

Planning

| Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2005 (Amendment No.4) (section 73A amendment) | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Proposal Title : | Sydney Local Environmental F | Plan 2005 (Amendment No.4) (| section 73A amendment) | |
| Proposal Summary : | nmental Plan 2005 under section /9 to correct an error in the | | | |
| PP Number : | PP_2012_SYDNE_004_00 | Dop File No : | 12/15935-1 | |
| Proposal Details | | | | |
| Date Planning Proposal Received : | 02-Oct-2012 | LGA covered : | Sydney | |
| Region : | Sydney Region East | RPA : | Council of the City of Sydney | |
| State Electorate : | SYDNEY | Section of the Act : | 73A - Minor Matter | |
| LEP Type : | 73A | | | |
| Location Details | | | | |
| Street : 188 | 3-194A George Street | | | |
| Suburb : Syd | dney City : | Sydney | Postcode: 2000 | |
| Land Parcel : Lot | t 1 DP 913005 | | | |
| DoP Planning Offi | cer Contact Details | | | |
| Contact Name : | Dan Cutier | | | |
| Contact Number : | 0292286475 | | | |
| Contact Email : | Daniel.Cutler@planning.nsw.gov | v.au | | |
| RPA Contact Detai | ils | | | |
| Contact Name : | Francesca O'Brien | | | |
| Contact Number : | 0292659069 | | | |
| Contact Email : | fobrien@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.a | u | | |
| DoP Project Mana | ger Contact Details | | | |
| Contact Name : | | | | |
| Contact Number : | | | | |
| Contact Email : | | | | |
| Land Release Data | 1 | | | |
| Growth Centre : | N/A | Release Area Name : | N/A | |
| Regional / Sub Regional Strategy : | Metro Sydney City subregion | Consistent with Strategy : | Yes | |

Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2005 (Amendment No.4) (section 73A amendment)

| IDP Number : | N/A | 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 : | Yes | | | | |
| If No, comment : | | | | | |
| Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? : | Νο | | | | |
| If Yes, comment : | | | | | |
| upporting notes | | | | | |
| Internal Supporting Notes : | | | | | |
| External Supporting Notes : | BACKGROUND | | | | |
| | Streets, Sydney (the APDG s Sydney Council for part of t | d within the block bounded by A site). Mirvac has lodged a devel this site known as development s of Sydney LEP 2005 and consi ue of about \$250 million. | opment application with City of block 2. The application was | | |
| | height controls were intend improved public open space | alternative height controls for th ed to encourage the redevelopn e. In preparing the development r identified an error in the land c | nent of the land and provide application for land in the | | |
| | Sydney LEP 2005 identifies three development blocks within the APDG site. These blocks are referred to by listing title descriptors. During the process of lodging a development application for development block 2 in the APDG site, the land owner and Council have identified that Lot 1 DP 913 005 has been omitted from the description of development block 2. | | | | |
| | Sydney LEP 2005, a develop whole of the development b | ernative height limits that apply oment proposal for development lock and no other land. The ider cannot be assessed under the p | t block 2 must relate to the ntified error means that Mirvac' | | |
| | application was lodged unde 'Savings and transitional pro the instrument in force at the | e time it was lodged. Therefore, | A of draft Sydney LEP 2012 ation must be determined under | | |
| | | osts to an important redevelopm | ent project in the Sydney CBD. | | |

Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2005 (Amendment No.4) (section 73A amendment)

Mirvac's application. This has the effect of allowing the application to be determined under draft Sydney LEP 2012.

Council officers have advised that Mirvac's development application for the APDG site will most likely be assessed by Council and the Central Sydney Planning Committee in December 2012.

PROPOSAL

Council argues that this is an obvious error consisting of a misdescription and that Lot 1 DP 913005 should be inserted into the description of development block 2 in clause 52A(8)of Sydney LEP 2005 as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act.

Adequacy Assessment

Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a)

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

 Council's submission requesting that the missing lot description be inserted in Sydney LEP 2005 as a minor amendment under s73A contains a section explaining the objectives of the proposed amendment.

Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The proposed amendment is to insert Lot 1 DP 913005 into the description of 'development block 2' in clause 52A of Sydney LEP 2005.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

Is the Director General's agreement required? No

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : No

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

 e) List any other matters that need to be considered :

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? N/A

If No, explain :

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

Council has provided a map showing the location of Lot 1 DP 913005 in the APDG site.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? No

 Comment :
 Council proposes a section 73a amendment to Sydney LEP 2005 to insert a missing lot description. An amendment under section 73A does not require exhibition.

