

Planning Team Report

Proposal Title : Planning proposal to amend the planning controls for 64-68 The Grand Parade, Bright Sands under Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011 (27 dwellings, 24 jobs)						
Proposal Summa	in relation to 64-68 * increasing the ma * increasing the flo	The planning proposal seeks to amend Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011 (RLEP 2011) in relation to 64-68 The Grand Parade, Brighton Le Sands by: * increasing the maximum building height from 13m to 36m (10 storeys); * increasing the floor space ratio from 1:1 to 4:1; and * applying clause 6.14 Design excellence.				
PP Number :	PP_2017_BSIDE_0	06_00	Dop File No :	17/05154		
roposal Details						
Date Planning Proposal Receive	30-Mar-2017		LGA covered :	Bayside		
Region :	Metro(CBD)		RPA :	Bayside Council		
State Electorate	ROCKDALE		Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal		
LEP Type	Spot Rezoning					
ocation Details	;			¥. 0		
Street :	64 The Grand Parade					
Suburb :	Brighton Le Sands	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2216		
Land Parcel :	Lot 8, DP 33420					
Street :	65 The Grand Parade			2		
Suburb :	Brighton Le Sands	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2216		
Land Parcel:	Lot 9, DP 651072					
Street :	66 The Grand Parade			27		
Suburb :	Brighton Le Sands	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2216		
Land Parcel :	Lot 10, DP 662061					
Street :	67 The Grand Parade					
Suburb :	Brighton Le Sands	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2216		
Land Parcel :	Lot 11, DP 654651					
Street :	Lot 1 The Grand Parade					
Suburb :	Brighton Le Sands	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2216		
Land Parcel :	Lot 1, DP 798421					

DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

Contact Name :	Michael Kokot
Contact Number :	0292746564
Contact Email :	michael.kokot@planning.nsw.gov.au

RPA Contact Details

Contact Name :	John McNally
Contact Number :	0256216830
Contact Email :	john.mcnally@bayside.nsw.gov.au

DoP Project Manager Contact Details

Contact Name :	Martin Cooper
Contact Number :	0227465825
Contact Email :	martin.cooper@planning.nsw.gov.au

Land Release Data

Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with Strategy	
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha)		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	27
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created :	24
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes		
If No, comment :	The Department of Planning and communication and meetings wit has not met any lobbyists in relat any meetings between other Depa	h lobbyists has been complie ion to this proposal, nor has	ed with. Sydney Region East the Director been advised of
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The site is currently zoned B4 Mix The planning proposal seeks to a land from 13m to 36m (10 storeys intensification of a prime corner s development, creating additional services.	mend the height and FSR cor) and from 1:1 to 4:1 respecti lite within the Brighton Le Sa	ntrols applying to the subject vely. This would facilitate the nds Centre for a mixed use
	Potential amenity impacts from th	e scale of the proposed inter	sification of the subject land

