

Planning Proposal - 95 Queens Road, Five Dock				
Proposal Title :	Proposal Title : Planning Proposal - 95 Queens Road, Five Dock			
Proposal Summary :	Amend the Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013 to add the land use 'Child Care Centre' to Schedule 1 - Additional Permitted Uses for 95 Queens Road, Five Dock.			
PP Number :	PP_2013_CANAD_001_00	Dop File No :	13/08331	
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	15-May-2013	LGA covered :	Canada Bay	
Region :	Sydney Region East	RPA :	City of Canada Bay Council	
State Electorate :	DRUMMOYNE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
			i.	
	Queens Road			
	e Dock City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2046	
Land Parcel : Lot	t 92 DP 1047100			
DoP Planning Office	cer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Tharani Yoganathan			
Contact Number :	0292286502			
Contact Email :				
RPA Contact Detai	ils			
Contact Name :	Peter Giaprakas			
Contact Number :	0299116406			
Contact Email :	Peter.Giaprakas@canadabay.nsv	v.gov.au		
DoP Project Manager Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Sandy Shewell			
Contact Number :	0292286436			
Contact Email :	sandy.shewell@planning.nsw.go	v.au		
Land Release Data				
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro Inner West subregion	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes	

## Planning Proposal - 95 Queens Road, Five Dock

Planning Proposal - 98	Queens Road, Five Dock			
MDP Number :		Date of Release :		
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A	
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	0	
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	12	
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes			
If No, comment :	The Department of Planning and Infrastructure's Code of Conduct has been complied with. Sydney Region East has not met with or communicated with any lobbyist in relation to this planning proposal.			
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No			
If Yes, comment :				
Supporting notes				
Internal Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal seeks to amend the Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013 to add the land use 'child care centres' to Schedule 1 - Additional Permitted at 95 Queens Road, Five Dock.			
	The Department supports this planning proposal because: - It will fulfil a need identified in Council's Child and Family Needs Strategy. - It is in a suitable location as it is adjoins RE1 Public Recreation, R2 Low Density Residential and R3 Medium Density Residential; - It will have minimal impacts on the surrounding environment and local community.			
External Supporting Notes :	Canada Bay Council has accepted the Minister's offer to delegate his plan-making functions under the EP&A Act. Council is seeking delegation to carry out the Minister's functions under section 59 of the EP&A Act 1979 to progress this planning proposal.			
	Council supports this planning proposal because: - There is a growing need for child care centres in the Canada Bay local government area; - The use of schedule 1 - additional permitted uses allows flexibility for this site, without having to rezone or compromise the IN1 General Industrial zone by permitting child care centres for the entire zone.			
Adequacy Assessment				
Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a)				
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes			
Comment :	The objective of this planning	proposal is:		
	- To permit 'Child Care Centre' Road, Five Dock.	as an additional land use un	der schedule 1, for 95 Queens	
Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)				
Is an explanation of pro-	Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes			

Comment : The explanation of provisions is adequate.

Planning Proposal - 95 Queens Road, Five Dock					
The planning proposal will amend the Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013 by adding to schedule 1:					
- Use of Certain land at 95 Queens Road, Five Dock being Lot 92 DP 1047100					
Development for the following purposes is permitted with consent: child care centre					
Justification - s55 (2)(c)					
a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes					
b) S.117 directions identifie	d by RPA :	A : 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones			
* May need the Director Ge	eneral's agreement	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? No					
c) Consistent with Standard	d Instrument (LEPs) Orde	er 2006 : <b>Yes</b>			
d) Which SEPPs have the I	RPA identified?	N/A			
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :					
Have inconsistencies with i	tems a), b) and d) being	adequately justified? Yes			
If No, explain :	<ul> <li>1.1 Business and Industrial Zone The planning proposal is inconsistent with this direction because by using part of this site for a non industrial use such as a child care centre it reduces the potential floor space for industrial uses in an industrial zone. This inconsistency requires the Director General's approval. It is recommended that the Director General approve this inconsistency because Council's Child and Family Needs Strategy has identified a need for child care centres in this area. The planning proposal does not remove the industrial zone. Instead it adds the land use 'child care centre', to schedule 1 - additional permitted use. It will also create 12 jobs. </li> <li>6.3 Site Specific Provisions The planning proposal is inconsistent with this direction as it does not permit child care centres for the entire IN1 General Industrial zone and it does not rezone the site to an existing zone that allows child care centres. The retention of the industrial zone is important and allowing child care centres in all industrial zones is not considered appropriate as it has the potential to compromise the function of industrial land. Adding the land use 'child care centre' into Schedule 1 is considered the most appropriate way forward and the inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance. The planning proposal is considered consistent with the relevant SEPPs.</li></ul>				
Mapping Provided - s5	Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)				
Is mapping provided? No					
Comment :	This planning proposal does not amend any maps in the Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013.				
Community consultation	on - s55(2)(e)				
Has community consultation	n been proposed? Yes				
Comment :		exhibit the planning proposal for 28 days. A minimum of 14 days as this is a low impact proposal.			

