### **Candidate profile – Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore - Property Development NSW**

#### Instructions

- One profile is required for each precinct on the candidate list
- Fill out the first table and include the name of the Precinct, the address and details about the land size and use/s. You may wish to include a map of the site to show the location.
- Provide responses based on the information and resources available.
- Refer to prompting questions to guide your response.

Note: this guidance is not an exhaustive list of information to provide. You may include other information if it is relevant to the question being asked.

- Please include the file name of supporting documents attached to your candidate profile. These must be attached to the email when you submit your application.
- All forms must be returned to <a href="mailto:rezoningpathways@dpie.nsw.gov.au">rezoningpathways@dpie.nsw.gov.au</a> by COB 30 June 2024

Candidate details					
Precinct address	Jordan Esplanade, Coffs Harbour 2450				
Precinct name	Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore				
Proposed land area (ha)	The precinct is approximately 62ha in size (Figure 1).  The main area to be rezoned is 6ha of vacant land adjacent to the rail corridor shown in yellow in Figure 2.				

	iic at
Proponent / developer	Property and Development NSW
Existing land use	Wider Precinct (demonstrated in Figure 1):
	SP2 – Railway, RE1 - Public Recreation, RE2 - Private Recreation, W4 - Working Waterfront, SP2 – Tourism, Marine, Wharf and Boating Facilities,
	The precinct is divided into sub-precincts in the Masterplan as follows (see Figure 2):
	Railway Land:
	SP2 – Railway
	Marina:
	W4 – Working Waterfront
	Deep Sea Fishing Club:
	RE2 – Private Recreation
Proposed land use	The Coffs Jetty Masterplan envisages the revitalisation of the precinct for residential apartments, tourist and visitor accommodation, retail, cafes, commercial spaces, community areas and extensive improvements to the Coffs foreshore public open space. New buildings would predominately be located on 6ha of vacant land adjacent to the rail corridor up to 6 storeys.
	It is understood that the commercial / residential areas needing to be rezoned to implement the masterplan are proposed to be MU1 – Mixed Use

### Candidate profile – Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore - Property Development NSW

**Location Map** 



Figure 1 – Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore precinct

# **Candidate profile – Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore - Property Development NSW**

Site Map - Proposed area for Rezoning



Figure 2 – Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore sub precincts

### **Candidate profile – Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore - Property Development NSW**

Structure Plan - Proposed area for Rezoning

The required land use planning changes apply to the 3 sub precincts which include the Railway Land, Marina and the former Deep Sea Fishing Club (see Figure 2). The main rezoning area is the 6ha railway land with increased height changes proposed for the other precincts.

Criteria	Weighting	Response – commentary and evidence	Prompting questions
1. Provides significant and meaningful public benefits through housing supply/diversity and alignment with State policies land use strategies  List the type and number of dwellings that will be delivered including timings and alignment to other public benefit outcomes	35%	Understood from recent media reports that 450 dwellings are proposed in the precinct. It is understood this equates to 250 permanent dwellings and 200 tourist accommodation units.  The precinct is located within the existing Urban Growth Area Boundary under the North Coast Regional Plan 2041.  According to NSW Government Population projections, the Coffs Harbour population is projected to grow by approximately 9000 people from 2024 to 2041. This requires an additional 5861 dwellings by 2041.  Development of the Coffs Jetty Foreshore land aligns with the North Coast Regional Plan 2041 and the Coffs Harbour Regional City Action Plan.  At this stage, PD NSW has not committed to a figure for affordable housing requirement on this site.	<ul> <li>□ Creates a substantial number of dwellings (e.g., &gt;2,000) or contributes to a substantial proportion of housing for the region or LGA against their housing targets or housing needs?</li> <li>□ Are these within a declared Growth Area?</li> <li>□ Will the dwellings address an undersupply of housing?</li> <li>□ Aligns, delivers, or supports a Strategy, Plan, Government Priority or Policy?         <ul> <li>○ Aligns with the Greater Sydney Region Plan, Regional Plans or District Plans?</li> <li>○ Delivers a State planning priority?</li> <li>○ Delivers a State transport priority?</li> <li>○ Deliver on the local housing strategy?</li> <li>○ Respond to urgent housing needs following natural disasters or economic changes?</li> </ul> </li> <li>□ Aligns with Government Priorities         <ul> <li>(e.g. will it bring more affordable home purchase opportunities to market? Consider size of proposed dwellings, dwelling mix, local housing markets)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

2. To what extent is the proposal providing social and affordable housing?	10%	DPHI notes there is a broad Government position that renewal of surplus government land would provide 30% social and affordable housing.		Delivers a commitment to increase or improve affordable or social housing?  How many social housing or affordable housing dwellings are proposed?
anordable housing:		At this stage, PD NSW has not committed to a figure for	) [D)	What is LAHC's involvement (proponent / stakeholder for part of site etc)?
		affordable housing requirement on this site.		Is Aboriginal housing being provided through the Aboriginal Housing Office (AHO)?
		PD NSW will need to confirm affordable housing target.  Schedule 1		What is the role of the Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC) in the provision of more affordable housing options?
		DPHI is not aware that LAHC, AHO or the LALC have been involved in the process to date.		

### **Candidate profile – Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore - Property Development NSW**

3. Any impediments
to delivery can be
managed and or
have a clear
pathway to
resolution

List agencies and resource requirements for successful delivery including any complexities, risks or misalignment

25%

Consultation will be required with a number of agencies, including:

- Transport for NSW,
- Biodiversity Conservation Division,
- NSW Rural Fire Service,
- Heritage NSW.

