

## Attachment 5 - Individual Submissions and Responses

No.	Issue	Response
1	Concerned at the removal of very important environmental protections from our rural landscape.	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
	Concerned with the proposal to allow grazing in E2 zones.	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.</p> <p>As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li><li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li></ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013.</p> <p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p>
	Concerned that E3 areas are proposed to be replaced by RU1 or RU4 zoning with open land use tables, as well as smaller lot sizes.	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential.</p>
	Concerned at the proposed removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlay and associated clause from ELEP 2012.	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
	Why is Council ignoring expert advice?	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
	I want Council to withdraw this proposal and review it with expert State agencies and a genuinely representative community advisory panel, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>

<p>2 Request existing dwelling entitlement be included on Dwelling Entitlement Map. Oppose proposed 500ha minimum lot size if it would affect dwelling entitlement.</p> <p>Support removal of sunset clause for dwelling entitlements.</p>	<p>The subject property has a dwelling entitlement and this entitlement will be retained as a result of the proposed removal of the sunset clause from ELEP 2012. However, the planning proposal will be amended to remove the Dwelling Entitlement Map from ELEP 2012 as it is no longer required. The proposed minimum lot size will not affect the existing dwelling entitlement for the subject lot.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>3 Object to allowing "extensive agriculture" without consent in E2 zones, which are predominantly coastal wetlands.</p> <p>Concerned at the weakening of environmental protections for land currently zoned Environmental to RU1. In addition, the weakening of protections for the offset area negotiated as part of the Broulee biodiversity certification agreement is short-sighted.</p> <p>The proposal is inconsistent with Ministerial Direction 2.1.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not propose to allow extensive agriculture without consent in E2 zones. The proposal is to allow grazing without consent in E2 zones, however this would not apply to areas defined as environmentally sensitive, such as coastal wetlands.</p> <p>The vast majority of land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or Rural 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. The RU1 zone under ELEP 2012 is the equivalent zone to the current zoning. All of the offset areas associated with the Broulee Biocertification Agreement are currently or are proposed to be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. There is no weakening of protections for these areas.</p> <p>The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.</p>
<p>The draft Strategy needs to be withdrawn and re-written to strike a better balance between agriculture, development and protection of the environment.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was adopted by Council in February 2016 following four years of consideration of the issues and significant community input. Council is of the view that the Strategy strikes the right balance. The planning proposal that was placed on public exhibition is not a review of the Strategy, but is to implement the recommendations of the Strategy.</p>
<p>4 Eurobodalla's values will be severely impacted by the rezoning proposals that will permit the clearing of much forested land in private ownership.</p> <p>Area 1 - RU1 zoning is ridiculous. This land is heavily forested and steep and is not suitable for clearing for agriculture or for subdivision into 200ha lots.</p> <p>Area 1a (north) - RU1 zoning is totally inappropriate as the land is heavily forested and steep, apart from the flat areas along the creek that were cleared in the 19th century.</p>	<p>The planning proposal involves zoning land from a rural zone under RLEP 1987 to a rural zone under ELEP 2012. There will be no change to the existing clearing of vegetation legislation that governs rural land.</p> <p>The subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) under RLEP 2012, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture. The proposed minimum lot size of 200ha does not facilitate subdivision, as all of the lots in this area are less than 200ha in size.</p> <p>The subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) under RLEP 2012, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture.</p>
<p>Area 4 (north and south) - The proposed RU1 zoning all along the banks of the upper Clyde offers no buffer zones along the river to protect water quality from the effects of clearing, erosion and fertiliser run-off. The proposed E2 areas along the middle reaches of the Clyde River do not cover large stretches of the river and offer inadequate protection for the riverbank. There are also no environmental protections for the banks of the large tributary creeks such as Nelligen Creek.</p> <p>Area 4c - Opposed to zoning large areas of land west of Murramarang National Park as RU1.</p>	<p>The majority of land in this area along the banks of the Clyde River is already zoned RU1. The remaining areas are zoned Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture. The areas of E2 along parts of the Clyde River are existing, not proposed, zoning.</p> <p>Clause 6.7 of ELEP 2012 provides for water quality matters to be considered in the assessment of any development application within certain buffer distances from watercourses. No change is proposed to this clause.</p> <p>The majority of the subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) under RLEP 2012, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture. An area of wetland within this area is already zoned E2.</p>
<p>5 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>6 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>7 The proposal will affect tourism as it undermines biodiversity.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not change existing environmental protections which are predominantly included in NSW Government legislation. The planning proposal facilitates modest additional development, including rural tourism, and will not change the character of the Shire or negatively affect the tourism industry.</p>

Small lot sizes will result in extensive clearing.	The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential.
Grazing within coastal wetland should not be allowed.	The planning proposal does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.
Bush fire areas should not be developed, especially with small lots.	Almost the whole of Eurobodalla is bush fire prone. Any proposals for subdivision or development in bush fire prone areas must be assessed against the requirements of Planning for Bushfire Protection 2016.
There is scant mention of State Forests in the planning proposal.	State Forests are already zoned RU3 and no changes to the zoning of State Forests is proposed. Management of State Forests is not governed by ELEP 2012.
	Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.
Not enough is said about climate change.	
Mining should not be allowed in our rural drinking water catchments.	State Environmental Planning Policy (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007 governs the permissibility of mining in NSW.
Chemical usage as well as fertilisers should not be allowed within drinking water catchments or around coastal wetlands near the marine park. The document is not user friendly. The size and complexity kept people away.	The management of agricultural activities is not governed by ELEP 2012. A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding.
8 Concerned that Council is ignoring the advice of State agencies.	The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
Concerned at the impact of the planning proposal in regards to the thousands of hectares identified as High Conservation Value and the resultant loss of environmental protection.	Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> .
Allowing small lot sizes in subdivisions will allow incidental clearing for fences and access, etc, endangering native wildlife.	The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.
The planning proposal will jeopardise our claim to the 'Nature Coast' title and impact on our tourism and recreation industries.	The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
9 I am very much in support of the new amendments to the LEP 2012.	The planning proposal does not change existing environmental protections which are predominantly included in NSW Government legislation. The planning proposal facilitates modest additional development, including rural tourism, and will not change the character of the Shire or negatively affect the tourism and recreation industry.
10 Oppose lot averaging in RU4 and E4.	Noted
Oppose maximum height of buildings at 8.5m, as farm structures can be higher.	Lot averaging currently applies to the E4 zone. The planning proposal seeks to add the RU4 zone to the existing clause. This provision allows for subdivision in a manner that achieves improved environmental outcomes.
Oppose split zoning of RU4 and E4 on property.	The 8.5m maximum height of buildings standard already applies to the subject land. The planning proposal does not change the existing standard.
	The split RU4 and E4 zoning already applies to the subject land. The planning proposal does not change the existing zoning.

	Oppose the airspace operations clause affecting property as planes are extremely high and would not have any impact.	The airspace operations clause is proposed to ensure development does not impact on the flight path. The planning proposal is consistent with the recommendations of the Council's adopted Rural Lands Strategy. There were significant opportunities for community involvement in the process of developing the Rural Lands Strategy over the last six years, including the public exhibition of a Rural Lands Issues Paper, a Policy Directions Paper and a draft Rural Lands Strategy. All of these opportunities were heavily publicised and drew many submissions from the community.
11	Concerned about the process of developing the planning proposal. I recall going to a meeting 6 years ago, and since that time there has been minimal information about the planning process in the public domain.	The development of the Rural Lands Strategy considered all relevant social, economic and environmental issues relating to rural land in Eurobodalla. All members of the community had opportunities to contribute to the development of the Strategy. Council considered all issues raised in many submissions before adopting the Strategy. The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council. In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
	Concerned that the development of the proposal utilised significant input from the rural community but did not consider the broader context of community interest.	
	The current proposal should be reviewed by a widely representative community panel including experts in sustainability, environment, catchment management, aesthetics and the regional economy.	
12	Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.	
13	Although I support the RLS, I don't think it goes far enough as it keeps the balance too far on the environmental protection side.	The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
14	Commend the overall proposal, however request proposed minimum lot size be reduced from 5ha to 2ha, either totally or at least for half of property.	The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional subdivision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal. The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.
15	We consider that the proposal should be withdrawn, reviewed with a broader cross section of expert advice and community input and redrafted so that it takes a better account of environmental values. Consultation associated with this proposal has privileged large landholders. Everyone who lives in Eurobodalla has an interest in the health of the forests, waterways, wildlife and landscapes that make up the environment.	
	Concerned at the removal of the E3 zone over some 38,000ha of rural land and its zoning as RU1 or RU4.	The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987): - Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone) - Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone) In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

<p>Disagree with the proposed open land use tables as this widens possible uses unacceptably.</p> <p>Disagree with the proposal to remove the minimum lot size of 1000ha and to allow significant subdivision.</p> <p>Particularly concerned about the zoning of areas 24, 25 and 25a to RU1 instead of E3.</p>	<p>The proposed use of open land use tables is not considered to represent 'anything goes'. The purpose of the open land use tables is to provide greater flexibility to land owners to change land uses without the need for an amendment to the LEP. Certain land uses will remain prohibited in the RU1 and RU4 zones and any additional permitted land uses cannot be undertaken without development consent. Before Council can grant development consent, assessment of the proposal against the relevant provisions of NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies needs to be undertaken.</p> <p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential.</p> <p>These areas are already partly zoned RU1 and partly Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture.</p> <p>Much of the land around the Tuross Lakes has been used for agricultural purposes for centuries as this is some of the most productive rural land in Eurobodalla. The wetlands around Tuross Lakes are defined as environmentally sensitive areas and grazing is not proposed to be permitted as exempt development in, and within 100m of, these coastal wetlands.</p>
<p>Allowing grazing around the shores of Tuross Lakes waterways would be a retrograde step.</p> <p>The idea seems to be that any development is good development. It ignores the fact that development can have economic costs borne by others. For example actions that harm water quality will affect the oyster industry and recreational fishing.</p>	<p>The planning proposal aims to facilitate some additional development, however all new development requires the consent of Council and the impacts of development are considered in the assessment of development applications.</p>
<p>Council has ignored the advice of expert bodies like OEH, RFS and LLS. In expanding permissible uses, Council lists development along waterways that are part of the Batemans Marine Park without any acknowledgement that the Marine Park exists. Clearly the only authority that should be making relevant decisions is the Marine Park, not Council.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p> <p>Requiring development consent for marine infrastructure does not remove the requirement for the relevant NSW Government agency to give their approval to any structure or development in the Batemans Marine Park.</p>
<p>No awareness of the impact of climate change, failure to take account of the impact on the shire's water supply, removal of the terrestrial biodiversity map are also of concern.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p> <p>Potential impacts on the shire's water supply are appropriately considered at the development application stage.</p> <p>The relocation of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map from the LEP to a Code and referenced in Development Control Plans does not change the process of assessment the environmental impacts of development proposals.</p>

The removal of the E3 zone will see more land clearing for (particularly) grazing, which will undoubtedly impact unfavourably on our local wildlife and natural habitats.

Council has ignored the expert advice of various agencies and qualified individuals. It is disappointing that the majority of our Council members seem to disregard the importance of our Shire's biodiversity.

16 Information provided to the community as part of this process was both cumbersome, poorly constructed and too extensive in size to comprehend and assess. The proposal contradicts itself on numerous occasions, for example it discusses the value and limited extent of agricultural land whilst justifying developments into smaller lots.

The replacement of RU1 zoning with RU4 along with a reduction in the lot size will break up extensive tracts of productive agricultural land into unviable size portions for the purpose of agriculture. It also increases the potential of weed and feral animal management.

The replacement of RU1 zoning with RU4 will also lead to reduction in native vegetation and fragmentation of habitat for many species, including threatened fauna. Increased clearing also has an impact on tourism, commercial fishing and oyster farming.

Of great concern is the changes that will allow grazing in E2 zones including wetlands.

There is no understandable justification for the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity map and replacement with a vegetation overlay. This does not identify EEC, TEC or wildlife corridors. How will these be assessed from the impacts of development?

17 Opposed to the changes as they will remove necessary environmental protections for the Eurobodalla region and will facilitate activities such as land clearing, chemical use, fencing and sewage discharges that will harm local wildlife and their habitat.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding.

The planning proposal facilitates a small number of additional lots. In the most productive agricultural lands, the proposed minimum lot size does not facilitate subdivision of small lots.

There are only a small number of areas where RU1 is proposed to be changed to RU4. These are not in the most productive agricultural lands. The use of the RU4 zoning provides some additional dwelling entitlements which will improve the active management of land to minimise weed and feral animal issues.

There are only a small number of areas where RU1 is proposed to be changed to RU4. These are not in the most productive agricultural lands. The planning proposal facilitates a small number of additional dwellings and lots that will not result in extensive clearing of vegetation. Any proposed development that involves clearing of land will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

	<p>The region has far more to gain from maintaining its unique natural environment than from encouraging economic development in the form of increased dwellings and agricultural activities. If our unique natural environments is protected everyone gains from a greater quality of life and the region can remain a vibrant tourism destination.</p>
<p>18 Concerned about the impact of forest and agricultural land tourism, recreation, and the Shire's biodiversity.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of land. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of land. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>Concerned about environmental impact of an increase of land used for grazing. Increased clearing and grazing will do nothing to mitigate the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p>
<p>19 The Strategy is based on over 4 years of extensive community consultation. Council has presented well researched and evidence-based proposals. The original proposed template created immense obstacles to any development on land with any vegetation on it. The NSW Government already has legislation and regulations in place to protect biodiversity. The multiple layering of constraints have been a major source of concern for the sustainable management of rural lands. Support the reduction in lot sizes, retention of dwelling entitlements and provision for boundary adjustments.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The planning proposal does not facilitate any land owner clear-felling their land. Land owners must continue to comply with relevant NSW Government environmental legislation, including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> and the <i>Local Land Services Act 2013</i>.</p>
<p>20 Totally against the plan that will allow any land owner to clear-fell their land.</p> <p>Concerned about the impacts on climate change from clearing of forests.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact on wildfire from mosaic clearing of forests.</p>	<p>The vast majority of land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not facilitate an increase in grazing.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of land. Any development facilitated by the planning proposal must consider the impacts of bush fire through an assessment in accordance with Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2016.</p>
<p>Concerned about climate change impacts of clearing for grazing.</p>	<p>The vast majority of land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not facilitate an increase in grazing.</p>
<p>Concerned about the impact on biodiversity. If Council does not regulate and curb the excesses of landowners, who will? Who will foster and protect the environment? With the proposed 'open slather' rules, it is more likely that landowners will destroy the environmental values on their own land.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>

<p>Concerned about additional land uses for R5 and E4, 'open land use' for RU1 and RU4, grazing in E2.</p>	<p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>Concerned at removal of Terrestrial Biodiversity overlay and clause 6.6. How will anyone know where these important items are if they are removed from Council's planning instrument?</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
<p>Concerned at rezoning of High Conservation Value areas, with 90% proposed to be rezoned to primary production.</p>	<p>The vast majority of land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased risks to water catchments, oyster farming or lakes in Eurobodalla. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on the water catchments, aquaculture and lakes will be assessed.</p>
<p>Concerned at impact of the quality of our water supply.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of land. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>Concerned at impact on employment in the tourism industry.</p>	<p>The proposed increase in minimum lot size is to facilitate development at an appropriate scale to minimise impacts on water quality of Wagonga Inlet. No change to the planning proposal is recommended. The lot averaging clause could also be used to provide smaller lots in suitable locations, without increasing the potential lot yield.</p>
<p>21 Object to increase in minimum lot size from 1500m<sup>2</sup> to 2500m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>The planning proposal was notified and exhibited by Council in excess of the minimum requirements outlined in the Gateway Determination issued by the Minister for Planning. All land owners directly affected were notified in writing. All State agencies identified in the Gateway Determination were notified in writing. A media release was issued. Two public notices were placed in local papers. State agencies were all informed in writing of the extension of the public exhibition period, as was the community through a media release. This follows extensive community engagement over four years on the Rural Lands Strategy, which the planning proposal is seeking to implement.</p>
<p>22 We are dismayed at the inadequate consultation process of presenting and communicating these changes to the community.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal. Similarly, the planning proposal acknowledges where it is inconsistent with S117 Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for those inconsistencies.</p>
<p>We are perturbed that the expert advice from State Agencies has been ignored. We note that many changes are inconsistent with the advice and Directions from the Minister for Planning.</p>	<p>It is important to note that, despite the concerns raised by some NSW Government Agencies and the identified inconsistencies with the Ministerial Directions, the Minister for Planning issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.</p>
<p>We are deeply disturbed by the depth and width of the proposed changes, their environmental and economic impact and their deleterious effect on the Shire's Heritage.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>

<p>Concerned about damage to important natural assets like waterways as a result of the clearance of shorelines, the removal of 1A1 catchment protection zone of the Deua River and the re-zoning of lakes, rivers and creeks to an RU4 status.</p> <p>Concerned about negative impacts of significant Aboriginal Heritage Areas. Under the proposed changes, Aboriginal Heritage at Najanuka would be threatened with a green light given to clearing its steep and heavily forested lands.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not facilitate clearing of shorelines (clearing of riparian areas is regulated by the NSW Water Management Act 2000). The zoning applied to land must be consistent with the NSW Government's LEP Template which does not include a zone directly equivalent to the Rural 1(a1) zone in RLEP 1987. No lakes or rivers are proposed to be zoned RU4. It is not uncommon for smaller creeks to have the same zone as the adjoining land.</p> <p>The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.</p>
<p>Concerned at damage to a vital tourist industry, marketed as part of "The Nature Coast".</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased risks to water catchments, oyster farming or lakes in Eurobodalla. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on the water catchments, aquaculture and lakes will be assessed.</p>
<p>Concerned at the jeopardy to a healthy and economically vibrant local Oyster industry.</p>	<p>The proposal to reduce minimum lot sizes does not allow significant subdivision, as the proposed minimum lot sizes to be applied are generally consistent with the existing size of lots in each area. Across the Eurobodalla Shire, a total of 122 additional lots are facilitated by the planning proposal. In land proposed to be zoned RU1 Primary Production, the additional number of lots that would be allowed is 60, representing a 2% increase in the total number of rural lots. This is not considered to represent significant subdivision in rural areas and will not result in significant clearing of land.</p>
<p>Concerned at the ecological impacts of rezoning on biodiversity. The reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and inevitably reduce habitat for native species.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>23 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>24 We consider that the public has not been adequately informed of the need to change the boundaries of the various lots comprising Kyla Park. Area 22b - Kyla Park - the previously proposed E3 was considered as adequate for the protection of the special historical features and landscape of Kyla Park. The RU1 zone does not seem consistent or appropriate as the lands are not areas of primary production, but are places where colonial and Aboriginal history have to be carefully protected and managed for future generations. The proposed 'open land use' for the RU1 zones is totally unsuitable to and inconsistent with the conservation of the historical landscape.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not change the boundaries of the subject lots.</p> <p>The Kyla Park Grazing Lands are currently zoned part Rural 1(a) and part Rural 1(c) under the Rural LEP 1987. The Rural 1(c) zone permits subdivision of the land to 2ha lots. The proposal is to zone the main area of grazing lands to RU1 Primary Production with a minimum lot size of 100ha and the smaller areas to RU1 with a minimum lot size of 20ha, except for a small area to RE1 Public Recreation. The proposed open land use table for the RU1 zone does not mean that the land will be proposed for alternative uses as any development of the land must be consistent with existing plans of management for the land. It is also proposed to transfer the existing heritage item 'Kyla Park grazing lands' from the RLEP 1987 to ELEP 2012.</p>
<p>25 Object to the prevention of dwelling entitlements in area 28 for lots less than 20ha in size.</p>	<p>The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>Object to some areas achieving subdivision and dwelling outcomes and other areas missing out.</p>	<p>In all planning proposals of this kind, there are properties that benefit and properties that do not. Any further changes that would result in additional subdivision and dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>26 State agencies have objected to parts of the strategy. Council has totally disregarded their expert advice.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>

The biodiversity of the Shire will be compromised and this proposal significantly reduces environmental protections, including for sensitive catchments such as the Deua River, the Clyde and Wagonga Inlets.

Concerned at the removal of important environmental protections, affecting around 90% of the thousands of hectares with high environmental values (called HCV in the LEP) with RU1 zoning and open land use. This will allow uncontrolled land clearing, smaller lot sizes and road building together with many additional land uses.

The plan will result in more fragmentation of the Shire's environmentally important bushlands, a loss of habitat and a greater impact on threatened species and ecosystems, due to the removal of a number of conservation measures from the LEP to protect our forests, rivers, wetlands and water catchments. The exiting LEP ensures the Eurobodalla coast remains a top tourist destination and wonderful place to live.

Large landholders and property developers stand to benefit while the broad community faces the inevitable clearing of forested rural land and the steady degradation of Eurobodalla from the Nature Coast to the Naked Coast.

I am dismayed that Council has dismissed significant objections to the Proposal by State agencies including the Rural Fire Service, the South East Local Land Services, the Department of Heritage and Environment, Department of Primary Industries - Water & Fisheries. Many of Council's changes are inconsistent with both advice from the agencies and Directions from the Minister for Planning.

I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The planning proposal provides for a modest increase in lots and dwellings and will not result in uncontrolled land clearing. Development consent is required for subdivision, dwellings and any additional land uses proposed. All applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The planning proposal provides for a modest increase in lots and dwellings and will not result in uncontrolled land clearing. Development consent is required for subdivision, dwellings and any additional land uses proposed. All applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The planning proposal provides for a modest increase in lots and dwellings and will not result in significant land clearing. The planning proposal also facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. Development consent is required for subdivision, dwellings and any additional land uses proposed. All applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal. Similarly, the planning proposal acknowledges where it is inconsistent with S117 Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for those inconsistencies.

It is important to note that, despite the concerns raised by some NSW Government Agencies and the identified inconsistencies with the Ministerial Directions, the Minister for Planning issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.