	<ul> <li>A project timeline of the planning proposal contains an estimated time frame of 6 months. This is considered adequate.</li> </ul>
Additional Director	General's requirements
Are there any additiona	al Director General's requirements?
If Yes, reasons :	
Overall adequacy o	f the proposal
Does the proposal mee	et the adequacy criteria? <b>Yes</b>
If No, comment :	The planning proposal provides adequate information on the following:
	- Objectives and intended outcomes
	- Explanation of provisions
	- Justification for the planning proposal
	- Community consultation
	- Project timeline
	- Evaluation criteria for delegation
	Delegation of the plan making function is considered to be appropriate.
oposal Assessment	
Principal LEP:	
Principal LEP: Due Date : June 2013	
	Council has forwarded the draft Canada Bay LEP 2013 to the Department to be made. The Department is working towards the finalisation of this instrument. The planning proposal will amend either Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013, depending on the timing of finalising the draft Canada Bay LEP 2013
Due Date : June 2013 Comments in relation	Department is working towards the finalisation of this instrument. The planning proposal
Due Date : June 2013 Comments in relation	Department is working towards the finalisation of this instrument. The planning proposal will amend either Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013, depending on the timing of finalising the draft Canada Bay LEP 2013.
Due Date : <b>June 2013</b> Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	Department is working towards the finalisation of this instrument. The planning proposal will amend either Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013, depending on the timing of finalising the draft Canada Bay LEP 2013.
Due Date : June 2013 Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Assessment Criteri	Department is working towards the finalisation of this instrument. The planning proposal will amend either Canada Bay LEP 2008 or draft Canada Bay LEP 2013, depending on the timing of finalising the draft Canada Bay LEP 2013.

	0).							
			ild and Family Needs Strategy					
as it recognises that Council needs to 'encourage the expansion of childcare places for								
private sector'. The planning proposal is fufilling this gap for child care centres in the Canada Bay LGA.								
The planning proposal is not consistent with the following strategies: Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 Action E3.2 Identify and retain strategically important employment lands. The draft Inner West Subregional Strategy A1.6 Improve Planning and Delivery of Employment Lands								
					Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031			
					Objective 13: Provid	de a well lo	cated supply of industrial lan	ds
amount of industria because the indust	I land with rial zone is	in the LGA. These inconsister not removed, and this planni	ncies are considered justified					
The planning proposal will not adversely affect critical habitats, threatened species or ecological communities. The potential traffic and environmental implications will be assessed through the child care centre provisions under the Canada Bay Development Control Plan 2008 at the development application stage.								
The planning proposal will have a positive impact for the LGA as it will increase local employment and commercial activity.								
5								
Routine		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days					
6 Month		Delegation :	RPA					
PAC required?	No							
proceed ?	Yes							
) : <b>No</b>								
udies, if required.								
	under two year olds private sector'. The Canada Bay LGA. The planning proportion Metropolitan Plan fr Action E3.2 Identify The draft Inner Wess A1.6 Improve Plann Draft Metropolitan S Objective 13: Provid The planning proportion amount of industria because the industria because the industria because the industria control Plan 2008 a The planning proportion employment and co S Routine 6 Month PAC required? proceed ?	under two year olds through e private sector'. The planning p Canada Bay LGA. The planning proposal is not of Metropolitan Plan for Sydney Action E3.2 Identify and retain The draft Inner West Subregio A1.6 Improve Planning and De Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Objective 13: Provide a well lo The planning proposal is inco amount of industrial land with because the industrial zone is a need for child care centres i The planning proposal will no ecological communities. The p assessed through the child ca Control Plan 2008 at the devel The planning proposal will har employment and commercial is s Routine 6 Month PAC required? No proceed ? Yes	under two year olds through existing Council services, not is private sector'. The planning proposal is fufilling this gap for Canada Bay LGA. The planning proposal is not consistent with the following existing Council and Plan for Sydney 2036 Action E3.2 Identify and retain strategically important emplor The draft Inner West Subregional Strategy A1.6 Improve Planning and Delivery of Employment Lands Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031 Objective 13: Provide a well located supply of industrial land The planning proposal is inconsistent with these strategies amount of industrial land within the LGA. These inconsister because the industrial zone is not removed, and this planning a need for child care centres in the Canada Bay LGA. The planning proposal will not adversely affect critical habit ecological communities. The potential traffic and environme assessed through the child care centre provisions under th Control Plan 2008 at the development application stage. The planning proposal will have a positive impact for the LG employment and commercial activity. S Routine PAC required? No proceed ? Yes					

Identify any internal consultations, if required :

## No internal consultation required

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No

If Yes, reasons :

## Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	ls Public
Project Timeline.docx	Determination Document	No
Attachment_4 95 Queens Road, Five Dock.docx	Determination Document	No
Council letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	No
Council Report.pdf	Determination Document	No
Planning Proposal - 95 Queens Road, Five Dock.pdf	Proposal	No

## Planning Team Recommendation

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

S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036
Additional Information :	It is recommended the planning proposal proceed subject to the following conditions:
	- Planning proposal is exhibited for 14 days.
	- Planning proposal be completed within 6 months.
	- A public hearing is not required to be held.
	- The Director General considers the inconsistency with directions 6.3 Site Specific Provisions to be of minor significance.
	- The Director General's approval for the inconsistency with direction 1.1 Business and Industrial zone is required. It is recommended that the Director General approve this inconsistency with the direction.
	- An authorisation to exercise delegation to make the plan be issued to the council for this planning proposal.
Supporting Reasons :	The planning proposal should be approved for the following reasons:
	- It is in a suitable location as it adjoins RE1 Public Recreation, R2 Low Density Residential and R3 Medium Density Residential;
	<ul> <li>It is considered this planning proposal will have minimal impact on the surrounding environment;</li> </ul>
	- It is considered that the addition of 'Child Care Centres' is fulfilling a demand for this use in the area; and
	- Council proposes to progress the planning proposal under delegation. The matter is considered to be of local significance and the use of council's delegation is supported.

Planning Proposal - 95 Queens Road, Five Dock				
Signature:	- El rewells			
Printed Name:	Sandy Shewell Date:	27.5.13		

