

Rezoning of part of 136-154 Menangle Street, Picton						
Proposal Title :	Rezoning of part of 136-	-154 Men	angle Street, Picton			
Proposal Summary	To rezone part of 136-154 Menangle Street, Picton, for residential development.					
PP Number :	PP_2012_WOLLY_001_(	00	Dop File No :	12/05398		
Proposal Details						
Date Planning Proposal Received	08-Mar-2012 :		LGA covered :	Wollondilly		
Region :	Sydney Region West		RPA :	Wollondilly Shire Council		
State Electorate :	WOLLONDILLY		Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal		
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning					
Location Details						
Street : P	Part of 136-154 Menangle Stre	et				
Suburb : P	Picton C	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2571		
Land Parcel : P	Part of Lot 12 in DP 1126525					
DoP Planning Of	ficer Contact Details					
Contact Name :	Mato Prskalo					
Contact Number :	0298738568					
Contact Email :	mato.prskalo@planning.n	ısw.gov.a	au			
RPA Contact Det	ails					
Contact Name :	Kitty Carter					
Contact Number :	0246778230					
Contact Email :	kitty.carter@wollondilly.n	sw.gov.a	u			
DoP Project Man	ager Contact Details					
Contact Name :	Terry Doran					
Contact Number :	0298738557					
Contact Email :	terry.doran@planning.nsv	<i>w</i> .gov.au				
Land Release Da	ta					
Growth Centre :	N/A		Release Area Name :	N/A		
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro South West subre	gion	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes		

MDP Number :		Date of Release :			
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :			
No. of Lots :	17	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	17		
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	0		
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes				
If No, comment :	The Department's register of lobbyist contacts was examined on 23 March and there are no records of any contacts related to this Planning Proposal.				
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No				
If Yes, comment :	To the best of the regional team's knowledge, there has been no meetings or communications with registered lobbyists.				
upporting notes					
Internal Supporting Notes :	The Planning Proposal and Council report are located in the 'Documents' section.				
External Supporting Notes :					
	jectives - s55(2)(a)				
Is a statement of the ob					
	The Proposal will rezone 2.32 ha of a large rural allotment (34.84ha) on the south eastern edge of the Picton urban area for residential development (17 allotments).				
Comment :					
Comment :	edge of the Picton u The rezoning will all (0.47ha) of the same		it (17 allotments). vith an adjoining, small part v zoned for residential		
Comment :	edge of the Picton u The rezoning will all (0.47ha) of the same development (with th	rban area for residential developmen ow the land to be jointly developed w allotment, that is vacant and already	it (17 allotments). with an adjoining, small part v zoned for residential otments).		
	edge of the Picton u The rezoning will allo (0.47ha) of the same development (with th A concept plan is sh	rban area for residential developmen ow the land to be jointly developed w allotment, that is vacant and already ne potential to create 4 additional allo own on page 15 of the Proposal doci	it (17 allotments). with an adjoining, small part v zoned for residential otments).		
	edge of the Picton u The rezoning will all (0.47ha) of the same development (with th A concept plan is sh section). isions provided - s5	rban area for residential developmen ow the land to be jointly developed w allotment, that is vacant and already ne potential to create 4 additional allo own on page 15 of the Proposal doci	it (17 allotments). with an adjoining, small part v zoned for residential otments).		
<b>xplanation of prov</b> i s an explanation of pro	edge of the Picton un The rezoning will allo (0.47ha) of the same development (with the A concept plan is sh section). isions provided - s55 visions provided? Yes The Proposal seeks - rezone land from Zo	ban area for residential developmen ow the land to be jointly developed w allotment, that is vacant and already ne potential to create 4 additional allo own on page 15 of the Proposal doct	it (17 allotments). with an adjoining, small part v zoned for residential otments). ument (refer to 'Documents' 2 Low Density Residential, and		
xplanation of prov	edge of the Picton un The rezoning will allo (0.47ha) of the same development (with the A concept plan is sh section). isions provided - s55 visions provided? Yes The Proposal seeks - rezone land from Zo - apply a minimum lo	tban area for residential development ow the land to be jointly developed w allotment, that is vacant and already ne potential to create 4 additional allo own on page 15 of the Proposal doct 5(2)(b) to: one RU2 Rural Landscape to Zone R	at (17 allotments). with an adjoining, small part or zoned for residential otments). ument (refer to 'Documents' 2 Low Density Residential, and ht limit of 9m to that land.		

