

Planning Proposal te	o permit a child care centre a	at 97-99 Queens Road, Fi	ive Dock
Proposal Title :	Planning Proposal to permit a	child care centre at 97-99 Que	eens Road, Five Dock
Proposal Summary :	Amend the Canada Bay LEP 2 Additional Permitted Uses for		
PP Number :	PP_2013_CANAD_002_00	Dop File No :	13/14857
Proposal Details	- sine of Brits 21-years in	Concernent States and States	- Sectore Statement
Date Planning Proposal Received :	05-Sep-2013	LGA covered :	Canada Bay
Region :	Sydney Region East	RPA :	City of Canada Bay Council
State Electorate :	DRUMMOYNE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning		
Location Details			
Street : 97	-99 Queens Road		
Suburb : Fiv	ve Dock City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2046
Land Parcel : Lo	t 11 DP 1135519		
DoP Planning Offi	icer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Nava Sedghi		12
Contact Number :	0285754117		
Contact Email :	nava.sedghi@planning.nsw.gov	<i>r</i> .au	12 1
RPA Contact Deta	ills		
Contact Name :	Peter Giaprakas		
Contact Number :	9911640600		
Contact Email :	Peter.Giaprakas@canadabay.ns	sw.gov.au	
DoP Project Mana	iger Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Sandy Shewell		
Contact Number :	0285754115		
Contact Email :	sandy.shewell@planning.nsw.g	ov.au	
Land Release Dat	a		
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro Inner West subregion	Consistent with Strategy:	Yes

Planning Proposal to	permit a child care centre at 9	7-99 Queens Road, Five	DOCK
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A
No. of Lots	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0
Gross Floor Area	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment 🛙	The Department of Planning and I Sydney Region East has not met v planning proposal.		
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal seeks to an 'Child Care Centre' to Schedule 1 Dock.	-	
	The Department supports this pla - It will achieve an objective identi - The site is in close proximity to p - It is in a suitable location as it is R2 Low Density Residential; and - It will have minimal impacts on t	fied in Council's Child and Fa oublic transport; diagonally opposite RE1 Pub	lic Recreation and opposite
External Supporting Notes :	Canada Bay Council has accepted functions under section 23 the EP Minister's functions under section proposal.	&A Act. Council is seeking d	elegation to carry out the
	Council supports this planning pr - There is a growing need for child - The use of schedule 1 - additiona having to rezone or compromise to centres for the entire zone.	l care centres in the Canada I al permitted uses allows flexi	bility for this site, without
Adequacy Assessmen	t		sales republic april in
Statement of the obj	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	The objective of this planning p	proposal is:	
	- To permit a 'Child Care Centre Queens Road, Five Dock.	e' as an additional land use u	nder schedule_1, for 97-99
Explanation of provi	isions provided - s55(2)(b)		
ls an explanation of pro	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :	The explanation of provisions i	s adequate.	

The planning proposal will amend Schedule 1 of the Canada Bay LEP 2013:

- Use of Certain land at 95 & 97-99 Queens Road, Five Dock being Lot 92 DP 1047100 & Lot 11 DP 1135519.

Development for the purposes of a child care centre is permitted with development consent.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones

6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements

6.3 Site Specific Provisions

7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Is the Director General's agreement required? No

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? N/A

e) List any other matters that need to be considered :

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes

If No, explain :

1.1 Business and Industrial Zone

The planning proposal is inconsistent with this direction because by enabling a non industrial use such as a child care centre on the site, it will reduce the potential floor space for industrial uses in the IN1 General Industrial zone. This inconsistency requires the Director General's approval. It is recommended that the Director General approve this inconsistency because Council's Child and Family Needs Strategy has identified a need for child care centres in this area. The planning proposal does not remove the industrial zone. Instead it adds the site 97-99 Queens Roads, Five Dock to schedule 1 - additional permitted uses, in order to permit the land use of a 'child care centre.' It will also create 20 full-time jobs and 5 part-time jobs.

6.3 Site Specific Provisions

The planning proposal is inconsistent with this direction as it does not permit child care centres for the entire IN1 General Industrial zone and it does not rezone the site to an existing zone that allows child care centres. The retention of the industrial zone is important and allowing child care centres in all industrial zones is not considered appropriate as it has the potential to compromise the function of industrial land. Adding the site to allow land use 'child care centre' into Schedule 1 is considered the most appropriate way forward and the inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance.

The planning proposal is considered consistent with all other section 117 directions.

The planning proposal is considered consistent with the relevant SEPPs.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? No

Comment :

There are no amendments to maps associated with the Canada Bay LEP 2013.

