

#### Rezoning of 1A & 1B Queen Street, Auburn Rezoning of 1A & 1B Queen Street, Auburn Proposal Title : To rezone an area of industrial land (2.7ha) at 1A and 1B Queen Street, Auburn, adjacent to Proposal Summary : Auburn town centre, to allow redevelopment for high density residential purposes. It is also proposed to amend the maximum height and floor space ratio controls applying to the site, with appropriate controls to be established following detailed design studies. Dop File No : QA 212910 PP\_2013\_AUBUR\_002\_00 **PP Number : Proposal Details** LGA covered : Auburn 02-May-2013 **Date Planning Proposal Received :** Sydney West Joint Regional Plar RPA: Sydney Region West Region : Section of the Act : 55 - Planning Proposal State Electorate : AUBURN LEP Type : Spot Rezoning **Location Details** 1A and 1B Queens Street Street : Auburn Postcode : 2144 Suburb : Auburn City : Lots 1 and 2, DP1160950 Land Parcel : **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details David Radich** Contact Name : 0298601568 Contact Number : david.radich@planning.nsw.gov.au Contact Email : **RPA Contact Details David Radich** Contact Name : 0298601568 Contact Number : Contact Email : david.radich@planning.nsw.gov.au **DoP Project Manager Contact Details** Contact Name : **Terry Doran** Contact Number : 0298601149 terry.doran@planning.nsw.gov.au Contact Email : Land Release Data Release Area Name : N/A Growth Centre : N/A Metro West Central Regional / Sub Consistent with Strategy : Yes subregion **Regional Strategy:**

| MDP Number :   |  | Date of Release :  |             |
|--|--|--|-------------|
| Area of Release (Ha)<br>:  |  | Type of Release (eg<br>Residential /<br>Employment land) : | Residential |
| No. of Lots :  | 0  | No. of Dwellings<br>(where relevant) :                     | 810         |
| Gross Floor Area :   | 0  | No of Jobs Created :                                       | 0           |
| The NSW Government<br>Lobbyists Code of<br>Conduct has been<br>complied with :   | Yes  |  |             |
| If No, comment :   | At this point in time, to the best of the regional team's knowledge, the Department's Code of Practice in relation to communications and meetings with lobbyists has been complied with. No such communications or meetings have occurred. |  |             |
| Have there been<br>meetings or<br>communications with<br>registered lobbyists? : | No   |  |             |
| If Yes, comment :  |  |  |             |
| Supporting notes   |  |  |             |
| Internal Supporting<br>Notes :   | The intended outcome is to redevelop the site to accommodate a high residential development in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport infrastructure.   |  |             |
|  | The intended outcome is to redevelop the site to accommodate a high residential development in close proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport infrastructure.   |  |             |

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The intended outcome of the Planning Proposal is to "facilitate the delivery of the redevelopment of the site to accommodate a high quality residential scheme that successful integrates with surrounding land uses and capitalises on the site's proximity to existing facilities, services and public transport infrastructure".

The statement of objectives refers only to development for residential purposes without making it clear that the proposal is for high density residential. This will require amendment prior to exhibition to be consistent with the Guidelines

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The proposed outcome will be achieved by amending ALEP 2010 as follows: - Amending the ALEP 2010 Land Zoning Map applicable to 1A and 1B Queen Street,

- Auburn to zone the land R4 High Density Residential.
- Amending the ALEP 2010 Height of Building Map.
- Amending the ALEP 2010 Floor Space Ratio Map.

The explanation of provisions does not refer to the proposed zoning, whic is only shown on the map. This should be amended prior to exhibition to be consistent with the Guidelines.