.

Rezoning of part of 13	6-154 Menangle Stre	et, Picton
	size for the residual	es not specify a size. It is considered that the minimum permissible lot land (i.e. the 'residual allotment') should be 30 hectares. Council ted and have agreed to this figure.
	• • •	osed to be facilitated by amending the following maps forming part of vironmental Plan 2011:
	- Land Zoning Map - - Lot Size Map - Shee - Height of Buildings	
Justification - s55 (2	2)(c)	
a) Has Council's strateg	gy been agreed to by the [	Director General? No
b) S.117 directions iden	tified by RPA :	1.2 Rural Zones
* May need the Director	General's agreement	<ul> <li>2.1 Environment Protection Zones</li> <li>2.3 Heritage Conservation</li> <li>3.1 Residential Zones</li> <li>3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport</li> <li>4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land</li> <li>4.3 Flood Prone Land</li> <li>4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection</li> <li>7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036</li> </ul>
Is the Director Gener	ral's agreement required?	Yes
c) Consistent with Stand	dard Instrument (LEPs) O	rder 2006 : <b>Yes</b>
d) Which SEPPs have t	he RPA identified?	SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SREP No. 20 - Hawkesbury–Nepean River (No. 2 - 1997)
<ul> <li>e) List any other matters that need to be considered :</li> </ul>		
Have inconsistencies wi	ith items a), b) and d) beir	g adequately justified? No
If No, explain :	SECTION 117 DIRE	
	DIRECTION 1.2 RUI	RAL ZONES
	Landscape) to a res Proposal is inconsi the inconsistency is	ies to the Proposal as it rezones land from a rural zone (RU2 Rural sidential zone (R1 Low Density Residential) and, therefore, the stent with the Direction, requiring justification. It is considered that s justified on the basis of being of minor significance. The approval of I to the inconsistency will be required pursuant to clause 5(d) of the
	permits a range of r dairy farming but it Notwithstanding thi document) shows t residential cul-de-s considered that suc assessment and co	ent is proposed to remain zoned RU2 Rural Landscape, which rural land uses. It is understood that the land was previously used for is not known whether future agricultural use of the land is intended. is, the indicative subdivision layout (on page 15 of the Proposal hat the residual allotment will be accessed through a proposed ac. While this may increase the potential for land use conflicts, it is th issues can be adequately managed through the development ntrol process. Therefore, no change to the current RU2 Rural s required for the residual allotment.
	DIRECTION 2.1 - EN	IVIRONMENT PROTECTION ZONES
	This Direction appli	es to the Proposal as it contains environmentally sensitive land,

.

.

#### being Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW) and steeply sloped land.

The land proposed for residential development is largely cleared and contains only small areas of CPW (combined with weed species), which are not the more significant Priority Conservation Land CPW. The Proposal seeks to retain mature remnant trees and incorporate them into the residential development. It is considered that, despite the limited occurrence of CPW on the site, a flora and fauna study should be carried out because of the CPW's 'endangered' status.

Cumberland Plain Shale Woodland Forest is subject to the Federal Government's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. Accordingly, Council will need to consult with the Federal Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. Council will also need to consider Section 34A consultation with the Director-General of the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH).

Council should be required to demonstrate consistency with the Direction prior to undertaking community consultation.

## **DIRECTION 2.3 – HERITAGE CONSERVATION**

This Direction requires the Proposal to facilitate heritage conservation. While there are currently no listed heritage items on the site, the part of the site which is already zoned for residential purposes is located within the Picton Heritage Conservation Area (HCA), as listed in the heritage schedule under Camden LEP 2010. In addition, the site itself may raise heritage matters as it has a long farming history. Aboriginal archaeological issues may also be present.

Therefore, Council should undertake a heritage study and consult the Heritage Branch of the Office of Environment and Heritage. The study should include consideration of potential visual impacts of the proposed development on the Picton HCA, given the encroachment of proposed residential development onto visually prominent land. Council should be required to demonstrate consistency with the Direction prior to undertaking community consultation.

## **DIRECTION 3.1 - RESIDENTIAL ZONES**

This Direction applies to the Proposal as it seeks to rezone land for residential development. The Proposal is consistent with the Direction in so far as it will broaden the choice of housing locations locally and will contribute to the housing target identified for Picton under Council's Wollondilly Growth Management Strategy 2011. The site is also identified as a potential residential growth area under that Strategy.

