

Planning Team Report

Draft Amendment No 6 to Camden LEP 2010 - Housekeeping Amendments				
Proposal Title :	Draft Amendment No 6 to Camden LEP 2010 - Housekeeping Amendments			
Proposal Summary :	The Planning Proposal seeks to make minor housekeeping amendments to Camden LEP 2010. The proposed amendments are to rectify anomalies and errors in the LEP and associated maps that has occurred when the development controls existed in the previous LEPs/DCPs were transitioned to Camden LEP 2010. Some of these changes are to reflect the approved subdivision patterns, zoning of unzoned lands and changes to the land use tables.			
	Details of the amendments are in the Council's Planning Proposal at Tag A in the "Documents" section of this report.			
PP Number :	PP_2011_CAMDE_002_00	Dop File No :	11/15092-1	
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	21-Oct-2011	LGA covered :	Camden	
Region :	Sydney Region West	RPA :	Camden Council	
State Electorate :	CAMDEN	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
LEP Type :	Housekeeping			
Location Details				
Street :				
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :	
Land Parcel : 359) Narellan Road, Currans Hill and	other various matters, Can	nden LGA	
DoP Planning Office	cer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Cho Cho Myint			
Contact Number :	0298738583			
Contact Email :	chocho.myint@planning.nsw.go	ov.au		
RPA Contact Detai	ils			
Contact Name :	Kate Speare			
Contact Number :	0246547804			
Contact Email :	kate.speare@camden.nsw.gov.au			
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Terry Doran			
Contact Number :	0298738557			
Contact Email :	terry.doran@planning.nsw.gov.a	au		

	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro South West subregion	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
MDP Number :	0	Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :	0.00	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 :	0
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with : If No, comment :	Yes		
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :	To the best of the knowledge of relation to communications and Region West has not met with an Director been advised of any me concerning the proposal.	meetings with Lobbyists has ny lobbyist in relation to this p	been complied with. Sydn proposal, nor has the Regi
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	As discussed above, the Plannin to Camden LEP 2010, to mainly development controls contained Camden LEP 2010.	rectify anomalies which has o	ccurred when the
	Some of the changes include ou Principal LEP being made but we	-	-
	-	ere not progressed for various ensure that the planning prov t with the previous Camden L nden LEP 2010 and to maintain	s reasons. isions contained within EPs/DCPs which were in n the 'status quo' approach

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

Council's objective is clear - to make minor housekeeping amendments to Camden LEP

	2010 mainly to rectify controls into the prin	anomalies and errors occurred when transferring previous planning cipal LEP.
Explanation of provi	sions provided - s55	(2)(b)
Is an explanation of pro	visions provided? Yes	
Comment :		I's proposed amendments/justification are at Tag A in the of this report. Relevant sites, current and proposed zonings are
Justification - s55 (2)(c)	
a) Has Council's strateg	y been agreed to by the D	lirector General? No
b) S.117 directions ident	tified by RPA :	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
* May need the Director	General's agreement	 1.2 Rural Zones 2.1 Environment Protection Zones 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036
Is the Director Gener	al's agreement required?	Yes
c) Consistent with Stand	lard Instrument (LEPs) Or	der 2006 : Yes
d) Which SEPPs have the	ne RPA identified?	N/A
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	Assessment of the F are in the following s	Planning Proposal in accordance with the relevant S117 Directions section.
Have inconsistencies wi	th items a), b) and d) bein	g adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :	The relevant s.117 d	lirections are as follows:
	This direction applie Camden Valley Way	INDUSTRIAL ZONES es only to the site known as "Landturn" site located between , The Northern Road, and The Old Northern Road, Narellan. The zoning are shown at Tag 3.
	additional permitted	5 Business Development under Camden LEP 2010 and is subject to an I use under Schedule 1 of LEP 2010 which allows, among other floor area of "retail premises" on the land of not more than 11,300 y at Tag 3(a)).
	under the previous (itted use for this land was described in the Schedule 1 as "shops" Camden LEP 46 (copy at Tag 3(b)), and was converted to "retail e conversion into the Camden LEP 2010.
	a situation where a v 11,300m2 floor spac the additional permi	ition "retail premises" (a group term) instead of "shops" has created wide range of types of "retail premises" will be counted towards the e cap on this site. Council as asserted that this was not intended by tted use listed in LEP 46 and that this anomaly will result in an t of "shops" which is significantly smaller than envisaged for this
		maly, Council has proposed that Schedule 1 Clause 19 of Camden ed by substituting the term "retail premises" with the term "shops".
	Development Zone b	proposed to amend the land use table for the B5 Business by adding "retail premises" as a prohibited use and allowing "food ' and "neighbourhood shops" as permitted with consent to retain the

the "status quo" approach as adopted during the conversion of the former Camden LEPs into the new LEP template format. The definition of "shops" in the Camden LEP 2010 does not contain "food and drink premises". Detailed discussion on these issues are in the Council's Planning Report at Tag A.