|   | and floor space ratio.   | ovisions currently does not include the proposed maximum height<br>As stated elsewhere in the proposal, these are to be established<br>ies. The planning proposal will then be amended.   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Justification - s55 (2)                 | (c)  |   |  |  |
| a) Has Council's strategy               | been agreed to by the Di   | rector General? <b>No</b>   |  |  |
| b) S.117 directions identi              | fied by RPA :  | 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones   |  |  |
| * May need the Director (               | General's agreement  | 3.1 Residential Zones<br>3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport<br>6.3 Site Specific Provisions<br>7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036  |  |  |
| Is the Director Genera                  | al's agreement required?   | /es   |  |  |
| c) Consistent with Standa               | ard Instrument (LEPs) Ord  | ler 2006 : <b>Yes</b>   |  |  |
| d) Which SEPPs have th                  | e RPA identified?  | SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land)<br>SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land<br>SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development<br>SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004<br>SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007   |  |  |
| e) List any other                       | 117 DIRECTIONS   |   |  |  |
| matters that need to<br>be considered : | 1.1 Business and In  | dustrial Zones  |  |  |
|   | residential as appose<br>The land does not ge<br>services type indust<br>current use any loss<br>While this proposal v | direction is to protect employment areas. The use of the site for<br>ed to industrial uses can be justified for the following reasons;<br>enerate a significance amount of employment as the use is small<br>ry such as warehousing and small goods production. Based on the<br>of employment or employment land is not significant.<br>will result in some loss of employment potential, a considerable<br>ble such land exists in the vicinity of the site Auburn Town Centre). |  |  |
|   | It is considered this  | inconsistency is of minor significance. The agreement of the lelegate is required and is recommended.   |  |  |
|   | 3.1 Residential Zone   | S   |  |  |
|   | needs without and s<br>proposal will provide<br>amenity values. The  | ovide a range of housing choices for future and existing housing<br>ignificant impact of the environment or resource lands. The<br>e opportunity for good urban design in an area which has low<br>site is located adjacent to established residential areas and near<br>as shops and public transport.   |  |  |
|   | The proposal is cons   | The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the residential zones.  |  |  |
|   | 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport   |   |  |  |
|   | integrating land use<br>This proposal will im<br>Station and the oppo  | sistent with this direction as the site supports the principle of<br>and transport with access to public and private transportation use.<br>proved transportation choice with its proximity to Auburn Railway<br>ortunity for residents to walk and cycle to the Auburn town centre<br>y reduce the number of trips on the local roading network.   |  |  |
|   |  | is consistent with the objectives of Integrating Land Use and educe travel demand on the road network and offer alternative   |  |  |
|   | 6.3 Site Specific Prov   | visions   |  |  |

| The Planning Proposal has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Standard Instrument and in a manner consistent with the Auburn LEP 2010.   |
|---|
| 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036   |
| The planning proposal is consistent with the aims of the Metropolitan Plan as it is delivering housing choice and supply in existing areas within Sydney  |
| SEPPS   |
| SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land)  |
| Pursuant to SEPP 32, each council (and the Minister) must consider whether urban land<br>is no longer needed or used for the purposes for which it is currently zoned or used,<br>whether it is suitable for redevelopment for multi-unit housing and related development<br>in accordance with the aims and objectives of this Policy and whether action should be<br>taken to make the land available for such redevelopment. |
| SEPP No 55Remediation of Land   |
| This Policy aims to promote the remediation of contaminated land for the purpose of reducing the risk of harm to human health or any other aspect of the environment  |
| A Phase 1 Contamination Report has been prepared which identifies likely site<br>contamination arising from the history of industrial use of the site.<br>SEPP 55 provides a statutory planning framework for further investigations and suitable<br>remediation through the rezoning and development application processes.  |
| It will be recommended a Phase 2 investigation is carried out as a conditions of the gateway determination.   |
| SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development   |
| SEPP 65 provides a statutory framework, and calls up the Residential Flat Design Code to ensure that subsequent development applications achieve an appropriate standard of design quality.   |
| Future development will be undertaken in accordance with SEPP 65 and the accompanying Residential Flat Design Code. SEPP 65 provides a statutory framework to guide the design quality of residential flat developments.  |
| SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004  |
| The BASIX SEPP will require all future residential development facilitated by this proposal to achieve mandated levels of energy and water efficiency.  |
| SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007  |
| The Infrastructure SEPP aims to facilitate the efficient delivery of infrastructure across<br>the State. The proposed development will require existing utility services to be<br>upgraded and/or augmented to enable the future residential population to be<br>accommodated. These works will need to be undertaken in accordance with the<br>provisions of the SEPP.   |
| Other matters   |
| The planning proposal states on Page 17 that the State and Local Government are supportive of this proposal. This statement is incorrect and is to be deleted before public exhibition. Auburn Council does not support the proposal and the State government has not expressed an opinion.   |

