

ATTACHMENT 4 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE DELEGATION OF PLAN MAKING FUNCTIONS

Checklist for the review of a request for delegation of plan making functions to councils

Local Government Area: City of Canada Bay

Name of draft LEP: Planning Proposal Additional Use, 'child care centre'

Address of Land (If applicable): 97-99 Queens Road, Five Dock (Lot 11 DP 1135519)

Intent of draft LEP: To allow the site an additional use, with consent, of 'child care centre' further to existing permitted uses under the current IN1 General Industrial zone

Additional Supporting Points/Information: Allowing the additional use further to the existing permitted uses on the IN1 General Industrial site will maintain the existing zone's objectives and at the same time recognise the specific opportunities the site presents to accommodate additional child care facilities for the City of Canada Bay LGA

Evaluation criteria for the issuing of an Authorisation	Council response		Department assessment	
	Y/N	Not relevant	Agree	Not agree
(Note: where the matter is identified as relevant and the requirement has not been met, council is attach information to explain why the matter has not been addressed)				
Is the planning proposal consistent with the Standard Instrument Order, 2006?	Y		Y	
Does the planning proposal contain an adequate explanation of the intent, objectives, and intended outcome of the proposed amendment?	Y		Y	
Are appropriate maps included to identify the location of the site and the intent of the amendment?	Y		N/A	
Does the planning proposal contain details related to proposed consultation?	Y		Y	
Is the planning proposal compatible with an endorsed regional or sub-regional planning strategy or a local strategy endorsed by the Director-General?	Y		N	
Does the planning proposal adequately address any consistency with all relevant S117 Planning Directions?	Y		N	
Is the planning proposal consistent with all relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs)?	Y		Y	
Minor Mapping Error Amendments	Y/N			
Does the planning proposal seek to address a minor mapping error and contain all appropriate maps that clearly identify the error and the manner in which the error will be addressed?	N		N	
Heritage LEPs	Y/N			
Does the planning proposal seek to add or remove a local heritage item and is it supported by a strategy/study endorsed by the Heritage Office?	N		N	
Does the planning proposal include another form of endorsement or support from the Heritage Office if there is no supporting strategy/study?	N		N	
Does the planning proposal potentially impact on an item of State Heritage Significance and if so, have the views of the Heritage Office been obtained?	N		N	

Does the planning proposal create an exception to a mapped development standard?	N		2	
Section 73A matters				
Does the proposed instrument a. correct an obvious error in the principal instrument consisting of a misdescription, the inconsistent numbering of provisions, a wrong cross-reference, a spelling error, a grammatical mistake, the insertion of obviously missing words, the removal of obviously unnecessary words or a formatting error?; b. address matters in the principal instrument that are of a consequential, transitional, machinery or other minor nature?; or c. deal with matters that do not warrant compliance with the conditions precedent for the making of the instrument because they will not have any significant adverse impact on the environment or adjoining land? (NOTE – the Minister (or Delegate) will need to form an Opinion under section 73(A)(1)(c) of the Act in order for a matter in this category to proceed).	N		2	

NOTES

- Where a council responds 'yes' or can demonstrate that the matter is 'not relevant', in most cases, the planning proposal will routinely be delegated to council to finalise as a matter of local planning significance.
- Endorsed strategy means a regional strategy, sub-regional strategy, or any other local strategic planning document that is endorsed by the Director-General of the department.