Infrastructure and services, including reticulated water and sewer, are located in the vicinity of the site and would need to be extended to the site. The Proposal indicates that this would be funded by the developer at no cost to Government. Sydney Water is currently seeking Ministerial approval to modify the servicing boundary for the Picton Sewerage Treatment Plant. However, the site is located immediately outside the boundary, therefore, separate negotiations would be required with Sydney Water in relation to servicing. Consultation is also required with all other main utility providers, including Roads and Maritime Services (the proposal will rely on the creation of a new access point to a State road (i.e. Menangle Street)).

The proposed minimum lot size for the residential development is 700m2. It is noted that clause 4.1(5) of Wollondilly LEP 2011 prevents the creation of lots less than 975sqm in Zone R2 Low Density Residential if they are not serviced by a reticulated sewerage scheme. A third of the proposed lots are over 975sqm, as shown on the indicative subdivision layout on page 15 of the Proposal document. The variation in proposed lot sizes may lead to disorderly development if reticulated sewer cannot be provided in a

# Rezoning of part of 136-154 Menangle Street, Picton

timely manner, particularly as the four proposed lots that do not form part of the Proposal (i.e. fronting Menangle Street) are located within Sydney Water's existing servicing boundary and can be serviced from existing infrastructure. Therefore, it is considered that Council, as part of its consultation with Sydney Water, should investigate all appropriate means for ensuring a strategic approach to sewer servicing, including the possibility of servicing the site from current spare capacity at the STP.

It is noted that proposed Lot 21, as shown on the indicative subdivision layout, is 3067sqm in size. The layout shows that the majority of the allotment is considered to be unsuitable for building due to steeply sloping land. The constrained land may create expectations of re-subdivision due to its size and proposed residential zoning. However, although Wollondilly LEP 2011 does not include mapping of constraints, clause 4.1(c) of the LEP requires the subdivision of land to be compatible with the landscape and environmental constraints of the land. Nevertheless, it is considered to be preferable for the constrained land to be zoned more appropriately. Therefore, it is considered that Council should consider an alternative zoning for the constrained land.

# **DIRECTION 3.4 - INTEGRATING LAND USE AND TRANSPORT**

This Direction applies to the Proposal as it rezones land for urban purposes. The Direction requires the Proposal to be consistent with:

- 'Improving Transport Choice - Guidelines for planning and development (DUAP 2001)', and

- 'The Right Place for Business and Services - Planning Policy (DUAP 2001)'.

The Proposal is considered to be generally consistent with the Improving Transport Choice guideline, and hence this Direction, as the site is located on the edge of the Picton urban area and is within 550m walking distance of the town centre. The site is also close to Picton Railway Station.

#### **DIRECTION 4.2 - MINE SUBSIDENCE AND UNSTABLE LAND**

This Direction applies to the Proposal as it is located within a proclaimed Mine Subsidence District (i.e. Picton). The Direction requires Council to consult with the Mine Subsidence Board and notify the Department of the results prior to undertaking community consultation. Following consultation, Council is required to demonstrate the Proposal's consistency with the Direction.

#### **DIRECTION 4.3 – FLOOD PRONE LAND**

The Proposal indicates that the site adjoins flood prone land but is not flood prone itself. However, the Council report notes that a small part of the site is prone to flooding. In addition, there are stormwater and drainage issues affecting the proposed residential land as it is surrounded by steeply sloping land. Therefore, this Direction applies to the Proposal as it rezones flood prone land.

As the Proposal does not identify the precise location of the flood prone land and its proposed zoning, the consistency of the Proposal with the Direction cannot be determined at this time. Therefore, Council should be required to address this matter and demonstrate consistency before undertaking community consultation.

# **DIRECTION 4.4 – PLANNING FOR BUSHFIRE PROTECTION**

This Direction applies to the Proposal as the site contains bush fire prone land. Pursuant to section 4 of the Direction, Council will be required to consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service following receipt of the Gateway Determination and prior

## Rezoning of part of 136-154 Menangle Street, Picton

to undertaking community consultation, and take into account any comments made. A determination of the consistency of the Proposal with the Direction will be made once the above steps have been completed.

**DIRECTION 7.1 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE METROPOLITAN PLAN FOR SYDNEY 2036** 

This Direction requires the Proposal to be consistent with the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. The Proposal is generally consistent with this Plan, particularly as it provides additional housing opportunities in an appropriate location.