	will be ameliorated by the application of the Clause 6.14 Design Excellence of Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011 (RLEP 2011). The planning proposal is supported because it: * is generally consistent with State planning policy; * enables the development of a landmark building, providing a transition between
	* is generally consistent with State planning policy;
	the high density commercial Novotel site to the south and high density
	residential development to the north; * enables adaptive reuse of existing local heritage listed buildings;
	* provides economic and community benefits through 27 additional
	dwellings and 24 new jobs, within walking distance of the Brighton Le
	Sands Centre and bus services to Rockdale Station; and
	* contributes to the renewal of the Brighton Le Sands Centre, in a vibrant mixed use precinct.
External Supporting Notes :	Council supports the planning proposal to amend the height to 36m (10 storeys) and floor space ratio to 4:1 applying to 64-68 The Grand Parade, Brighton Le Sands. The planning
	proposal will enable the redevelopment of a corner site within the Brighton Le Sands
27	Centre, creating additional dwellings and jobs close to public transport and other services.
	The planning proposal also seeks to mitigate potential amenity impacts associated with
	redevelopment of the site land by applying Clause 6.14 Design Excellence provision of Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011.
	Council has requested delegation of the Minister's plan making functions under section 59 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act), which is considered appropriate in this instance.
equacy Assessme	nt
Statement of the ol	bjectives - s55(2)(a)
Is a statement of the o	bjectives provided? Yes
Comment :	The objective of the planning proposal is to amend maximum permissible height of buildings and FSR controls pertaining to the site to enable:
	a) The development of a landmark building incorporating adaptive reuse of existing heritage structures.
	b) A transition in building height between existing high density commercial development
	south of the subject site (Novotel building) and existing high density residential
	development north of the subject site.
	c) A more active streetscape through active ground floor uses enabled by an increase in the permissible scale of development.
	the permissible scale of development. d) Increased housing supply and choice within the walking catchment of the
	the permissible scale of development. d) Increased housing supply and choice within the walking catchment of the Brighton-Le-Sands commercial centre through mixed use development.
	the permissible scale of development. d) Increased housing supply and choice within the walking catchment of the Brighton-Le-Sands commercial centre through mixed use development. e) A site of scale, character and form to complement surrounding urban qualities and
	the permissible scale of development. d) Increased housing supply and choice within the walking catchment of the Brighton-Le-Sands commercial centre through mixed use development.

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

To achieve the objectives of the planning proposal, the following amendments to RLEP 2011 are sought: * increasing the maximum building height from 13m to 36m (10 storeys); * increasing the floor space ratio from 1:1 to 4:1; and * applying clause 6.14 Design excellence.

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

- 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.3 Home Occupations
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes
- 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes

SEPPs

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land) SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development SEPP No 70—Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007

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

The proposal is considered to be consistent with the relevant SEPPs and deemed SEPPs.

Section 117 Directions The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with the identified relevant Section 117 Directions, except for the following:

Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate soils

The planning proposal seeks to intensify land use on land identified as Class 4 Acid Sulfate Soils, as identified on the Acid sulfate soils Map in RLEP 2011 (Sheet ASS_005). The Secretary needs to be satisfied that the inconsistency is either justified by a study or is of minor significance.

The planning proposal states that consistency with this Direction is justified as the proposal is supported by a preliminary contamination and groundwater assessment report prepared by Compaction and Soil Testing Services Pty Ltd (2014). The report concludes that the site is within an area of low probability of containing acid sulfate soils at depths greater than 3m and that a dewatering management plan would be required for any proposed excavation. The requirement of a dewatering management plan to mitigate the impact of any identified acid sulfate soils can be addressed at the development application stage. In addition, any future development application for the site must satisfy the provisions of Clause 6.1 Acid sulfate soils of RLEP 2011.

It is agreed that the inconsistency with this Direction is considered of minor significance because the impact of any identified acid sulfate soils can be addressed at the development application stage. As part of the Gateway determination, Council will be required to consult with the Office of Environment and Heritage in regards to the acid sulfate soils. The provisions of Clause 6.1 Acid sulfate soils of RLEP 2011 will apply to any future development application for the site.

Have inconsistencies w	vith items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :	
Mapping Provided -	s55(2)(d)
Is mapping provided? Y	fes
Comment :	The mapping includes relevant map extracts identifying the current and proposed provisions, which are adequate to identify the subject land for community consultation.
Community consult	ation - s55(2)(e)
Has community consult	ation been proposed? Yes
Comment :	Council proposes a 28 day exhibition period, which is supported.
Additional Director	General's requirements
Are there any additional	I Director General's requirements? No
If Yes, reasons :	
Overall adequacy of	the proposal
Does the proposal meet	t the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	It is considered that generally sufficient detail has been provided.
Proposal Assessment	
Principal LEP:	
Due Date :	
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	Rockdale Local Environmental Plan was made in 2011.
Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	The intended outcome of the proposal can only be achieved through the amendment of Rockdale LEP 2011.