|   | The planning proposal does not currently include a project timeline as required by the document 'A guide to preparing local environmental plans'.  |
|---|--|
| Have inconsistencies w  | ith items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes  |
| If No, explain :  |  |
| Mapping Provided -  | s55(2)(d)  |
| Is mapping provided? Y  | /es  |
| Comment :   | The only LEP mapping provided is a proposed amendment to the land use zone mapping. The height of buildings and floor space ratio maps will be amended as per the outcomes of future studies.  |
| Community consult   | ation - s55(2)(e)  |
| Has community consult   | ation been proposed? Yes   |
| Comment :   | It is anticipated that the Planning Proposal will be required to be publically exhibited for 28 days in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Planning and Infrastructure guidelines   |
|   | Public exhibition will occur in accordance with Auburn Council's usual procedures. It is anticipated that the proposal would be notified by way of:<br>- A public notice in the local newspaper(s)   |
|   | <ul> <li>A notice on the Auburn Council website.</li> <li>Written correspondence to adjoining and surrounding landowners.</li> </ul>   |
| Additional Director   | General's requirements   |
|   | General's requirements   |
|   | General's requirements   |
| Are there any additional  | I Director General's requirements? No  |
| Are there any additional<br>If Yes, reasons :<br>Overail adequacy of  | I Director General's requirements? No  |
| Are there any additional<br>If Yes, reasons :<br>Overail adequacy of  | I Director General's requirements? No  |
| Are there any additional<br>If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Overail adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :  | I Director General's requirements? No<br>the proposal<br>t the adequacy criteria? Yes<br>The Proposal contains sufficient information to enable adequate assessment for the<br>purpose of a Gateway determination, however a number of amendments are required<br>prior to public exhibition.  |
| Are there any additional<br>If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Overail adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal mee  | I Director General's requirements? No<br>the proposal<br>t the adequacy criteria? Yes<br>The Proposal contains sufficient information to enable adequate assessment for the<br>purpose of a Gateway determination, however a number of amendments are required<br>prior to public exhibition.  |
| Are there any additional<br>If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Overail adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal meet<br>If No, comment :<br><b>Poposal Assessment</b>  | I Director General's requirements? No<br>the proposal<br>t the adequacy criteria? Yes<br>The Proposal contains sufficient information to enable adequate assessment for the<br>purpose of a Gateway determination, however a number of amendments are required<br>prior to public exhibition.  |
| Are there any additional<br>If Yes, reasons :<br>Overall adequacy of<br>Does the proposal meet<br>If No, comment :<br>Poposal Assessment<br>Principal LEP:                                      | I Director General's requirements? No<br>the proposal<br>t the adequacy criteria? Yes<br>The Proposal contains sufficient information to enable adequate assessment for the<br>purpose of a Gateway determination, however a number of amendments are required<br>prior to public exhibition.  |
| Are there any additional<br>If Yes, reasons :<br>Overall adequacy of<br>Does the proposal meet<br>If No, comment :<br>oposal Assessment<br>Principal LEP:<br>Due Date :<br>Comments in relation | I Director General's requirements? No the proposal the adequacy criteria? Yes The Proposal contains sufficient information to enable adequate assessment for the purpose of a Gateway determination, however a number of amendments are required prior to public exhibition. The Principal Auburn Local Environmental Plan (ALEP 2010) was made on 29 October 2010. This planning proposal seeks to amend the ALEP 2010. |

•

| Rezoning of 1A & 1B Q                                 | lueen Street, Aubi   | ım           |  |   |
|---|--|--------------|--|---|
| Consistency with<br>strategic planning<br>framework : | The planning proposal is consistent with the principles for sustainable cities which<br>underpin the Auburn City Community Strategic plan (CSP) 2011. The CSP is a Council<br>initiative designed to respond to the priorities of the Auburn community over the next 10<br>years which includes amongst other things, housing affordability and quality of<br>development. The CSP was publicly exhibited in March 2011 and formally adopted by<br>Council on 18 May 2011. |              |  |   |
|   | The planning propo<br>for Sydney to 2031,  |              |  | he 'Draft Metropolitan Strategy   |
| Environmental social economic impacts :               | Given the establish<br>threatened species  |              | al use of the land, it is unlikely<br>ny of the sites. | y that any critical habitats or   |
|   | impacts, however it  | t is conside |  | II be some minor social<br>will be mitigated by the social<br>n services and the town centre. |
|   | The proposed community and public authority consultation process will provide feedback of social and economic effects the planning proposal is likely to cause.  |              |  |   |
| Assessment Proces                                     | S  |              |  |   |
| Proposal type :                                       | Precinct   |              | Community Consultation<br>Period :                     | 28 Days   |
| Timeframe to make<br>LEP :                            | 12 Month   |              | Delegation :   | DG  |
| Public Authority<br>Consultation - 56(2)(d)<br>:      | Origin Energy<br>Transport for NSW<br>Transport for NSW<br>Sydney Water<br>Telstra   |              | d Maritime Services                                    |   |
| Is Public Hearing by the                              | PAC required?  | No           |  |   |
| (2)(a) Should the matter                              | · proceed ?  | Yes          |  |   |
| If no, provide reasons :                              |  |              |  |   |
| Resubmission - s56(2)(t                               | ə) : <b>No</b>   |              |  |   |
| If Yes, reasons :                                     |  |              |  |   |
| Identify any additional st                            | tudies, if required. :   |              |  |   |
| If Other, provide reason                              | <b>s</b> :   |              |  |   |
| Urban Design Study an                                 | ıd Traffic, Transport a  | nd Access    | ibility Study.   |   |
| Urban Design Study<br>This report will be prep        | pared by a qualified a   | nd indepen   | dent urban design expert and                           | will consider the following:  |
| Relevant studies prepa                                | red by and on behalf   | of Council   | including:   |   |
| AECOM, "Auburn City                                   | Urban Design Study.'   | ' 30 Septer  | nber 2012.   |   |
| GMU Urban Design & A<br>Town Centres." Septen         |  | )esign Den   | sity Study: Auburn and Lidco                           | mbe   |