The Planning Proposal is of a housekeeping nature. The Planning Proposal has the affect of reducing the floor area for "Business premises" (group term for "retail premises") permitted on the land, and is inconsistent with the direction but the inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance as these changes are mainly to achieve and retain the "status quo" approach as adopted by Council in converting the previous planning provisions into the new LEP template format.

Should the Gateway determine that the proposal proceeds, it is considered that the inconsistency is of a minor nature and the Director General's delegate endorsement is recommended on that basis.

1.2 RURAL ZONES

This direction applies when a relevant planning authority prepares a planning proposal that will affect land within an existing or proposed rural zone (including the alteration of any existing rural zone boundary).

As the Proposal seeks to rezone a RU1 Primary Production zoned land within Macarthur Resource Recovery Park and generally will affect land zoned rural - this Direction applies.

The Proposal seeks to rezone RU1 land to a SP2 Zone to allow the expansion of the adjoining Waste Management Facility for the purpose of slope stabilisation. It will have the effect of reducing the rural agriculture land (site location is at Tag 9), however, the rezoning involves a very small area of agricultural land within the broader rural zone surrounding the site, has not been used for agricultural purposes and is not considered to have impact on the the general rural character of the locality. The adjoining land is also used as a Waste Management Facility. Accordingly, the inconsistency with this direction is considered to be of a minor significance.

The proposed uses to be prohibited within RU1 and RU2 zones for "public administration building", "warehouse or distribution centres", "truck depots" and "highway Service Centres" are considered to be valid and are supported as these use are not mandated uses and are not particularly relevant to the objectives of the rural zones and do not support rural agricultural uses. Additional uses proposed within these zones are "heliports", "sawmill or log processing works" and "signage", which are considered to minor and are supported.

Should the Proposal be allowed to proceed, it is recommended that the Director General's delegate approve this minor inconsistency.

3.1 RESIDENTIAL ZONES

This direction applies when a relevant planning authority prepares a Planning Proposal that will affect land within an existing or proposed residential zone (including the alteration of any existing residential zone boundary), or in any other zone in which significant residential development is permitted or proposed to be permitted.

This Planning Proposal seeks to rezone some R2 Low Residential Density zoned land (e.g. Harrington Park, Struggletown, Mount Annan, Narellan Vale and Spring Farm Release Areas) to R3 Medium Density Residential Zone. The proposed rezonings are basically to reinstate the density, minimum lot size and height controls which were in existence before Camden LEP 2010 was made and were erroneously omitted in the transition process. It does not reduce the existing residential density, and therefore, the Proposal is not inconsistent with this Direction.

3.4 INTEGRATING LAND USE AND TRANSPORT

This direction applies when a relevant planning authority prepares a planning proposal that will create, alter or remove a zone or a provision relating to urban land, including land zoned for residential, business, industrial, village or tourist purposes.

As discussed above, this Planning Proposal seeks to rezone some R2 Low Residential Density zoned land within Harrington Park, Struggletown, Mount Annan, Narellan Vale and Spring Farm Release Areas higher density residential zones such as R1 General Residential and R3 Medium Density Residential Zones. The proposed rezonings are basically to reinstate the density, minimum lot size and height controls which were in existence before Camden LEP 2110 was made and were omitted in the transition process. It is of minor nature and involves small areas within these release areas and will not be inconsistent with the objectives of improving access to housing, jobs and services by walking, cycling and public transport, and reducing travel demand including the number of trips generated by development and the distances travelled by car etc. and, therefore, the Planning Proposal is not inconsistent with this Direction.

6.2 RESERVING LAND FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES

This direction applies as the Planning Proposal includes land zoned RU1 to be rezoned SP2 as part of Waste Management Facility at Glenlee, as shown on the Land Zoning Map at Tag 9.

The Macarthur Resource Recovery Park (MRRP) requested Council to amend the LEP 2010 to enable an amended Planning Project Approval obtained from the Department of Primary Industries for waste services operations on the site, which adjoins the current "waste and resource management facilities". The amended approval includes the use of this land for the purposes of slope stabilisation. "Waste or resource management facilities" is currently permissible in RU1 Zone, however, Council has proposed that this land be rezoned to SP2 to allow "waste or resource management facilities" so that the zoning is consistent with the rest of the MRRP land zoned SP2.

