

Proposal Title :	Include shop top housing as a permissible land use at 181 James Ruse Drive, Camellia		
Proposal Summary	The planning proposal seeks to amend Parramatta LEP 2011 by the inclusion of shop top housing as an additional permitted use on the site at 181 James Ruse Drive, Camellia.		
PP Number :	PP_2011_PARRA_002_00 Dop File No : 10/22473		
posal Details			
Date Planning Proposal Received	17-Oct-2011	LGA covered :	Parramatta
Region :	Sydney Region West	RPA :	Parramatta City Council
State Electorate :	PARRAMATTA	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning		
cation Details			
`	81 James Ruse Drive		
Suburb : C	Camellia City :	Parramatta	Postcode : 2142
Land Parcel :			
oP Planning Of	ficer Contact Details Michael Druce		
Contact Name : Contact Number :	0298738564		
Contact Number : Contact Email :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g	jov.au	
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g ails	jov.au	
Contact Number : Contact Email :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g	jov.au	
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def Contact Name :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g tails Sue Stewart		
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def Contact Name : Contact Number : Contact Email :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g tails Sue Stewart 0298065550		
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def Contact Name : Contact Number : Contact Email : oP Project Man	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g tails Sue Stewart 0298065550 sstewart@parracity.nsw.gov.au		
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def Contact Name : Contact Number : Contact Email : oP Project Man Contact Name :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g tails Sue Stewart 0298065550 sstewart@parracity.nsw.gov.au		
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def Contact Name : Contact Number : Contact Email :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g tails Sue Stewart 0298065550 sstewart@parracity.nsw.gov.au		
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def Contact Name : Contact Number : Ontact Email : OP Project Man Contact Name : Contact Number :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g tails Sue Stewart 0298065550 sstewart@parracity.nsw.gov.au tager Contact Details		
Contact Number : Contact Email : PA Contact Def Contact Name : Contact Number : Ontact Email : OP Project Man Contact Name : Contact Number : Contact Email :	michael.druce@planning.nsw.g tails Sue Stewart 0298065550 sstewart@parracity.nsw.gov.au tager Contact Details		N/A

menude shop top noda	ning as a permissione land as	e at for James Ruse Drive, Camenia
MDP Number :		Date of Release :
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings 0 (where relevant) :
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created : 0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes	
If No, comment :		
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No	
If Yes, comment :	relation to communications and m Region West has not met with any	e regional team, the Department's Code of Practice in neetings with Lobbyists has been complied with. Sydney / lobbyist in relation to this proposal, nor has the Regional tings between other departmental officers and lobbyists
Supporting notes		
Internal Supporting Notes :	public exhibition of the draft Princ	to a submission from the proponent received during sipal LEP, the Parramatta Council resolved to add e use on the subject site (via Schedule 1 Additional
	residential development (i.e. resid building controls to be significant (retaining a 12m height limit) nor p	nent also asked (as part of its submission) for straight lential flat buildings) to be permitted on the site and for ly increased. Council resolved not to increase controls permit straight residential on the subject site, and to ng it to prepare and submit a planning proposal for the
	 Substantial changes to the draft LEP proposed by the council after the first exhibition were re-exhibited, however, the proposal to permit shop top housing on the site was not included in the re-exhibited material. 	
	Planning and Assessment Act 197 use on this site. However this was	• •
	issues that must be considered un Remediation of Land prior to chan contamination (such as permitting b. the site is in an area where flo significance are key issues. The in	James Hardie site, and there may be contamination nder State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 – aging LEP controls that may increase risk to health from a residential development on the site). boding, traffic management and items of State heritage ntroduction of residential development on the site is hese issues, potentially via appropriate studies and/or ncies.
External Supporting Notes :		

Adequacy Assessment

Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a)

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : The stated objective of the planning proposal is to include shop top housing in the range of permissible land uses at 181 James Ruse Drive, Camellia.

Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The planning proposal seeks to amend the Parramatta LEP 2011 by the inclusion of shop top housing in Schedule 1 - Additional Permitted Uses, relating to the site at 181 James Ruse Drive, Camellia. The site is zoned B5 Business Development under Parramatta LEP 2011. The maximum height and floor space ratio provisions applying to the site would remain unchanged at 12 metres and 1.5:1 respectively.

Shop top housing is defined by Parramatta LEP 2011 as 'one or more dwellings located above ground level retail premises or business premises'.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
 2.3 Heritage Conservation
 3.1 Residential Zones

- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
- 4.3 Flood Prone Land
- 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

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

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land) SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 SREP No. 28 – Parramatta

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

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No

If No, explain :

A. 117 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones This direction applies where a planning proposal may affect land within an existing or proposed business or industrial zone.