Auburn Council, "Auburn Town Centre Strategy 2031." Endorsed 4 February 2009.

| The profile the proposed<br>Town Centre.  | development would present when v   | viewed in the broader district context  | of the Auburn                          |
|---|--|---|--|
|   | nned future scale and character of<br>nds) which is identified for two stor  | the lands adjoining the site to the so<br>ey medium density housing.  | uth-east (e.g.                         |
| The scale and presentation  | on of the development when viewed  | l from the Main Western Railway.  |  |
| site and will provide the c   | letailed design criteria to inform an  | e height and FSR controls that will be<br>accompanying draft site specific Dev<br>CP Style Manual and Style Template. | e applied to the<br>velopment          |
| It is anticipated that the d  | raft DCP will be publicly exhibited  | with the draft LEP instrument.  |  |
| The traffic study will inclu<br>and advise of opportuniti<br>for walking and cycling. | ıde an analysis of any local traffic i<br>es to integrate these areas with the   | mpacts resulting from redevelopmen<br>local public transport network includ   | t of these sites<br>ling opportunities |
| The traffic report will prov  | vide detailed modelling and analysi  | s of:   |  |
| Intersection pressures at   | Station Road rail bridge.  |   |  |
| Impacts upon town centre  | e traffic.   |   |  |
| Pressure on street netwo  | rks around Queen Street and conn   | ections to Olympic Drive.   |  |
| The Auburn Town Centre  | bypass route.  |   |  |
| The traffic assessment w  | ill include consideration of the cum   | ulative impact of traffic generated by  | the current and                        |
| planned provisions of AL  | EP 2010 in relation to Auburn Town   |   |  |
| Identify any internal consul  | Itations, if required :  |   |  |
| No internal consultation i  | required   |   |  |
| Is the provision and fundin   | g of state infrastructure relevant to th   | is plan? <b>No</b>  |  |
| If Yes, reasons :   |  |   |  |
| Documents   |  |   |  |
| Document File Name  |  | DocumentType Name   | ls Public                              |
| Planning Proposal1a_1b  | _Queen_Street,_Auburnpdf   | Proposal  | Yes                                    |
| Planning Team Recomm  | endation   |   |  |
| Preparation of the planning   | g proposal supported at this stage:F   | Recommended with Conditions   |  |
| S.117 directions:   | <ul> <li>1.1 Business and Industrial Zones</li> <li>3.1 Residential Zones</li> <li>3.4 Integrating Land Use and Trans</li> <li>6.3 Site Specific Provisions</li> <li>7.1 Implementation of the Metropol</li> </ul> | sport   |  |
| Additional Information :  | The planning proposal should pro   | ceed subject to the following condition   | ons:                                   |
|   |  | bition a amended planning proposal<br>ludes, but is not limited to the followi  |  |
|   |  | ded to reflect the finding of the urban<br>ratio and height of building controls v                                    |  |
|   |  |   |  |

| zoning of 1A & 1B Q  | ueen Street, Auburn   |  |  |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
|                      | b) The planning proposal is amended to reflect the findings of the transportation study.  |  |  |
|                      | c) The explanation of provisions is amended to reflect the proposed Floor Space Ratio<br>and Height of Building controls.   |  |  |
|                      | d) The maps are amended to include the proposed Floor Space Ratio and Height of<br>Building controls.   |  |  |
|                      | e) The planning proposal is amended to address the consistency of the proposal with the<br>'Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2013, March 2013'.  |  |  |
|                      | f) The proposal is amended to be consistent with the requirements set out in the document 'A guide to preparing local environmental plans'.   |  |  |
|                      | 2) The proposal comply with SEPP 55 Remediation of Land and Phase 2 contamination investigation is carried in accordance with the SEPP requirements.  |  |  |
|                      | 3) The timeframe to submit the amended planning proposal is 4 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.   |  |  |
|                      | 4) it is recommended that the Director General or delegate agree that the inconsistency of the proposal with S.117 Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones is of minor significance.  |  |  |
| Supporting Reasons : | The proposal will support and assist the growth of Auburn Town Centre by providing new homes in proximity to existing public transport infrastructure and will enable new housing opportunities and choice within the locality. |  |  |
|                      |   |  |  |
| Signature:           | S Mugert  |  |  |
| Printed Name:        | SHANE NUGENT Date: 10/5/13  |  |  |

N/ TEAM LEADER