This rezoning will create additional reservation but would not alter or reduce the existing reservation, and as such the inconsistency with the direction is of a minor significance.

Should the Proposal be allowed to proceed, it is recommended that the Director General's delegate approve this minor inconsistency.

6.3 SITE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

This direction applies when a relevant planning authority prepares a planning proposal that will allow a particular development to be carried out.

The Planning Proposal involves changes to additional uses which have been permissible with consent on certain lands in the Schedule 1 of the Camden LEP. Under this direction, a Planning Proposal that will amend another environmental planning instrument in order to allow a particular development proposal to be carried out must not include site specific provisions that are not already in the instrument being amended. The Planning Proposal proposes:

- (1) Senior's housing to be permissible with consent on land at 359 Narellan Road, Currans Hill; and
- (2) restricts the retail floor area of 11,300 sqm for shops within "Landturn" site, Narellan.

Council has advised that these are to merely reinstate the previous permissibility and controls intended for the sites and are not new proposals, and therefore, not considered to be inconsistent with this direction.

Although the Seniors housing was previously a permitted use in the previous Camden LEP 48 and a DA has been approved for construction of Seniors housing on the site, it will effectively add a land use which is otherwise not permissible within the current RU2

zone to be carried out on the site. Therefore, it is considered that the Proposal is inconsistent with this Direction, however, considering the fact that this is a use previously permitted on the land and that a development approval has been previously issued for construction of seniors housing on the site, the inconsistency with the direction is of minor significance.

Should the Proposal be allowed to proceed, it is recommended that the Director General's delegate approve this minor inconsistency.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

An exhibition period of two weeks has been proposed by Council. Considering the housekeeping nature of the Planning Proposal, Council has not proposed for government agency consultation.

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 :	The Planning Proposal was previously submitted twice but, on both occasions, were considered to be poor with various inconsistencies and without required details and justification relating to the proposed changes.
	The complete package of the Planning Proposal was received on 21 October, 2011.
	The Planning Proposal is not a result of any agreed strategy, study or report. It addresses matters which are of a housekeeping nature.
	It is considered that the Planning Proposal provides the best way of achieving the intended outcome as it seeks to address several minor anomalies and amendments in a relatively prompt and efficient manner. Given the minor housekeeping nature of the matters contained within this planning proposal, it is not considered that a "Net Community Benefit Test" need to be undertaken.
	The Planning Proposal will strengthen the Camden LEP 2010 by ensuring that it is up-to-date and consistent with the Standard Instrument LEP, and provide greater certainty for the community.
	The Planning Proposal is not inconsistent with both the draft South Western Regional Strategy and the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036.
	There is no likelihood of any adverse affect on any critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, as a result of this proposal. No likely environmental effects are envisaged as a result.

Proposal Assessment **Principal LEP:** Due Date : The principal plan was made in September, 2010. Comments in relation to Principal LEP : The Planning Proposal is to amend the Camden LEP 2010. Assessment Criteria It is considered that the Planning Proposal provides the best way of achieving the Need for planning intended outcome as it seeks to address the minor anomalies and amendments in a proposal : relatively prompt and efficient manner. The Planning Proposal is not a result of any strategic study or report. The planning Consistency with proposal addresses matters which are of a housekeeping nature. strategic planning framework : The Planning Proposal is not inconsistent with both the draft South West Subregional Strategy and the Sydney Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036. The inconsistency of the Planning Proposal with S117 Directions are addressed in the "Justification - S55(2)(c)" section of this report. A detailed assessment of the proposal by the regional team is in the table at Tag C. As discussed in Tag C (item 2), Council's proposal to allow a seniors housing development on the land at Currans Hill, as an additional use in Schedule 1, is not considered to be a preferred option. Legal advice has been sought as to whether this land can be developed under the SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability), however, this advice is yet to receive by the regional team. It is proposed that in the event that the option for seniors development is considered valid, the Planning Proposal be amended to remove the Council's proposed option to add "senors housing" on the land in the Schedule. In general, it is considered that the proposed rezonings and map changes are supported as it will rectify anomalies occurred when Camden LEP 2010 was made. Some of the proposed uses to the Land Use Table (item 1 at Tag C) will have the effect of duplicating the uses already permitted or prohibited in the zone (e.g. prohibiting "retail premises" from B5 zone will duplicate with "Cellar door premises" and "roadside stalls" already prohibited in the zone). It is recommended the proposed changes to the land use table be reviewed to be consistent with the Department's guidelines and circulars for preparing LEPs before it is publicly exhibited.