28 Request proposed minimum lot size be reduced from 5ha to 2.5ha.

29	<p>The strategy will result in agricultural and forest land being subdivided and cleared. Environmental protections on our waterways would be lost. We need to protect our environment to lessen the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>The planning proposal provides for a modest increase in lots and dwellings and will not result in uncontrolled land clearing. Development consent is required for subdivision, dwellings and any additional land uses proposed. All applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p>
30	<p>Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land that is part of the Gulaga Aboriginal significant landscape.</p> <p>Council should listen to and consider the facts from experts both within and external to Council including the South East Local Land Services and the Office of Environment and Heritage.</p> <p>I would like an amendment to the strategy showing Council's responsibility/commitment to rural road infrastructure in line with promoting our rural economy.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not change existing environmental protections which are predominantly included in NSW Government legislation. The planning proposal facilitates modest additional development, including rural tourism, and will not change the character of the Shire or negatively affect the tourism industry.</p> <p>The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of the Rural Lands Strategy relating to the ELEP 2012. It is not a review of the Strategy.</p>
31	<p>The proposals for subdividing as well as grazing and applying more building lots will impact on our waterways, forest clearing and climate change.</p> <p>Our own Rural Fire Service advises against this.</p> <p>The proposal will put a strain on our water supply.</p>	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. All of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 or RU4 is currently included in a zone that permits grazing. No increase in grazing potential is facilitated by the planning proposal. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>A detailed response to the submission from RFS has been prepared.</p> <p>The planning proposal provides for a modest increase in lots and dwellings that will have no discernible impact on Council's water supply.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
32	<p>Please withdraw this Proposal and review with expert State agencies and a genuine advisory group that will represent a broader community that hold in mind our native conservation experience.</p> <p>Eurobodalla's natural resources must be protected for tourism, for native biodiversity, for our contribution to minimising climate change and for our own health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to biodiversity or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and the tourism industry will be assessed.</p>

	The proposed changes to permitted uses and reduction in minimum lot sizes will have a large negative effect by the reduction and fragmentation of the shire's important bushlands. The land clearing that would inevitably follow the proposed changes would have significant impacts on climate change and native wildlife habitat.	The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
	The proposal to allow grazing in areas zoned as wetlands is positively Trumpeque and must be removed.	While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.
	I implore you to reject the planning proposal and rework it into something that will support the growth of the Shire but not at the cost of our precious bushland.	The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
33	Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.	In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
34	Why are no extra dwellings envisaged for Belowra (proposed 500ha minimum lot size), when 12 are envisage for the Cadgee, Nerrigundah and Tinpot areas (100ha minimum lot size)? Belowra should also have a 100ha minimum lot size.	The Belowra area is predominantly very large rural properties, while the Cadgee, Nerrigundah and Tinpot areas is more fragmented. The minimum lot sizes applied are appropriate to each location consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
	Support RU1 zoning for Belowra area, however there are smaller lots in single ownership that could be zoned RU4.	Noted. Zoning the smaller lots RU4 would generate additional dwelling entitlements in this area. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.
	Support removal of sunset clause for dwelling entitlements.	Noted
	Support proposal to increase permitted land uses, but strongly oppose 'home occupation (sex services)' being permitted with consent in rural zones.	Noted.
	Support the proposal to permit detached dual occupancies in the RU4 zone.	Noted
	Detached dual occupancy, secondary dwellings, camp grounds and home based child care should all be permitted with consent in the RU1 zone.	All of these uses are already permitted with consent in the RU1 zone.
	Support the uses of emergency services facilities and public worship in the RU1 zone with consent.	Noted
	Support removal of biodiversity map from LEP.	Noted
	Support flexibility to allow boundary adjustments.	Noted
	Request that the Watercourses Map for the Belowra area be removed from the LEP as it is incomplete.	The draft watercourses map on exhibition shows only where the existing map in ELEP 2012 will be updated. Notwithstanding, it is true that in more remote areas, not all watercourses are shown on this map. This does not mean that the map should be removed, as the NSW Water Management Act 2000 applies to all defined watercourses, not just those shown on an LEP map.
	All split zones should be removed from the LEP.	By zoning the majority of deferred land to the RU1 or RU4 zones, the existence of split zoning will be significantly removed from the LEP. However, in some locations, a split zoning is appropriate to maintain, such as where the majority of land is zoned RU1 but a wetland on the property is zoned E2.
35	Object to Council seeking to remove important environmental protections.	Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

		The subject land is currently zoned 7(f1) under the Rural LEP 1987, a zone in which certain forms of agriculture are permitted with or without consent. Land clearing is permitted with consent. The proposed RU1 zoning does not change the permissibility of agricultural activities on the subject land. Any land clearing is now regulated under the <i>NSW Local Land Services Act 2013</i> .
	Object to rezoning of land adjacent to Burrawang Coastal Club property. E3 zoning should be reinstated to our block and the adjoining block.	The subject land is proposed to have a minimum lot size that prevents subdivision and no additional dwelling entitlements are facilitated by the planning proposal. The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.
36	I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience. Support the proposed RU4 zoning for our land with a minimum lot size of 10ha.	Noted
	Council and the Rural Lands Steering Committee should be commended for the hard work and dedication they have invested into the Strategy. The Planning Proposal provides Eurobodalla rural businesses and agriculture to expand and grow successfully by providing opportunities for land owners to pursue new activities on their land. The planning proposal provides more opportunities for rural living and is strongly supported.	Noted The planning proposal does not propose any change to the minimum lot size for the subject property. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.
37	Request reduction of minimum lot size to enable two lot subdivision. Support the planning proposal. A great deal of work has gone into it and it shows. The Strategy seems to achieve a good balance between valuing	
38	biodiversity and encouraging growth and jobs.	Noted
	The number of new lots and houses to be created is particularly small which means the rural feel of the Shire will not be adversely affected.	Noted
	Current environmental laws already ensure high value flora and fauna is protected and the Local Land Services regulates clearing on rural land.	Noted
39	Need to protect and add to our forests to provide oxygen for the rest of Australia.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased clearing of forests. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed. In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
40	Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch. Object to no minimum lot size for the Oaks Ranch property.	In relation to minimum lot size, the area the subject of this planning proposal is proposed to have a 40ha minimum lot size.

<p>Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEM 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch. Object to no minimum lot size for the Oaks Ranch property. The planning proposal is deficient in that it fails to disclose the full facts concerning the permitted uses of Oaks Ranch and it does not address the potential conflict between Oaks Ranch and The Estuary Estate.</p> <p>41 The proposed zoning to RU1 with 20ha minimum lot size will greatly benefit our land's potential.</p> <p>42 We would like to see the land zoned appropriately to legitimise a profitable excavation and firewood business on the property.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p> <p>In relation to minimum lot size, the area the subject of this planning proposal is proposed to have a 40ha minimum lot size.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to zone the deferred matter on the Oaks Ranch property to RU1, which is similar to the current Rural 1(a) zoning under the Rural LEP 1987. While the proposal includes additional permitted uses for the RU1 zone, all additional uses will require development consent. Any potential impacts on adjoining properties will be assessed at the development application stage.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>It appears that the existing business on the property could fall within the definition of rural industry or home industry. These uses are permitted with consent in the RU1 zone.</p>
<p>We would also appreciate a possible building entitlement for permanent caretaker's quarters to sustain our business.</p>	<p>The submitter owns two adjoining lots, one with a dwelling, one without. The lot without a dwelling is greater than 20ha and would achieve a dwelling entitlement from the planning proposal. Should the two lots be amalgamated, the land would be large enough to subdivide into three 20ha lots, each with a dwelling entitlement.</p>
<p>We would like the opportunity in one day subdividing a small portion of our land into smaller lots for tourist accommodation. We currently have an approved DA for a yoga hall and would like to change this to a functions hall with an addition for eco cabins and a caretakers residence.</p> <p>The RLEP has had a long extensive period of consultation. This is an excellent outcome finding the right balance between what is needed to give flexibility to the agriculture sector and what is doable under legislation. Well done ESC.</p> <p>43</p>	<p>Tourist accommodation is permitted with consent in the RU1 zone and the planning proposal seeks to make a function centre permissible with consent. Subdivision of the land, following amalgamation of the two lots, would potentially achieve three 20ha lots.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>44 We agree to land more than 200ha being able to subdivide into 100ha lots.</p> <p>We are concerned about small houses being built for tourism accommodation in the Central Tilba area and the impacts of more tourists in the area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Tourist accommodation is permitted with consent in the RU1 zone and the planning proposal seeks to make additional tourist activities permissible with consent. Development consent is required for tourist development and the impacts on the local area will be considered as part of the assessment of development applications.</p>
<p>Concerned about damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and Tourism. The strategy would result in agriculture and forest land being subdivided and cleared. Environmental protections of our waterways and bush would be lost. We understand the RFS, LLS and OEH have all objected to parts of the Strategy. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka.</p> <p>45 Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, affecting thousands of hectares identifies as having high conservation values (90% will be zoned primary production). The proposal will result in more fragmentation of environmentally important bushlands, a loss of habitat and connecting corridors and a greater impact on threatened species.</p> <p>Concerned that the reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed.</p> <p>The planning proposal will not threaten Najanuka. No further subdivision or dwellings are facilitated in this area. The planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.</p> <p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>

Concerned with the additional land uses proposed. While consent is required, environmental reasons are rarely used to decline an application.

The effects of climate change have not been considered.

Water catchments, oyster farming and lakes at risk from subdivision and clearing in water catchment areas, shorelines near oyster farming areas and land adjoining lakes, rivers and creeks.

Council is ignoring expert advice from State agencies.

We urge Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.

46 Environmental management and the protection of biodiversity will rely on DCPs which have less legal force.

More lots and dwellings means more clearing (including for fire protection); more habitat fragmentation and more threatened species. Grazing will be allowed in sensitive E2 zoned land so that all livestock will be free to graze the undergrowth and waterways.

47 The proposals will threaten large areas with land clearing and grazing, causing further habitat loss, disconnection of wildlife corridors and further fragmentation of remaining forested areas. These are contributing factors to biodiversity loss, water catchment degradation, species extinction and climate change.

48 Proposed rezoning permitting both a reduction in lot size and additional land uses threatens our most valuable resource and ignores the expert advice provided by government agencies.

Council must ensure that any future development is regulated to protect our natural environment wherever possible. The current planning proposal does not fulfil that obligation.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased risk to water catchments, oyster farming and lakes. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality will be assessed.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

Development Control Plans can provide guidance for environmental assessment irrespective of the zoning of the land.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.

The planning proposal provides for modest additional subdivision and dwellings in our rural areas. Any development resulting from the planning proposal will require development consent and this will be assessed in accordance with relevant environmental legislation and policies.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

49	<p>The proposal will achieve greater transparency and simplification of planning lands in the Shire. It strikes a good balance between protecting land with environmental and scenic value and the rights of rural landholders to gain some economic benefit from their land.</p>	Noted
	<p>I support the open land use tables. It makes more sense to identify prohibited uses rather than attempt to list all allowable uses. An open land use table would potentially increase economic development by allowing landholders greater flexibility to make land use changes without excessive red tape.</p>	Noted
	<p>I support lot averaging in the RU4 zone as it provide flexibility to subdivide where there are environmental or topographical constraints. The minimum 2ha lot size would ensure the overall rural nature of the landscape is not unduly impacted and these lots are large enough for small scale rural activities.</p>	Noted
	<p>I support removal of the sunset clause and sealed road provision, providing the rights of landholders who meet the current criteria are preserved.</p>	Noted
	<p>I support the zoning and minimum lot size proposals. A relatively small increase in rural subdivision and housing is likely to have very minimal impact, if any, on the rural landscape. It provides a small increase in land supply for people wishing to move to the Shire for lifestyle reasons, particularly small farmlets, generating economic benefit for the area as a whole. Clearly the small number of new lots would not result in over-development.</p>	Noted
	<p>I support removing the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and placement of the Native Vegetation overlay in relevant DCPs. Overall it seems a reasonable compromise between protection of biodiversity on private lands and not overly restricting development options. Rural landholders already have so may laws, rules and regulations to contend with in regard to environmental impacts.</p>	Noted
	<p>It is important landholders be recognised and treated equitable for conserving the natural values on private lands for the wider public good. If landholders choose to lock up land in Conservation Agreements, they should be adequately compensated.</p>	Noted. The NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 provides for conservation agreements and funding to landholders who enter into such agreements.
50	<p>No objection to the planning proposal overall.</p>	Noted
	<p>The LEP increases the extent of the existing wetlands area above the 10m contour. This area of extension is proposed to be zoned RU1. In view of the zoning I request the extension of wetland mapping be removed.</p>	<p>The proposed extension of the wetland area is consistent with the mapping initially prepared for ELEP 2012, however the area of extension was part of the deferred matter and retains a Rural 1(a) zoning under the Rural LEP 1987. For this reason the small extension of the area to be mapped as wetland will be zoned RU1. The wetland mapping does not prohibit development on that part of the land, it simply triggers consideration of impacts on the wetland as part of the assessment of a development application. It is therefore not proposed to amend the wetland mapping at this time.</p>
	<p>We note that the cadastre shows the driveway of our property as being on the neighbouring property, which is incorrect. Please amend the cadastre mapping accordingly.</p>	<p>The existing area of wetland on the subject property is zoned E2 but is not mapped as a Coastal Wetland under the Coastal Management SEPP. Council uses the NSW Land and Property Information (LPI) cadastre and cannot amend this mapping. For the mapping to be amended by LPI, the land owner would need to provide survey information to confirm any inaccuracy in the cadastre.</p>
51	<p>Request existing dwelling entitlement be included on Dwelling Entitlement Map.</p>	<p>The subject property has a dwelling entitlement and this entitlement will be retained as a result of the proposed removal of the sunset clause from ELEP 2012. However, the planning proposal will be amended to remove the Dwelling Entitlement Map from ELEP 2012 as it is no longer required. The proposed minimum lot size will not affect the existing dwelling entitlement for the subject lot.</p>

I was struck by the quality of the planning proposal, the thoroughness, organisation and presentation.

52 Why is Council ignoring the advice of scientists in the field? RFS, LLS and OEH have all challenged the validity of the proposals saying they are inconsistent with the advice and directions of the state planning authority.

The proposal will have a devastating impact on the natural heritage and conservation values of the shire.

I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with the appropriate State authorities along with representatives from the broader community, including several people with a genuine nature conservation background.

Object to the removal of the E3 zone from the LEP which will leave our local natural assets unprotected from clearing and development.

53 I believe that existing stands of native bushland on subdividable properties should be protected past the NSW Government protections. If larger blocks are allowed to subdivide into smaller blocks the vegetation will be severely compromised by clearing to enable the provision of infrastructure.

I do not believe that encouraging subdivision or boundary adjustment in a way that is less harmful to the environment is enough protection. Environmental protections should disable the ability to clear a high percentage of existing bushland. The new NSW Biodiversity laws are weak and there are too many loopholes. I do not believe that the credit system protects anything substantial.

Cattle grazing along waterways should be stopped.

Noted.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that native vegetation will be severely compromised as a result. Not all potential subdivision will require clearing for dwellings or infrastructure. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on native vegetation will be assessed.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 requires proponents of development to undertake comprehensive assessment of environmental impacts and to offset impacts.

Many rural landholders are protecting waterways from the impacts of grazing by fencing off and revegetating riparian areas. Council will continue to work with Local Land Services and landholders to increase the extent of waterways protected from grazing.

<p>54 As a small land owner running sheep and growing vegetables on the Deua River, I do not support the proposed RU1 zoning of the vegetated part of my land. The E3 zone as previously proposed was appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. However, Council has previously resolved not to use the E3 zone in Eurobodalla. The proposed zoning is consistent with the current Rural 1(a) zoning under the Rural LEP 1987.</p>
<p>I do not support the proposed changes to the E2 zone. Objects to proposed RU4 zoning as it does not permit the existing approved use of the site as a Private Caravan and Camping Area. Requests appropriate zoning to ensure the continued operation of the use, such as the RE2 Private Recreation zone.</p>	<p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p> <p>Council approved a Private Caravan and Camping Area in 1976. The use has existing rights and can continue to operate in accordance with the consent. There is therefore no need to apply a zone that makes the use permitted with consent. It is appropriate to zone the subject land the same as surrounding land. No change to the proposed zone is recommended.</p>
<p>56 I support the proposed LEP as directed from the exhaustive Rural Lands Strategy. This strategy is totally evidence based and will provide for continued growth of Eurobodalla's rural sector and allow for a greater diversity of income potential. The increased dwelling entitlements also allow for further production opportunities as well as lifestyle experiences. Biodiversity controls are covered by the LEP mirroring both State and Federal legislation and DCP controls. All relevant Government agencies participated along with community members in the development of the strategy.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy applied a strategic landscape approach to the application of minimum lot sizes, with a modest number of additional lots and dwellings being able to be achieved as a result of this planning proposal. Any development resulting from the planning proposal will require the consent of Council and must comply with relevant</p>
<p>57 My heart drops at the thought of our environments being compromised by mindless and unprotected development.</p>	<p>The Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan 2012 already contains provisions relating to protection of watercourses and important wetlands are zoned E2. No change is proposed to the waterways provisions and the proposal for grazing to be exempt development in the E2 zone does not apply to coastal wetlands defined as environmentally sensitive areas. The planning proposal provides a high level assessment of the potential for development in each area to impact on environmental areas. Detailed assessment of any specific development application will be undertaken as part of the development assessment process, based on the specific details of the proposal, in accordance with the relevant requirements of NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
<p>There is no assurance that landholders would be obliged to steer clear of waterways and wetlands. The planning proposal talks about "likely to be avoidable", "likely to be minor", "would be able to avoid" and "there are opportunities available to", which offer no guarantees. I would like to see very specific requirements written into any planning proposal in terms such as "no landholder shall".</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
<p>I am concerned with the strong voice of business and property holders in the consultation process and the silenced voice of members of the community.</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>58 I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it, paying careful attention to the advice of expert State agencies and setting up an advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including people with wide conservation experience, and expertise in Aboriginal heritage.</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>59 We support the planning proposal to amend ELEM 2012. This RLEP has gone on for over ten years and three different councils. There has and continues to be a lot of misinformation and propaganda circulating from people ignorant of the facts and the extensive process that has transpired.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

60	<p>Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism and recreation industry.</p> <p>If the plan is adopted the result will be more fragmentation of the Shire's environmentally important bushlands, a loss of habitat and connecting corridors and a greater impact on threatened species and ecosystems. Land clearing is one of the biggest contributors to climate change and endangering native wildlife.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not change existing environmental protections which are predominantly included in NSW Government legislation. The planning proposal facilitates modest additional development, including rural tourism, and will not change the character of the Shire or negatively affect the tourism and recreation industry.</p>
61	<p>Objects to the RU1 zoning of his land and seeks a dwelling entitlement, on the basis that the flood modelling and mapping for Moruya is incorrect.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.</p> <p>The current zoning of the land is Rural 1(a). The RU1 zone is the equivalent zone to Rural 1(a). The subject lot does not have a dwelling entitlement. No change to the proposed zoning is recommended.</p>
62	<p>The proposal will allow for the destruction of the nature coast which is the basis of our tourism industry.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not change existing environmental protections which are predominantly included in NSW Government legislation. The planning proposal facilitates modest additional development, including rural tourism, and will not change the character of the Shire or negatively affect the tourism and recreation industry.</p>
	<p>The Strategy should consider the future challenges particularly climate change which will not be addressed by removing environmental protection and opening up land use.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p>
	<p>The additional land uses for RU1 and RU4 are ill conceived, if development would be approved it would significantly change the whole character of the region. New permissible uses such as function centres, information and education facilities and restaurants or cafes, etc would create a lot of additional traffic and require large areas to be cleared to cater for relevant services and bushfire protection measures and contribute to more runoff into our waterways. New land uses being considered on a case by case basis is totally unacceptable and does not provide any protection.</p>	<p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p>
	<p>Our waterways should remain clean to ensure the oyster industry can thrive.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
	<p>The reduction in lot sizes will also increase land clearing and therefore contribute to climate change and endanger native wildlife.</p>	<p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted. Its application will therefore be limited and is unlikely to result in grazing activities in E2 zones where this is not currently undertaken with existing use rights.</p>
	<p>It is not clear why the allowing of grazing of livestock in the E2 zone would not encourage farmers who currently do not have existing use rights to commence such activities.</p>	
	<p>Areas identified as having high conservation values will not be adequately protected.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed. All of the relevant land attributes, includes conservation values will continue to be publicly available to inform existing and prospective land owners about the issues that need to be considered in planning any development proposal.</p>
	<p>It is better to have restrictions up front so expectations are not raised, and before people have spent time and money of development proposals.</p>	

<p>In some areas there are SEPP14 wetlands, where dwellings can be located more than 100m away from wetlands to avoid detrimental impacts. This is not convincing, people might have animals or gardens with run off.</p>	<p>Development in the vicinity of coastal wetlands is managed through the Coastal Management SEPP (that replaced SEPP 14).</p>
<p>I request that Council withdraw the Proposal and that a genuine community advisory panel be established, including people with nature conservation experience and experts from State agencies.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch. Object to no minimum lot size for the Oaks Ranch property.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p> <p>In relation to minimum lot size, the area the subject of this planning proposal is proposed to have a 40ha minimum lot size.</p>
<p>The planning proposal is wrong on so many counts and should not go ahead. I am concerned about maintaining the rich biodiversity we have now.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.</p>
<p>After several years of consultation and planning, no further delay is warranted. This RLEP needs to be passed ASAP. The new RLEP will benefit all Eurobodalla, especially the viability of the rural sector.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The submission period was too short and should be extended or re-opened for at least another month.</p>	<p>The exhibition period was in excess of the Minister's requirements as outlined in the Gateway Determination.</p>
<p>The original constitution of the Advisory Panel was flawed from the outset and therefore the Strategy in no way protects or enhances the interests of the entirety of the Shire.</p>	<p>The development of the Rural Lands Strategy considered all relevant social, economic and environmental issues relating to rural land in Eurobodalla. All members of the community had opportunities to contribute to the development of the Strategy. Council considered all issues raised in many submissions before adopting the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
<p>I was happy to have the bushland on my property zoned E3, and still am. Why does Eurobodalla not recognise the importance of environmental protection as our adjoining Councils do?</p>	<p>Noted. Council does recognise the importance of environmental protection and will continue to assess development applications in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p>
<p>The proposal to allow unconditional grazing in E2 protection areas is Trumpian in its intent. It is anti-scientific, anti-logic and anti-environment.</p>	<p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>The concerns of State agencies appear to have been ignored.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>

67 Please tear up this first draft and start again, this time with a truly representative community panel with space for ecologists, hydrologists and other scientists who have actual expertise in land use matters. Requests an amendment to ELEP 2012 to allow a 3 stage subdivision of his land.

68 I do not support the E4 zoning for the land at George Bass Drive Mossy Point as the entire area (12a) is Bangalay Sand Forest EEC and the area is adjacent to significant coastal wetlands. The entire area should be zoned E2. The Planning Proposal will not achieve the goals of the Rural Land Strategy, because the proposal will lead to the degradation of the Eurobodalla's natural assets, loss and fragmentation of the region's productive agricultural lands and severely restrict Council's capacity to make land use decisions in the future.

69 The large volume of information in the proposal and supporting documents make it very difficult for residents to participate in this consultation process. Council's decision to not protect high value environmental lands with zonings that protect these values is inconsistent with regional and state policy objectives and Ministerial Directions. Using RU1 to 'blanket' zone a range of land types regardless of their value to agriculture or environmental values will not lead to protection of agricultural land and will significantly reduce protections for areas of environmental value. The additional land uses are not compatible with agricultural productions (eg. correctional centres, car parks or places of worship). The loss of high quality agricultural land along the coast through incompatible use and zoning high quality agricultural land as RU4 and subjecting it to further fragmentation and degradation through development pressure are poor land use decision by Council. I do not support the open land use table proposal in RU1 and RU4.

Grazing is not a compatible use of wetlands and riparian lands and should not be exempt development in E2 zones.

Many areas of productive agricultural land will be subject to increased pressure through subdivision and dwelling establishment. Clearing of native vegetation for dwellings, fence lines and roads etc does not require approval.

I do not support the land at George Bass Drive, Mossy Point (area 12a) being partly zoned E4 for 19 new lots and 20 dwellings as the entire area has been ground truthed and validated as Bangalay Sand Forest EEC. The proposal is also not consistent with SEPP (Coastal Management) 2018. The entire area should be zoned E2.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional subdivision or dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.

A large portion of the subject site contains EEC and all of the EEC is proposed to be zoned E2. The area that is not EEC is proposed to be zoned E4. Any future subdivision of the area proposed to be zoned E4 requires development consent and the impacts of the development on the environmental values of the EEC and adjoining wetlands will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and policies including the Coastal Management SEPP.