| Additional Director | General's requirements | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Are there any additiona | I Director General's requirements? No | | |
| If Yes, reasons : | | | |
| Overall adequacy of | f the proposal | | |
| Does the proposal mee | t the adequacy criteria? Yes | | |
| If No, comment : | Council has submitted all the required information to allow the Department to assess its proposal as an amendment under section 73A of the EP&A Act. | | |
| oposal Assessment | | | |
| Principal LEP: | | | |
| Due Date : October 20 | 12 | | |
| Comments in relation to Principal LEP : | Draft Sydney LEP 2012 is currently being assessed by Parliamentary Counsel and is close to finalisation. | | |
| | Council has been formally consulted as required by section 59 of the EP&A Act and all issues with the written instrument have been resolved. PC is checking the draft LEP maps. Once the maps have been finalised,PC can issue an Opinion that the draft LEP can be legally made. | | |
| | Lot 1 DP 913005 has been inserted into the description of development block 2 in draft Sydney LEP 2012 to rectify the error made in Sydney LEP 2005. | | |
| | Draft Sydney LEP 2012 clause 1.8A 'Savings and transitional provisions' has been amended to allow Mirvac's development application relating to development block 2 in the APDG site to be assessed under the provisions of draft Sydney LEP 2012. | | |
| Assessment Criteria | l | | |
| Need for planning proposal : | Council advises that the amendment is required because of concern that a development application for the redevelopment of part of the APDG site cannot proceed without Lot 1 DP 913005 being inserted into the description of development block 2 in clause 52A of Sydney LEP 2005. | | |
| Consistency with strategic planning framework : | The proposed amendment is consistent with Council's strategic vision for the redevelopment of the APDG site. | | |
| Environmental social economic impacts : | The proposed amendment is to rectify an error in Sydney LEP 2005 to allow the alternative height controls for the APDG site to apply as intended by Council. | | |
| | The proposed amendment will create no additional environmental or social impacts and would have a positive economic impact by allowing a major development application to proceed. | | |