Environmental social There is no likelihood of any adverse affect on the environment, critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, as a result of this proposal.

Assessment Process

Proposal type	:	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	14 Days
Timeframe to LEP :	make	6 Month	Delegation :	DDG
Public Author Consultation -				

s Public Hearing by the PAC required?	Νο	
2)(a) Should the matter proceed ?	Yes	
f no, provide reasons :		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No		
f Yes, reasons :		
dentify any additional studies, if required. :		
f Other, provide reasons :		
dentify any internal consultations, if required		
Netropolitan and Regional Strategy		

Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
	Proposal	Yes
Tag_1Proposed_Land_Use_Table_amendments.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_2Narellan_Road, Currans_Hill.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag 3 - Landturn_site,_Narellan.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag	Proposal	Yes
4(a)R3_Zone_at_Harrington_Park_Release_Area.pdf		
Tag_4(b)R3_Zone_at_Struggle_Town,_Narellan.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_4(c)R3_Zone_at_Mount_Annan.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_5Height_of_buildings_at_Elderslie.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_6Minimum_lot-size_and_rezoning_Narellan	Proposal	Yes
Vale,_Spring_Farm.pdf		
Tag_7Rezoning_at_Macarthur_Resource_Recovery_P ark.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_8Boundary_adjustments_Oran_Park_and_Spring	Proposal	Yes
farm.pdf	Duran and	Vee
Tag_ACouncil_Report_23_November_2010_ incl_ minutes.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_ACouncil_report_Res_2_site_Mt_Annan_South.p	Proposal	Yes
df Tag A Council_report_Res_2_sites_Struggletown.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag A - Planning_Proposal_letter_from_Council.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Tag_3(a)Extract_from_Camden_LEP_2010.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_3(b)Extract_from_repealed_Camden_LEP_46.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Tag_2(a)Extract_from_Repealed_Camden_LEP_48.pd	Proposal	Yes
f	· · · • • •	
Tag_8(a)Consultation_with_Land_Release_Team.pdf	Proposal	No
Tag_CSummary_table_of_proposed_changes_with_P lanning_Team's_consideration.xls	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

	to canden LEF 2010 - nousekeeping Amendments
	1.2 Rural Zones
	2.1 Environment Protection Zones
	2.3 Heritage Conservation
	3.1 Residential Zones
	5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
	7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036
6 JUIZE 11 C. 11	
Additional Information :	The Planning Proposal should proceed subject to the following conditions:
	(1)the Director General's delegate agrees that any inconsistency with section 117 directions:
	. 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones;
	. 1.2 Rural Zones;
	. 6.2 Reserving land for public purposes; and
	. 6.3 Site specific provisions
	are justified as minor matters.
	(2)the Planning Proposal is to be revised based on the outcome received from the
	Legal Branch, as to the whether the land at Currans Hill (item 2 at Tag C)
	adjoins land zoned primarily for urban purpose, to be considered under the
	SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability). If this is not
	a valid option, then the Planning Proposal is to remain as proposed by Council i.e.additional use option);
	(3)community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the
	Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ("EP&A Act") as follows:
	(a) the planning proposal must be made publicly available for 14 days; and
	(b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements
	for public exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for
	material that must be made publicly available along with planning
	proposals as identified in section 4.5 of A Guide to Preparing LEPs
	Department of Planning 2009).
	(4)consultation is not required with the public authorities under section 56(2)
	(d) of the EP&A Act:
	(5)a public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the EP&A Act; and
	(6)the timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 6 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.
	In view of a number anomalies in the proposed Land Use Table, it would be
	appropriate for Council to review the proposed land uses and group terms with
	reference to the Department's Planning Circulars, in particular "PS 11-011
	Amendment to Standard Instrument (Local Environmental Plans) Order 2006", to
	ensure existing land use terms do not overlap across definitions and cross referencing the group term/sub-term relationships.
Supporting Reasons :	The Planning Proposal is supported as it will rectify anomalies occurred when
	transferring previous LEPs and provisions into Camden LEP 2010 and allow previous development controls and land uses to apply on the land.
	The Planning Proposal will strengthen the Camden LEP 2010 by ensuring that it is up-to-date and consistent with the Standard Instrument LEP, and provide greater certainty
	for the community.

Draft Amendment No 6 to Camden LEP 2010 - Housekeeping Amendments				
Signature:	Annat			
Printed Name:	CHO CHO MYINT Date: 27/10/11			