The planning proposal is implementing the recommendations of the Rural Lands Strategy. Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or agricultural land. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and agricultural land will be assessed.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

The vast majority of the subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987, zones in which agriculture and land clearing are permitted.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The planning proposal provides for modest additional subdivision and dwellings. The most productive agricultural lands are proposed to have a minimum lot size that prevents further subdivision. In any case, clearing for dwellings and associated infrastructure does require development consent from Council.

A large portion of the subject site contains EEC and all of the EEC is proposed to be zoned E2. The area that is not EEC is proposed to be zoned E4. Any future subdivision of the area proposed to be zoned E4 requires development consent and the impacts of the development on the environmental values of the EEC and adjoining wetlands will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and policies including the Coastal Management SEPP.

<p>I do not support removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity overlay from ELEP 2012 or its replacement with a Native Vegetation overlay. It is not clear how EECs will be identified and managed in the assessment of development applications given the Native Vegetation overlay does not include them. I do not support removal of bio-corridors from the overlay.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
<p>70 Object to the additional land uses and open land use table when the E3, Terrestrial Biodiversity Maps and clause 6.6 are to be removed from the LEP. DCPs cannot replace the legal strength of the LEP.</p>	<p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. The E3 zone does not apply, and is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>Object to opening all E2 zone to the grazing of livestock.</p>	
<p>Any additional uses below the high tide mark are beyond Council's responsibility and should not be listed. This will create an expectation of approval when it is not up to Council to decide and should be left to Marine Parks and relevant departments with marine expertise.</p>	<p>The identification of marine infrastructure as requiring development consent in the LEP does not remove the approval requirements of relevant State agencies.</p>
<p>Object to detached dual occupancies being permitted with consent in R5, E4 and almost all rural zones. This will put more people at risk from bushfires.</p>	<p>Almost the whole of Eurobodalla is bush fire prone. Any proposals for subdivision or development in bush fire prone areas must be assessed against the requirements of Planning for Bushfire Protection 2016.</p>
<p>Object to subdivisions in what should have been E3 zones unless the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 are reinstated in the LEP. Object to subdivision into smaller lots in areas that should have been E3, some of which are near important oyster producing waterways.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or waterways. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and waterways will be assessed.</p>
<p>Object to smaller lot subdivision adjoining estuaries, lakes, rivers and major creeks. Land clearing is a major source of pollution to our waterways.</p>	<p>The majority of additional lots that could be created as a result of this planning proposal will still be rural lots larger than 10ha in size. On lots larger than 10ha, any clearing associated with a new dwelling or other activity, if required, can be located a good distance away from waterways. In any case, the impacts of any development of land that adjoins or contains a waterway will be assessed at the development application stage. Land owners with existing dwelling entitlements have an expectation to be able to build a dwelling. Council has resolved through the Rural Lands Strategy to ensure these entitlements are not lost. In relation to the issue of dwelling entitlements and unsealed roads, the submitter has misunderstood the purpose of the clause that is proposed to be removed. The clause does not require all new dwellings to have access to a sealed road. The clause provides additional dwelling entitlements (over and above existing entitlements) where the lot has access to a Council maintained sealed road. The predominant lot size in Area 10 is 10ha. Seven of the lots are currently larger than 20ha in size. The application of a 10ha minimum lot size allows these larger lots to be subdivided to the same size as the majority of the lots in this area.</p>
<p>Object to dwelling entitlements being ongoing. Object to new dwelling entitlements on unsealed roads.</p>	
<p>Object to unnecessary and damaging subdivision at Jeremadra (Area 10) and the forested habitat along Tomakin Road (Area 8b).</p>	<p>A small number of additional lots and dwellings are proposed for Area 8b. With the proposed RU4 zoning and application of the lot averaging clause, these additional lots could be developed in a manner that minimises the extent of any clearing required for future dwellings.</p>

<p>Object to the 19 lots and 20 dwellings at Mossy Point (Area 12a). While I support the E2 zoning of the EEC, there is no way so many lots can be squeezed into the non-EEC section without complete clearing.</p>	<p>The number of lots and dwellings assumes all future lots are at the proposed minimum lot size of 1000m<sup>2</sup>. The reality is that some lots will be larger and with the inclusion of internal roads and services, the final number of future additional lots is likely to be less than 19. The impact of any proposed subdivision of the land will be assessed at the development application stage in accordance with relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p>
<p>Object to the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6. The clause is necessary to give Council legal backing to refuse a development that cannot "avoid, minimise or mitigate" the impacts on these HCV areas.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
<p>The planning proposal and the Rural Lands Strategy should be withdrawn and reviewed by consultation with the whole community, not just landholders with vested interests.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>71 I applaud Council seeking to remove artificially trumped up environmental protections from our rural landscape. The proposal represents a more balanced approach from the draconian and flawed 2012 draft plans.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The proposed rezoning as RU1 and RU4 makes good sense. I agree with the proposed open land use tables. The broader community stands to benefit from modest clearing of forested rural lands and the steady, planned development of the Eurobodalla. I also agree with the proposal to remove the minimum lot size of 1000ha and to allow subdivision.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>72 Concerned with the proposal to allow stock to graze on areas currently zoned E2, and rezoning DM zones to RU1 or RU4. Grazing should not be allowed in E2 and the DM zones adjacent to waterways should be zoned E2. Examples of concern are the E2 and DM zones surrounding Malabar Creek wetlands and the lagoons behind George Bass Drive between Moruya airport and Broulee. Other examples are on Lot 42 DP 588989 and Lot 6 DP 821498 that surround a lagoon on Mogendoura Creek. Also concerned about wetlands near Moruya Heads and Congo.</p>	<p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted. All of the areas identified of concern are coastal wetlands where grazing cannot be exempt development.</p> <p>In relation to the zoning of DM areas, the vast majority of these areas are currently including in a rural zone under the Rural LEP 1987 in which agriculture and clearing are permitted.</p>
<p>73 Object to the proposal because it reduces environmental protection standards and does not include provisions to adequately protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas. The proposal would result in more fragmentation of the Shire's environmentally important areas, a loss of habitat and connecting environmental corridors and a great impact of human activity on threatened species and ecosystems.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>

Object to removal of Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6. Overlays are critical for accurate delineation of environmentally sensitive areas and for consideration early in any planning for a land use. It is important to separately define extant native vegetation, EECs and bio-corridors as they require different actions to protect and conserve environmental value. Clearing of vegetation needs to be monitored and controlled independently of lot size because of the cumulative impact of clearing.

Object to the threat posed by this proposal to already seriously fragmented ecological communities, particularly endangered ones. Concerned by proposals to subdivide and permit dwellings on land close to Burrawang that includes significant areas of Bangalay Sand Forest and Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest (Areas 10a, 11a and 12a). Environmental zoning is essential for all vegetated parts of these areas.

Object to grazing of livestock as exempt development in the E2 zone.

Council must withdraw this proposal and review it in conjunction with State agencies to identify all plots of land with high environmental value and zone them to protect these values and use overlays, such as the existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map, that enable planning and land management that will protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas.

74 The RLS Planning Proposal shows my lot with two zones RU1 and RU4. The correct zone should be RU1 only.

The RLS Heritage map shows an archaeological item exists within an area impinging over the northern boundary of my property. There is no heritage on my land.

I would like it noted that it is far beyond the capacity of landowners to cover and comprehend the mass of documentation exhibited.

I do not recognise any means by which my property rights are reduced or removed. I reject anything which negatively impacts on the right to access minerals on my land. I also do not agree with any changes that negatively impact on RAMA rights. I reject all overlays, whether within or without the LEP.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.

The planning proposal permits a small number of additional lots and dwellings in Areas 10a and 11a. In area 12a, the area that is groundtruthed as EEC is proposed to be zoned E2, while the area identified for additional lots and dwellings is not EEC.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The subject lot is proposed to be zoned RU1 only.

The planning proposal proposes no heritage on the subject property.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

Noted.

75 Concerned that Council is proposing to remove E3 zones from over 38,000ha of rural land and allow widespread subdivision of agricultural land. The changes will lead to widespread habitat fragmentation. Increased runoff and erosion will damage water catchments, lakes and rivers and potentially threaten important tourism and oyster industries.

Many areas proposed for rezoning have high conservation values and many changes go against advice from State agencies.

I ask Council to withdraw the proposal and any changes should be subject to extensive consultation with a representative community panel which includes nature experts and State agencies.

76 Concerned about RU1 zoning of land north of Potato Point Road to the Tuross Lakes that is presently zoned E3. E3 zoning is being completely removed which will significantly reduce environmental protections.

Grazing in E2 zones will destroy more than 40 years of conservation protection and restoration.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

<p>Around 90% of HCV areas will be zoned primary production which will allow land clearing and many additional land uses. The result will be more fragmentation of the Shire's environmentally important bushlands, a loss of habitat and connecting corridors and a greater impact on threatened species and ecosystems.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the area proposed to be zoned RU1 or RU4 are currently included in a rural zone under the Rural LEP 1987, zones in which agriculture and clearing are permitted.</p>
<p>Reductions in lot size will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species. The additional land uses and open land use for RU1 and RU4 will allow application for any sort of development apart from one of the very few prohibited uses.</p>	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>Some of the changes in the proposal have been strongly opposed by State agencies.</p>	<p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>The effects of climate change have not been considered.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p>
<p>Concerned about impacts on our water supply, both quality and supply.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on water supply or water quality. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water supply and water quality will be assessed. The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
<p>I call on Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.</p> <p>77 Support the proposed RU4 zoning for our land.</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>Request proposed minimum lot size be reduced from 5ha to 2ha.</p>	<p>The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional subdivision or dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>Removal of environmental classifications and overlays undermines ability to adequately consider impacts of land development, leading to outcomes such as: siltation and pollution of waterways; introduction of weeds and feral animals; destruction/degradation of flora and fauna habitat; removal of carbon sequestering vegetation; fragmentation of ecological communities; failure to protect wetlands, watercourses and significant bioprecincts with appropriate and adequate buffer zones.</p> <p>78</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>

Proposal will also have social impacts including: reduction of amenity and access to natural lands; increased demand for provision for peripheral services like roads, sewerage, water supply, power, bushfire protection; destruction of natural aesthetics; effect on tourism visitation.

I suggest Council convenes broadbased community panels of residents and experts to review the LEP, advise on any development applications that come before Council and recommend offsets to compensate for development consents that involve land disturbance. The planning proposal should be abandoned in favour of full and proper consultation with all stakeholders before submitting any revision to the Department of Planning and Environment.

Concerned about the RU1 zoning of land between George Bass Drive and Beach Parade, Guerilla Bay. With rezoning, vegetation clearing is now proposed as allowable on these lands. The land should have the previous protections of 7(f1) and a restriction of minimum lot size preventing subdivision.

79

Vegetation clearing in catchments areas increases run-off of sediments and nutrients into waterways, impacting on fisheries and oyster farming.

Concerned if vegetation overlays are removed, causing irreversible damage to our best assets - our unique natural environment.

How can Council reject the significant objections made by some State agencies?

Environmental controls are necessary especially since protective E3 zones are to be removed from over 38,000 ha of rural land, allowing for widespread subdivision and the inevitable vegetation clearing.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any negative social impacts. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water supply and water quality will be assessed. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The subject land is currently zoned 7(f1) under the Rural LEP 1987, a zone in which certain forms of agriculture are permitted with or without consent. Land clearing is permitted with consent. The proposed RU1 zoning does not change the permissibility of agricultural activities on the subject land. Any land clearing is now regulated under the *NSW Local Land Services Act 2013*.

The subject land is proposed to have a minimum lot size that prevents subdivision and no additional dwelling entitlements are facilitated by the planning proposal.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

There is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The reduction in lot sizes permits a very modest number of additional lots to be created. A total of 122 lots across the Shire is facilitated by the planning proposal. Clearing of vegetation would not be required for every proposed subdivision or dwelling facilitated by the planning proposal as some properties that benefit already have some cleared areas. Where clearing is proposed in association with a development proposal, Council will assess the impact of the proposal on the environment will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

<p>I am appalled that I have to again object to a proposal that will make large areas of pristine native vegetation in the Broulee area vulnerable to clearing. Areas 10a (particularly the area closest to the coastline) and 11a (particularly the large block immediately behind Bengello Beach) should have environmental zones. Better yet, declare them nature parks.</p>	<p>The subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) under the Rural LEP 1987. The proposed RU1 zoning translates existing zoning to the ELEP 2012. The declaration of any lands as nature reserves is a matter for the State Government and would usually involve the purchase of the land by the State or the voluntary conservation of the land by the land owner.</p>
<p>The proposal to rezone the best part of 38,000 ha of environmental land such that private landholders will be able to clear pristine, endangered old growth forest and convert it to farmland and other uses.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987, zones in which agriculture and land clearing are permitted.</p>
<p>Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>The documentation and plans are too technical and make it difficult to fully understand. Therefore, either the timeframe should be extended or the entire process set aside to allow for simpler and clearer documentation to be drafted.</p>	<p>A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.</p>
<p>With a large percentage of rural land to be zoned RU1 or RU4 and no use of E3, environmental management and biodiversity protection will rely on DCPs which have less legal force.</p>	<p>Development Control Plans can provide guidance for environmental assessment irrespective of the zoning of the land.</p>
<p>More lots and dwellings means more clearing (including for fire protection); more habitat fragmentation and more pressure on threatened species. Grazing will be allowed in sensitive E2 zoned land so that all livestock will be free to graze the undergrowth and waterways.</p>	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>The changes do not seem to be well aligned with strong environmental protection objectives that need to be maintained to minimise the impact of pollution and contamination of land and waterways. Concerned about considerable development in the future in the Maloneys Beach area 4c.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that the proposal conflicts with strong environmental protection objectives. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and water quality will be assessed.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates no additional lots or dwellings in area 4c.</p>
<p>Concerned that Council is ignoring significant advice from a NSW State authority (OEH) in relation to the Terrestrial Biodiversity overlay.</p>	<p>A detailed response to the submissions from OEH has been prepared.</p>
<p>Concerned for the protection of wildlife habitats and animal welfare and hopes that Council will not approve land clearing and forest destruction. The Rural LEP process has been extensive and thorough. This draft is a vast improvement on the previous LEP and subsequent proposals. A building block for the future.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. The proposal will not result in clearing of significant areas. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.</p>
<p>Concerned about impacts on water quality, wildlife habitats, Aboriginal heritage, the biodiversity of the areas, tourism, the oyster industry and increased fire risk.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be significant impacts to water quality, Aboriginal heritage, biodiversity, tourism or the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on these matters will be assessed.</p>
<p>The strategy could result in agricultural and forest land being subdivided and cleared, some of which is the Gulaga Aboriginal significant landscape of Little Gulaga.</p>	<p>The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.</p>

Rezoning proposals will increase land clearing and decrease native wildlife habitats some of which is old growth forests.

The planning proposal provides for modest additional development in rural areas. The proposal does not increase the potential for agricultural activities as the land proposed to be zoned RU1 or RU4 is already included in a zone that permits agriculture. It will not result in significant land clearing.

86 The proposal to remove E3 zone from the LEP will leave few constraints on environmental values in the shire. This will affect 380sq kms that have identified high conservation values. DCPs are a weaker mechanism that will not adequately protect important environmental values.

The plan would allow for subdivision of large blocks of agricultural land into small blocks of 5ha, 10ha and 20ha. This will result in extensive clearing around our pristine wetlands, estuaries and rivers.

The 1987 protections resulted in healthy catchments. If these are removed we will end up with much less vegetation cover, more erosion, salinity, etc. With more hobby farms in the bush there will be more fire risk, as has been raised by the NSW Rural Fire Service.

Removal of current environmental protections will also impact on the shire's carbon footprint. The 38,000ha of E3 land in the LEP 2012 absorbs 109,000 tonnes of carbon per year, equivalent to 30,000 average households energy emissions.

87 I support the Rural Lands Strategy as proposed. It has been consulted to death by all stakeholders.

88 Concerned at how the proposed zoning change to E4 will affect tree management on our lot. If tree management will be more costly and arduous, request rezoning to RU1, or part E4, part RU1.

We would like to ensure that the zoning continues to allow a secondary dwelling or caretakers cottage.

A second parcel we own is proposed to be zoned E2. It should be noted that this is private land.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be significant impacts to water catchments, and the planning proposal will not result in significant clearing. The planning proposal does not increase the permissibility of agricultural activities in rural areas, as the land is already included in a zone that permits agriculture. A detailed response to the submission from the RFS has been prepared.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

Noted

The subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) under the Rural LEP 1987. Vegetation management for rural purposes is currently regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. Where a development is proposed that involves the removal of vegetation, development consent from Council is required. Under the proposed E4 zone, vegetation management is regulated under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 and the Vegetation in Non Rural Areas SEPP. While the regulatory regime will change with the rezoning to E4, this does not necessarily result in more costly or arduous processes as there are exemptions from requiring approval for minor tree management activities.

A secondary dwelling is a permitted use, with consent in the E4 zone. The planning proposal includes detached dual occupancy as a new permitted use, with consent, in the E4 zone. The LEP does not define a caretakers cottage, however either a secondary dwelling or a detached dual occupancy could be used for this purpose.

Noted. The subject land is a small vacant lot that is not suitable for a dwelling due to environmental constraints.

<p>89 The proposals have the potential to threaten significantly large areas within the Shire with land clearing and grazing, causing further habitat loss and connecting wildlife corridors, a major contributor to biodiversity loss, species extinction and climate change.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. The proposal will not result in clearing of significant areas and no additional grazing potential is facilitated. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.</p>
<p>Why is Council ignoring the advice of experts in the field? RFS, LLS and OEH have all challenged the validity of the proposals saying they are inconsistent with the advice and directions of the state planning authority.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with the appropriate State authorities along with representatives from the broader community including several people with a genuine nature conservation background.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
<p>90 Strongly support the planning proposal and Council's efforts to facilitate the use of the Shire's rural lands towards a more diversified and stronger economy.</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>We are happy to see jetties and function centres as additional uses for the RU4 zone.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>We note that helipads are not proposed as allowable on RU4 land. We think this is an oversight that needs to be corrected.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Helipads are proposed to be permitted with consent in the RU4 zone.</p>
<p>91 Disagree with the proposal to rezone 38,000 ha of E3 zoning as RU1 or RU4.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
<p>There are great benefits to be derived from protecting our natural environment and with it the region's biggest industry - tourism. There is scope to promote small-scale food production and rural tourism, as long as these activities do not detract from the region's natural assets.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>

<p>There is some merit in creating smaller rural lots and providing greater flexibility around the types of activities that could be permitted. However, not if the end result detracts from the Shire being a desirable place to live or visit. I therefore oppose the open land use tables. A more suitable remedy would be to streamline the Council's approval processes.</p> <p>I am opposed to prioritising the availability of land for rural residential and bush living. However there should be scope for Council to approve individual proposals that specifically combine rural food production and/or tourism elements.</p> <p>As the owner of land affected by the proposed changes to the LEP 2012, I support this change.</p>	<p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p> <p>The proposal does not prioritise land for rural residential and bush living. The proposal provides for a modest increase in rural subdivisions for small-scale rural activities and facilitates additional rural tourism opportunities.</p>
<p>92</p> <p>Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>93</p> <p>Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>94</p> <p>The time allowed to study the proposal was not great if you consider the possible impacts and changes.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with significant opportunities for community input. It is not a review of the Strategy. The planning proposal has been exhibited in excess of the requirements outlined in the Gateway Determination.</p>
<p>95</p> <p>Almost all services, departments and some consultants to Council have opposed the changes. Of particular concern was the RFS report that highlighted potential catastrophic consequences as the proposed changes would make some areas undefendable in the event of bushfires.</p>	<p>Detailed responses to submissions from State agencies have been prepared.</p> <p>Almost the whole of Eurobodalla is bush fire prone. Any proposals for subdivision or development in bush fire prone areas must be assessed against the requirements of Planning for Bushfire Protection 2016.</p>
<p>Development seems to be the sole consideration, there is less concern about conservation, the detrimental effects on the environment and our unique tourism industry.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and the tourism industry will be assessed.</p>
<p>Concerned about potential development at Mossy Point (Area 12a). The site should be zoned unsuitable for development, as it is subject to inundation, will result in removal of forest vegetation that will cause an increase in the water table and the area has high conservation values. The proposal will also put at risk the Tomakin Spit from increased urbanisation causing increased storm runoff surges.</p>	<p>A large portion of the subject site contains EEC and all of the EEC is proposed to be zoned E2. The area that is not EEC is proposed to be zoned E4. Any future subdivision of the area proposed to be zoned E4 requires development consent and the impacts of the development on the environmental values of the EEC and adjoining wetlands will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and policies including the Coastal Management SEPP.</p>
<p>96</p> <p>The planning proposal addresses the development opportunities, but ignores the impacts of the changes. With the development proposed, the landscapes change and the impact on the natural resources increases.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>97</p> <p>Object to grazing of livestock as exempt development in the E2 zone. The new RU1 and RU4 zones occur in previous E2 zoned areas. The previous rural zones had agricultural and environmental objectives.</p>	<p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p> <p>No land currently or previously zoned E2 is proposed to be rezoned to RU1 or RU4.</p>

The open land use tables will require a significant increase in the number of development approval officers with increased knowledge of the specific impacts of these new land uses on the natural system. Also need an increase in compliance officers, all requiring increased rates to fund these staffing needs.

Object to minimum averaging in RU4 zones. My confidence in impacts being assessed is seriously depleted given how readily ESC dismisses state agencies environmental concerns. The minimum 2ha lot size when using lot averaging would, if a dwelling was erected, result in the loss of almost all vegetation for asset protection zones.

Object to reduced minimum lot sizes and additional dwellings and other development opportunities. Lots 100ha and under seem destined to create the most damage.

The assessment of additional dwellings should be doubled to take into account the potential for dual occupancy dwellings on each lot.

Why goes against the advice of agencies and remove the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map from the LEP if Council intends to simply replicate it in a Code?

Concerned about damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry. The strategy will result in agricultural and forest land being subdivided and cleared and environmental protections on our waterways and bush would be lost. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land. Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.

Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, called High Conservation Values in the LEP. Around 90% of the HCV will be zoned primary production which will allow land clearing and many additional land uses.

Concerned the reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.

Concerned that the additional land uses means almost anything goes. While development needs approval, it isn't often anything is refused, especially for environmental reasons.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. While the planning proposal may result in some additional development applications submitted to Council, it is unlikely to require a significant increase in development assessment and compliance staff.

The application of lot averaging to the RU4 zone will allow smaller lots in suitable areas, providing the overall density of development is not exceeded. This provision allows for subdivision in a manner that achieves improved environmental outcomes.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot sizes that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The vast majority of lots in rural areas are already less than 100ha in size. This has not resulted in widespread destruction of vegetation or major environmental impacts.

The planning proposal acknowledges that detached dual occupancies are currently permitted with consent in the RU1 zone and are proposed to be permissible in the RU4, E4 and R5 zones. Not all properties will have dual occupancies, so it is not possible to estimate the number of these developments that will be proposed in the future.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers. Locating the map in a Code will facilitate simpler amendments to the map as new information becomes available.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed.

The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.

