

Proposal Title : Proposal Summa	buildings and decrease the the Rouse Hill Regional Cen ry : The proposal seeks to amer Southern, Eastern and Cent	The Hills Local Environmental Plan 2012 - Amendment No. 18 - to increase the height of buildings and decrease the minimum lot size applicable to certain residential development in the Rouse Hill Regional Centre The proposal seeks to amend the planning controls applicable to specific locations within the Southern, Eastern and Central Residential Precincts of the Rouse Hill Regional Centre, restoring the controls that applied to these areas prior to the introduction of The Hills LEP 2012.			
PP Number :	PP_2013_THILL_009_00	Dop File No :	13/09106		
Proposal Details					
Date Planning Proposal Receive	30-May-2013 ed :	LGA covered :	The Hills Shire		
Region :	Sydney Region West	RPA :	The Hills Shire Council		
State Electorate :	HAWKESBURY	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal		
LEP Type :	Precinct				
Location Details					
Street :	Various streets				
Suburb :	Rouse Hill City :	The Hills	Postcode : 2155		
Land Parcel :					
DoP Planning (Officer Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Chris Browne				
Contact Number :	0298601108				
Contact Email :	Contact Email : chris.browne@planning.nsw.gov.au				
RPA Contact Details					
Contact Name :	Alicia Jenkins				
Contact Number :	0298430396				
Contact Email :	ajenkins@thehills.nsw.gov.au	ı			
DoP Project Ma	nager Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Derryn John				
Contact Number :	0298601505				
Contact Email :	derryn.john@planning.nsw.go	ov.au			

Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	Rouse Hill Regional Centre
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro North West subregion	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residentíal / Employment land) :	Residential
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	52
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :	To the best of the knowledge of the regional team, the Department's Code of Practice in relation to communications and meetings with Lobbyists has been complied with. Sydney West has not met with any lobbyist in relation to this proposal, nor has the Regional Director been advised of any meetings between other departmental officers and lobbyists concerning this proposal.		
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :	The Department's Lobbyist Contact Register has been checked on 29 May 2013, and there have been no records of contact with lobbyists in relation to this proposal.		
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	THE SITE		
	The Rouse Hill Regional Centre is a mixed use town centre surrounded by residential areas of varying densities. It is divided into precincts, and Council's proposal is to increase building height limits in specific locations yet to be developed in the Southern, Eastern and Central Residential Precincts. It should be noted that the proponent's proposal also included a change to clause 4.1B of the LEP (Exceptions to minimum lot sizes for certain residential development) to allow subdivision down to, and residential development on, lots as small as 160m2; this would apply across the entire Rouse Hill Regional Centre. Council has not adopted this change as part of its proposal. This issue is further discussed in the Adequacy and Assessment sections of this report.		
	BACKGROUND		
	The Rouse Hill Regional Centre is the late 1980s. A Regional Enviro was gazetted in 1989, and led to proponent claims that a number The Hills LEP 2012 at the time of proposal with Council in order to	onmental Plan, SREP 19 (Rous the development of a Master of the Master Plan's controls its publication, and the propo	se Hill Development Area), Plan for the site. The were not clearly translated to
	EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING D	ELIVERY	