This Direction is relevant in this case as the addition of the use 'Shop Top Housing' (a sub-term of 'Residential Accommodation') has the potential to impact on the business activities permissible in the B5 zoning for the site.

Potential land use conflict associated with business activities that can generate high levels of noise and include heavy vehicle movements 24 hours a day (such as 'Warehouse or distribution centres') and the proposed residential development may be an issue.

Council will need to consider this issue and demonstrate how it will manage any

potential land use conflicts through a study or strategic work that supports the proposal to introduce residential development into this business zone and identifies appropriate controls or standards to ensure that the shop top housing is designed to minimise land use conflicts.

B. 117 4.3 Floodprone Land

This direction applies where a planning proposal creates, removes or alters a zone or a provision that affects flood prone land. This proposal intends to introduce a residential use (shop top housing) in a business zone in an area of flood prone land (see Parramatta City Council Flood Map).

As such it is inconsistent with the direction, specifically (6) a planning proposal must not contain provisions that apply to flood planning areas which: -(6a) permit development in floodway areas; and -(6d) are likely to result in substantially increased requirement for government spending on flood mitigation measures or services.

The provisions of the planning proposal (to introduce a residential use) are not considered as being of minor significance and accordingly Council will need to demonstrate that the planning proposal is in accordance with a floodplain risk management plan prepared in accordance with the principles and guidelines of the Flood Development Manual 2005 ((9a) of the Direction). In addition to issues related to building within flood prone land, key issues that pertain to this site as detailed in Appendix L of the Flood Development Manual 2005 during flood events relate to L6.2 Effective Warning Time and, L6.8 Effective Flood Access.

The planning proposal, as submitted, does not indicate whether the above issues have been considered by the Floodplain Risk Management Committee nor whether they have been incorporated into a floodplain risk management plan.

Before the planning proposal can proceed to exhibition the issues arising fom this direction will need to be satisfactorily addressed and Council will need to demonstrate that the proposed rezoning has been considered by the Floodplain Risk Management Committee and incorporated in a floodplain risk management plan.

C. SEPP 55 - Remediation of Land

The site is understood to be highly contaminated and subject to SEPP 55 - Remediation of Land.

A Remedial Action Plan (RAP) has been submitted with the planning proposal which details the remediation measures claimed to meet the guidelines for the proposed activities for the site. The proponent has submitted the RAP to the Office of Environment (OEH) for approval. However, OEH has indicated that it does not support the proposed remediation. As such Council will need to ensure that approved remediation measures are adopted prior to the finalisation of this amendment.

Council should be directed to resolve this issue prior to exhibition.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

Council has provided a site location map. It is considered this would be adequate for exhibition purposes.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

Council proposes an exhibition period of minimum 28 days. Community consultation will include notice in the local newspaper, on Council's website and written notices to land owners in the vicinity of the site (including University of Western Sydney and Sydney Turf Club).

Additional Director General's requirements

Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No

If Yes, reasons :

Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? No

If No, comment :	The following should occur prior to exhibition:
	1. Adequate consideration and response to requirements of S117 directions (specifically
	1.1 and 4.3);
	2. Completion of and incorporation of outcomes of appropriate studies (eg. heritage,
	flooding and traffic); and
	3. Preparation of an adequate remediation action plan (endorsed by OEH)

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation The Principal Parramatta LEP 2011 was made on 7 October 2011. to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	Council had previously sought the inclusion of shop top housing for this site as part of Parramatta LEP 2011 and this was included as part of the S68 submission. The Department did not agree to this and recommended that the Minister's delegate remove this provision from the final instrument. See 'Background' in Internal Notes for further supporting information.
	Council states that the planning proposal is not the result of a strategic study. However, the site is included within the investigation area of the River Road, Rosehill, Camellia Study (RRCS) for which heritage, contamination and flood investigations are being carried out. This is being funded under the Department's LEP Acceleration Fund.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The Draft West Central Regional Strategy (Draft WCSRS) shows the site as part of the Camellia/Rosehill Heavy Manufacturing precinct and identifies it as a mixed use/employment precinct. Reference is made in the Draft WCSRS to the artificial and natural barriers that isolate this precinct, protecting the amenity of the surrounding areas.
	The Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 identifies the retention of strategically important industrial land, including the Camellia peninsular, as one of its aims. This site is somewhat seperated from the Camellia heavy industrial precinct by the rail corridor. It is not included in the precinct zoned for heavy industrial under either the Parramatta LEP 2011 or the (now repealed for Parramatta) SREP 28. Rather it is zoned B5 Business Development under Parramatta LEP 2011. This permits a range of employment uses including business, office, retail and warehouse or distribution uses.
	The addition of shop top housing to the range of permissible uses would allow for dwellings to be located above ground floor retail or business premises. The site was not examined under Council's Residential Development Strategy. However, Council argues that this additional use would support nearby industrial precincts and the University of Western Sydney by providing a range of services and residential accomodation.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The site is located on Parramatta River and would require consideration of impact on mangroves and any fish habitats. The wetlands at the interface with Parramatta River are heritage listed. Additionally , there are historic view corridors between heritage items at

Elizabeth Farm and the former Female Orphan School on the UWS site.

