plan incorporate water quality objectives and water monitoring provisions?	N/A	
1.3.8	Has a stormwater management plan been developed and is it incorporated into the plan?	Yes	Storm Consulting ( <b>Annexure 7</b> ) have prepared a Stormwater Management Plan which has been incorporated into the subdivision layout and infrastructure to be provided in the form of bio-filtration systems.
1.3.14	Does the plan create the potential for impacts on groundwater? If so, does the plan incorporate management controls for groundwater?	Yes	The report of Storm Consulting considers potential impacts on ground waters.
1.4.5	Will proposal be subject to coastal hazards? Can conditions be imposed which minimise impacts?	No	The site, although within the coastal zone, is well clear of the actual coastline and is not expected to be subjected to coastal hazards.
1.4.7	Development proposals in or adjacent to estuaries – impacts.	No	The impact on estuaries is addressed in the ecological assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting ( <b>Annexure 3</b> ) and this has concluded that the proposal is unlikely to impact on estuaries due to the stormwater treatment proposed, the separation of the site from estuaries, and the dense vegetation that surrounds the site.

Strategic Action	Provision		Indicate how the Development Proposal is consistent/inconsistent with the Policy
<b>Recognise and accommodate natural processes and climate change</b>			
2.1.1	Does a coastline, estuary or floodplain PoM apply to the land? If so, does the proposal incorporate provisions to give effect to these plans?	No	
2.1.4	If the site is affected by Acid Sulfate Soils, does the plan incorporate objectives for their management in accordance with the ASS Manual?	N/A	Assessment undertaken by Martens Consulting Engineers ( <b>Annexure 4</b> ) has revealed that the site is not expected to contain acid sulfate soils. Further, the site is not identified in acid sulfate soils mapping prepared by SCC.
2.2.2	Does the plan include provisions for sea level change as provided by the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change?	N/A	The developable portions of the subject site at a minimum of RL 46 m AHD are well above anticipated sea level rises that have been modelled (refer Section 5.4.1 of EA).
<b>Protect and enhance the aesthetic qualities of the coastal zone</b>			
3.1.2	Does the plan include provisions to protect areas or items of high aesthetic value? If so, in what way?	N/A	Visual assessment undertaken (refer Section 5.1 of EA) has revealed that the site is not prominent and will not be visible from any waterway. No significant visual impacts are anticipated.
3.2.1	Guidelines – South Coast Design Guidelines/Guidelines for Tourism Development along NSW Coast.	N/A	
3.2.2	Use of good design principles will be encouraged to ensure more compact, human scale.	Yes	The proposal is of good design, considerate of a Masterplan and Principles developed by the Cox Group and adopted by SCC. The subdivision incorporates a centrally sited commercial precinct to and a permeable layout with good pedestrian access to encourage active transport for local trips.
3.2.4	How does the plan address design and locational principles listed below (as detailed in Appendix C Table 3 p83 Coastal Policy):	N/A	The site does not contain a frontal dune.
	• only essential public developments (eg. surf lifesaving club) on beach frontal dunes;		
	• overshadowing of beaches and waterfront open space;	N/A	Development will not overshadow a beach or waterfront open space as the site is not near these features.
	• preservation of undeveloped headlands;	N/A	The site does not contain an undeveloped headland.
	• new development on developed headlands (require environmental assessment including visual impact from adjoining beaches);	N/A	The site does not contain a headland.

Strategic Action	Provision		Indicate how the Development Proposal is consistent/inconsistent with the Policy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no buildings greater than 14 m (unless justified following environmental planning considerations);</li> </ul>	N/A	No buildings are proposed. SCC has controls to discourage development of a height outlined in this clause.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>do building height controls apply to the land? In what form (eg. LEP, endorsed DCP)?</li> </ul>	Yes	SCC has a number of policies and DCPs which regulate the height of development (refer Section 4.6 of EA).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is DUAP concurrence required or does council have assumed concurrence? If so, up to what height?</li> </ul>	N/A	Not applicable as no buildings are proposed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the plan establish a setback line from coastal lakes, estuaries, beaches, foreshores and cliffs? Provide details.</li> </ul>	N/A	The site does not contain any coastal lakes, estuaries, beaches, foreshores or cliffs.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is public access to foreshore to be maintained or provided? If so, how does the plan achieve this?</li> </ul>	N/A	The site does not contain a foreshore.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have provisions been made for dedication or an agreement entered into, to ensure use and maintenance of the public access area?</li> </ul>	Yes	The proposal incorporates the preservation of ecologically sensitive lands identified in ecological studies undertaken on behalf of SCC and our clients.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourist or recreational developments adjacent to or within a National Park, Nature Reserve or State Recreation Area.</li> </ul>	N/A	Tourist or recreational development is proposed.
3.3.1	Has a regional and/or local housing strategy been developed to encourage compact towns? If so, does the plan comply?	Yes	The site is identified in the Nowra Bomaderry Structure Plan and the South Coast Regional Strategy as an area for urban development. (Refer Section 3.4.3 of EA).
<b>Protect and conserve cultural heritage</b>			
4.1.2	How does the plan conserve or protect known regional/local items or areas of coastal heritage?	N/A	A heritage assessment has been undertaken which revealed that the site and surrounds does not contain any items of environmental heritage (refer Section 5.5 of EA and <b>Annexure 8</b> ).
4.1.4	Does the plan protect any significant views or vistas within or from towns?	Yes	Visual assessment reveals that the site does not contain any significant views or vistas to or from any towns (refer Section 5.1 EA).