The consideration of these agencies in relation to this proposal has not been requested at this stage and feedback is currently unknown, as a planning report detailing the rezoning proposal has not yet been received.

In addition, Council will need to be consulted on the proposal. Coffs Harbour City Council have a standing resolution that it does not support the Masterplan prepared by PD NSW.

Additionally, the land has been identified as culturally significant to the local Aboriginal community. PD NSW have been advised an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report must be prepared and submitted to support the package, however PD NSW has advised that this will not form part of the preliminary package to be submitted to the Department.

- ☐ Are there are a significant number of dependencies with other agencies? If so, will State intervention will accelerate / improve the capability to amplify investment and public benefits?
- Are there environmental constraints or issues likely to impact pace of delivery, such as biodiversity, hazards, bushfires, flooding?
- How resolved are the known issues (land use, environment, stakeholders, land owners)?
   Consider timing and level of complexity.
- ☐ How clear is the pathway to resolution (months / years to resolve)?
- ☐ Is there funding/ resourcing to resolve the impediments to the planning decision?

A. Investment is committed or available to deliver the rezoning?   The Coffs Jetty Masterplan notes the NSW Government is not developing the precinct for profit and all funds generated would be reinvested into the precinct. The Masterplan also notes that financial forecasts show the costs of delivering public open space, civil infrastructure, community spaces and additional parking would not be met by the proceeds of the proposed development. PDNSW has finalised its New Policy Proposal submission to Treasury for Stage 2 lodgement. This will need to address The Treasurer's feedback to Minister Kamper that the proposal must be supported by a cost neutral option.   State Proposal submission to the proposal must be supported by a cost neutral option.   State Proposal submission to the proposal must be supported by a cost neutral option.   State Proposal submission to the proposal must be supported by a cost neutral option.   State Proposal must be supported by a cost neutral option.   Supports significant Govt or 3rd party committed mixes and additional parking well on the method of costs as a proportion to SLR benefits are balance. For example, cost per lot and ROI) – Infrastructure occommunity spaces and additional parking would not be met by the proceeds of the proposal development.   PDNSW has finalised its New Policy Proposal submission to Treasury for Stage 2 lodgement. This will need to address The Treasurer's feedback to Minister Kamper that the proposal must be supported by a cost infrastructure setting the proposal must be supported by a cost infrastructure outcome that may be sometime to realize? (e.g., planned precincts associated with a future 'fast rail' corridor')    In the support of the proposal must be supported by a cost infrastructure infrastructure in not yet funded or community of the		 	
	committed or available to deliver the rezoning?  • What current commitments to investment and/or infrastructure have been made?  • What costs still need to be accounted for (e.g., infrastructure utilities, DPE costs)  • Is the proponent able to fund utilities (e.g. sewer, water) and infrastructure required?  • What are the	is not developing the precinct for profit and all funds generated would be reinvested into the precinct. The Masterplan also notes that financial forecasts show the costs of delivering public open space, civil infrastructure, community spaces and additional parking would not be met by the proceeds of the proposed development.  PDNSW has finalised its New Policy Proposal submission to Treasury for Stage 2 lodgement. This will need to address The Treasurer's feedback to Minister Kamper that the proposal must be supported by a cost	committed investment (e.g., > \$500m)?  Costs as a proportion to SLR benefits are balanced. For example, cost per lot and ROI) – Include infrastructure Estimated Total Cost (ETC) from consultant  If enabling infrastructure is not yet funded or committed, does the developer have capacity to fund utilities / critical infrastructure to support precinct development?  Can leverage existing or committed high-capacity public transport, or it is logical to sequence public transport post development (e.g., rapid bus transit)  Investment will commence within 5 years post rezoning?  An investment today (now) is required to support a longer-term infrastructure outcome that may be some time to realise? (e.g., planned precincts

commitments to funding and criticality of investment being provided now		GIPA access	a di	Splicat
Community sentiment	members of the regarding the I some members	reports on the Jetty Foreshores have identified some e community have expressed significant concern Masterplan. It is understood this includes opposition from its of the local Aboriginal community, who support the sal to retain the foreshore area as public open space.		Is the proposal consistent with community expectations?  What are the known local issues?  What are the council views?  Is the community likely to support or oppose?
Other stakeholder views	Council's May PD NSW Mas be preserved land through a seeks to comp	City Council has resolved not to support the Masterplan. or has made numerous public statements opposing the terplan. Council's position is that the railway land should for public open space. Council has sought to acquire the purchase proposal which was not supported and now pulsorily acquire the land, however this is yet to be the Office of Local Government.		What are other the stakeholder views?

#### Candidate profile - Coffs Harbour Jetty Foreshore - Property **Development NSW**

	X/O
Local MP Gurmesh Singh has made numerous public statement supporting the Coffs Jetty masterplan and development.	Jico.

#### **Determining the suitable pathway:**

- Is there a strong justification to deviate from normal planning processes due to known issues?
- If not a state-led rezoning, is Council able and willing to deliver the rezoning (with or without DPE funding)?
- Are there other pathways / alternative options that could facilitate this proposal?

Due to Council opposition a planning proposal pathway is not available.

- Council is resistive of the proposal due to resourcing, cost or complexity (further consideration required if resistance is due to misalignment/disagreement with development sequencing)
- ☐ The costs and/or complexity involved will be challenging for the Council to manage within a reasonable timeframe
- ☐ DPE will still be required to contribute significant funding to support Council-led rezoning and mitigates benefit of deferring from a SLR
- There are limited alternative pathways that will achieve the same timely outcomes/benefits

#### **Attachments**