Consistency with	A PLAN FOR GROWING SYDNEY
strategic planning framework :	The subject land is located within the Central Subregion, south of the Global Economic Corridor, close to Sydney Airport, Rockdale and Kogarah Centres. Key priorities for this subregion are to accelerate housing supply, choice and affordability, and build great places to live.
	 The planning proposal is consistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney, particularly by assisting the following directions: 2.1 Accelerate housing supply across Sydney: the proposal assists action 2.1.1 Accelerate housing supply and local housing choices, by providing 27 more
	dwellings and 24 jobs, in a Centre close to public transport; • 2.3 Improve housing choice to suit different needs and lifestyles: additional residential floor space will improve housing choice; • 3.3 Create healthy build environments: the proposal provides additional
	residential density within walking and cycling distance of shops, schools and local parks, and community facility enhancement opportunities from developer contributions; and
	 4.3 Manage the impacts of development on the environment: by increasing housing and commercial development without adverse environmental impacts, including adaptive reuse of local heritage items.
	DRAFT SYDNEY CENTRAL DISTRICT PLAN The planning proposal is consistent with the draft Plan by assisting with the implementation of its Productivity, Liveability and Sustainability priorities. These include: * LP 2 Delivery housing diversity: by providing 27 additional dwellings; * LP 3 Facilitate delivery of safe and healthy places: (see 3.3 above); and * LP 13 Conserve and enhance environmental heritage: (see 4.3 above).
	ROCKDALE CITY COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN 2013-2025 The planning proposal is consistent with the Rockdale Community Strategic plan, (as demonstrated in detail in Table 2 of the planning proposal), particularly as it envisions future growth in locations including Brighton Le Sands.
	BRIGHTON LE SANDS MASTERPLAN Stage 1 (Parking) of Council's Brighton-Le-Sands Masterplan has been made publically available. The proposed amendment to the Rockdale LEP is consistent with the Stage 1 (Parking) Masterplan.
Environmental social economic impacts :	Environmental impacts The proposal is unlikely to have any adverse environmental impacts on any critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities and their habitats, given the highly developed nature of the subject land. As previously noted in this report, acid sulfate soils and management of groundwater can be suitably addressed at the DA stage.
	In relation to built form and scale, the planning proposal is supported by a detailed Urban Design Report by AE Design Partnership, which concludes the proposal (especially after deletion of the earlier cantilever over the heritage terraces) is appropriate to the surrounding environment, because it is:
	 * consistent with the SEPP 65 Apartment Design guidelines with respect to such corner sites; * conforms to the transition in building height along the Grand Parade and
	Princess Street; * providing reasonable year-round solar access of surrounding areas, including the Novotel; and
	* does not result in view loss from the public domain.
	In addition, the Urban Design Study states the proposal has urban design merit and is in the public interest because it:
	* improves the vibrancy and vitality of the area by providing a landmark building, adding to its tourist appeal;
	* enables adaptive reuse of the 5 heritage buildings (Saywell Terraces) and does

	Princess Street, and	not detract from nearby local heritage items (being street trees along Princess Street, and linear open space east of The Grand Parade); and * provides an appropriate car parking solution.			
	The Department agrees that the proposal is unlikely to have any adverse impact upon the built environment, as it enables adaptive reuse of the 5 heritage buildings whilst improving the vibrancy and vitality of a landmark site.				
	Social and economic impacts It is agreed that proposal is not anticipated to have any adverse social or economic impacts, nor is it likely to create any additional demand on existing public infrastructure.				
*	 The proposal would have the following positive social and economic impacts: * providing 27 dwellings and 24 jobs close to public transport, infrastructure and other services, contributing to the LGA's dwelling target under the draft Central District Plan; * making more efficient use of urban in-fill land, easing pressure on other areas; and * contributing to the revitalisation of Brighton Le Sands, together with conserving the heritage buildings along The Grand Parade. 				
ssessment Proces	S				
Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days		
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months	Delegation :	RPA		
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Office of Environment Transport for NSW - R	t and Heritage Roads and Maritime Services			
s Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	Νο			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
f no, provide reasons :					
	、 				
Resubmission - s56(2)(t f Yes, reasons :	o): No				
dentify any additional st	udies, if required.				
f Other, provide reasons					
Cher, provide reasons	5				
dentify any internal con	sultations, if required :				
No internal consultation	n required				
s the provision and fund	ling of state infrastructure	e relevant to this plan? No			
f Yes, reasons :					
uments			No. 1940		
691					