#### SEPPs AND REPs

SYDNEY REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN No. 20 - HAWKESBURY-NEPEAN RIVER (No. 2 - 1997) ('SREP 20')

The provisions of SREP 20 apply to the Proposal and require Council to give consideration to general planning considerations, specific planning policies, recommended strategies and specific development controls.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY No. 55 - REMEDIATION OF LAND

This SEPP requires Council to consider whether land that is proposed for rezoning is contaminated and can be remediated. Council proposes to undertake a contamination study in view of the past agricultural use of the land. It is considered that the study should be made a Gateway requirement.

### Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

## Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

Council proposes to exhibit the Proposal for a period of 28 days.

## **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? Yes

If No, comment :

#### Proposal Assessment

#### Principal LEP:

Due Date : February 2011

Comments in relation The Principal LEP, Wollondilly LEP 2011, was made in February 2011. to Principal LEP :

# Rezoning of part of 136-154 Menangle Street, Picton

Assessment Criteria	l			
Need for planning proposal :	A Planning Proposal is required to rezone the land.			
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The Proposal is consistent with the general direction of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydne 2036 and the draft Southwest Subregional Strategy as it provides additional housing opportunities in a generally appropriate location.			
	Wollondilly Growt Department for en Strategy until the	h Management Stra dorsement. The De completion of the G .andowner Nominat	tegy 2011. Council h partment has delaye iovernment's Review	in principle, with Council's as submitted the Strategy to the d its consideration of the / of Potential Housing it is considered that, in principle,
Environmental social economic impacts :	existence of envir	onmental, social an	d economic impacts	l in this report will determine the and whether they can be issues and that these will be
Assessment Process	5			
Proposal type :	Minor	Com Perio	munity Consultation	28 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	12 Month	Dele	gation :	DG
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Office of Environment and Heritage Mine Subsidence Board NSW Rural Fire Service Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services Sydney Water Telstra Transgrid			
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
If no, provide reasons :	Council should be required to amend the Proposal to clarify that it applies to 'part' of Lot 12, DP 1126525, and not the whole allotment.			
Resubmission - s56(2)(b)	) : <b>No</b>			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional stu	udies, if required. :			
Flora Fauna Heritage Bushfire Flooding If Other, provide reasons	:			
	, a traffic and trans			

Identify any internal consultations, if required :

## No internal consultation required

Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? Yes

If Yes, reasons : The Proposal indicates that the land owner will fund the extension of infrastructure and services to the site. Consultation should be undertaken with relevant key relevant infrastructure and service providers prior to exhibition to determine delivery timeframes and likely costs.

# Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
Council_covering_letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Planning_proposalPart_1.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Planning_proposalPart_2.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Council_report.pdf	Study	Yes

# Planning Team Recommendation

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

S.117 directions:	1.2 Rural Zones				
	2.1 Environment Protection Zones				
	2.3 Heritage Conservation				
	3.1 Residential Zones				
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport				
	4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land				
	4.3 Flood Prone Land				
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection				
	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. The Director General approves the inconsistency with section 117 Direction 1.2 – Rural				
	Zones on the basis that it is of minor significance;				
	2. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the EP&A Act				
	1979 for a period of 28 days;				
	3. The timeframe for completing the local environmental plan is to be 12 months from				
	the week following the date of the Gateway Determination;				
	4. The description of the land to which the Proposal applies should be amended to				
	clarify that it applies to 'Part' Lot 12, DP 1126525 (rather than the whole of the allotment),				
	5. A minimum permissible lot size of 30 hectares should apply to the rural residue land;				
	6. Consideration by Council should be given to an alternative proposed zoning for the				
	part of proposed Lot 21 affected by environmental constraints;				
	The following conditions should be met, and their compliance endorsed by the Sydney				
	West Regional Branch, prior to community consultation:				
	7. A flora and fauna study is required. The Director-General of the Office of Environment				
	and Heritage should be consulted on the proposed rezoning. Consultation may also be				
	required with that Office under section 34A of the Environmental Planning and				
	Assessment Act 1979, in relation to the Cumberland Plain Woodland. The Federal				
	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities should				
	be consulted in relation to the Cumberland Plain Woodland. Consistency with section 117				
	Direction 2.1 Environment Protection Zones should subsequently be demonstrated by				

ent of a.
n Ilar, ily to al ulted ntial
7 ould
tion
with
and out;
on to

4

.

.