in the Rouse Hill Regional Centre				
	stage how many extra du dwellings is an estimate	vill allow for increased residential density. It is unclear at this wellings will be provided as a result. The above figure of 52 new based on the height increase and the land area affected. Should addition to clause 4.1B be adopted, the housing delivery is likely r.		
External Supporting Notes :				
Adequacy Assessme	nt			
Statement of the ol	ojectives - s55(2)(a)			
Is a statement of the o	bjectives provided? Yes			
Comment : The purpose of the planning proposal as lodged by Council is to increase the maxim building height for a number of identified sites in the residential precincts of the Rou Regional Centre. The small site in the Southern Precinct will see an increase from 15 21m, the site in the Eastern Precinct will see an increase from 10m to 12.5m, and the the Central Precinct will see an increase from 12m to 21m.		number of identified sites in the residential precincts of the Rouse Hill small site in the Southern Precinct will see an increase from 15m to astern Precinct will see an increase from 10m to 12.5m, and the site in		
	It should be noted that the proponent's proposal also included a reduction in minimum lot size for certain residential development (across the Regional Centre) from 240m2 to 160m2. Council did not adopt this in its submission to the Department. (This issue is discussed further throughout this report.)			
Explanation of prov	visions provided - s55	(2)(b)		
Is an explanation of pr	ovisions provided? Yes			
Comment :	Council has provided a table showing the intended increase in building heights (from 15m to 21m in the Southern Precinct, from 10m to 12.5m in the Eastern Precinct, and from 12m to 21m in the Central Precinct), and has identified the three relevant sites on a map.			
Council has also provided details of the proponent's desired minimum lot size change, which Council has not adopted. This change was to have occurred as an additional subclause in 4.1B(3) of The Hills LEP 2012, allowing for development consent to be granted to a single development application within an R3 or R4 zone within the Rouse Hill Regional Centre that is both the subdivision of land into three or more lots and the erection of an attached dwelling or a dwelling house on each resulting lot if the size of each lot is equal to or greater than 160m2. (Clause 4.1B already contains this provision, LGA-wide, for lots equal to or greater than 240m2 in R3 and R4 zones.)				
	Both Council and the proponent have made it clear that development on lots smaller than 240m2 is intended. Council's stated intent in not adopting the above subclause is that such development can still be approved via Clause 4.6 of the LEP (Exceptions to development standards), and the added rigour of this approach will ensure that the outcome is justified in terms of providing a functional product with good amenity.			
Justification - s55 (2)(c)			
a) Has Council's strate	gy been agreed to by the Di	rector General? No		
b) S.117 directions ide	ntified by RPA :	2.3 Heritage Conservation		
* May need the Director General's agreement		3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 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? Y	es	
c) Consistent with Standar	c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes		
d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?		SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SREP No. 19 - Rouse Hill Development Area SREP No. 20 - Hawkesbury–Nepean River (No. 2 - 1997)	
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 :	2.3 Heritage Conservation		
	A State heritage item, Mungerie House, falls within the proposal's ambit. The approved Rouse Hill Master Plan identifies a 70m curtilage around this item, limiting building height to one storey. The proposal does not include any development that is inconsistent with this curtilege.		
	While it is probable that the proposal is consistent with the Direction, any potential inconsistency should be addressed by Council consulting the Office of Environment and Heritage.		
	3.1 Residential Zones		
	The proposal is consistent with this Direction. It will increase residential density and will provide a greater range of housing choice.		
	3.3 Home Occupation	s	
	The proposal is consi residential zones.	The proposal is consistent with this Direction. Home occupations are permissible in residential zones.	
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport		
	The proposal is consistent with this Direction. It will intensify residential development close to transport, shops and services, thus reducing the need for trips by car.		
	6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements		
	The proposal as lodged by Council is not consistent with this Direction. Should the proponent's preferred approach of applying a minimum lot size of 160m2 to the subject land not proceed, the proponent will continue to lodge development applications for lots smaller than the minimum lot size of 240m2. Each of these development applications will require the Director General's concurrence under clause 4.6 of The Hills LEP 2012.		
	If the planning proposal includes the proponent's changes to Clause 4.1B, it will be consistent with the Direction.		
	6.3 Site Specific Provisions		
	The proposal does not contain site-specific provisions, and is therefore generally consistent with this Direction.		
	7.1 Implementation of	the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036	
	The proposal is consistent with this Direction. The proposal is consistent with the		