The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation value vegetation. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The reduction in lot sizes permits a very modest number of additional lots to be created. A total of 122 lots across the Shire is facilitated by the planning proposal. Clearing of vegetation would not be required for every proposed subdivision or dwelling facilitated by the planning proposal as some properties that benefit already have some cleared areas. Where clearing is proposed in association with a development proposal, Council will assess the impact of the proposal on the environment will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

<p>Concerned that Council is ignoring expert advice by the consultant and State agencies.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>The effects of climate change have not been considered.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p>
<p>Concerned that water catchments, oyster farming and lakes are at risk from clearing and smaller lots in the upper reaches of the Deua River. High level 1 protection (a1) for water catchments with some agriculture would be removed to allow RU1. Oyster farming in the Clyde River and Wagonga Inlet are threatened by clearing allowed along shorelines. Sensitive areas next to lakes, rivers and creeks will have RU4 zoning, leading to smaller lots, clearing for subdivision and reduced water quality.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.</p>
<p>99 I would like to acknowledge the extensive work of Council staff in updating its documentation. I support the planning proposal which will provide me with a good chance of attaining a dwelling entitlement and be able to work my land as a primary production small lot.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>100 Request the minimum lot size for our land be reduced from 2ha to 1ha.</p>	<p>Noted The planning proposal does not propose any change to the minimum lot size for the subject property. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.</p>
<p>101 Extremely disappointed that Council is looking to remove environmental protections from the beautiful South Coast. Agriculture has commenced recently near our property in Runnyford causing hunting dogs to terrorise wildlife, sheep grazing on our land after crossing E2 land and the appearance of foxes.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. Noted. The issues raised relate to the management of rural land, not the permissibility of agriculture.</p>
<p>102 It is not acceptable to remove all environmental considerations from the LEP and to allow grazing in the E2 zone.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>I applaud the positive response in making more uses possible on RU1 land so that rural land holders could use their land for other means of income.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

In order to plan appropriate development or even property management, knowledge about the existing vegetation is very important.

I support a scheme to financially compensate landholders for protecting vegetation.

It is good that Council wished to educate and encourage landowners in the protection of wetlands however the first step is the prohibition of grazing in the E2 zone.

In the Guerilla Bay area, the old 7(f1) zoning protecting important coastal areas from being cleared should not be changed to RU1. A new zoning category must be instated for these lands. Perhaps E4 with a large minimum lot size.

The relevant vegetation information will continue to be available to land owners, purchasers and the broader community.

The NSW Government has legislated such a scheme through the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The subject land is currently zoned 7(f1) under the Rural LEP 1987, a zone in which certain forms of agriculture are permitted with or without consent. Land clearing is permitted with consent. The proposed RU1 zoning does not change the permissibility of agricultural activities on the subject land. Any land clearing is now regulated under the NSW Local Land Services Act 2013.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal does not facilitate widespread subdivision of rural lands. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The planning proposal facilitates modest additional development in rural areas. All proposed developments require development consent and the planning proposal will not change current development assessment processes.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

103 Concerned with the removal of protective E3 zoning, allowing widespread subdivision of agricultural lands.

Appalled that advice from State agencies has been ignored.

The proposal will endanger planning and development staff at Council, who will be subject to far more entreaties and possible bribery from and by developers seeking advantage.

I ask that the proposal be withdrawn and reviewed with help from the affected State bodies and representative community members.

<p>104 We are outraged and disappointed at the removal of the E3 zone.</p> <p>The south coast is so unique, so pristine. We have wildlife here that needs protection. For rural lands to make way for more housing is not low impact. Rural areas need to remain rural.</p> <p>Our catchments are affected now by clearing, by mining, by subdivisions.</p> <p>We are concerned at the impact on wetlands from allowing grazing.</p> <p>We would like to see Council withdraw the proposal and review it with a view to prioritising the protection of the environment.</p> <p>If amendment number 15 for town signs is only to allow town direction signs to be erected on private property I have no objection. However, if the "tourist facilities or activities" are individual businesses then I do object to the change.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.</p> <p>As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be destruction of biodiversity or negative impacts on water quality. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and water quality will be assessed.</p> <p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>105 Council proposes to have less restriction of vegetation clearing on rural lands leaving it to the landowners to be the arbiter of good science and land husbandry. The majority of State agencies say don't do it. Their concern for soil conservation, water quality and scenic retention is valid. I submit that environmental zoning or overlays are essential to maintain the integrity of the Shire's natural environment.</p> <p>106 we support the inclusion of detached dual occupancy for R5 land.</p> <p>We are disappointed our 2ha lot cannot be further subdivided.</p> <p>We are against E3, environmental overlays and terrestrial overlays in the LEP.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment is to facilitate directional signage to towns, not to individual businesses.</p> <p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The planning proposal does not propose any change to the minimum lot size for the subject property. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

107	<p>Concerned that the rezoning proposals and the reduction in lot sizes will result in increased land clearing, reducing native species habitat and negatively affecting local biodiversity.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.</p>
	<p>It is alarming that much of the expert advice from State agencies has not been heeded.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
108	<p>I am pleased to see that Council has listened to many of the concerns raised by rural land owners and has accordingly proposed numerous changes to the LEP.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>I support removing split zoning from rural land, removing the sunset clause for dwelling entitlement, removing the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and retaining a Native Vegetation Map in the relevant DCPs.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>I note that the aerial photograph used in Volume 3 of the planning proposal is out of date. Council should ensure that any maps used are as recent as possible.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
109	<p>Object to the removal of the E3 zone from the LEP and the protection it provides to land with special environmental attributes.</p>	
	<p>Object to the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlay from the LEP, which highlights and informs land owners of development constraints, streamlines the planning approval process and eliminates inappropriate development expectations.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
	<p>Object to changes to RU1 and RU4 to allow subdivision of rural lands to small lots and other inappropriate uses, such as destructive mining and extractive industry. The changes would require significant removal of native vegetation for commercial purposes and to make way for housing, roads, fences and bushfire protection. This level of clearing will ultimately affect the health and quality of water catchments, lakes and rivers downstream. The RU3 zone allows for long term forestry uses, an inappropriate use of native forests and not sustainable in the longer term.</p>	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. Mining and extractive industry is already permissible in rural areas under State Environmental Planning Policy (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) SEPP 2007. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and water quality will be assessed.</p> <p>No changes to the RU3 zone are contained in the planning proposal.</p>

110	<p>Concerned at the removal of important environmental protections from our rural landscape.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> .</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>
111	<p>Concerned at the climate change implications with 380 square kilometres of rural land proposed to be rezoned to remove E3 protections and give them general agricultural zoning RU1 or RU4. The new zoning would allow land clearing for agriculture resulting in the removal of native forests.</p> <p>Disappointed that the proposal allows smaller lot sizes and greater subdivision of rural land, that will fragment wildlife habitat as forests are cleared for housing, roads, fences and bush fire asset protection zones. The proposal will also threaten our precious waterways, our drinking water catchments as well as the oyster, other fisheries and tourism industries.</p> <p>Why has Council not satisfied the objections made by State agencies?</p> <p>I ask that Council withdraw the proposal and it should be reviewed by a genuinely representative community panel including scientific experts and NSW Government agencies.</p> <p>Concerned that multiple safeguards have been removed opening up vast areas for potential development. This will have enormous implications for tourism and recreation, oyster farming, fishing, grazing and traditional farming.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.</p> <p>As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p> <p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> .</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The planning proposal does not rezone any existing E2 zoned areas.

The ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation values. The HCV mapping is an assessment tool that will continue to be used in the assessment of development applications.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal does not facilitate additional grazing activities as all land proposed to be rezoned to RU1 or RU4 is already included in a rural zone that permits grazing.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The present E3 and E2 zoning is vital for maintenance of ecosystems. Of particular concern are the areas of high environmental values designated as High Conservation Values in the LEP.

We understand that Council has dismissed significant objections to the proposal by State agencies.

I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is truly representatives of the broad community including several people with wide nature conservation experience.

112 The proposal is a threat to habitat and animals by subdividing land, clearing our forests and allowing increased grazing, and I am strongly against it.

It appears that Council has ignored the advice from the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage to retain the Terrestrial Biodiversity Maps in their current form in the LEP. Why?

113 I am alarmed that important environmental protections have been removed and the Council is ignoring the advice of State agencies which have objected to the changes. How can Council ignore the agencies. Many of the areas proposed for rezoning are described by the Office of Environment and Heritage as having High Conservation Values, including EECs and areas with Aboriginal cultural heritage, biodiversity hotspots and threatened species habitat.

<p>I am deeply concerned that the proposed changes will add significantly to carbon emissions. 380 square kilometres of rural land is proposed to be rezoned to remove E3 environmental protections and give them general agricultural zoning RU1 or RU4. The new zoning would allow clearing of native forest for agriculture.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
<p>Local oyster growers are very concerned about the possible impact on their industry due to the reduced protection of waterways.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed. The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>I do not believe that Council has genuinely consulted with the community and have failed to adequately alert the community to the reach of these proposed changes. It should be reviewed by a genuinely representative community panel including scientific experts and NSW Government agencies.</p> <p>We give our approval for the strategy to be implemented as soon as possible.</p> <p>114 Submission made on behalf of three land owners.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>We do not support the removal of clause 6.6 and the associated Terrestrial Biodiversity Maps from the LEP to a Code and DCP. Clause 6.6 should be retained and amended to better reflect the public interest, to ensure net benefits to the environment and only permit development that is essential to meeting the aims of the LEP. The public interest should be accorded priority over all other interests in environmental and biodiversity matters.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
<p>We encourage the inclusion of a formal commitment to ensuring the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environmental values and biodiversity of Eurobodalla's waterways and foreshores in the LEP. Such a commitment should be stated unambiguously in clause 1.2(2) of the LEP.</p>	<p>Clause 1.2(2) of the LEP already contains the aims: "<i>to provide measures to protect and manage the biodiversity and environmental values of the land and waterways</i>" and "<i>to ensure that development takes into account the environmental constraints of the land and minimises any off site and on site impacts on biodiversity, water resources and natural landforms</i>".</p>
<p>Concerned that Council is seeking to remove very important environmental protections. I am upset at the destruction to biodiversity that the proposed changes will bring, including from the removal of E3 environmental protections from 380 square kilometres of land. How can Council reconcile this with its eco-tourism strategy.</p> <p>116</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The proposals to allow smaller lot sizes and greater subdivision of rural land will increase the destruction of biodiversity, reduces the protection of waterways and our water catchment areas.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be destruction of biodiversity or negative impacts on water quality. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and water quality will be assessed.

Why has Council not satisfied the objections made by the Office of Environment and Heritage and other agencies? In particular, OEH supports the Terrestrial Biodiversity Mass as they now stand in the LEP. This biodiversity mapping protects known Aboriginal cultural heritage, biodiversity hotspots and threatened species habitats. Council has not demonstrated that its changes will keep these protections in place. On what authority can Council ignore such advice? Has Council informed the Minister for Local Government and Minister for the Environment that it plans to remove the E3 environmental protections.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Can council give an assurance that existing Councillors do not have a conflict of interest if they vote to amend the LEP and adopt this strategy?

Councillors are required to declare any conflicts of interest at the beginning of every Council meeting in relation to any item on the Agenda for that meeting.

I urge Council to withdraw this proposal. If a rezoning is essential and the case still needs to be made, a review should be held by a committee that includes community representation with established local environmental and animal welfare groups, scientific experts and NSW Government agencies.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

117 I urge Council to exclude the Kyla Park Grazing Lands from the proposal and to specifically restore the earlier E3 zoning for the lands.

The Kyla Park Grazing Lands are currently zoned part Rural 1(a) and part Rural 1(c) under the Rural LEP 1987. The Rural 1(c) zone permits subdivision of the land to 2ha lots. The proposal is to zone the main area of grazing lands to RU1 Primary Production with a minimum lot size of 100ha and the smaller areas to RU1 with a minimum lot size of 20ha, except for a small area to RE1 Public Recreation. The proposed open land use table for the RU1 zone does not mean that the land will be proposed for alternative uses as any development of the land must be consistent with existing plans of management for the land. It is also proposed to transfer the existing heritage item 'Kyla Park grazing lands' from the RLEP 1987 to ELEP 2012.

118 The planning proposal has the potential to negatively affect oyster farming businesses. Any loss of environmental protections that results in land clearing affects us. Removing environmental protection from approximately 38,000 hectares of agricultural land is bad for the catchments where there are oyster leases and as a result is bad for the oyster industry.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

<p>While our property will not be directly affected, we are concerned about the longer term viability of the local economy. We feel that the Rural Lands Strategy is a step in the right direction to improve this. By allowing some rural land to be built on and additional limited subdivision, it should attract more permanent residents to the area. Permanent rural residents are more likely to contribute to the local economy in a different way to tourists. We don't see the proposal destroying the environment. There are already stringent environmental laws that protect the environment. The Strategy is a good balance between providing flexibility in planning regulations to aid diversification of the local economy and contributing to protect the natural environment.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>I am shocked and distressed at the possible long term impacts of some of the proposed changes, including the removal of important environmental protections.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>
<p>The proposal is challenging to unpack. Although the time for comments was extended, I believe that a much more accessible, comprehensive and consultative community consideration process is warranted.</p>	<p>The planning proposal was notified and exhibited by Council in excess of the minimum requirements outlined in the Gateway Determination issued by the Minister for Planning. All land owners directly affected were notified in writing. All State agencies identified in the Gateway Determination were notified in writing. A media release was issued. Two public notices were placed in local papers. State agencies were all informed in writing of the extension of the public exhibition period, as was the community through a media release. A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal. This follows extensive community engagement over four years on the Rural Lands Strategy, which the planning proposal is seeking to implement.</p>
<p>I request that the proposal be withdrawn and reconsidered with a broader range of inputs and considerations, with input from State agencies, other environmental experts and a genuine community advisory panel, including people with wide nature conservation experience.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>Concerned at the proposed removal of E3 zoning and the proposed RU1 or RU4 zoning. I disagree with the proposed open land use tables, that unacceptably broaden possible uses. Concerned at the removal of the 1000ha minimum lot size to allow significant subdivision.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential.</p>

Concerned about the implications of allowing grazing without restriction for E2 areas, including habitat for endangered species and sensitive wetlands.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

I am amazed that Council planning appears to have failed to consider long term considerations around climate change.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

It is worrying that Council has dismissed significant advice and objections from NSW State agencies.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

121 The proposal will result in more fragmentation of the Shire's environmentally important bushlands, a loss of habitat and connecting corridors and a greater impact on threatened species and ecosystems.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

122 Weakening environmental regulations in the interests of business, farmers' freedoms and "progress" would ultimately destroy the very reason for the Eurobodalla's attractiveness to the clients of the Shire's businesses. Please apply this fundamental principle to your decision making, maintain existing environmental land classifications and reintroduce the biodiversity overlays that were lost during a previous (and misleading) campaign by a powerful minority group.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

123 I am aware that a certain amount of growth is justified, but not at the expense of losing the uniqueness of Eurobodalla.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

It is so important that the oyster industry has confidence in and a guarantee that it can continue farming in pristine waters. Full environmental protection is necessary, with no risks from contamination through poor agricultural practices possibly resulting from these suggested rezoning changes.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

The proposal would be the ideal opportunity to retain the original overlays for E3 zones to protect delicate ecosystems, including riparian and estuarine vegetation.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>124 I oppose all of the recommendations in this proposal. We must no longer demand more from our natural systems.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>125 I strongly disapprove of the rezoning of 38,000 hectares of forested areas in Eurobodalla Shire. The proposed rezoning to allow rural-residential development is irresponsible, misguided and goes against the advice of State agencies.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>126 I agree with the Rural Lands Strategy and how that strategy has been incorporated into the LEP.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>127 The proposal only deals with economic development, with little consideration for the considerable environmental assets and potential of the shire. Rather than sustainable development, the rezoning is likely to lead to a proliferation of hobby farms with considerable environmental impact and little long-term economic benefit.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. It will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>The proposal omits the E3 zoning widely used by other councils in the state and biodiversity mapping which is essential for identifying the areas in most need of protection.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.</p> <p>As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013.</p>

The proposed reduction of minimum lot sizes will lead to extensive piecemeal land clearing and bushland fragmentation. There has been no assessment of the environmental impact.

There has been little consideration of the need for special protection of the coast or rivers and wetlands. There has been no consideration of the need to preserve wildlife corridors and EECs.

The advice of State agencies has been ignored. Permitted land uses are so broad that almost any kind of development is possible, making it impossible to provide appropriate protection of our environment.

128 I object to removing the Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlay and clause 6.6 which the OEHL has condemned.

I object to removing the E3 zoning. It is vital to protect areas of high conservation value including EECs.

I object to increasing fragmentation and disintegration of bushland and potential wildlife refuges by proposed subdivisions as in area 10, which ignores advice from OEHL.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The lots in area 10 are currently zoned RU1 Primary Production under ELEP 2012 or Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987. The predominant lot size in the area is around 10ha. Seven lots are over 20ha in size and each would benefit from subdivision to create two 10ha lots. All of these lots currently have a dwelling or a dwelling entitlement.

Development applications would be required for subdivision and additional dwellings and they would need to be assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016. The impact, if any, on threatened species would be a part of that assessment.

<p>I object to ignoring advice from State agencies.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>Little recognition is given to the impacts of climate change and the role of land clearing in accelerating that change through CO2 emissions.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation. The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p>
<p>I object to the rezoning in several areas from Deferred Matter to RU1 with a very wide range of activities. The range of activities offered under RU1 is far too wide and would be very difficult to monitor and control.</p>	<p>The subject lands are currently zoned 7(f1) under the Rural LEP 1987, a zone in which certain forms of agriculture are permitted with or without consent. Land clearing is permitted with consent. The proposed RU1 zoning does not change the permissibility of agricultural activities on the subject land. Any land clearing is now regulated under the <i>NSW Local Land Services Act 2013</i>.</p>
<p>At least two Deferred Matter zones to the east of Burrawang property could be zoned E2.</p>	<p>The subject land is proposed to have a minimum lot size that prevents subdivision and no additional dwelling entitlements are facilitated by the planning proposal. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>Grazing in E2 zones with EECs is incompatible with environmental protection.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
<p>I ask Council to withdraw the proposal and it should be reviewed with the expert State agencies and balanced with a genuine community advisory panel that represents the broad community, including people with wide nature conservation experience.</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>I query whether the RU1 zone is appropriate for the deferred lands as the area is heavily vegetated and is habitat for a number of endangered ecological communities. Has Council considered that RE2 might be a more appropriate zone. Was this area one of those referred to by OEH as not suitable for large scale expansion and that an environmental zone is essential for the vegetated areas.</p>	<p>The subject land is currently zoned Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987, a zone which permits agriculture without consent, and clearing with consent. The OEH submission to the planning proposal did not specifically object to the proposal in relation to the subject site. In relation to minimum lot size, the area the subject of this planning proposal is proposed to have a 40ha minimum lot size.</p>
<p>Object to no minimum lot size for the Oaks Ranch property.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p></p>
<p>In future, Council should make people aware that there may be a Schedule 1 permitted uses relating to land the subject of a planning proposal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>130 Support removal of Terrestrial Biodiversity overlay.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	Request removal of E2 zone from part of property.	The proposal to make grazing of livestock exempt development in the E2 zone will address the substantive issue raised. The E2 zone on the subject property is a riparian area that is not defined as environmentally sensitive land. The subject property has existing use rights for grazing of the E2 part of the land which separates two areas of RU1 zoned land. It is therefore not proposed to remove the E2 zone.
131	Request a dwelling entitlement for the land.	The subject land does not currently have a dwelling entitlement and the planning proposal does not facilitate one.
132	I object to the rezoning proposals, including land clearing in areas deemed by OEH to have high environmental values. We must ensure that the proposed strategy does not reduce environmental protections.	Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . The changes to ELEG 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.
	I object to the reduction in lot sizes which will inevitably increase land clearing. Land clearing is one of the biggest contributors to climate change and endangering native wildlife.	The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
	I object to the additional land uses. While development needs approval, it isn't often anything is refused, especially for environmental reasons. We are concerned that State agencies have pointed out that many of the changes are inconsistent with their advice and Directions from the Minister for Planning.	For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.
	We are aware that OEH objects to the proposed changes of zoning from Environmental to RU1 including environmental offsets under the Broulee Bio-Certification Agreement, including the proposed subdivision of the deferred lot at George Bass Drive Mossy Point. The whole lot has been validated Bangalay Sand Forest EEC and impacts on the lagoon.	A detailed response to the submission from OEH has been prepared. All of the environmental offsets under the Broulee Biocertification Agreement are currently zoned E2 or are proposed to be zoned E2. The land at Mossy Point is not wholly validated as EEC. A large portion of the subject site contains EEC and all of the EEC is proposed to be zoned E2. The area that is not EEC is proposed to be zoned E4. Any future subdivision of the area proposed to be zoned E4 requires development consent and the impacts of the development on the environmental values of the EEC and adjoining wetlands will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and policies including the Coastal Management SEPP.
133	We congratulate Council on the Rural Lands Strategy. After a lot of consultation with the public and taking all views into account, we think the strategy is very fair and equitable. The proposal will not change Eurobodalla's healthy lifestyle and country landscape.	Noted
	More blocks in rural areas is likely to lead to more houses being built which will mean more jobs for tradespeople. Increased population is good for future economic growth.	Noted
	We need more simple and flexible local planning rules and we feel the strategy will do this. Owners of rural land should be allowed to use their land as they want, without excessive regulation, to grow food, graze sheep/cattle and to subdivide into smaller blocks, provided they are of a suitable size for rural areas.	Noted
	Our landscape and our environment also needs to be protected. We think there are already enough regulations placed on farmers and people living in rural areas. Federal and State laws already exist to protect the environment very well. Yet more environmental protections are not need in the Rural Land Strategy.	Noted
134	I support the proposed RLS.	Noted
135	I support the draft RLS.	Noted

	I have spoken to a number of residents in the Bingie, Tuross Head and broader community. Virtually without exception, the consensus is that the proposed RLS is a positive initiative that demonstrates Council's commitment to protecting the environment. Although most would have preferred the Council to go much further and provide land owners with greater rights regarding use of their land, we recognise the need to be realistic or risk achieving nothing and continuing to be hamstrung by unfair restrictions and red tape.	Noted
	Local Land Services already regulates clearing of land on rural properties and existing environmental laws, both at the Commonwealth and State level, protect high value flora and fauna where development is proposed. The proposed RLS still strongly maintains the balance in favour of the environment over development, but some flexibility is better than none.	Noted
	The lot averaging initiative is a great idea as it allows more of the high value environmental land to be retained and locked away by allowing building entitlements to be moved from those areas to other lots (within the owner's holding) with far less environmental value. The proposed 2ha minimum lot size is not too small for small scale agricultural activities.	Noted
	It would be easy to simply create more residential blocks by expanding existing suburbs. But many of these will be bought by Canberra people who wont live in the Shire. However, providing more rural land with building entitlements will bring in people who would not consider moving to the suburbs. These new residents will have a different lifestyle and support a greater range of businesses than people in the suburbs (eg rural suppliers, rural machinery, fencing and other contractors). The Shire can only benefit from having a greater diversity of people with a greater diversity of lifestyles. The proposed Rural Lands Strategy seems to achieve a good balance in this area.	Noted
	Whilst I have never been a great fan of subdividing, the modest initiatives in this area are supported and can benefit the community in general. There should not be sunset clauses for development purposes. Existing entitlements must also not be taken away or given a sunset clause.	Noted
	The proposed RLS provides greater transparency, reduced red tape and greater streamlining of development and environmental issues.	Noted
136	I commend the Council for the work that has gone into the planning proposal. Most of our families concerns have been addressed.	Noted
	Request that one lot also be included on the Dwelling Entitlement Map.	The subject lot does not have a dwelling entitlement and the planning proposal does not facilitate one.
137	Concerned about damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry. The strategy will result in agricultural and forest land being subdivided and cleared and environmental protections on our waterways and bush would be lost. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land. Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed. The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.

