**PLANNING PROPOSAL 24 – LEP REVIEW 2016 AT B**

Note: Requesting delegation for the General Manager for the planning proposal

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **LEP ref.** | **Amendment** | **Explanation of Provisions** | **Council resltn/ Excel schedule** |
|  | **LEP TEXT** |  |  |  |
|  | **Zoning** |  |  |  |
| 1 | R4 Zone  Para. 3 | Add permissible use with consent: “restaurants or cafes” in the R4 High Density Residential Zone. | To clarify that such uses are permissible, in addition to “neigh  bourhood shops”, to add to local amenity in high density areas. | Resolutn 1l Sched. No.58 |
| 2 | IN2 zone  Para 3. | Add permissible uses with consent: "animal boarding or training establishment", “medical centre” , “vehicle repair station” and “vehicle body repair workshop” in the IN2 Light Industrial Zone. | To ensure services in the area meet the needs of the workforce of around 7,000 employees in the lane Cove West industrial area. | Resolutns 1b. 1k and 1l, Sched. No.48 |
|  | **Development standards** |  |  |  |
| 3 | Cl.4.1 | Add:  (4B)(i)"Despite any other provision of this Plan, development consent must not be granted to a development application for the subdivision of land on which development for the purpose of dual occupancy is erected or is proposed to be erected if the subdivision would result in each of the dwellings that comprise the dual occupancy being located on separate lots.”  (ii) Subdivision of dual occupancies is to be excluded from the use of cl.4.6. | It had been understood, in liaison with the Department during drafting of the LEP under the Standard LEP, that the “dual occupancy” definition prevented subdivision.  However, DA applicants frequently query this as a basis for refusals and it is intended now to clarify that dual occupancies may not be subdivided. | Resolutn 1d |
| 4 | Cl.4.3 | Height Objective to read:  (1)   1. “To maintain satisfactory solar access to existing buildings and public areas, and have regard to privacy and visual impacts of development on neighbouring properties, particularly where zones meet, and 2. to relate development to topography. ” | Current wording “to minimise” is theoretically impossible to achieve without demolishing development, especially in an area of transition to higher density, and was adversely commented on by the JRPP as inhibiting the use of cl.4.6 to vary the development standard for a DA on merit. The Ashfield model is the basis for the proposed wording, following review of other councils’ LEPs. | Resolutn 1a |
| 5 | Cl.4.4 | Add: “(2B) If a lot is a battle-axe lot or other lot with an access handle, the area of the access handle is not to be included in the lot size for the purpose of floor space ratio calculation.” |  | Resolutn 1j |
|  | **General** |  |  |  |
| 6 | Cl.5.3 | Adopt cl.5.3 of the Standard LEP, including:-  “(2) This clause applies to so much of any land that is within the relevant distance of a boundary between any 2 zones. The relevant distance is 15 metres.” | Zone boundaries – the standard LEP allows a distance to be specified into an adjacent zone to facilitate appropriate development. | Resolutn 1c |
| 7 | Cl.6.1(6) | Edit to read "and" not "or" . | To ensure that works are both (i) less than 1 tonne of soil and (ii) not likely to lower the water table. | Resolutn 1l, Sched. No.53 |
|  | **Heritage**  **editing** |  |  |  |
| 8 | *Greenwich*  Schedule 5 &  HER\_004 | Delete the following Local Items:   * I89, I90, I91 (13,15 & 16 Kingslangley Rd). | DAs approved – Demolition. | Resolutn 1l, Sched. Nos.14, 15, 16, 30,31, |
| 9 | *Lane Cove*  Schedule 5 &  HER\_001 | Delete Item I168. | The street trees in front of 87-93 Longueville Rd were the item, but they have since died (and due to a mapping error, they had been erroneously located on Birdwood Lane.) | Resolutn 1l, Sched. No.27 |
| 10 | *Longueville*  Schedule 5 &  HER\_002 | Delete 73 Arabella St – Lot A DP 311252 – House – Local – Item I228. | DA approved – Demolition. | Resolutn 1l, Sched. Nos.14, 15, 16, 30,31, |
| 11 | *Northwood*  Schedule 5 &  HER\_004 | Delete 62 Northwood Rd – Lot 1 DP 826939 – House – Local – Item I293. | DA approved – Demolition. | Resolutn 1l, Sched. Nos.14, 15, 16, 30,31, |
| 12 | *Riverview*  Schedule 5 &  HER\_002 | Delete 44 College Rd South – Lot 7 DP 739156 – House – Local – Item I317. | DA approved – Demolition. | Resolutn 1l, Sched. Nos.14, 15, 16, 30,31, |
|  | **LEP MAP** |  |  |  |
| 13 | FSR\_001 to 004 | Properties in regular subdivision patterns are to be mapped consistently with neighbours at the R2 standard FSR 0.5:1. | A software issue has identified some "small lots" and therefore permissible at FSR 0.6 that are in fact the same size as neighbouring properties with FSR of only 0.5:1. This causes incompatible building bulk and streetscape. |  |
| 14 | FSR\_001 & HOB\_001 | Adjust FSR and Height along boundaries between Lot 120 DP 613223 and Lot 51 DP 862728 (these are different sections of Caroline Chisholm retirement centre at 40A Cope St). | To match property boundaries (cadastre). | Resolutn 1l, Sched. No.42 |
| 15 | FSR\_002 & HOB\_002 | 3 Dunois St, Longueville – add FSR and Height labels. | Labels are missing for this R2 Low Density Residential property.. | Resolutn 1l, Sched. No.43 |
| 16 | HER\_001 to 004 | Map all properties to be consistent with the Text amendments as indicated above. | As above. | As above. |
| 18 | LRA\_002  Land reservation Acquisition | Add western portions of 3A, 5A & 7A Dettmann Ave and 41 Stuart St, Longueville (parts of Lot 4 DP317113, Lot 3 DP 317113, Lot 17 DP 1702 and Lot 2 DP 205722 respectively). | For future public land acquisition of properties which have already been zoned E2 Environmental Conservation in anticipation. | Resolutn 1i |
| 19 | CL\_001  Foreshore, Riparian, Envnmentl Protectn | 14 Gay St: Apply an Environmental Protection (EP) layer over the southern portion, on the Environmental Protection Land Map. The EP layer is applied to private properties under the Standard LEP. | Council’s Open Space & Urban Services Division and the Lane Cove Bushland Management Advisory Committee have identified the site as an integral part of Upper Stringybark Reserve, valuable ecologically and aesthetically. This includes an Endangered Ecological Community – Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest. The site is 2,790m2 in total. A developable area of around 1,500m2 would remain. | Resolutn 1e |
| 20 | General | Other amendments for editing as identified for exhibition. |  |  |
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