in the Rouse Hill Regio	nai Centre
	Metropolitan Plan's housing objectives, particularly in terms of providing housing choice, and providing medium density housing close to centres. It also assists in meeting Growing and Renewing Centres Action B1.3 (Aim to locate 80 per cent of all new housing within the walking catchments of existing and planned centres of all sizes with good public transport).
	SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007
	Nothing in the proposal is inconsistent with the Infrastructure SEPP. The proponent will need to ensure that future development is consistent with the SEPP.
	SREP No. 19 - Rouse Hill Development Area
	The proposal will assist in delivering the objectives of the SREP, and is therefore consistent with it.
	Aim (1)(a) of SREP No 19—Rouse Hill Development Area is "to accommodate part of the long-term growth of the Sydney Region by providing a mechanism for identifying land suitable for urban purposes and by providing for the orderly and economic development of that land". Aim (1)(e)(i) of the SREP is "to provide accommodation, including a variety in housing type, tenure, price and location".
	While these aims are served to a certain extent by the proposal as lodged by Council, they will be better facilitated if the proponent's 160m2 provision in Clause 4.1B(3) of the LEP is included in the planning proposal.
	SREP No. 20 - Hawkesbury–Nepean River (No. 2 - 1997)
	Given that the proposed development intensification is within the scope of the approved Rouse Hill Master Plan, it is unlikely to have a significant negative impact on the environment of the Hawkesbury-Nepean River system. It is therefore unlikely to be inconsistent with the SREP. To ensure consistency, it is recommended that the RPA consult the Hawkesbury–Nepean Catchment Management Authority.
Mapping Provided -	s55(2)(d)
Is mapping provided? Ye	es
Comment :	
Community consulta	ition - s55(2)(e)
Has community consulta	tion been proposed? Yes
Comment :	The Hills Shire Council proposes to: - advertise the proposal in local newspapers; - exhibit the proposal at Council's administration building; - publish the proposal on Council's website; and - write to owners of adjoining properties.
	Council has not specified an intended exhibition period, but has indicated that it will comply with the Gateway Determination.
Additional Director G	Seneral's requirements
Are there any additional	Director General's requirements? Yes
If Yes, reasons :	As stated previously, Council's planning proposal does not include a provision of the

proponent's proposal, namely an addition to Clause 4.1B(3) of The Hills LEP 2012 to allow certain residential development to occur on lots as small as 160m2.			
Council and the proponent agree that development on lots smaller than 240m2 is intended, but Council did not initially explain by what mechanism it intended to carry this out. Council was asked for an explanation, and stated that its intent is to apply Clause 4.6 (Exceptions to development standards), meaning that every such development application will need to be referred to the Director General for concurrence. This approach is inconsistent with section 117 Direction 6.1 (Approval and Referral Requirements), and is undesirable in terms of rational planning and efficient process.			
	Aim (1)(a) of SREP No 19—Rouse Hill Development Area is "to accommodate part of the long-term growth of the Sydney Region by providing a mechanism for identifying land suitable for urban purposes and by providing for the orderly and economic development of that land". Aim (1)(e)(i) of the SREP is "to provide accommodation, including a variety in housing type, tenure, price and location". These aims will be better facilitated by the inclusion of the proponent's 160m2 provision in Clause 4.1B(3) of the LEP.		
	It is therefore recommended that the Gateway Determination include a condition requiring Council to reinstate the 160m2 provision in the planning proposal.		
Overall adequacy of	the proposal		
Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes			
If No, comment :			
Proposal Assessment			
Principal LEP:			
Due Date :			
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The Hills LEP 2012 is a Principal LEP.		
Assessment Criteria			
Need for planning proposal :	The planning proposal is the result of an application by the proponent to increase building height and decrease minimum lot size. The Rouse Hill Masterplan, approved by Council and mandated by the DCP, includes a target of 1,800 new dwellings, and the proposal will assist in meeting this target.		

