

Boomajarrill
120 Franks Place
Hartley, 2790

Lithgow City Council

Re: Draft LEP 2013

Dear Sherilyn.

Sorry to leave it to the last minute to make this submission.
I really said most of what I needed to say for the Lithgow Environment Plan that was the forerunner to this one.

I can see that you and your team have put a great deal of time and effort into this LEP. It really shows, and I do apologise for not giving it the time it deserves in response, though I have read most of it, on line and been to the Information Session at Hartley.

I guess the difference is ultimately that you all get paid to do this work - and I have to fit it in with all the other responsibilities that I have at my own time and expense. And I suppose that goes for most of the ratepayers in any council district.

Land Use Zoning is my major concern.

Even though the stated definition of **Large Lot Residential** is "to provide residential housing in a rural setting while preserving, and minimising impacts on environmentally sensitive locations and scenic quality", how does that equate to "not hindering the proper and orderly development of urban areas in the future?"

It feels like you're turning Rural Residential into Dormitory Suburb for Lithgow, and I admit that my street seems to have developed in that way, but there are also many in Hartley who are doing quite interesting and productive things on their 5 acres blocks that are not possible on smaller lots or in urban settings and are definitely rural in nature.

I'm not happy with seeing 5 to 8 horses being kept on 5 or 6 acres and destroying the quality of the land by their overcrowding, but I would not want to see people prevented from having a few sheep or chickens or alpacas kept sustainably on their properties.

As for "maintaining and improving the water quality of receiving water catchments", which has been tacked on to every one of your land use categories, the Envirocycle style miniature sewerage treatment works that most of these small acreage homesteads seem to install use toxic chemicals, lots of power, need lots of maintenance and make bad smells.

If you're serious about keeping the water quality high there are better ways to treat effluent than these.

E4 Environmental Living

"This zone is generally intended to provide for low impact residential

development in areas of special environmental or scenic value."

This sounds great - until you get to:

"To maintain the rural character of the lands within the zone whilst preserving the land for future urban growth."

If this land has special environmental or scenic value now, surely it will have special environmental or scenic value into the future and should not be earmarked for future urban development but left "to maintain the rural character of the lands within the zone!"

Zone RU1 - Primary Production

This is the zoning that worries me the most, where the best agricultural land is lumped in together with land-destroying mining and extractive industries.

If your aim is:

"To minimise the fragmentation and alienation of resource lands.

- To minimise conflict between land uses within this zone and land uses within adjoining zones.
- To minimise the environmental and visual impact of development on the rural landscape. "

then why do you lump such conflicting activities together?

Surely Eco-tourist facilities, intensive agriculture, heavy industrial storage establishments, dwelling houses and extractive industries need to be kept as separate as possible. Lumping them, and all the others nominated together in one category and expecting there to be no conflict between uses within this zone is being naive at best and opening the doors for exploiters like the Coal Seam Gas industry to ride roughshod over the whole agricultural landscape and destroy what is valuable to most residents and farmers.

This does not make sense! This whole section needs a critical rethink!

RU2 - Rural Landscape.

This looks really promising:

- "To maintain the rural landscape character of the land.
- To provide for a range of compatible land uses, including extensive agriculture. "

and then you go and spoil it all by trying to preserve the agricultural production and scenic "resources" of the land in the same place as having mineral and extractive production. These are conflicting interests and should be kept separate.

Agricultural land should be protected from mining and "extractive industries". Here you're expecting the lion to lay down with the lamb. It will only cause trouble and pain to follow this course!

And now that you're going to allow Roads to be built across all land use zones without the need for Council's consent, the Coal Seam Gas Industry will be laughing and the citizens of Great Lithgow will be the ones to suffer!

Please consider all the ramifications of your zoning and the allowed activities within each one, particularly those that claim to protect the scenic and agricultural lands before going ahead with this LEP.

Sincerely

Diane Green
green120@tpg.com.au
9th August 2013