The Heritage Council has provided comments on the proposal concluding that it does not support the planning proposal. They note that Council has recently commissioned heritage consultants to review historic views in Rosehill/Camellia and that the study is in draft form and additionally that the findings of the study should inform decision making about the location, form bulk and scale of development on the site. This is supported.

The Heritage Council also argues that the issue of historic view corridors should be addressed prior to the planning proposal proceeding through the Gateway as the most appropriate time for it to be addressed is at the planning proposal stage. This position is not supported as the planning proposal does not change or increase the planning controls that are already in place on the site (ie. a maximum height of 12 metres and a floor space ratio of 1.5:1). Parramatta Council argues that these elements of heritage conservation can be addressed at the DA stage. This is supported with the proviso that the findings of the above mentioned historic view study informs DA decisions.

The site is flood affected and is discussed under the relevant 117 direction earlier in the report. Council argues that Parramatta LEP and DCP 2011 include provisions for floodprone land that are consistent with the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy and the principles of the Floodplain Development Manual and as such flood issues on the site would be addressed at the DA stage. However, with a proposed change of use to a form of residential development, 117 4.3 requires that a more rigorous consideration of flood issues is undertaken and considered by the Floodplain Risk management Committee. The 117 Direction also requires this outcome to be formally endorsed by the Director General.

The site is mapped as Class 4 on the Acid Soils Map. This would be addressed at DA stage.

The site is highly contaminated and subject to SEPP 55 - Remediation of Land. A Remedial Action Plan has been submitted with the planning proposal which details the remediation measures claimed to meet the guidelines for the proposed activities for the site. This has been submitted by the applicant to OEH. OEH indicated that it does not support the proposed remediation. The agreement of OEH to the remediation plan for the site is required before the change in use to shop top housing (residential use) can be made.

Economic effects: Council states that the opportunity for employment uses will not be diminished significantly and rather, with the broadening of activities to include retail (as part of Shop Top Housing)economic activity may be enhanced.

Assessment Process

Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	12 Month	Delegation :	DDG
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Catchment Management Author Office of Environment and Herit Department of Primary Industry Department of Transport NSW Transport NSW Roads and Traffic Authority State Emergency Service	tage	

	the PAC required? No		
(2)(a) Should the ma	tter proceed ? Yes		
If no, provide reasons	s :		
Resubmission - s56(2	2)(b) : Yes		
if Yes, reasons :	 Prior to exhibition Council needs to provide further information to satisfy the requirements of S117 directions 1.1 (Business and Industrial Zones) and 4.3 (Flood Prone Land). The Director General's agreement to these inconsistencies is required. A Remediation Action Plan for the site, which has been endorsed by the Office of . Environment, is to be provided and made available for exhibition with the planning proposal. 		
	issues have been adequately add	s to be satisfied that Traffic Management ressed prior to exhibition. As such it is r ge, including these studies, be resubmitt	ecommended
dentify any additiona	al studies, if required. :		
Other - provide deta i f Other, provide reas			
The Department of T blan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin		ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek a	elopment of the
The Department of T blan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek a	elopment of the
The Department of T blan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T dentify any internal c	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannir consultations, if required :	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek a	elopment of the
The Department of T blan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin equirements for a T dentify any internal c No internal consulta	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannir consultations, if required :	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek ad ng proposal.	elopment of the
The Department of T blan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T dentify any internal c No internal consultar s the provision and fo	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannir consultations, if required : tion required	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek ad ng proposal.	elopment of the
The Department of T blan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T dentify any internal c No internal consulta s the provision and fo f Yes, reasons :	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannir consultations, if required : tion required	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek ad ng proposal.	elopment of the
The Department of T blan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T dentify any internal c No internal consultar s the provision and fu f Yes, reasons : uments	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannin consultations, if required : tion required unding of state infrastructure relevant to	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek ad ng proposal.	elopment of the
The Department of T olan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T dentify any internal c No internal consultat s the provision and fu f Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Council Letter Plann	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannin consultations, if required : tion required unding of state infrastructure relevant to	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek a ng proposal. this plan? No	elopment of the lvice on
The Department of T plan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T Identify any internal c No internal consultat Is the provision and fu if Yes, reasons : uments Document File Name Council Letter Plann Drive.pdf	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannin consultations, if required : tion required unding of state infrastructure relevant to	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek ad ng proposal. this plan? No DocumentType Name Proposal Covering Letter	lopment of the lvice on Is Public Yes
The Department of T plan (TMAP) in relati site than this plannin requirements for a T Identify any internal c No internal consultat Is the provision and fu If Yes, reasons : 	ion to the site. However this was in co ng proposal. Nevertherless, Council sl ransport Study to support this plannir consultations, if required : tion required unding of state infrastructure relevant to sing Proposal 181 James Ruse 81 James Ruse Drive.pdf	ntext of a greater range of uses and deve hould consult with Transport and seek an ng proposal. this plan? No DocumentType Name	lopment of the lvice on Is Public