<p>Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, called High Conservation Values in the LEP. Around 90% of the HCV will be zoned primary production which will allow land clearing and many additional land uses.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation value vegetation. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
<p>Concerned the reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.</p>	<p>The reduction in lot sizes permits a very modest number of additional lots to be created. A total of 122 lots across the Shire is facilitated by the planning proposal. Clearing of vegetation would not be required for every proposed subdivision or dwelling facilitated by the planning proposal as some properties that benefit already have some cleared areas. Where clearing is proposed in association with a development proposal, Council will assess the impact of the proposal on the environment will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.</p>
<p>Concerned that Council is ignoring expert advice by the consultant and State agencies.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>The effects of climate change have not been considered.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p>
<p>Concerned that water catchments, oyster farming and lakes are at risk from clearing and smaller lots in the upper reaches of the Deua River. High level 1 protection (a1) for water catchments with some agriculture would be removed to allow RU1. Oyster farming in the Clyde River and Wagonga Inlet are threatened by clearing allowed along shorelines. Sensitive areas next to lakes, rivers and creeks will have RU4 zoning, leading to smaller lots, clearing for subdivision and reduced water quality.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.</p>
<p>138 We support the suggested additional uses for the E4 zone, particularly the opportunity to build a detached dual occupancy.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>139 I support the draft LEP, which will allow me to apply for a detached dual occupancy.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>140 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
<p>141 Objects to the proposal for the zoning of the Kyla Park Heritage Grazing Lands. The rezoning amendments would make permissible further inappropriate land uses. The proposal does not offer a sound rationale for the changes. The proposal would materially compromise the objectives of land protection, heritage conservation, aboriginal heritage protection and lake/estuary protection for the land.</p>	<p>The Kyla Park Grazing Lands are currently zoned part Rural 1(a) and part Rural 1(c) under the Rural LEP 1987. The Rural 1(c) zone permits subdivision of the land to 2ha lots. The proposal is to zone the main area of grazing lands to RU1 Primary Production with a minimum lot size of 100ha and the smaller areas to RU1 with a minimum lot size of 20ha, except for a small area to RE1 Public Recreation. The proposed open land use table for the RU1 zone does not mean that the land will be proposed for alternative uses as any development of the land must be consistent with existing plans of management for the land. It is also proposed to transfer the existing heritage item 'Kyla Park grazing lands' from the RLEP 1987 to ELEP 2012.</p>

We understand that a number of State agencies had pointed out that many of the proposed changes are inconsistent with their advice and with Directions from the Minister for Planning. Moreover, Tuross Head and Kyla Park residents were not given the rationale behind the change to RU1 for the Heritage Grazing Lands. The current 'consultative' process is seriously flawed.

I am concerned that Council is seeking to remove even more environmental protections.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with advice from State agencies and some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

The planning proposal was notified and exhibited by Council in excess of the minimum requirements outlined in the Gateway Determination issued by the Minister for Planning. All land owners directly affected were notified in writing. All State agencies identified in the Gateway Determination were notified in writing. A media release was issued. Two public notices were placed in local papers. State agencies were all informed in writing of the extension of the public exhibition period, as was the community through a media release. This follows extensive community engagement over four years on the Rural Lands Strategy, which the planning proposal is seeking to implement.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal does not allow widespread subdivision of rural land. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The Rural Lands Strategy applied a strategic landscape approach to the application of minimum lot sizes. Land ownership was not a consideration.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Council is proposing to remove protective E3 zones and allow widespread subdivision of agricultural land.

Will any existing or past councillors family or friends benefit from having their land able to be subdivided.

Many of Council's proposals go against advice from State agencies.

Object to an animal boarding establishment being permissible on land in my area, as the lots are too small and there would be intolerable noise and increased traffic.

Object to reduction in minimum lot size from 600m<sup>2</sup> to 550m<sup>2</sup> for land at Lewana Close, Lilli Pilli.

The subject areas is proposed to be zoned RU4. In this zone, as animal boarding or training establishment is permissible with consent. Prior to granting consent for such a use, if one were to be proposed, Council would assess the proposal with regards to noise and other impacts on adjoining properties.

The proposed reduction in minimum lot size is to ensure consistency of standards across the R2 Low Density Residential Zone. All R2 zoned land adjoining the subject land has a minimum lot size of 550m<sup>2</sup>.

145	<p>We appreciate that our last submission (along with others) was discussed and commented on as part of this plan.</p> <p>We are pleased that E3 zoning has gone and the proposed RU4 zoning on our property has been recommended.</p> <p>We would prefer that the minimum lot size be reduced from 20ha to 5 to 10ha.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional subdivision or dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
	<p>At this stage we are happy with the proposed 6 dwelling entitlements for our property, but ask that if this does not go ahead, all of our existing dwelling entitlements be retained on the Dwelling Entitlements Map.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
146	<p>Concerned that Council is seeking to remove very important environmental protections.</p> <p>The size and content of the proposal is a barrier to general community understanding.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.</p>
	<p>Concerned about native forests being cleared for housing, roads, fences and bush fore reduction. Increased runoff and erosion will ultimately damage water catchments, lakes and rivers.</p> <p>Many of the areas proposed for rezoning are described by OEH as having high conservation values, including known Aboriginal cultural heritage, biodiversity hotspots and threatened species sightings.</p>	<p>Given the level of additional subdivision and dwellings facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that widespread clearing will occur as a result. In many cases, there are already cleared areas on lots that may benefit from additional development potential. In other cases, where clearing is required to achieve additional development, such clearing requires development consent and assessment of the impact of such clearing will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.</p> <p>A separate detailed response to the submission from the Office of Environment and Heritage has been prepared.</p>
	<p>I want Council to withdraw this proposal and it should be reviewed with a genuinely representative community panel including nature experts and State agencies. Future consultation documents should be written in plain English.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>

<p>147 Concerned and dismayed that Council is seeking to remove the protection of E3 zoning over significant areas of rural land, making way for subdivision and completely inappropriate and unnecessary development. The impact on our environment will be massive and irreversible if the proposal goes ahead.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>Council has ignored advice from State agencies.</p>	<p>The proposal was referred to the NSW Heritage Office who raised no objections.</p>
<p>148 I urge Council to withdraw the proposal and to take into consideration the views of the community and other agencies. Against the proposed changes to land clearing in Eurobodalla as the Heritage committee has not approved the proposal.</p>	<p>The subject land is not currently zoned E3. It is currently zoned 7(f1) under the Rural LEP 1987, a zone in which certain forms of agriculture are permitted with or without consent. Land clearing is permitted with consent. The proposed RU1 zoning does not change the permissibility of agricultural activities on the subject land. Any land clearing is now regulated under the NSW Local Land Services Act 2013.</p>
<p>149 Concerned about the proposed rezoning of natural coastal bushland in Guerilla Bay from the current E3 zone to RU1, which will result in the removal of very important environmental protections. We do not believe the land could ever be used for primary production. It is a nature reserve for a wide variety of fauna and flora and natural water courses which requires conservation and the protection that the current E3 zone provides. We ask Council to re-examine this proposed rezoning for Guerilla Bay. We understand that State agencies have registered their concern to the proposed rezoning.</p>	<p>Detailed responses to the submissions from State agencies have been prepared.</p>

<p>150 Concerned that removal of the E3 zones may lead to environmental degradation.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p>
<p>Concerned the decreases in minimum lot size would increase land clearing leading to reduced habitat for native species.</p>	<p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>Significant objections have been raised by State agencies and I don't understand why their expert opinions have been disregarded.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>The proposal should be reviewed addressing the concerns of the community and the expert agencies. Request the minimum lot size be reduced from 100ha to 40ha to permit a dwelling entitlement for each of my three lots. 151 Part of our property is zoned E2 and we do not want grazing permitted on this land. This would set a dangerous precedent for Burrawang and other areas under the same zoning. 152</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p> <p>The subject property is a holding that has one dwelling entitlement. The planning proposal would also permit one dwelling if the three properties were amalgamated.</p> <p>Noted. The intent of the proposal to allow grazing in E2 areas is to allow existing grazing activities to continue. Importantly, the provision would not apply to land identified as environmentally sensitive, including coastal wetlands.</p>
<p>The part of the Burrawang property that is deferred and proposed to be RU1 could be zoned E3. Concerned with the proposed RU1 zoning of land adjoining Burrawang with additional permitted land uses having an impact on the environmental values of the Burrawang property. Recommend that property be zoned E2 or E3.</p>	<p>Council has previously resolved not to use the E3 zone in Eurobodalla. The proposed RU1 zone permits the current use of the land for tourist accommodation.</p> <p>Any proposed development of the land requires the approval of Council. Clearing of vegetation for rural purposes must comply with the NSW Government's clearing requirements or must obtain approval from the Local Land Services. Any such approvals would have regard to the impact of the development or clearing on the local environment.</p>
<p>Concerned that the extent of clearing of vegetation will increase under the proposal and impact adversely on natural values.</p>	<p>The proposal does not necessarily result in increased clearing of vegetation. Approvals are required from Council for the development of land. Clearing of vegetation for rural purposes must comply with the NSW Government's clearing requirements or must obtain approval from the Local Land Services. Any such approvals would have regard to the impact of the development or clearing on the local environment.</p>

<p>Concerned that E3 as formerly proposed was withdrawn. E3 was a zone of environmental protection for areas of high conservation value and also EECs and should be retained.</p>	<p>The E3 zone is identified by the NSW Government as a zone for environmental management, as distinct from the E2 Environmental Protection zone. Notwithstanding the intent of each zone, it is not the zoning of land that protects high conservation values. High conservation values are protected through the assessment of development applications in accordance with relevant statutory requirements, most notably the NSW <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p>
<p>Concerned with increasing fragmentation and disintegration of bushland and potential wildlife refuges by proposed subdivision, as in area 10, which ignores advice from OEH.</p>	<p>The lots in area 10 are currently zoned RU1 Primary Production under ELEP 2012 or Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987. The predominant lot size in the area is around 10ha. Seven lots are over 20ha in size and each would benefit from subdivision to create two 10ha lots. All of these lots currently have a dwelling or a dwelling entitlement. Development applications would be required for subdivision and additional dwellings and they would need to be assessed in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>. The impact, if any, on threatened species would be a part of that assessment.</p>
<p>Concerned at potential development in area 10a. Referred to previous OEH submissions recommending environmental zoning for the vegetated area.</p>	<p>In the OEH submission to the planning proposal for area 10a, it is noted that there are some cleared areas that could facilitate additional dwellings.</p>
<p>Concerned at potential development in area 12a. Referred to previous OEH submission objecting to clearing of any EEC.</p>	<p>A large portion of the subject site contains EEC and all of the EEC is proposed to be zoned E2. The area that is not EEC is proposed to be zoned E4. Any future subdivision of the area proposed to be zoned E4 requires development consent and the impacts of the development on the environmental values of the EEC and adjoining wetlands will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and policies including the Coastal Management SEPP.</p>
<p>Concerned with the further weakening of environmental protection through the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity overlay and associated clause 6.6 of ELEP 2012. BY removing biodiversity from a map, how can the statutory requirements operate to conserve the biodiversity.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers. The statutory requirements for environmental protection in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p>
<p>Concerned that Council is ignoring the advice of expert State agencies.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal. Similarly, the planning proposal acknowledges where it is inconsistent with S117 Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for those inconsistencies. It is important to note that, despite the concerns raised by some NSW Government Agencies and the identified inconsistencies with the Ministerial Directions, the Minister for Planning issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.</p>
<p>Concerned that little recognition is given to the impact of climate change, the role of land clearing in accelerating that change through CO2 emissions, population growth, the increasing prevalence of drought, more request and intense bushfires and pressure on water supplies. An assessment should be made of the total extent of possible clearing under the proposal.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation. It is not possible to estimate the amount of clearing that could be facilitated by the planning proposal. The extent of clearing depends on the location of an proposed development facilitated by the planning proposal. Not all additional potential development opportunities would require clearing.</p>

Concerned at impacts of other developments. With a significant increase in population, how will the sewerage works to the north of Burrawang cope with the increasing load and what provisions will be made for the increased effluent load, including the outflow into the ocean off Barlings Beach?

The planning proposal does not result in an increase in population in the Barlings Beach area. The Burrawang property is located in area 12, in which there are no additional lots or dwellings proposed.

153 I believe the proposed changes open up land use to multiple usages and smaller allotments. Unregulated private usage can lead to damage to the greater good, such as water usage, land clearing and damage to Aboriginal sites.

Given the level of additional subdivision and dwellings facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that widespread clearing will occur as a result. In many cases, there are already cleared areas on lots that may benefit from additional development potential. In other cases, where clearing is required to achieve additional development, such clearing requires development consent and assessment of the impact of such clearing will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 and other relevant legislation relating to water and Aboriginal heritage.

154 Concerned about damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry. The strategy will result in agricultural and forest land being subdivided and cleared and environmental protections on our waterways and bush would be lost. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land. Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed. The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.

Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, called High Conservation Values in the LEP. Around 90% of the HCV will be zoned primary production which will allow land clearing and many additional land uses.

The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation value vegetation. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

Concerned the reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.

The reduction in lot sizes permits a very modest number of additional lots to be created. A total of 122 lots across the Shire is facilitated by the planning proposal. Clearing of vegetation would not be required for every proposed subdivision or dwelling facilitated by the planning proposal as some properties that benefit already have some cleared areas. Where clearing is proposed in association with a development proposal, Council will assess the impact of the proposal on the environment will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

Concerned that the additional land uses means almost anything goes. While development needs approval, it isn't often anything is refused, especially for environmental reasons.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Concerned that Council is ignoring expert advice by the consultant and State agencies.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

The effects of climate change have not been considered.

	<p>Concerned about water supply. Current proposals for State Forests will result in more clear-felling and denser regrowth, which has the effect of increasing sedimentation of streams and reducing water yield. The planning proposal will add to these problems, with increased grazing and cleared land reducing the quality of the Shire's water supply. The Department of Primary Industries does not think Council has given enough consideration to provision of adequate water supplies as small rural subdivisions will place greater demand on water resources.</p>
155	<p>I support the Rural Lands Strategy. Placing undue restrictions on what owners of rural properties can do on their land and unnecessarily restricting some development on rural lands will stifle economic investment and job creation in the area and could lead to stagnation of the local economy.</p>
	<p>Environmental laws already protect high value native vegetation and fauna in the State. It seems unnecessarily restrictive to place more red-tape on rural property owners by way of local planning regulations. Council needs to weigh up the pros and cons of protecting the rural landscapes and biodiversity of the Shire versus stimulating the local economy through controlled small increases in rural subdivisions leading to job creation and increased demand for goods and services, and allowing more flexible uses of rural land potentially leading to a more diverse and growing eco-tourism sector. In my view, the proposed Rural Lands Strategy gets the balance right.</p>
156	<p>The planning proposal is incomplete as it does not review transparently and comprehensively the existing and proposed zoning and additional permitted uses for the Oaks Ranch property. Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>
157	<p>The removal of the E3 zone is a real disappointment to Landcare volunteers. The changes to zoning in the proposal will directly impact on the land they have been managing and it will also affect land and water downstream.</p>
	<p>Allowing unrestricted grazing in the E2 areas is a complete turnaround in the philosophy of a Council who has previously fostered significant environmental initiatives and markets itself to tourists as the Nature Coast.</p>
	<p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Any development that requires consent will be assessed in accordance with the relevant environmental legislation, including legislation relating to land clearing and impacts on water resources.</p>
	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
	<p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>

<p>I'm alarmed that council has not listened to the objections from State agencies and that many of the proposed changes are contrary to the advice of the agencies and even inconsistent with directions from the Minister for Planning.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>158 Concerned at the removal of very important environmental protections from our rural landscape.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>Concerned with the proposal to allow grazing in E2 zones.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential.</p>
<p>Concerned that E3 areas are proposed to be replaced by RU1 or RU4 zoning with open land use tables, as well as smaller lot sizes.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
<p>Concerned at the proposed removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlay and associated clause from ELEP 2012.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>Why is Council ignoring expert advice?</p>	

I want Council to withdraw this proposal and review it with expert State agencies and a genuinely representative community advisory panel, including several people with wide nature conservation experience. I oppose the removal of any environmental protections. This area is in a unique position where our natural environment and wildlife are our competitive advantage to other areas in NSW and Australia. The number one economic driver is tourism so let's be smart and make decisions about increasing economic growth while enhancing and completely protecting the natural environment.

159  
160 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.

161 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.

162 Both tourism and recreation will be damaged by the council's proposal. Businesses such as oyster farming and fisheries will be hurt. Council promotes "Unspoilt Eurobodalla" yet this plan will contribute to despoiling Eurobodalla.

The rezoning proposals will detrimentally affect thousands of hectares, including old growth forest, lands with high conservation values, wetlands, estuaries and shores. Clearing of land and permitting grazing will destroy or devalues these places.

The maps in the planning proposal are difficult to read. In particular the Map 2 legend in Volume 3 is difficult to read.

Areas 10a, 11 and 11a should not be available for primary production, subdivision etc.

For area 7a and 7b, Map 3 in Volume 3 does not indicate what land use is intended for the area on the east side of George Bass Drive, though Map 5 indicates that this area could be subdivided. Runoff from this area is likely to affect the shore and ocean below it.

For areas 8, 8a and 8b, it appears additional land is to be rezoned for primary production which directly abuts the creek, so fertilizers and animal excrement will pollute the creek as well as more bush clearing with its adverse effects.

In Area 12, the land leading to Burrewarra Point needs preservation.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.

In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the tourism, oyster and fishing industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on these industries will be assessed.

The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

These areas are already partly zoned RU1 and partly Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture. No change to the permissibility of agriculture in these areas is proposed. The planning proposal facilitates a maximum of four additional lots across these three areas.

The area east of George Bass Drive is proposed to be zoned E4. No further subdivision of this area is proposed.

These areas are already partly zoned RU1 and partly Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture. No change to the permissibility of agriculture in these areas is proposed.

The subject land is currently zoned 7(f1) under the Rural LEP 1987, a zone in which certain forms of agriculture are permitted with or without consent. Land clearing is permitted with consent. The proposed RU1 zoning does not change the permissibility of agricultural activities on the subject land. Any land clearing is now regulated under the *NSW Local Land Services Act 2013*.

The subject land is proposed to have a minimum lot size that prevents subdivision and no additional dwelling entitlements are facilitated by the planning proposal.

The deferred areas are likely to have been deferred because opening it up for development will negatively impact on habitat and adjoining land and/or waterways.

Why is Council ignoring the advice of experts and State agencies, including areas identified with high conservation values, no increased grazing of coastal wetlands and opposition to the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity overlays and associated clause 6.6.

Land clearing and increased grazing will result in increased sedimentation and reduction in the quality of the water supply.

Lot size reductions will result in land clearing, one of the largest contributors to endangering native wildlife and climate change.

With regards to the additional land uses there are insufficient measures proposed to protect against harmful developments. The blocks proposed for change often include the edge of forest. Also the blocks do not appear to take the topography into account. For example area 8, all these straight lines look neat and tidy but will result in many extra trees being removed.

I want this proposal to be withdrawn and Council to use the protections built into the 2012 draft plan. If the plan needs updating it needs to be done following the advice of the experts and State agencies, and genuine consultation with residents, tourist operators, oyster farmers, scientists and environmental groups.

163 The planning proposal is lodge and difficult to comprehend. The maps and diagrams are overly complicated.

The Eurobodalla will not remain unspoilt by this proposal. Council is seeking to remove much needed environmental protections. This Council wants to remove the right of Council to refuse development that could damage the environment.

The subject lands are not being "opened up for development". The planning proposal facilitates a small number of additional lots and dwellings in these areas. No changes to the permissibility of agriculture in these areas is proposed.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased impacts on water quality. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality will be assessed.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The maps show existing lots and the lines being referred to are the existing property boundaries.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013.

The planning proposal does not facilitate significant housing or infrastructure. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The 1000ha minimum lot size was applied to land zoned RU1 when ELEP 2012 was made in 2012 to reflect the previous provisions of the Rural LEP 1987 which limited further subdivision of rural land. Notwithstanding this large minimum lot size, there are very few properties over 1000ha in size in Eurobodalla. Most of Eurobodalla's rural land is already much smaller in size.

The proposal to reduce minimum lot sizes does not allow significant subdivision, as the proposed minimum lot sizes to be applied are generally consistent with the existing size of lots in each area. Across the Eurobodalla Shire, a total of 122 additional lots are facilitated by the planning proposal. In land proposed to be zoned RU1 Primary Production, the additional number of lots that would be allowed is 60, representing a 2% increase in the total number of rural lots. This is not considered to represent significant subdivision in rural areas.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

Council is proposing to convert the majority of the E3 zoning to rural zoning for almost 40,000 hectares of rural land which allows for habitat destruction. Housing and infrastructure will replace native forests and animals/birds. This can have the effect of damaging creeks, rivers and dams. What becomes of our drinking water?

Where in the document has Council sought expert advice? Has Council received submissions or advice from Environment and Heritage, WaterNSW and Primary Industries and other agencies. I am aware that some agencies did not support the council proposals in 2015. What consideration did Council give to their comments and where is that borne out in your documentation?

I ask that Council withdraw its proposal and set up a community group including residents, tourist operators, scientists and seek input from State authorities.

164 I'm deeply disturbed by the proposed removal of environmental protections from our rural landscape, including the E3 zone.

The proposal also removes the minimum lot size of 1000ha and allows significant subdivision.

Council's Proposal also allows grazing without restriction in all E2 Environmental Conservation areas, some 4500 ha, including habitat for endangered species and sensitive wetlands.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal. Similarly, the planning proposal acknowledges where it is inconsistent with S117 Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for those inconsistencies.

Council has dismissed significant objections to the Proposal by State agencies. Many of Council's changes are inconsistent with both advice from the agencies and Directions from the Minister for Planning.

It is important to note that, despite the concerns raised by some NSW Government Agencies and the identified inconsistencies with the Ministerial Directions, the Minister for Planning issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

Council has also failed to consider the impact of forest clearing on climate change and the much weaker protection against land clearing under the new State laws that last year replaced the Native Vegetation Act.

In relation to the new NSW Government's land clearing laws, these had not yet been finalised at the time of developing the Rural Lands Strategy. In relation to clearing of vegetation for rural purposes, given the vast majority of the lands proposed to be zoned RU1 are currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987, there is no change to how the land clearing regulations apply as a result of this planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

The proposal should be reviewed by a genuinely representative community advisory panel, including scientific experts and NSW government agencies. Finally commonsense has prevailed and we are again back with a rural zoning. The State template was given with instructions to use like for like (ie. If it was rural put it into a rural classification). This was not done.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

165 Congratulations for changing it.

Noted

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

166 I object to the proposal which appears to be attempting to remove protections from our forests, rivers, wetlands and water catchments.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

It is difficult not to be cynical and suspicious about the motives behind the proposed changes when it will allow such practices as grazing in sensitive wetlands, large subdivisions on potentially productive land and threatens the viability of important industries such as tourism and oyster farming. Tourism is a large employer and economic base to the region. This is contingent upon protection of bushland, wetlands, native species to maintain the nature coast brand.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to the tourism or oyster industries. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on these industries will be assessed.