Planning proposal to amend the planning controls for 64-68 The Grand Parade, Brighton Le

4-68 The Grand Parade raffic Report.pdf Contamination Report.p leritage Impact Statem Arboriculture Assessme ning Team Recomr Preparation of the planni	ent.pdf ent Report.pdf mendation ing proposal supported at this stage 1.1 Business and Industrial Zon 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ	es ansport	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes		
Traffic Report.pdf Contamination Report.p Heritage Impact Statem Arboriculture Assessme ning Team Recomr Preparation of the planni	odf eent.pdf ent Report.pdf mendation ing proposal supported at this stage 1.1 Business and Industrial Zon 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ	Proposal Proposal Proposal Proposal Recommended with Conditions es	Yes Yes Yes		
Heritage Impact Statem Arboriculture Assessmenning Team Recomm Preparation of the planni	ent.pdf ent Report.pdf mendation ing proposal supported at this stage 1.1 Business and Industrial Zon 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ	Proposal Proposal Proposal Recommended with Conditions es	Yes Yes		
	ent.pdf ent Report.pdf mendation ing proposal supported at this stage 1.1 Business and Industrial Zon 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ	Proposal Proposal Recommended with Conditions es	Yes		
Arboriculture Assessmenning Team Recommercement Preparation of the planni	ent Report.pdf mendation ing proposal supported at this stage 1.1 Business and Industrial Zon 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ	Proposal Recommended with Conditions es			
nning Team Recomr Preparation of the planni	mendation ing proposal supported at this stage 1.1 Business and Industrial Zon 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ	Recommended with Conditions es	Yes		
Preparation of the planni	ing proposal supported at this stage 1.1 Business and Industrial Zon 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ	es ansport			
Preparation of the planni S.117 directions:	 1.1 Business and Industrial Zom 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ 	es ansport			
S.117 directions:	 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ 	ansport			
	 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ 				
	3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ				
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Tr 3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ				
	3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ				
	3.5 Development Near Licensed 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ				
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral Requ				
		irements			
	6.2 Reserving Land for Public P				
	6.3 Site Specific Provisions				
	7.1 Implementation of A Plan fo	r Growing Sydney			
Additional Information :		proposal proceeds subject to the follow	ing conditions:		
	1. Consultation is required with				
	* Office of Environment and H				
	* Transport for NSW - Roads a	-			
	* Sydney Airport Authority;	ind Maritime Services,			
		bu and			
	* Civil Aviation Safety Authori	y; and of Infrastructure and Regional Developm	ant		
	Commonwealth Department	or intrastructure and Regional Developin	ieni.		
	2. The planning proposal must l days.	be made publicly available for a minimun	n of 28		
	3. The timeframe for completing	the LEP is 9 months.			
	4. A public hearing is not requir	ed.			
Supporting Reasons:	The planning proposal is suppo	rted because it:			
4	* is generally consistent with St				
	* enables the development of a landmark building, providing a transition between				
	the high density commercial Novotel site to the south and high density				
	residential development to the north;				
	* enables adaptive reuse of existing local heritage listed buildings;				
	* would provide economic and community benefits by providing 27 additional				
	dwellings and 24 new jobs, within walking distance of the Brighton Le				
	Sands Centre and bus services to Rockdale Station; and				
		he Brighton Le Sands Centre in a vibrant	t mixed		
	use precinct.	-			
Signature:	Ul. lag	17			
		, , ,			
Printed Name	MARTIN COOPER	Date: 28/04/2	017		

.

h