liu	the Rouse Hill Regio	
11565	Consistency with strategic planning framework :	METROPOLITAN PLAN FOR SYDNEY 2036 and DRAFT NORTH WEST SUBREGIONAL STRATEGY
	namework .	The proposal is consistent with the Metropolitan Plan's housing objectives, particularly in terms of providing housing choice, and providing medium density housing close to centres. It also assists in meeting Growing and Renewing Centres Action B1.3 (Aim to locate 80 per cent of all new housing within the walking catchments of existing and planned centres of all sizes with good public transport).
		The draft North West Subregional Strategy sets a target of 36,000 new dwellings by 2031, and focuses on the need to provide these dwellings in close proximity to jobs, transport and other infrastructure. The proposal will assist in meeting these requirements.
		DRAFT METROPOLITAN STRATEGY FOR SYDNEY TO 2031
		The draft Metropolitan Strategy builds on and is generally consistent with the existing Metropolitan Plan. The one significant difference for the purposes of this proposal is that the draft Strategy acknowledges the future North West Rail Link, which will greatly increase public transport capacity in the subregion, providing greater support for growth such as this proposal entails.
		LOCAL STRATEGIC PLANNING DOCUMENTS
		The Hills 2026 Community Strategic Direction and The Hills Shire Local Strategy (Residential Direction, Integrated Transport Direction and Centres Direction) includes themes of promoting housing development and variety close to existing infrastructure, particularly transport. Rouse Hill is identified as a Planned Major Centre under the Centres Direction, and the proposal's intensification of residential development will support this status.
	Environmental social	ENVIRONMENTAL
	economic impacts :	The proposal is unlikely to have any significant negative environmental impact. The majority of the subject land is currently vacant, and does not contain critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats. The exception to this is the Caballo Street site in the Eastern Precinct; a Vegetation Management Plan has been prepared as part of the approved Master Plan, and will prevent any adverse effects.
		SOCIAL
		The proposal is likely to have an overall positive social impact. It will help to meet Sydney's and the North West Subregion's housing needs, it will improve the diversity of housing products in The Hills Shire, and it will increase residential density in proximity to both physical and social infrastructure.
		Given the proposal's intent of increasing residential density, it is likely that it will result in increases in traffic movement. Roads and Maritime Services should be consulted to ensure the viability of these increases.
		ECONOMIC
		The proposal is likely to have an overall positive economic impact. An intensification of residential development in close proximity to shops and transport is likely to stimulate economic growth.

Assessment Proces	s				
Proposal type :	Routine	Comm Period	unity Consultation	28 Days	
Timeframe to make	9 Month	Delega	tion :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Office of Environ Landcom	pean Catchment Manag ment and Heritage N - Roads and Maritimo			
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(I	o) : No				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional st	tudies, if required. :				
If Other, provide reason	s :				
Identify any internal con	sultations, if required	1 :			
No internal consultatio					
Is the provision and fund	ling of state infrastru	cture relevant to this pla	in? No		
If Yes, reasons :					
cuments					
Document File Name			DocumentType Na	me	Is Public
Planning proposal.pdf			Proposal		Yes
Cover letter.pdf			Proposal Covering Determination Do		Yes
Council report.pdf Council report - part 2.p	odf		Determination Do		Yes Yes
DCP extract.pdf	<i>7</i>		Study	sument	Yes
			-		<u></u>
nning Team Recom	nendation				
Preparation of the planni	ing proposal support	ed at this stage : Recor	nmended with Conc	litions	
S.117 directions:	2.3 Heritage Con				
	3.1 Residential Z				
	3.3 Home Occup				
		and Use and Transport I Referral Requirement			
	6.3 Site Specific	-	~		

- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Additional Information : It is recommended that the proposal proceed subject to the following conditions:

	(1) Consultation with (a) Roads and Maritime Services, (b) the Office of Environment and Heritage, (c) the Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment Management Authority, and (d) Urban Growth NSW (formerly Landcom);		
	(2) The Director General's delegate agrees that any inconsistencies with section 117 directions 2.3 Heritage Conservation and 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements are justified and/or of minor significance;		
	(3) Inclusion of the proponent's intended addition to Clause 4.1B(3) of The Hills LEP 2012, to ensure that certain residential development is permissible on lots as small as 160m2;		
	(4) Community consultation for 28 days; and		
	(5) The timeframe for completing the local environmental plan is to be 9 months from the week following the date of the Gateway Determination.		
Supporting Reasons :	The planning proposal will ensure consistency with the Rouse Hill Master Plan, which is the result of an extensive strategic planning process. Adoption of the proponent's intended addition to Clause 4.1B(3) will greatly assist in meeting the Master Plan's target of 1,800 new dwellings. Further, the proposal will provide for intensification of residential development in a planned Major Centre, close to shops, services and transport.		
Signature:	Dema Solm		
Printed Name:	DERRYN JOHN Date: 7 JUNE 2013		