The planning proposal facilitates additional rural tourism opportunities.

<p>High conservation value areas should not be zoned for primary production - this will allow land clearing and reduce environmental protections.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent.</p>
<p>Reduction in land lot sizes will increase land clearing endangering native wildlife and in some cases reduce future agricultural land use potential.</p>	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot sizes that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>The strategy is at odds with the current Eurobodalla community strategic plan and inconsistent with the advice of State agencies.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>167 Changing zoning from environmentally protected to rural means that there will be a massive clearing of forested areas which will impact bird life, native habitats, waterways, and the Eurobodalla's greenhouse emissions.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent.</p>
<p>Why is Council ignoring the advice of State agencies?</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>The forested area between Tomakin Road and the Tomaga River is a major habitat corridor. OEHL said it should be given an E zone. This proposal will zone it RU4.</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>Area 10 is also a significant habitat corridor. OEHL said it should be given an E zone. This proposal will zone it RU4, with larger lots subdivided to 10ha.</p>	<p>This area is already partly zoned RU1 and partly Rural 1(a) under RLEP 1987, a zone which permits clearing and agriculture. No change to the permissibility of agriculture in these areas is proposed. A small number of additional lots and dwellings are facilitated by the planning proposal. The proposal also provides for the use of lot averaging to facilitate subdivision in a manner that will improve environmental outcomes.</p>
<p>168 The council is seeking to remove very important environmental protections from our rural landscape, including the E3 zone.</p>	<p>The predominant lot size in Area 10 is 10ha. Seven of the lots are currently larger than 20ha in size. The application of a 10ha minimum lot size allows these larger lots to be subdivided to the same size as the majority of the lots in this area.</p> <p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>

<p>The new zoning would allow clearing of forests for agriculture with important implications for climate change. Changing zoning of the E3 land to RU1 or RU4 with an open land use table will further weaken environmental protection since many of these areas are covered with intact native vegetation. The habitat fragmentation and land clearing that will potentially result from such blanket rezoning, when areas are cleared for housing, roads, fences and bush fire reduction, will result in destruction and degradation of the biodiversity of our area and potentially threatened the image of the shire as the Nature Coast.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal does not facilitate significant housing or infrastructure. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>Grazing without approval in the extremely sensitive E2 areas should not be allowed.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.</p>
<p>The local oyster industry could also be at risk from erosion, runoff and siltation as rural land is rezoned and subdivided. The health of our estuaries and the ecosystems Batemans Marine Park are also at risk with a resultant effect on tourism.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
<p>I request that the proposal be withdrawn and a new community advisory panel be established comprised of some rural landowners but also scientists and other community members who are aware of the importance of our natural environment.</p>	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>169 Some of the Rural Lands Planning Proposals agreed to by Council are without controversy. Council should seek immediate approval for these proposals. Those areas creating environmental controversy should be dealt with separately as ongoing issues.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>170 The proposed rezoning will remove vital environmental protections from our beautiful nature coast, ignoring council's 2012 plan which recognised the need for conservation measures to protect the forests, rivers, wetlands and water catchments.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>
<p>The proposed open land use tables for RU1 and RU4 zones is not compatible with environmental values.</p>	<p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p>

Council's proposed E3 zoning allows for grazing and other rural activities which would inevitably upset the delicate ecological balance of the coastal ecosystems as well as undermining its attractions to visit and tourism in general. Grazing without restriction in all the E2 areas must not be allowed. Castle, horses, sheep, goats and pigs etc. must not be allowed to destroy our wetlands and clean water.

I am dismayed that Council has dismissed significant objections to the proposal by State agencies. Many of the proposed changes are inconsistent with advice from the agencies and directions from the Minister for Planning.

Council has failed to consider the impacts of forest clearing on climate change and the much weaker protection against land clearing under the new state laws that last year replaced the Native Vegetation Act.

I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.

The proposed Rural Land Strategy is difficult to find on your website. Given its importance, surely it should be on the homepage of the website, but it is not. The proposal is not easy to find and when it is found, it is large and difficult to follow.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

In relation to the new NSW Government's land clearing laws, these had not yet been finalised at the time of developing the Rural Lands Strategy. In relation to clearing of vegetation for rural purposes, given the vast majority of the lands proposed to be zoned RU1 are currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987, there is no change to how the land clearing regulations apply as a result of this planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

During the public exhibition period, a link to the planning proposal was on Council's homepage. A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

Many environmental protections have been discarded. The E3 zone has disappeared completely, grazing is now permitted in the E2 zones, and subdivisions will be allowed on lands that contains EEC's. Many of the changes will further fragment the land and lead to a reduction of biodiversity, threaten endangered species and lead to a poorer ecosystem overall. This threatens the health of agricultural lands as well as the forests.

I ask that Council withdraw this planning proposal and consult with a wider range of interest groups within the Shire to develop a strategy that meets the needs of all its residents.

Object to obstacle surface limitation. My home is already above the relevant height restriction and any changes will now require referral to CASA, adding another level of bureaucracy and add complexity and time to the planning approval process. The clause also limits the potential to build another dwelling on my land.

The details in the planning proposal relating to this matter are inadequate, difficult to find and there has not been community consultation regarding the introduction of this clause. The planning proposal refers to the Merimbula Airport, not the Moruya Airport.

We own land affected by the proposed changes. We support the proposed changes.

172

I have strong concerns about the potentially harmful alterations to zoning of land of environmental sensitivity and heritage significance.

173

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

No land in Eurobodalla is zoned E3 and this planning proposal does not propose to apply the E3 zone to any land.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

While the proposed obstacle surface limitations clause is proposed to be included in ELEP 2012, the effect of the clause is currently in operation. It is appropriate to refer applications for development that exceeds the relevant height limit to CASA for consideration. In relation to the subject property, there is an existing beacon between the Moruya Airport and the dwelling on the lot. An officer of CASA has advised that the existence of the beacon ensures that planes fly above the property and there is unlikely to be any objection to further development of the property. A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

Every land owner affected by the airport obstacle limitations clause was sent a letter informing them of the planning proposal.

The planning proposal includes an example clause from the Bega Valley LEP.

Noted

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation or negative impact on heritage. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

174	<p>I object to the proposed removal of existing environmental protective zone E3.</p> <p>I object to the additional land uses proposed for E4 and R5 and to open land use for RU1 and RU4.</p> <p>Proposed rezoning that enables further environmental damage with climate change impacts is irresponsible.</p> <p>The proposed rural land changes put our environment and rural way of life at risk at the very time when state protections of the environment, agriculture and wildlife management are shamefully inadequate.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.</p> <p>As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013.</p> <p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
	<p>Rezoning proposals will negatively affect on the Shire's biodiversity.</p> <p>Reduction in lot sizes increases land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.</p> <p>If rural lands around Congo are rezoned to allow for more clearing and more development this will damage the environment and the well being of the community. I appreciate that the current proposal is not proposing extensive or substantial rezonings in and around Congo. However, any weakening of environmental protections and "upzonings" around Congo can be precedent setting.</p>	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.</p> <p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
175	Request correction of cadastre and E2 zone boundaries.	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>Council uses the NSW Land and Property Information (LPI) cadastre and cannot amend this mapping. For the mapping to be amended by LPI, the land owner would need to provide survey information to confirm any inaccuracy in the cadastre.</p> <p>The E2 zone boundaries on the subject property are generally consistent with the coastal wetland mapping in the Coastal Management SEPP. It is therefore not proposed to amend the E2 zone.</p>
176	Council should consider very carefully any removal of hard-won environmental protection. It is imperative that corridors are preserved for our unique native wildlife. Areas around wetlands need to be preserved as habitat and as protection from run-off polluting our waterways.	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>

The proposal is about diminishing and removing as many environmental protections as possible. The proposal also seeks to vest more discretionary power about rural land use with internal units in Council, but without any added safeguards, appeal provisions or accountability.

The proposed removal of protection of E3 zoning over large areas of rural land, and the proposed introduction of open land use tables, widens land use provisions unacceptably.

We now face the likelihood of considerable clearing of forested rural land. We want to see careful and sympathetic development that preserves the quality of life in the region, not uncontrolled and opportunistic activity that degrades the region.

Allowing untrammelled subdivision of large properties in rural areas is a retrograde step. We do not need or want unregulated land use in Eurobodalla.

Concerned about the relaxation of protections for E2 areas by introducing grazing without restriction.

Council has already dismissed the significant and valid objections of State agencies.

Concerned about even more foreshore development along the northern parts of Tuross Lake. We request that all further foreshore/lakeside development be embargoed and that further subdivision be prevented, particularly in that area, until such time as a comprehensive assessment is undertaken.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The planning proposal makes no changes to the powers of staff in relation to delegations to approve development applications, it makes no changes to appeal provisions in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and does not reduce the accountability for land use decisions.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The planning proposal facilitates no additional subdivision or dwellings on the northern side of Tuross Lake.

We request that Council withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is broadly representative of the whole Eurobodalla community.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

178 I do not support the proposal noting that respected organisations and State agencies have disagreed with it. It is irresponsible to put forward a policy that is inadequate in addressing the impact it will have on climate change.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

179 I am dismayed that Council is attempting to undo very important environmental protections.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

Concerned about the consultation process and time frame for commenting.

The planning proposal was notified and exhibited by Council in excess of the minimum requirements outlined in the Gateway Determination issued by the Minister for Planning. All land owners directly affected were notified in writing. All State agencies identified in the Gateway Determination were notified in writing. A media release was issued. Two public notices were placed in local papers. State agencies were all informed in writing of the extension of the public exhibition period, as was the community through a media release. This follows extensive community engagement over four years on the Rural Lands Strategy, which the planning proposal is seeking to implement.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services

Concerned about the removal of E3 zoning over large tracts of rural land and rezoning it RU1 or RU4. The proposed open land use tables expand the use of this area exponentially. The likely consequence will be land clearing.

Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

Concerned about the changes to the E2 zone.	While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.
Appalled that advice from State agencies has been ignored.	The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
180 The community is greatly concerned about the proposed removal of some important environmental protections.	Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
Concerned that Council is ignoring the advice of State agencies.	The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.
The proposal should go before a body truly representative of people in the Shire before it comes before Council for a decision.	This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.
181 If implemented, nearly all conservation measures that have protected our relatively unspoilt environment will be lost. Consequently, opening up nearly all land for clearing and grazing.	Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
The smaller that blocks are allowed, the more clearing takes places, which places the abundance of flora and fauna native to this region under threat.	In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
182 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.	In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
183 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.	In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
184 Concerned about the impact of the proposal on our image, our locale, our businesses (eg. oyster farmers) and the future of our precious environment.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

Concerned about our reputation if Council dismisses the significant objections made by State agencies. Have any of all of the relevant agencies objected to the proposal. If so, why was their advice disregarded? Were they approached for their advice prior to community consultation? If the agencies advice is disregarded, how will our objections be treated? Is the proposal consistent with Ministerial Directions? If not, the proposal should be revisited with further consultation with the agencies and their recommendations, together with the set rules and regulations, be given due respect and adhered to.

I support the potential to subdivide smaller holdings in the south Narooma area, into 20ha lots with dwelling entitlement. This area is extremely poor for farming purposes. Adding to the already granted smaller lots in this area, by passing this LEP there will be some perceived equity in the rulings. This is also a further area for the spread of the local population and therefore raising the rate base for Council.

The proposed removal of most environmental protection measures and reduction of rural lot sizes would result in unmitigated destruction and loss of high conservation values, quality agricultural lands and rural landscape values.

Nature-based tourism is the most important economic industry in our Shire, that will be undermined by the proposal.

The rezoning proposals will not protect biodiversity and other special ecological attributes in rural areas. I do not support the proposal to replace E3 zones with RU1 zones. I do not support the proposal to reduce permissible rural lot sizes. Small lot sizes and a significant increase in the number of smaller rural lots would inevitably lead to widespread land clearing and the cumulative impacts of such clearing.

I strongly oppose the proposed exclusion of Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlays from the LEP. It must be in the LEP to properly inform planning decisions and ensure conservation of biodiversity.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Noted

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and the tourism industry will be assessed.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

I note that Council has ignored the expert advice of Council staff, consultants and State agencies.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

I was shocked to discover the extent to which the local rural area will no doubt be affected by this planning proposal. Even the bushland area at the entrance to Mossy Point, which I had always believed to be Crown Land, could be subdivided and developed.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire. In relation to the area at the entrance to Mossy Point (Area 12a), a large portion of the subject site contains EEC and all of the EEC is proposed to be zoned E2. The area that is not EEC is proposed to be zoned E4. Any future subdivision of the area proposed to be zoned E4 requires development consent and the impacts of the development on the environmental values of the EEC and adjoining wetlands will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and policies including the Coastal Management SEPP.

If Council's intention is to bring more people and growth to the area, the focus should be on development of the towns, not the little hamlets.

A diverse mix of housing opportunities should be planned for. This planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural housing opportunities and a small number of additional large residential lots on land at Mossy Point that does not contain EEC.

Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.

In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.

No acknowledgement of the natural environment that has made the Eurobodalla the tourism magnet it has become.

The Rural Lands Strategy addresses the natural values that draw tourists to the area and provides discussion around the potential to increase rural tourism opportunities. This planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of the strategy in this regard.

Concerned about dismantling of environmental protection that previous councils have put in place.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

Concerned about removal of E3 zones all together to allow agriculture and other uses on previously identified sensitive land. It seems much of the high conservation value land will be rezoned allowing land clearing and grazing of livestock of what was sensitive E3 land.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):  
- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)  
- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)  
In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

Concerned about removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity mapping overlay, which will result in habitat loss.	The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.
No thought to the future challenges of climate change issues and how they affect this coastal area.	Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
Concerned about the advice of OEH being disregarded. The RFS submission point to concern regarding lack of fire break provision for rezoned land for development.	A detailed response to the submissions from RFS has been prepared. The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.
Some proposals are inconsistent with ministerial guidelines for environmental protection.	The application of lot averaging to the RU1 zone was considered in the development of the Rural Lands Strategy, however it was not recommended at this time. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.
190 Request lot averaging be applied to the RU1 zone.	
191 The changes proposed to the zoning laws will only add to the degradation of this areas, spoiling the beauty of a landscape people come to enjoy. Leave the zoning laws as they are.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.
192 We are very supportive of the current proposal.	Noted
However we request that one lot be zoned RU4 with a minimum lot size of 2ha.	Zoning the subject lot RU4 would generate an additional dwelling entitlement in Area 11a. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.
193 The flora and fauna that we all enjoy in this area must be protected. Once rezoning/changes take place there is no turning back. Tourism is vital to this area. If we lose our unique beauty tourists will go elsewhere.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and the tourism industry will be assessed.

<p>I am supporting of many components of the Strategy, but am concerned about the impact of the following aspects on the environmental values of the Shire:</p> <p>Blanket removal of E3 zone and replacement with RU1 and RU4. The E3 zone should be retained and/or retained the biodiversity overlay system.</p> <p>194</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.</p> <p>As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
<p>Proposed decrease in minimum lot size from a current 1000ha down to significantly smaller sizes, especially on land that has previously been determined as having high conservation value. Smaller lot sizes will result in clearing/destruction and further fragmentation of threatened ecological communities, particularly as clearing of native vegetation on smaller sized lots does not require approval under native vegetation legislation. Much higher lot sizes should be retained.</p>	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>Grazing of livestock being exempt in E2 zones, in particular sensitive riparian and wetland areas. The strategy assumes this will not increase grazing of animals in wetlands, but if this is the case, why change the planning framework in this way? Intensive agriculture and grazing should be removed as permissible in E2 zone. Only allow existing uses, with consent, with an intention to phase these activities out over time.</p>	<p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted. Its application will therefore be limited and is unlikely to result in grazing activities in E2 zones where this is not currently undertaken with existing use rights.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p> <p>The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.</p>
<p>Council should take into account the submissions from State agencies and amend the strategy accordingly.</p> <p>195</p> <p>The plan is not consistent with Ministerial Directions.</p> <p>Why zone many thousands of hectares on native vegetation to RU1 and RU4. None of this land is suitable for agriculture. The plan will affect around 90% of land mapped as high conservation value.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent.</p>
<p>There is no mention of consultation with local Aboriginal people. The potential affect on the Gulaga Aboriginal significant landscape is significant.</p>	<p>All members of the community were consulted during the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. All Local Aboriginal Land Councils in Eurobodalla were informed in writing of the public exhibition of the planning proposal. The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.</p>

Council has not addressed the concerns raised by State agencies.	The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
It is wrong to remove all Terrestrial Biodiversity overlays, in favour of subdivision and development.	The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.
I am concerned about the impact on the oyster industry, particularly runoff concerns and the effect on water quality. Grazing will be allowed in fragile wetlands, having an adverse impact on the particular vegetation and affect water quality.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed. The planning proposal does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted. A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.
196 The document is long and complicated for an ordinary person to understand. Request minimum lot size be reduced from 40ha to 20ha to allow a two lot subdivision. 197 Why are no extra dwellings envisaged for Belowra (proposed 500ha minimum lot size), when 12 are envisage for the Cadgee, Nerrigundah and Tinpot areas (100ha minimum lot size)? Belowra should also have a 100ha minimum lot size.	The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional subdivision or dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal. The Belowra area is predominantly very large rural properties, while the Cadgee, Nerrigundah and Tinpot areas is more fragmented. The minimum lot sizes applied are appropriate to each location consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
Support RU1 zoning for Belowra area, however there are smaller lots in single ownership that could be zoned RU4. Support removal of sunset clause for dwelling entitlements.	Noted. Zoning the smaller lots RU4 would generate additional dwelling entitlements in this area. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal. Noted
Support proposal to increase permitted land uses, but strongly oppose 'home occupation (sex services)' being permitted with consent in rural zones.	Noted
Support the proposal to permit detached dual occupancies in the RU4 zone.	Noted
Detached dual occupancy, secondary dwellings, camp grounds and home based child care should all be permitted with consent in the RU1 zone. Support the uses of emergency services facilities and public worship in the RU1 zone with consent. Support removal of biodiversity map from LEP. Support flexibility to allow boundary adjustments.	All of these uses are already permitted with consent in the RU1 zone. Noted Noted Noted
Request that the Watercourses Map for the Belowra area be removed from the LEP as it is incomplete.	The draft watercourses map on exhibition shows only where the existing map in ELEP 2012 will be updated. Notwithstanding, it is true that in more remote areas, not all watercourses are shown on this map. This does not mean that the map should be removed, as the NSW Water Management Act 2000 applies to all defined watercourses, not just those shown on an LEP map.
All split zones should be removed from the LEP.	By zoning the majority of deferred land to the RU1 or RU4 zones, the existence of split zoning will be significantly removed from the LEP. However, in some locations, a split zoning is appropriate to maintain, such as where the majority of land is zoned RU1 but a wetland on the property is zoned E2.

198	<p>Concerned about the winding back of important environmental protections, land which has been attributed with high conservation values and was previously protected with E3 zoning.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> .</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>
199	<p>Council is proposing to remove the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 from the LEP, thus weakening environmental protections. If there is no zone that includes environmental management in the LEP, then DCPs are not able to safeguard good practices in environmental management or protect connectivity of ecosystems.</p> <p>I have particular concern for 10ha lots along waterways such as the Tomaga River with increased runoff and unrestricted grazing of stock in E2 areas impacting on habitat for endangered species and sensitive wetlands.</p> <p>I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel representative of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p> <p>Development Control Plans can provide guidance for environmental assessment irrespective of the zoning of the land.</p> <p>The existing lots along the southern side of the Tomaga River where a 10ha minimum lot size is proposed are already 10ha lots. The planning proposal facilitates no further subdivision of these lots.</p> <p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted. The E2 zoning along the Tomaga River are coastal wetlands and therefore grazing is not proposed to be permitted in these areas.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
200	<p>Concerned about community consultation process, the language used in planning documents, the lack of influence by community members in planning.</p> <p>Concerned that there is no mention of climate change in the planning proposal.</p> <p>We can't just deal with what Council is doing because its actions involve the complexity of present production and consumption processes and the way these are fuelled by changes in global labour costs. With the whole shire now blanketed with a numerous and growing list of restrictive overlays and still many E zones, it should be obvious why the people demanded the removal of all E zones and all overlays from all private property.</p>	<p>The planning proposal was notified and exhibited by Council in excess of the minimum requirements outlined in the Gateway Determination issued by the Minister for Planning. All land owners directly affected were notified in writing. All State agencies identified in the Gateway Determination were notified in writing. A media release was issued. Two public notices were placed in local papers. State agencies were all informed in writing of the extension of the public exhibition period, as was the community through a media release. This follows extensive community engagement over four years on the Rural Lands Strategy, which the planning proposal is seeking to implement.</p> <p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of the Council's adopted Rural Lands Strategy by making relevant amendments to ELEP 2012. The planning proposal does not relate to production and consumption processes or global labour costs.</p> <p>The ELEP 2012 contains a number of map overlays, one of which is proposed to be removed. Other mapping data is not contained in ELEP 2012. None of the overlay maps or other mapping data prohibit any development. All relevant mapping data is appropriately used to inform the assessment of development applications.</p>

201	The proposal would effectively remove many of the current environmental protections from rural land, opening the way for destructive clearing and environmental degradation.	Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> . The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in subdivision potential across the Shire.
	The proposal to allow grazing without restriction in all E2 zones could lead to degradation of wetlands and runoff that would affect waterways.	While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.
	Council has ignored or dismissed the advice of State agencies.	The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
	Concerned at the proposal to remove the Terrestrial Biodiversity overlays and associated planning tools.	The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.
	I call on Council to withdraw this Proposal and redraft in a more responsible manner, through genuine consultation with State agencies and an advisory panel more representative of the broader community, including those with actual expertise in conservation and environmental management.	The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.
202	Do not allow this destruction to take place. Keep the environment to control carbon emissions.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values will be assessed.
203	I support the proposed rezoning of land at George Bass Drive, Mossy Point to E4. The trees in this area block out sunlight to our home and do not allow us to install solar panels. The trees are also a danger and fire risk.	Noted
204	Object to the changes in zoning from environmentally protected to rural, meaning there will be a massive clearing of forested areas, which will impact bird life, native habitats, waterways and the Eurobodalla's greenhouse emissions.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
	Why is Council ignoring the expert advice of State agencies? We do not see evidence of balance or even of acknowledgement of the Council's justification for this amendment.	The planning proposal seeks to implement Council's adopted Rural Lands Strategy. The Strategy and the planning proposal provide detailed justifications for the proposed LEP amendments.

We are concerned that this amendment is to establish a "thin edge of the wedge" approach to opening land to development. What are the downstream proposals that the Council is aware of that will benefit from these changes in zoning?

The planning proposal provides for a modest increase in lots and dwellings and will not result in significant land clearing. The planning proposal identifies where additional lots and dwellings are facilitated.

205 Strongly wish Council to retain the Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlays.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

Strongly object to relaxing the regulations concerning grazing where it is now prohibited.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted. Grazing is currently permitted on the vast majority of land that is proposed to be rezoned to RU1 or RU4 under this planning proposal.

206 Object to reduction in minimum lot size from 600m<sup>2</sup> to 550m<sup>2</sup> for land at Lewana Close, Lilli Pilli.

The proposed reduction in minimum lot size is to ensure consistency of standards across the R2 Low Density Residential Zone. All R2 zoned land adjoining the subject land has a minimum lot size of 550m<sup>2</sup>.