Community consult	ation - s55(2)(e)
Has community consult	tation been proposed? Yes
Comment :	- Council proposes to exhibit the planning proposal for 31 days. A minimum of 14 days will be recommended as this is a low impact proposal.
	- A project timeline of the planning proposal contains an estimated time frame of 6 months. This is considered adequate.
Additional Director	General's requirements
Are there any additiona	al Director General's requirements? No
If Yes, reasons :	
Overall adequacy of	f the proposal
Does the proposal mee	et the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	The planning proposal provides adequate information on the following:
	- Objectives and intended outcomes
	- Explanation of provisions
¥2	- Justification for the planning proposal
	- Community consultation
	- Project timeline
	- Evaluation criteria for delegation
	Delegation of the plan making function is considered to be appropriate.
Proposal Assessment	and a set of a set of the set of
Principal LEP:	
Due Date :	
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The Canada Bay LEP 2013 was published on 2 August 2013.
Assessment Criteria	a
Need for planning proposal :	This planning proposal will amend the Canada Bay LEP 2013, to add the land use 'Child Care Centre' to Schedule 1 for 97-99 Queens Road, Five Dock. The site is currently zoned IN1 General Industrial and the planning proposal will maintain this zone. This amendment will cater for the identified need of child care centres in the Canada Bay LGA.

Planning Proposal to permit a child care centre at 97-99 Queens Road, Five Dock The planning proposal is consistent with the NSW 2021 Plan and the Community Strategic Consistency with strategic planning Plan (FuturesPlan20). framework : This planning proposal is also consistent with Council's Child and Family Needs Strategy as it recognises that Council needs to 'encourage the expansion of childcare places for under two year olds through existing Council services, not for profit providers and the private sector'. The planning proposal is fulfilling this gap for child care centres in the Canada Bay LGA. The planning proposal is not consistent with the following strategies: Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 Action E3.2 Identify and retain strategically important employment lands. The draft Inner West Subregional Strategy A1.6 Improve Planning and Delivery of Employment Lands Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031 Objective 13: Provide a well located supply of industrial lands The planning proposal is inconsistent with these strategies as it seeks to reduce the amount of industrial land within the LGA. These inconsistencies are considered justified because the industrial zone is not removed, and this planning proposal will cater towards a need for child care centres in the Canada Bay LGA. Environmental social The planning proposal will not adversely affect critical habitats, threatened species or economic impacts : ecological communities. The potential traffic and environmental implications will be assessed through the child care centre provisions under the Canada Bay Development Control Plan 2008 at the development application stage. The planning proposal will have a positive impact for the LGA as it will increase local employment and commercial activity.

Assessment Process

Proposal type :	Routine		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :					
Is Public Hearing by the I	PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(b)) : No				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional stu	udies, if required. :				
If Other, provide reasons	1				

Identify any internal consultations, if required :

No internal consultation required

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? $\ensuremath{\,\text{No}}$

If Yes, reasons :

Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
Council letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Council Minute - Planning Proposal - 97-99 Queens Rd,	Determination Document	Yes
Five Dock.pdf		
Council Report - Planning proposal - 97-99 QueensRd,	Determination Document	Yes
Five Dock.pdf		
Planning Proposal for 97-99 Queens Road, Five Dock	Proposal	Yes
August 2013.pdf		
attachment 4 - evaluation criteria for the delegation of	Determination Document	Yes
plan making functions.pdf		

Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions

S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036
	7.1 implementation of the metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036
Additional Information	It is recommended that the planning proposal proceed subject to the following conditions:
	1. The planning proposal is to be exhibited for a minimum of 14 days.
	2. The planning proposal is to be completed within 6 months of the Gateway determination.
	3. A public hearing is not required to be held.
	4. The Director General considers the inconsistency with section 117 Direction 6.3 - Site Specific Provisions to be of minor significance.
	5. The Director General's approval for the inconsistency with section 117 Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones is required. It is recommended that the Director General approve this inconsistency with the direction.
	6. A written authorisation to exercise delegation under section 59 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 is issued to Council in relation to the planning proposal.
Supporting Reasons	The planning proposal should be approved for the following reasons:
	- It is in a suitable location as it is diagonally opposite RE1 Public Recreation and opposite R2 Low Density Residential;
	- It is considered this planning proposal will have minimal impact on the surrounding environment;
	- The site is in close proximity to public transport;
	- It is considered that the planning proposal will meet the need for 'Child Care Centres' in

	the LGA; and
	- Council proposes to progress the planning proposal under delegation. The matter is considered to be of local significance and the use of council's delegation is supported.
Signature:	Shewelf

÷