Strategic Action	Provision		Indicate how the Development Proposal is consistent/inconsistent with the Policy
<b>Promote ecologically sustainable development and use of resources</b>			
5.1.2	Does a regional industry, economic development and/or tourism strategy apply to the area? Does the plan comply?	No	
5.1.3	Is the land identified as Class I, II or III (Prime Crop and Pasture Land) in NSW Agriculture's Land Classification Scheme? If so, how does the plan protect this resource?	No	
5.1.7	Does the plan affect or facilitate the identification or development of areas for aquaculture?	N/A	
5.1.8	Does the proposal conflict with mineral exploration, mining or extraction? How does the plan ensure ecologically sustainable development of the resource and protect environmentally significant sites?	Yes	The proposal is based on a Masterplan adopted by SCC which promotes a sustainable layout based around a centrally located commercial precinct with roads able to accommodate a public transport route and a walkable neighbourhood to reduce car dependency and active transport for local trips.
5.2.3	Are there plans of management that apply to the site? How does the plan integrate these to ensure responsible and ecologically sustainable development and use of resources?	No	
5.2.11	Does a regional and/or local tourism plan apply to the area? If so, how does the development proposal complement this plan?	No	
<b>Provide ecologically sustainable human settlement</b>			
6.1.1	Is the plan consistent with a regional settlement strategy prepared by DUAP and consistent with the Coastal Policy?	Yes	The proposal is consistent with the SCRS (refer Section 3.4.3 of EA) and the Coastal Policy (Section 4.2.4).
6.1.2	Is the plan consistent with an urban land release/settlement strategy endorsed by DUAP and consistent with the Coastal Policy?	Yes	The proposal is consistent with the NBSP and the anticipated release area map.
6.1.4	Does the plan create canal estate developments as these types of developments are prohibited?	No	

Strategic Action	Provision		Indicate how the Development Proposal is consistent/inconsistent with the Policy
6.2.1	If the plan is for urban development then the plan should not promote ribbon, unrelated cluster developments and continuous urban areas. Does the plan therefore define urban boundaries and indicate the amount and form of development?	Yes	The proposal results in the creation of an urban area which is properly edged to appropriately define the urban boundary, and will enable its integration with adjoining lands also identified for further urban development in the NBSP.
	Does it take into consideration environmental and servicing implications?	Yes	Plan is considerate of the environmental constraints identified in separate consultants' reports. Refer separate infrastructure report prepared by Allen Price and Associates ( <b>Annexure 9</b> ).
6.2.2	The design of towns and buildings should have regard to energy efficient principles (ie. compact town form related to transport networks, in order to reduce energy dependency).	Yes	The proposal results in a layout having suitable orientation to enable maximum exposure to good solar access.
6.3.1	Is the plan consistent with a rural residential release strategy, endorsed by DUAP and consistent with the Coastal Policy, which preserves scenic, conservation, agricultural, significant mineral or extractive resources?	N/A	
6.4.1	Does the plan provide greater choice in housing?	Yes	Proposal results in the creation of a New Living Area consistent with Council's NBSP and Masterplanning Principles which will have a distinctive character which distinguishes it from other urban areas in the Shoalhaven.
6.4.2	Is the area close to an existing town centre?	Yes	Site is in close proximity to the Nowra township which is the largest centre serving the Shoalhaven and is the location of a range of medical, educational, commercial and recreational facilities and industrial employment opportunities.
	Does the plan provide for higher density residential development?	No	The plan does not specifically provide for higher density living however such could be provided dependent on market demand. Refer Section 3.4 of EA.
	Does the plan require additional infrastructure? What type?	Yes	Development will require the extension and augmentation of relevant infrastructure however this is anticipated by the relevant supply authorities. Refer separate infrastructure report ( <b>Annexure 9</b> ) and Section 5.2 of EA.

Strategic Action	Provision		Indicate how the Development Proposal is consistent/inconsistent with the Policy
<b>Provide for appropriate public access and use</b>			
7.2.3	Coastal safety assessment – considered in relation to any new coastal development.	N/A	Site is well removed from the actual coastline and is not subject to coastal hazards. Site is not affected by wave or wind action, coastal erosion, or sea level rise.
7.2.4	If the plan provides for tourism development, what provisions have been included in the plan to ensure public access to the foreshore?	N/A	No tourism development is proposed.