207 Any clearing of forested land and sensitive wetlands is abhorrent. Our area has become well known for its pristine waterways, abundant wildlife and clean food production, particularly oysters. To compromise these is concerning.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed. The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

I ask that council withdraw the proposal and review is with the wider community in mind.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

208 My overall impression of the changes are that current environmental protections are to be removed to facilitate the subdivision of private lands. Removing environmental controls will see a flood of subdivision proposals, which will degrade the scenic amenity and the "Nature Coast" tourism, but cause a fall in existing land values as the various subdividers compete with one another to sell their holdings.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in subdivision potential across the Shire.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The RLS will remove E3 lands from the LEP, making environmental protection of bushland, wetlands, estuaries and rivers a local development plan responsibility with few considerations for environmental values. This will adversely affect 380sq km of the shire that have high conservation values. Under the RLS, subdivisions will be assessed in isolation rather than holistically against the bigger environmental picture/impact.

The planning proposal will make no changes to the way development applications for subdivision are assessed.

Subdividing larger agricultural holdings and bushland will result in significant clearing for roads, buildings, fire protections, etc. Without appropriate environmental protections we will see large scale destruction of ecosystems. Clearing will reduce forest cover negatively impacting rainfall. It will reduce available water resources. It will degrade water quality in our lakes and estuaries.

I am not against the idea of subdividing rural lands but this needs to be done in such a way that the environmental, social and economic values of the shire are not damaged in the process.

Concerned about the removal of E3 environmental protections, turning important native forests into RU1 or RU4 agricultural land and housing subdivisions.

Allowing the removal of native forests that currently provide an important carbon sink, will release large amounts of carbon and be detrimental to the climate.

Smaller lot sizes and greater subdivision of rural land will fragment wildlife habitat with forest clearing for housing, roads, fences and bush fire asset protection zones. The risk of waterways being polluted due to greater development is of deep concern. As is the potential risk to our drinking water. Council's proposals will undermine local oyster farmers and tourism. Council has dismissed the existence of high conservation values and EECs, as advised by the Office of Environment and Heritage and ignored the fact that these areas include known Aboriginal cultural heritage, biodiversity hotspots and threatened species.

Council has ignored the expert advice of various State agencies.

I ask you to withdraw this proposal and ensure that it is reviewed by a genuinely representative community panel including scientific experts and NSW Government agencies.

The move to an open land use policy is likely to result in activities which will damage the environment. Rural land should continue to be protected environmentally. At the very least the principle should be that uses not explicitly permitted would require justification and consideration on a case by case basis.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs. The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 or RU1 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987, zones in which agriculture is permitted without consent and clearing is permitted with consent.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in subdivision and dwellings across rural areas. It does not change the permissibility of agriculture in rural areas. It will not result in large-scale clearing of native forests.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

A separate detailed response to the submission from the Office of Environment and Heritage has been prepared. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The planning proposal could result in extensive land clearing with damage to waterways. With tree clearing and increased density of dwellings, Eurobodalla will lose its unique asset - its natural beauty and pristine landscape, affecting the tourism industry.

The changes will add to Australia's climate change problems. Land clearing, especially for grazing will increase greenhouse emissions.

The proposals do not provide sufficient protection for Aboriginal sites of significance. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land.

There is a need for a stronger statement of principle in the planning proposal about protecting sites of historical significance on rural land. Allowing tourism signage needs to be done with care so that signs do not clutter and disfigure the landscape. The only tourist signs that should be allowed are signs that help tourists reach their destination and are sympathetic to the environment.

Concerned about allowing grazing and the building of boatsheds in the E2 zone because of the likely harm to flora, fauna and waterways.

The strategy does not utilise E3 zonings and limits the use of E2 zoning to a few wetlands and some coastal environments. The proposal will also allow grazing in the E2 zones, which will increase the damage to the fragile wetlands.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on waterways or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the tourism industry will be assessed.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.

The planning proposal ensures the ongoing protection of heritage assets in the Shire by including listed heritage items, conservation areas and Places of Aboriginal Heritage Significance in ELEP 2012.

This is exactly what is intended by the planning proposal.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

There are existing boatsheds on land zoned E2 adjoining waterways. Any future proposal for a boatshed would require development consent and approvals, leases or licences from the relevant State authority.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The current LEP includes a terrestrial biodiversity overlay that identifies EECs. The proposal is to replace this with a Native Vegetation overlay which doesn't identify EECs. Why forsake all that information currently available?

The draft strategy does not identify biocorridors which are important to maintain viable native flora and fauna into the future. The draft does not address how much land occurs in the biocorridors compared to the Native Vegetation overlay.

By allowing increased subdivision in heavily forested and steep terrain there would be a corresponding increase in bush fire measures, having a severe impact on native vegetation especially high conservation value land. The use of HCV overlays would allow the community and landowners to have realistic expectations of the development potential of the land.

I am also concerned about zoning of Council bushland reserves from 6(a) public open space to RU1. The proposal seeks to allow development of jetties, marinas, boatsheds and other nautical activities on RU1 and RU4 land. The proposal refers to the use of public lands for private facilities. The two words public and private do not sit well in the same sentence. The proposal also allows boatsheds in the E2 zone. Allowing one boatshed would set a precedent for other land owners. Boatsheds is not in the spirit or intent of environmental protection zones.

For my land, the proposal seeks to remove existing 7(a) wetland zoning. We ask for the 7(a) zoning or equivalent to be maintained.

Concerned about damage to conservation values and the tourism industry. Rezoning proposals should have no negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity in areas that have been identified as having high conservation values. There should be no measures such as land clearing or subdivisions of land that will reduce environmental protections.

I understand Council's consultant and the government's own experts have opposed some of the changes and pointed out that some are inconsistent with Ministerial Directions.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

The current mapping of biocorridors on the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map does not require protection of vegetation or rehabilitation of cleared areas. The Map simply identifies matters for consideration in the assessment of development applications. These same considerations will continue to be made in the assessment of development applications as the data will remain and will continue to be used, though it will not be included in the LEP and only existing native vegetation will be identified on the map to be included in a Code. Regionally significant biocorridors are mapped in the South East and Tablelands Regional Plan.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

No Council owned public reserves are proposed to be zoned RU1. Lands currently zoned 6(a) and proposed to be zoned RU1 are former Crown Lands that have been transferred to the relevant Local Aboriginal Land Council.

Marine infrastructure often has land-based and water-based components (both of which could be public or private). The planning proposal simply provides for development consent to be required for these kinds of developments, in addition to existing approvals or licences required from relevant State agencies.

There are existing boatsheds on land zoned E2 adjoining waterways. Any future proposal for a boatshed would require development consent and approvals, leases or licences from the relevant State authority. The existing area of E2 zone on the subject property was consistent with the SEPP 14 wetland boundary. No change to the existing E2 zoning is proposed. Notwithstanding the current mapping in the Coastal Management SEPP covers a larger area and provides relevant protections.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and the tourism industry will be assessed.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

South East Local Land Services said that while broad scale clearing needs approval at the state level, clearing for subdivision generally does not. They wanted the cumulative impact of clearing to be considered and it has not been.

Clearing for subdivision requires development consent and this will be assessed by Council in accordance with the relevant environmental legislation and policies.

OEH said there should be no grazing of coastal wetlands and they objected to subdivision and dwellings on lots with HCV. They opposed the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlay and clause 6.6.

A detailed response to the submissions from OEH has been prepared.

Current proposals for State Forests will result in more clear-felling and denser regrowth, which has the effect of increasing sedimentation of streams and reducing water yield. The planning proposal will add to these problems, with increased grazing and cleared land reducing the quality of the Shire's water supply. The Department of Primary Industries does not think Council has given enough consideration to provision of adequate water supplies as small rural subdivisions will place greater demand on water resources.

The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Any development that requires consent will be assessed in accordance with the relevant environmental legislation, including legislation relating to land clearing and impacts on water resources.

The proposed strategy will not protect land that has been identified by OEH as having high conservation values and can be zoned for primary production that will significantly reduce environmental protections. There are no controls to differentiate area of high ecological significance or high agricultural value and thus appropriately plan for land usage within parcels. The additional land uses proposed will mean that degradation or inappropriate development of both high ecological and agricultural lands will occur.

The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

213

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

Jetties (water recreation structures) are already permitted with consent in the E2 zone.

There are existing boatsheds on land zoned E2 adjoining waterways . Any future proposal for a boatshed would require development consent and approvals, leases or licences from the relevant State authority.

Concerned about allowing grazing, jetties and boatshed in E2 zones. Concerned about removal of high level protections in the upper Deua, changes opposed by OEH. The Deua is Moruya's town water supply, has EECs and endangered species and already is under pressure from forestry, the Araluen Road and existing development.

The planning proposal facilitates a very small number of additional lots and dwellings in the upper Deua. All of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently included in the 1(a1) zone which allows extensive agriculture without consent and clearing with consent. The planning proposal does not change this current land use permissibility.

In principle, smaller lot sizes is not a problem, however the resultant land clearing to comply with fire regulations has the potential to seriously impact on habitat and wildlife corridors and thus biodiversity. There is also no mechanism to preserve land with high agricultural values. We run the risk if a plethora of neatly mown 5 acre blocks and no food production.

No rural land will be able to be subdivided to as low as 5 acres as a result of this planning proposal. High value agricultural land will have minimum lot sizes in excess of 100ha.

Biodiversity overlays as a tool for assessing potential developments are essential. The removal of these overlays is a major flaw in the proposal.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

It is disappointing that Council has dismissed significant objections from State agencies and inconsistencies with Ministerial Directions.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

We are hopeful that Council will review the proposal and reconsider many of these serious issues, paying particular attention to the science and best practice in planning and land management as advised by expert State agencies and in consultation with a genuine community advisory panel that is a true representation of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

I fully endorse the submission by the chair of SHASA, Kathryn Maxwell. And reiterate her claims that removing environmental management from the LEP will lead to degradation of bushland, wetlands, estuaries and rivers in

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

214 Eurobodalla Shire.

Noted. A detailed response to the SHASA submission has been prepared.

Portions 1, 2, 12 and 154 Parish of Congo needs important environmental protection. I do not agree to the rezoning and subdivision proposal put

The subject lands are currently partly zoned RU1 under ELP 2012 and Rural 1(a) under the Rural LEP 1987. The proposal to zone all of the land RU1 with a 40ha minimum lot size maintains the existing rural zoning and does not permit subdivision.

215 forward by Council.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

216 Concerned that Council is ignoring expert advice.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

The contribution to climate change has not been taken into account.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

The additional land uses means anything goes.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The proposed reduction in lot sizes, in combination with the removal of environmental protections will remove, disrupt and fragment the Shire's environmentally significant bushlands, resulting in an exponential loss of habitat and connecting corridors, and placing greater pressure on threatened species and ecosystems.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

	<p>The largest employer in Eurobodalla is tourism and recreation. The draft proposal puts at risk the Nature Coast's greatest assets.</p>
217	<p>The planning proposal does not change existing environmental protections which are predominantly included in NSW Government legislation. The planning proposal facilitates modest additional development, including rural tourism, and will not change the character of the Shire or negatively affect the tourism industry.</p> <p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
218	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
219	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p> <p>Every tree in our shire is valuable providing habitat for our many species, including a number of endangered and threatened animals. Trees and forests are also vital to reduce the amount of atmospheric CO2 being released, causing climate change.</p>
	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
	<p>The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.</p> <p>I have read that State agencies have objected to the amendments to the LEP. Why would Council ignore their advice?</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p>
	<p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p> <p>The whole matter needs to be reviewed and needs to include representation from all concerned community groups, government agencies and experts across relevant fields.</p>
	<p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.</p> <p>I was especially alarmed to read the Clyde River Oyster Industry could be affected.</p>
	<p>The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.</p> <p>Areas of cultural Aboriginal significance and priceless tourism areas could be destroyed.</p>
220	<p>The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>The proposal is not in keeping with our current Community Strategic Plan which values the conservation of our natural environment.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and the tourism industry will be assessed.</p> <p>The proposal will be detrimental to our tourism industry as it will damage our waterways. Council's push to develop rural lands will damage our reputation as responsible managers of our natural environment.</p>

It will damage biodiversity in the region by fragmenting sensitive areas and reducing wildlife habitat and corridors.

The reduction in lot sizes will result in more land clearing, having a negative cumulative impact on the surrounding natural environment including waterways.

There appears to be little restrictions about land use - opening up this land to potentially damaging uses without any further checks and balances.

The strategy is in conflict with independent advice and therefore goes against best practice management of rural lands. For example, South East LLS said that clearing for subdivision does not need approval at the State level and with this goes loss of protection. OEH recommend no further clearing of coastal wetlands which are including in this strategy.

Climate change has not been considered in developing this strategy.

Land clearing in the upper Clyde will have a significant and long lasting negative effect on the local oyster industry.

Increased demand for water due to increased lots will have a negative impact on our natural waterways and sustainability of a reliable water source for the local population.

221 Request that whole of property have a 2ha minimum lot size.

222 The proposal is an exercise in removing virtually all local government environmental zoning controls over our Shire.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

Detailed responses to the submissions from State agencies have been prepared.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased impacts on water quality or supply. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and supply will be assessed. Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

<p>I object to the removal of E3 zoning from 380,000 square kilometres of rural land, 70% of which is forested, much is steep and along waterways with areas of HCV and EECs and threatened species. Rezoning these areas to RU1 opens these areas up to inappropriate development.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
<p>I object to allowing significantly smaller lots in the RU1 zones and increasing the range of activities allowed. This will lead to increased clearing of native vegetation in areas of HCV and along waterways, affecting water quality and the remote access leads to increased fire risk.</p>	<p>The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.</p> <p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>I object to allowing grazing without consent in E2 zones.</p> <p>I object to the removal of environmental overlays which currently allow easy access to understanding attributes and constraints to development. I object to the reliance on the lesser instrument of DCPs and Codes of Practice to protect environmental values in our Shire. Deferred matter in Areas 37a, 37b and 37c have all been converted from 1(a1) under RLEP 1987 to RU1 with no environmental zoning designation and with 40ha lot sizes. This land is part of the drinking water catchment for much of Eurobodalla's population. Removing environmental protections from this land risks grazing, clearing and other developments impacting on our water quality.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p> <p>Development Control Plans can provide guidance for environmental assessment irrespective of the zoning of the land.</p>
<p>I want Council to withdraw this Proposal and review it with a community advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including state agencies and people with wide nature conservation experience.</p>	<p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
<p>Concerned that the proposal removes existing protections for large areas of land with important environmental, cultural and social values.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>

<p>The concept that there should be wholesale removal of E3 zones across the entire Shire is absurd and opens the door to large scale clearing of vegetation and disturbance of habitat and soils via RAMA exemptions under the Local Land Services Act 2013.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.</p> <p>The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas. The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>The proposal will facilitate further rural subdivision on rural lands which will compromise the enormous natural values that make the area special.</p>	
<p>Council has access to detailed HCV mapping however is ignoring this information and have not proposed zoning that will protect these lands. Instead, most land zoned for environmental protection in the 2012 LEP is proposed to be zoned RU1 or RU4, which will allow land clearing and a range of additional uses that are incompatible with the sensitive nature of these lands, including wetlands, biodiversity offset areas, coastal protection lands, crown lands and Council's own bushland reserves. Concerned about the impact on native vegetation from a reduction in minimum lot sizes and broadening of permissible land uses, including making grazing in E2 wetlands permissible.</p>	<p>Council is not ignoring the detailed HCV mapping. This mapping will continue to be used as it is now in the assessment of development applications.</p> <p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p> <p>While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.</p>
<p>Concerned about the impact of removing biodiversity overlays from the LEP. The information provided by good overlays is not only important in the early planning stages to avoid impacting on significant natural assets, but also during the development assessment process.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
<p>Concerned about the impact of managing bushfire risk on highly constrained land. Concerned about the impacts on waterways and water quality from significant clearing that will result from increasing the extent of land zoned for primary production and the resulting increase in clearing.</p>	<p>Almost the whole of Eurobodalla is bush fire prone. Any proposals for subdivision or development in bush fire prone areas must be assessed against the requirements of Planning for Bushfire Protection 2016.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>Concerned about climate change impacts from clearing of land for agriculture.</p>	<p>Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.</p>

The proposal conflicts with NSW Government Acid Sulfate Soils Planning Guidelines, which states that environmental protection or eco-tourism zones may be preferable to urban or rural zones in areas where there is a high risk if acid should leach into the environment.

Concerned that Council is ignoring expert advice.

224 Concerned that Council is ignoring the advice of OEH.

Our waterways and associated mainly forested areas are what ensures we maintain a magnetism other areas have lost. Their survival guarantees continued attraction for visitors and residents. The economic survival of the Eurobodalla depends almost wholly on tourism.

The Terrestrial Biodiversity Map carefully sets out desirable objectives for our Shire. These objectives should remain and zoning changes under our planning scheme are unnecessary.

225 Do not support the replacement of the environmental overlays by resorting to the original RU overlays.

The integrity of the natural environment should be protected at all costs. I do not want unlimited subdivision compromising vulnerable coastal vegetation. Rezoning areas of high conservation value to allow land clearing for primary production and higher density development will destroy the high value tourism industry. More housing means more clearing for bushfire protection, roads, fences, views.

Subdivision means that protection that existed under a lower density zone will be removed allowing more clearing resulting in loss of habitat and more threatened species and ecosystems. The proposal will compromise our water quality, air quality and therefore the health of all residents.

The planning proposal is consistent with Ministerial Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils. The planning proposal completes the mapping of areas likely to be affected by Acid Sulfate Soils.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

The planning proposal does not facilitate unlimited subdivision. The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The planning proposal does not change the density of rural areas in any significant way. In most areas, the planning proposal facilitates up to four additional dwellings. This modest level of development is unlikely to compromise water quality, air quality or the health of residents. Any clearing associated with a development proposal and the potential impacts will all be assessed through the development application process.

	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>Why is Council ignoring expert advice?</p> <p>If we allow unmitigated subdivision which does not have the same environmental controls as larger lot clearing, there will be cumulative impacts that we may not be able to foresee or control in the future.</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not allow unmitigated subdivision. The planning proposal facilitates a small number of additional lots and most areas will continue to have large rural lots. All existing NSW Government environmental legislation and policies will apply and Council will continue to use detailed environmental mapping in the assessment of any development application for subdivision.</p>
<p>226 Object to the proposal to remove the Terrestrial Biodiversity Overlay that ensure continuity of wildlife corridors and conservation of the precious remaining areas of intact natural communities and habitat.</p> <p>Concerned about the extent of land clearing that might occur if smaller block sizes replace the current allowed sizes in the Shire.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
<p>227 We need to strengthen environmental protections, but I am concerned by elements in the planning proposal that threaten this.</p> <p>I object to the RU1 and RU4 zoning in areas with high conservation values. The proposed zoning will allow land clearing and many additional uses incompatible with HCVs.</p> <p>I am concerned about the fragmentation of our bushland. To maintain ecosystems we need connecting corridors. With increase in smaller lot sizes there will inevitably be more land clearing.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>The planning proposal does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential in rural areas. All of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 or RU4 is currently included in a rural zone that permits agriculture and clearing. No increase in clearing for agriculture is facilitated by the planning proposal.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>Why has Council ignored expert advice and Directions from the Minister for Planning?</p>	<p>The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.</p>
<p>I object to the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity layer and associated clause 6.6. These overlays are essential to good environmental management.</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>

I urge Council to withdraw this proposal and review it together with expert State agencies and a genuine community advisory panel that is truly representative of the broad community, including several people with wide nature conservation experience.

Concerned about damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry. The strategy will result in agricultural and forest land being cleared and subdivided and environmental protections on our waterways and bush would be lost. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land. Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.

Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, called High Conservation Values in the LEP. Around 90% of the HCV will be zoned primary production which will allow land clearing and many additional land uses.

Concerned the reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.

Concerned that water catchments, oyster farming and lakes are at risk from clearing and smaller lots in the upper reaches of the Deua River. High level 1 protection (a1) for water catchments with some agriculture would be removed to allow RU1. Oyster farming in the Clyde River and Wagonga Inlet are threatened by clearing allowed along shorelines. Sensitive areas next to lakes, rivers and creeks will have RU4 zoning, leading to smaller lots, clearing for subdivision and reduced water quality.

I am concerned about the negative impact on the biodiversity of the Shire. The current E3 zones have been completely removed from the proposal and this will significantly reduce the environmental protection by allowing grazing in areas which include all growth forest and high conservation value woodland, forest and wetland.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed.

The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.

The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation value vegetation. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The reduction in lot sizes permits a very modest number of additional lots to be created. A total of 122 lots across the Shire is facilitated by the planning proposal. Clearing of vegetation would not be required for every proposed subdivision or dwelling facilitated by the planning proposal as some properties that benefit already have some cleared areas. Where clearing is proposed in association with a development proposal, Council will assess the impact of the proposal on the environment will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)
- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The proposal includes a range of permissible lot sizes from areas as small as two hectares upwards. I am deeply alarmed at the impact of land clearing and habitat destruction for housing, roads and fences.

I am concerned about the additional land uses proposed and open land use for RU1 and RU4 zones. I am alarmed at the potential for land clearing, habitat destruction and loss of biodiversity.

Council is ignoring expert advice, including from several State agencies. Land clearing, especially for grazing cattle, will increase greenhouse emissions. Retaining intact native vegetation will mitigate the effects of climate change as vegetation provides carbon storage.

Concerned about water supply. Current proposals for State Forests will result in more clear-felling and denser regrowth, which has the effect of increasing sedimentation of streams and reducing water yield. The planning proposal will add to these problems, with increased grazing and cleared land reducing the quality of the Shire's water supply. The Department of Primary Industries does not think Council has given enough consideration to provision of adequate water supplies as small rural subdivisions will place greater demand on water resources.

230 Concerned that Council is weakening environmental protections by not including E3 zones in the new LEP.

Concerned about any proposals that allow for further subdivision and clearing of forested rural lands. The proposal will lead to widespread habitat fragmentation as native forests are cleared for housing, roads, fences and bushfire reduction. Increased runoff and erosion will ultimately damage water catchments, lakes and rivers and potentially threaten important tourism and oyster industries.

Many of the areas proposed for rezoning are described by OEH as having high conservation values, including known Aboriginal cultural heritage, biodiversity hotspots and threatened species sightings.

I note that the proposed changes goes against much of the advice from State agencies.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The planning proposal does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential in rural areas. All of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 or RU4 is currently included in a rural zone that permits agriculture and clearing. No increase in clearing for agriculture is facilitated by the planning proposal.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased impacts on water quality or supply. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and supply will be assessed.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the tourism and oyster industries. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on these industries will be assessed.