Planning Team Recommendation

Ministry of Transport letter.pdf

heritage council.pdf

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

S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
	2.1 Environment Protection Zones
	2.3 Heritage Conservation
	3.1 Residential Zones
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Study

Study

Yes

No

Include shop top housing as a permissible land use at 181 James Ruse Drive, Camellia It is recommended that the planning proposal be given approval to proceed with the Additional Information : following conditions. 1. That an amended planning proposal package be resubmitted to the Department under section 56(2) prior to exhibition that incorporates the following: A) the outcomes and recommendations of the heritage and flood investigations, being carried out as part of the River Road, Rosehill, Camellia Study (RRCS), relevant to the site are incorporated as part of the planning proposal. B) the requirements of S117 directions 1.1 (Business and Industrial Zones) and 4.3 (Flood Prone Land) are met to the satisfaction of the Director General, specifically: >> 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones - Council is to demonstrate how it will manage any potential land use conflicts through a study or strategic work that supports the proposal to introduce residential use into this business zone and identifies appropriate controls or standards to ensure that the shop top housing is designed to minimise land use conflicts. >> 4.3 Floodprone Land - Council is to demonstrate (under 9a of the Direction) that the planning proposal is in accordance with a floodplain risk management plan prepared in accordance with the principles and guidelines of the Flood Development Manual 2005, and that the proposed rezoning has been considered by Council's Flood Risk Management Committee and incorporated in a floodplain risk management plan. C) Consideration of traffic management and transport issues generally be addressed. This includes consultation with the Department of Transport for advice and direction of requirements for a transport study in relation to the planning proposal. D) That the Remedial Action Plan for the site is endorsed by the Office of Environment and Heritage and then reflected in the planning proposal. 2. That consultation with the following public authorities under S56 (2)(d) is undertaken: **Catchment Management Authority - Sydney Metro** Office of Environment and Heritage Department of Primary Industry (Fisheries) Department of Transport NSW Transport NSW **Roads and Traffic Authority** State Emergency Service 3. That the planning proposal should be placed on exhibition for a period of 28 days. 4. That a period of 12 months be given for completion. The planning proposal seeks to amend the Parramatta LEP 2011 by the inclusion of shop Supporting Reasons : top housing in Schedule 1 - Additional Permitted Uses, relating to the site at 181 James Ruse Drive, Camellia. The site is currently zoned B5. Other business zones would allow a range of uses inappropriate for this site such as Retail Premises, including shops, and some forms of straight Residential including Residential Flat Buildings. Therefore the use of Schedule 1 is supported in this instance. The addition of shop top housing to the range of permissible uses would allow for dwellings to be located above ground floor retail or business premises. Although the site was not examined under Council's Residential Development Strategy, it is agreed that this additional use would support nearby industrial precincts and the University of Western Sydney by providing a range of services and residential accomodation. The site is included within the investigation area of the River Road, Rosehill, Camellia Study (RRCS) for which heritage, contamination and flood investigations are being carried out. This is being funded under the Department's LEP Acceleration Fund. In order for the planning proposal to proceed there are a number issues that need to be addressed prior to exhibition. These include resolution of S117 direction requirements, completion and incorporation of study findings in the areas of heritage, flooding and

Include shop top housing as a permissible land use at 181 James Ruse Drive, Camellia		
Le le	traffic. In addition site contamination is a major issue that is likely to generate a high level of public interest (the site was used by James Hardie for many years). A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) has been prepared by the proponent and submitted to the Oficce of Environment (OEH) for approval. However, OEH has indicated that it does not support the proposed remediation. As such Council will need to ensure that approved remediation measures are adopted prior to the finalisation of this amendment. Council should be required to resolve this issue prior to exhibition.	
	As there is a significant amount of supporting material (studies etc) to be provided with the planning proposal it is appropriate that it be placed on exhibition for a period of 28 days.	
Signature: Printed Name:	lim Archer Date: 28/10/11	