| Period : Timeframe to make 3 Month Delegation : LEP : Dublic Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) Is Public Authority Consultation - 256(2)(b) - No Is Public Authority Consultations, if required : Is Public Authority Consultations, if required : Is Public Authority Consultations, if required : Is Public Authority Consultations and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No Is Public Consultation - 256(2)(b) - NO Is Public Consultation - 256(2)(b) - NO Is Public Authority Consultations, if required : Is Public Public Consultations, if Public Consultatis Public Consultations | ssessment Proces | ŝS | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| LEP: DecementType Name DecementType Name Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) is Public Hearing by the PAC required? No If no, provide reasons: Councit's proposed section 73A amendment should not proceed because: 1. It cannot be considered a minor matter or an obvious error. The insertion of Lot 1 DP 913005 into the description of development block 2 will significantly alter Sydney LEP 2005 as it was not previously identified as pard of development block 2, oither in the written instrument or associated LEP maps. The amendment would need to be made via a planning proposal. 2. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 rectifies the problem identified in Councils submission by inserting the missing lot description into the description of development block 2 in the APDG site and excluding Mirvac's development application from the savings provisions to allow that application to be assessed under draft Sydney LEP 2012 whon made, avoiding any delays. 3. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 is in its final stages of checking by Parliamentary Counsel and is expected to be made in the near future. It is highly unlikely that the proposed amendment to Sydney LEP 2005 would be made before draft Sydney LEP 2012. Resubmission - s56(2)(b): No If Yes, reasons : Identify any internal consultations, if required :: No No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : UpcumentType Name Is Public DocumentTie Name | Proposal type : | Minor | - | |
| Consultation - 56(2)(d) :: Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? No If no, provide reasons : Council's proposed section 73A amendment should not proceed because: 1. It cannot be considered a minor matter or an obvious error. The insertion of Lot 1 DP 913005 into the description of development block 2 will significantly alter Sydney LEP 2005 as it was not previously identified as part of development block 2, either in the written instrument or associated LEP maps. The amendment would need to be made via a planning proposal. 2. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 rectifies the problem identified in Councils submission by inserting the missing tot description into the description of development block 2 in the APDG site and excluding Mirvac's development application from the savings provisions to allow that application to be assessed under draft Sydney LEP 2012 when made, avoiding any delays. 3. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 is in its final stages of checking by Parliamentary Counsel and is expected to be made in the near future. It is highly unlikely that the proposed amendment to Sydney LEP 2005 would be made before draft Sydney LEP 2012. Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required : No No internal consultations, if required : No Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : umments DocumentType Name Is Public | | 3 Month | Delegation : | |
| (2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? No If no, provide reasons : Council's proposed section 73A amendment should not proceed because: 1, to annot be considered a minor matter or an obvious error. The insertion of Lot 1 DP p13005 into the description of development block 2, wither in the written instrument or associated LEP maps. The amendment would need to be made via a planning proposal. 2, Draft Sydney LEP 2012 rectifies the problem identified in Council's submission by inserting the missing lot description into the description of development block 2, wither made, avoiding any delays. 3, Draft Sydney LEP 2012 is in its final stages of checking by Parliamentary Counsel and is expected to be made in the near future. It is highly unlikely that the proposed amendment to Sydney LEP 2012 is in its final stages of checking by Parliamentary Counsel and is expected to be made in the near future. It is highly unlikely that the proposed amendment to Sydney LEP 2012 would be made before draft Sydney LEP 2012. Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required : No internal consultations, if required : No internal consultations, if required : Mession = step is intereasons : Immediate If yes, reasons : Immediate Internal consultations, if required : No internal consultation of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If yes, reasons : Immediate | • | | | |
| If no, provide reasons : Council's proposed section 73A amendment should not proceed because: 1. It cannot be considered a minor matter or an obvious error. The insertion of Lot 1 DP 913005 into the description of development block 2 will significantly alter Sydney LEP 2005 as it was not previously identified as part of development block 2, either in the written instrument or associated LEP maps. The amendment would need to be made via a planning proposal. 2. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 rectifies the problem identified in Councils submission by inserting the missing lot description into the description of development block 2 in the APDG site and excluding Mirvac's development application from the savings provisions to allow that application to be assessed under draft Sydney LEP 2012 when made, avoiding any delays. 3. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 is in its final stages of checking by Parliamentary Counsel and is expected to be made in the near future. It is highly unlikely that the proposed amendment to Sydney LEP 2005 would be made before draft Sydney LEP 2012. Resubmission - s56(2)(b): No If Yes, reasons : If Other, provide reasons : If other, provide reasons : Identify any internal consultations, if required : No No internal consultation s dista infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : Document File Name DocumentType Name Is Public | Is Public Hearing by the | PAC required? N | 0 | |
| 1. It cannot be considered a minor matter or an obvious error. The insertion of Lot 1 DP 913005 into the description of development block 2 will significantly alter Sydney LEP 2005 as it was not previously identified as part of development block 2, either in the written instrument or associated LEP maps. The amendment would need to be made via a planning proposal. 2. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 rectifies the problem identified in Councils submission by inserting the missing lot description into the description of development block 2 in the APDG site and excluding Mirvac's development application from the savings provisions to allow that application to be assessed under draft Sydney LEP 2012 when made, avoiding any delays. 3. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 is in its final stages of checking by Parliamentary Counsel and is expected to be made in the near future. It is highly unlikely that the proposed amendment to Sydney LEP 2005 would be made before draft Sydney LEP 2012. Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : If Other, provide reasons : Identify any internal consultations, if required : No internal consultations, if required : No No internal consultation of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : If Yes, reasons : Document File Name DocumentType Name Is Public | (2)(a) Should the matter | r proceed ? N | 0 | |
| is expected to be made in the near future. It is highly unlikely that the proposed amendment to Sydney LEP 2005 would be made before draft Sydney LEP 2012. Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 : | lf no, provide reasons : | It cannot be considered 913005 into the description 2005 as it was not previor written instrument or ass a planning proposal. Draft Sydney LEP 2012 inserting the missing lot APDG site and excluding to allow that application to avoiding any delays. | d a minor matter or an obvious error. The inse on of development block 2 will significantly al usly identified as part of development block 2 sociated LEP maps. The amendment would ne erectifies the problem identified in Councils s description into the description of development Mirvac's development application from the sa to be assessed under draft Sydney LEP 2012 of | ertion of Lot 1 DP ter Sydney LEP d, either in the ed to be made via ubmission by ent block 2 in the avings provisions when made, |
| If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 : : : : : : : : : : : : : : | | is expected to be made in | n the near future. It is highly unlikely that the p | proposed |
| Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 : | Resubmission - s56(2)(I | o) : No | | |
| If Other, provide reasons : 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 : cuments Document File Name Is Public proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal 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 : Cuments Document File Name Document File Name Is Public Proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal Yes | dentify any additional st | tudies, if required. : | | |
| No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : | f Other, provide reason | \$: | | |
| Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Document Type Name Is Public proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal Yes | dentify any internal con | sultations, if required : | | |
| If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Is Public proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal Yes | No internal consultatio | n required | | |
| cuments Document File Name Is Public proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal Yes | s the provision and func | ling of state infrastructure rel | levant to this plan? No | |
| Document File Name DocumentType Name Is Public proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal Yes | f Yes, reasons : | | | |
| proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal Yes | uments | | | |
| proposed section 73A amendment to Sydney Proposal Yes | Document File Name | | DocumentType Name | le Dublic |
| | proposed section 73A a | amendment to Sydney | | |

.

Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2005 (Amendment No.4) (section 73A amendment)



Date:

Signature:

Printed Name:

1se