A separate detailed response to the submission from the Office of Environment and Heritage has been prepared. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

231	Object to the changes to land clearing laws proposed. Clearing carbon (trees) is promoting global warming. We should be preserving trees more than ever before.	The planning proposal does not propose any changes to land clearing laws. Land clearing laws are contained in NSW Government legislation.
232	I do not support small block sizes, many new dwellings, grazing of wetlands, lack of protection of forested areas.	The planning proposal applies minimum lot size that are appropriate to the predominant existing lot size in each area. It does not result in significant subdivision or clearing potential. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
233	On balance we support the Rural Lands Strategy and feel that Council has done a good job. However, we request the minimum lot size for our land be reduced from 40ha to 2ha.	Noted The planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy. Any further changes that would result in additional subdivision or dwelling entitlements should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.
234	Concerned that Council is ignoring expert advice by the consultant and State agencies.	The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.
	Concerned about damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry. The strategy will result in agricultural and forest land being subdivided and cleared and environmental protections on our waterways and bush would be lost. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land. Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed. The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.
	Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, called High Conservation Values in the LEP. Around 90% of the HCV will be zoned primary production which will allow land clearing and many additional land uses.	The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation value vegetation. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.
	The effects of climate change have not been considered.	Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.
	Concerned that water catchments, oyster farming and lakes are at risk from clearing and smaller lots in the upper reaches of the Deua River. High level 1 protection (a1) for water catchments with some agriculture would be removed to allow RU1. Oyster farming in the Clyde River and Wagonga Inlet are threatened by clearing allowed along shorelines. Sensitive areas next to lakes, rivers and creeks will have RU4 zoning, leading to smaller lots, clearing for subdivision and reduced water quality.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.
235	Concerned about damage to conservation values and the tourism industry. Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values and the tourism industry will be assessed.

<p>Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, called High Conservation Values in the LEP. The proposal will significantly reduce environmental protections and old growth trees. Loss of habitat through fragmentation of our important bushlands will result in impacting on threatened species and ecosystems.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation value vegetation. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.</p>
<p>Concerned the reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.</p>	<p>The reduction in lot sizes permits a very modest number of additional lots to be created. A total of 122 lots across the Shire is facilitated by the planning proposal. Clearing of vegetation would not be required for every proposed subdivision or dwelling facilitated by the planning proposal as some properties that benefit already have some cleared areas. Where clearing is proposed in association with a development proposal, Council will assess the impact of the proposal on the environment will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.</p>
<p>How can Council ignore expert advice from State agencies?</p>	<p>The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.</p>
<p>236 Request a rezoning of the land to E4 with a 5ha minimum lot size.</p>	<p>Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.</p>
<p>237 Request a reduction in the minimum lot size to 2500m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.</p>
<p>238 Concerned about Crown Land being sold off without adequate environmental protection in place.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i>. The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p>
<p>Opposed to the excising of E3/DM zone from the LEP, the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map.</p>	<p>The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)</li> <li>- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)</li> </ul> <p>In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p>
<p>Concerned about the need to take into consideration the OEH report.</p>	<p>A detailed response to the submissions from OEH has been prepared.</p>

239	<p>Concerned about the lack of tools to assist landowners, potential purchasers or consent authorities to differentiate areas of high ecological significance or high agricultural value and thus appropriately plan.</p> <p>The additional uses proposed will mean that degradation or inappropriate development of both high ecological and agricultural value land will occur.</p> <p>Concerned about allowing grazing, jetties and boatsheds in E2 zones. Concerned about removal of high level protections in the upper Deua, changes opposed by OEH. The Deua is Moruya's town water supply, has EECs and endangered species and already is under pressure from forestry, the Araluen Road and existing development.</p> <p>In principle, I don't have a problem with smaller lot sizes, however the resultant land clearing to comply with fire regulations has the potential to seriously impact on habitat and wildlife corridors and thus biodiversity. There is also no mechanism to preserve land with high agricultural values. We run the risk if a plethora of neatly mown 5 acre blocks and no food production.</p> <p>Biodiversity overlays as a tool for assessing potential developments are essential. The removal of these overlays is a major flaw in the proposal.</p> <p>I hope the strategy can be reviewed again, with ecological and agricultural values seen as interdependent and attention paid to science and best practice in planning and land management.</p> <p>I would like reassurance that the environment will not suffer as a result of the changes and that the new zoning will include equivalent environmental protections that exist in the current zoning of rural lands.</p> <p>I am sympathetic to the views of the oyster industry. Council should carefully consider their views as this is a very important industry in our Shire.</p>	<p>All information and tools currently available to landowners, potential purchasers and consent authorities will continue to be available to assist in the preparation and assessment of development proposals.</p> <p>For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies. While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted. Jetties (water recreation structures) are already permitted with consent in the E2 zone. There are existing boatsheds on land zoned E2 adjoining waterways. Any future proposal for a boatshed would require development consent and approvals, leases or licences from the relevant State authority.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a very small number of additional lots and dwellings in the upper Deua. All of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 is currently included in the 1(a1) zone which allows extensive agriculture without consent and clearing with consent. The planning proposal does not change this current land use permissibility.</p> <p>No rural land will be able to be subdivided to as low as 5 acres as a result of this planning proposal. High value agricultural land will have minimum lot sizes in excess of 100ha.</p> <p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers. The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council. The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.</p>
240	<p>I would like reassurance that the environment will not suffer as a result of the changes and that the new zoning will include equivalent environmental protections that exist in the current zoning of rural lands.</p> <p>I am sympathetic to the views of the oyster industry. Council should carefully consider their views as this is a very important industry in our Shire.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p> <p>Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.</p>

241	<p>Concerned about the potential development in Oaks Ranch. I think rural tourism is a good thing but if dense residential housing must be created on rural land and then sold off to raise fund for a new or expanded tourism venture, it is imperative that all the plans are put forward. Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.</p>	<p>In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.</p>
242	<p>Object to the reduction in environmental protection standards and provisions. The proposal if adopted would increase fragmentation of the Shire's environmentally important areas of intact native vegetation, leading to a loss of habitat and connecting environmental corridors and a greater impact of human activity on threatened species and ecosystems.</p>	<p>Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> .</p> <p>The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
243	<p>Object to removal of Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6. Overlays are critical for accurate delineation of environmentally sensitive areas and for consideration early in any planning for a land use. It is important to separately define extant native vegetation, EECs and bio-corridors as they require different actions to protect and conserve environmental value. Clearing of vegetation needs to be monitored and controlled independently of lot size because of the cumulative impact of clearing.</p> <p>Object to the threat posed by this proposal to already seriously fragmented ecological communities, particularly endangered ones. Concerned by proposals to subdivide and permit dwellings on land close to Burrawang that includes significant areas of Bangalay Sand Forest and Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest (Area 12a).</p>	<p>The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.</p> <p>A large portion of the subject site contains EEC and all of the EEC is proposed to be zoned E2. The area that is not EEC is proposed to be zoned E4. Any future subdivision of the area proposed to be zoned E4 requires development consent and the impacts of the development on the environmental values of the EEC and adjoining wetlands will be assessed in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and policies including the Coastal Management SEPP.</p> <p>The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.</p> <p>This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.</p>
244	<p>Council must withdraw this proposal and review it in conjunction with State agencies to identify all plots of land with high environmental value and zone them to protect these values and use overlays, such as the existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map, that enable planning and land management that will protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
243	<p>Oppose the proposal on the grounds that it will have detrimental effects on the local natural environment. Let us protect the things we love about the Eurobodalla. The more clearing, the greater the population, hence the greater risk for water, both fresh and marine, to be polluted. We need to protect these environments for native wildlife.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent.</p> <p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>
244	<p>Zoning areas of high conservation value as suitable for primary production will result in land clearing and fragmentation of environmentally sensitive bushland. Land clearing will also be facilitated y the proposed reduction in lot sizes.</p>	<p>The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.</p>

The goals of the Rural Lands Strategy make it clear that biodiversity is not a priority. They only refer to complying with the statutory requirements, a minimalist approach. There is no recognition to the large role that land clearing plays in climate change.

I am astounded that several elements of the proposal are inconsistent with Ministerial Directions.

245 Request removal of item 15 of Schedule 1 of ELEP 2012 in relation to Oaks Ranch.

246 Concerned about damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry. The strategy will result in agricultural and forest land being subdivided and cleared and environmental protections on our waterways and bush would be lost. Aboriginal heritage is threatened at Najanuka by changes that would allow clearing of steep and heavily forested land. Council must protect the natural resources that underpin the tourism industry.

Concerned that the rezoning proposals will have a negative effect on the Shire's biodiversity, called High Conservation Values in the LEP. Around 90% of the HCV will be zoned primary production which will allow land clearing and many additional land uses.

Concerned the reduction in lot sizes will increase land clearing and reduce habitat for native species.

Concerned that the additional land uses means almost anything goes. While development needs approval, it isn't often anything is refused, especially for environmental reasons.

Concerned that Council is ignoring expert advice by the consultant and State agencies.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

In relation to the Oaks Ranch property, the only change proposed relates to the current deferred matter, and to the removal of a minimum lot size for the land currently zoned E2. The planning proposal does not relate to the existing Schedule 1 provision for the subject land. Any change to that provision should be the subject of a separate planning proposal.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage or the tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage and the tourism industry will be assessed.

The planning proposal will have no negative impacts on significant Aboriginal Heritage areas. In fact, the planning proposal seeks to complete the mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance that are currently located in the deferred areas, including Najanuka.

The vast majority of the land proposed to be zoned RU1 and RU4 is currently zoned Rural 1(a) or 1(a1) under the Rural LEP 1987. In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. ELEP 2012 does not identify high conservation value vegetation. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The reduction in lot sizes permits a very modest number of additional lots to be created. A total of 122 lots across the Shire is facilitated by the planning proposal. Clearing of vegetation would not be required for every proposed subdivision or dwelling facilitated by the planning proposal as some properties that benefit already have some cleared areas. Where clearing is proposed in association with a development proposal, Council will assess the impact of the proposal on the environment will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

For all proposed additional land uses, development consent is required from Council. Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant NSW Government environmental legislation and policies.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

The effects of climate change have not been considered.

Concerned that water catchments, oyster farming and lakes are at risk from clearing and smaller lots in the upper reaches of the Deua River. High level 1 protection (a1) for water catchments with some agriculture would be removed to allow RU1. Oyster farming in the Clyde River and Wagonga Inlet are threatened by clearing allowed along shorelines. Sensitive areas next to lakes, rivers and creeks will have RU4 zoning, leading to smaller lots, clearing for subdivision and reduced water quality.

247 Object to the removal of E3/DM zone, the removal of Terrestrial Biodiversity map from the LEP and the use of DCPs for environmental management of E3/DM zone. The proposed measures will potentially impact the connectivity of intact forests and degrade ecosystems from the catchment areas of the Shire's rivers to the coastal lakes.

The proposal degrades the only other environmental zone (E2).

Before this proposal is allowed to be finalised, the residents should be given a reasoned response to the objections and issues raised by State agencies. The proposal will at best make no difference to agriculture in the Shire, at worst the increase in rural residential will sanitise areas of moderate farming land.

Some subdivision is warranted. It is true that the biggest growth in farms that are providing a full time living for their families are small farms, as small as 2ha. Eurobodalla is leading the way in Australia for this farming revolution and yet the LEP does nothing to enable future growth of this sector. New subdivisions for small farms must be on good soils with access to affordable, permanent water. The proposed locations for rural subdivision will almost all lead to increased clearing for housing and bushfire protection with little actual food or fibre production. The soil types and agricultural capability has not been a factor in their selection.

Climate change was considered throughout the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. This issue was discussed in the Rural Lands Issues Paper, the Rural Opportunities and Constraints Report and the Policy Directions Paper, all of which informed the final Rural Lands Strategy adopted by Council. Given the planning proposal facilitates minimal clearing of vegetation, it is considered that there will be no climate change impacts as a result. In any case, it should be noted that the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 includes requirements for offsetting the clearing of native vegetation.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be any impacts on the oyster industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on water quality and the oyster industry will be assessed.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

Development Control Plans can provide guidance for environmental assessment irrespective of the zoning of the land.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

Detailed responses to submissions from State agencies have been prepared.

The planning proposal does not facilitate a significant increase in rural residential development. Rather, the proposal facilitates additional small lot rural land and some additional dwelling entitlements on rural lots.

The LEP facilitates additional small lot farming through the use of the RU4 zone and smaller minimum lot sizes, however only one area (Area 30a) is proposed to have a minimum lot size reduced to 2ha. This area has class 3 agricultural soils.

In other areas, the minimum lot sizes have been chosen to be consistent with the existing predominant lot size, with a modest number of additional subdivision and dwellings facilitated. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Provision of building entitlements are fine, but they can also be a hindrance as they inflate land cost to a point where it no longer becomes viable for a young farmer to purchase a property or to farm. There are several examples of new farms on floodplains on less than 2ha that are economically viable, yet this area has been largely ignored for possible subdivision.

The proposal fails community expectations on many levels. We are continually told that consultation has been held over many years. If that consultation had been genuine and has taken heed of the many concerns raised, why is there a last minute uproar about this scheme?

The community has found it too hard to unravel the complexities of the maps and zonings and believe that the whole scheme is about farming. The entire landscape of Eurobodalla will be affected by this proposal.

The scheme needs revisiting by State agencies that can provide an arm's length view of the true priorities for our rural lands.

Council is top heavy with developers and they want to develop our area. Fast track planning permits for subdivision, fast track environmental protections. Subdivide and build along the western side of the highway. Subdivide around Tilba on Aboriginal land. Remove forests. Encourage more empty holiday homes.

248 I support the Coastwatchers' submission to the planning proposal.  
249

I am deeply concerned the adoption of the Strategy by Eurobodalla Shire Council will wipe out critical environmental protections from our rural landscape.

250

The identification of minimum lot sizes to enable subdivision also enables dwelling entitlements on lots larger than the minimum lot size. It would not be appropriate to facilitate subdivision and dwellings on flood plains. Land on flood plains however can be leased to people for the purpose of undertaking primary production and subdivision for rural purposes (without dwelling entitlement) can be undertaken under clause 4.2 of ELEP 2012.

Significant consultation took place in the development of the Rural Lands Strategy. All submissions received during that process were taken into consideration in finalising the Strategy.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies . The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee on which a number of agencies were represented. Agencies have also been consulted on the planning proposal and detailed responses to their submissions have been prepared. This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

The planning proposal does none of the things suggested in this submission. It does not change approval processes or environmental assessment processes. Modest subdivision will be facilitated in some areas, but no subdivision is facilitated in the Tilba area. Aboriginal landscapes are protected through mapping of Aboriginal Places of Heritage Significance. The proposal will not result in widespread clearing of forests. The proposal is not about encouraging holiday homes.

Noted. A detailed response to the Coastwatchers' submission has been prepared.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* .

It is important to note that Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan 2012 (ELEP 2012) does not regulate the clearing of vegetation for agricultural purposes on rural land. This is regulated under the NSW *Local Land Services Act 2013* by Local Land Services.

The regulations for clearing of vegetation associated with a development application in rural areas are contained in the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* . In urban areas, the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* and the Vegetation in Non Rural Areas SEPP apply.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

I cannot understand why Council would propose the removal of protection of forests in light of the climate change implications of these changes. 380 square kilometres of rural land is proposed to be rezoned to remove E3 environmental protections and give them agricultural zoning RU1 or RU4. This new zoning would allow clearing for agriculture and subdivision of these highly forested areas.

The proposals to allow smaller lot sizes and greater subdivision of rural land will fragment wild life habitat as forests are cleared for housing, roads, fences and bush fire asset protection zones. Such clearing not only threatens habitat, wildlife and our insecure climate future - forest areas protect our precious waterways. The reduction in protection of waterways should not proceed as it threatens our drinking water catchments as well as the oyster, marine fisheries and tourism industries.

Many of the areas proposed for rezoning are described by the Office of Environment and Heritage as having High Conservation Values, including Endangered Ecological Communities. These areas include known Aboriginal cultural heritage, biodiversity hotspots and threatened species habitat.

Why has Council not satisfied the objections to the Rural Lands Strategy made by State agencies? The community deserves to hear how Council has responded to specific concerns of these agencies.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The 1000ha minimum lot size was applied to land zoned RU1 when ELEP 2012 was made in 2012 to reflect the previous provisions of the Rural LEP 1987 which limited further subdivision of rural land. Notwithstanding this large minimum lot size, there are very few properties over 1000ha in size in Eurobodalla. Most of Eurobodalla's rural land is already much smaller in size.

The proposal to reduce minimum lot sizes does not allow significant subdivision, as the proposed minimum lot sizes to be applied are generally consistent with the existing size of lots in each area. Across the Eurobodalla Shire, a total of 122 additional lots are facilitated by the planning proposal. In land proposed to be zoned RU1 Primary Production, the additional number of lots that would be allowed is 60, representing a 2% increase in the total number of rural lots. This is not considered to represent significant subdivision in rural areas.

Given the level of additional subdivision and dwellings facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that widespread habitat fragmentation will occur as a result. In many cases, there are already cleared areas on lots that may benefit from additional development potential. In other cases, where clearing is required to achieve additional development, such clearing requires development consent and assessment of the impact of such clearing will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, water quality or the oyster, marine and tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on these matters will be assessed.

A separate detailed response to the submission from the Office of Environment and Heritage has been prepared. The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

It is important to note that, despite the concerns raised by some NSW Government Agencies and the identified inconsistencies with the Ministerial Directions, the Minister for Planning issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

I urge you to abandon these amendments to the LEP 2012 and I ask council to withdraw this proposal. It should be reviewed by a genuinely representative community panel including scientific experts and NSW Government agencies.

I am disappointed in how these proposals have been communicated to the public - the large proposal document is a barrier to citizens having a full grasp of the implications of the changes.

251 Concerned about the removal of important environmental protections.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

Concerned about the removal of the E3 zoning over rural land area, breaking up animal habitats by creating smaller lot sizes for residents. I am concerned this could change the character, rural feel and productivity of our region.

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

A plain-English guide to the planning proposal was prepared and exhibited with the planning proposal to assist in community understanding. Council staff were also available during the exhibition period to assist in understanding the planning proposal.

The proposal is difficult to absorb and it is very long.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Do many of these proposals conflict with the advice of State agencies?

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

I want Council to withdraw this proposal and review it with a genuinely representative community panel including nature experts and State agencies.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

252	Object to the proposal on the grounds that it would allow for the destruction of large areas of native bush, the destruction of significant Aboriginal heritage bushland such as around Gulaga, the destruction of native wildlife due to further habitat reduction and the denigration of the quality of our waterways, which will in turn be detrimental to our local oyster farming industry.	Given the scale of additional development facilitated by the planning proposal is modest, it is not considered that there will be increased damage to conservation values, Aboriginal Heritage, water quality or the oyster and tourism industry. In any case, any new development requires consent from Council and, where relevant, the impacts of the development on these matters will be assessed.
253	Object to the removal of the Terrestrial Biodiversity Maps and clause 6.6. The mapping affords statutory protection to environmentally sensitive areas and gives certainty to the community. Moving the maps to Codes and DCPs reduces environmental protection and allows easy variation during assessment of development applications where the land is environmentally sensitive.	The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.
254	Request zone of land be changed from RU1 to SP3 Tourist.	Given the planning proposal is consistent with the Rural Lands Strategy, the requested change cannot be considered as part of this planning proposal.
255	We support the proposed zoning of our land to RU1 and to include information and education facilities as a use permitted with consent in that zone.	Noted
256	I want to confirm that the dwelling entitlement I have will be preserved. What minimum lot size is proposed for land that is shown white on the maps.	The subject lot is proposed to be zoned RU1. If the subject lot has an existing dwelling entitlement, it will be preserved.  For land shown white on the maps, no change is proposed to the existing minimum lot size.
257	Concerned about negative impacts on our local environment and native wildlife.	The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and facilitates additional rural and environmental tourism opportunities. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.
	With removal of E3 zoning, more land will be cleared for grazing. I am concerned about effect on waterways.	The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012. As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla. The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987): - Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone) - Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone) In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Concerned that Council is disregarding advice from State agencies.

The planning proposal acknowledges inconsistencies with some Ministerial Directions and provides justifications for these. Despite these inconsistencies, the Minister for Planning has issued a Gateway Determination to allow the planning proposal to be placed on public exhibition.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

I ask that Council reconsider these amendments.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

258 Growth is not endless and must be sustainable, without destroying our greatest asset, the natural beauty of this area.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Environmental protections in NSW are primarily delivered through NSW Government legislation, regulations and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), including the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*.

The changes to ELEP 2012 identified in the planning proposal do not change the existing environmental regulations contained in NSW Government legislation or SEPPs.

259 Protest the removal of environmental protections from 38,000ha of the south coast.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

The planning proposal seeks to implement the recommendations of Council's adopted Rural Land Strategy that was developed over a period of four years with input from the NSW Government through the Rural Lands Steering Committee and submissions by various agencies throughout the process. Council engaged with the NSW Government and considered all submissions received before adopting the Rural Lands Strategy. Further engagement with NSW Government agencies has been undertaken as part of this planning proposal process. Council disagrees with a number of issues raised by various NSW Government agencies and the areas of disagreement are addressed in the planning proposal.

Council has ignored the warnings of experts State agencies.

The planning proposal does not facilitate over-development. It facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

Extensive clearing of forested areas has a detrimental impact on bird life and waterways. It increases risk of wildfires. Over development will decrease the economic advantage visitors bring to the south coast.

The planning proposal facilitates a modest increase in rural lots and dwellings and will not result in significant clearing of vegetation. The planning proposal provides an appropriate balance between increased opportunities for agriculture and dwellings and maintaining the existing character of the shire.

260 I do not agree to the rezoning and subdivision proposal in environmentally sensitive areas.

While the planning proposal seeks to make grazing permitted with consent in the E2 zone, this does not permit grazing in coastal wetlands as they are defined as environmentally sensitive areas in which exempt development is not permitted.

The proposal will worsen the management of the catchments of rivers, wetlands and lakes, especially by allowing grazing in E2 areas.

The draft Eurobodalla Local Environmental Plan, exhibited in 2011 included a proposal to use the E3 Environmental Management zone for vegetated rural land in Eurobodalla. Following significant objections, Council resolved not to use the E3 zone and the subject land was deferred from the LEP when it was made in 2012.

As a result, there is no land currently zoned E3 in Eurobodalla. In this planning proposal, the E3 zone is not proposed to be applied to any land in Eurobodalla.

The lands that were previously proposed to be zoned E3 retain a zoning under the Rural Local Environmental Plan 1987. In most cases, the land is included in the following two rural zones (under the Rural LEP 1987):

- Zone 1(a) (Rural Environmental Constraints and Agricultural Zone)

- Zone 1(a1) (Rural Environmental Constraints, water Catchment Protection and Agricultural Zone)

In both of these zones certain forms of agriculture are permitted without consent and land clearing is permitted with consent. Clearing of vegetation in rural areas is also regulated by Local Land Services under the Local Land Services Act 2013. The planning proposal does not change the existing permissibility of agriculture or clearing in rural areas.

The existing Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and clause 6.6 in ELEP 2012 identify where vegetation is located and the clause provides matters for consideration in the assessment of a development application. Locating the map in a Code and referencing it through Development Control Plans will achieve exactly the same outcome. Given the increasing use of electronic mapping at State and local government level, the information contained on the map will continue to be readily available to land owners and developers.

The Rural Lands Strategy was developed with input from NSW Government agencies and all members of the Eurobodalla community had a number of opportunities to provide Council with feedback during the process of developing the Strategy. The process included the establishment of a Rural Lands Steering Committee following an open expression of interest for all members of the public to nominate for. Nominees with a range of interests were selected by Council to participate on the Committee.

This planning proposal is not a review of the Rural Lands Strategy. It seeks to implement the Strategy as adopted by Council.

E3 zones and terrestrial ecosystem maps are not included and by removing clause 6.6, it weakens Council's ability to refuse a development application that could not avoid significant environmental damage.

I want Council to withdraw the proposal. It should be reviewed with a genuinely representative community panel including ecologists and State agencies.