

| The Hills LEP 2012 - 4                | McCausiand Place, Kellyville  | ;                          |                         |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Proposal Title :                      | The Hills LEP 2012 - 4 McCauslan  | d Place, Kellyville        |                         |
| Proposal Summary :                    | The planning proposal seeks to facilitate development of a 20-unit residential flat building and<br>15 townhouses on land in Kellyville zoned R3 Medium Density Residential bi including<br>residential flat building as a permissible use and increasing the height on a portion of the site<br>from 10 metres to 12 metres. |                            |                         |
| PP Number :                           | PP_2016_THILL_010_00  | Dop File No :              | 16/07642                |
| Proposal Details                      |   |                            |                         |
| Date Planning<br>Proposal Received :  | 25-Oct-2016   | LGA covered :              | The Hills Shire         |
| Region :                              | Metro(Parra)  | RPA :                      | The Hills Shire Council |
| State Electorate :                    | BAULKHAM HILLS  | Section of the Act :       | 55 - Planning Proposal  |
| LEP Type :                            | Spot Rezoning   | e.                         | -                       |
| Location Details                      |   |                            | 5 <b>2</b> (            |
| Street : 4 M                          | cCausland Place   |                            |                         |
| Suburb : Kell                         | yville City :   |                            | Postcode :              |
| Land Parcel : Lot                     | 1001, DP 1172742  |                            |                         |
| DoP Planning Offic                    | er Contact Details  |                            |                         |
| Contact Name :                        | Chris Browne  |                            |                         |
| Contact Number :                      | 0298601508  |                            |                         |
| Contact Email :                       | chris.browne@planning.nsw.gov.a   | iu _                       |                         |
| <b>RPA Contact Detai</b>              | ls  |                            |                         |
| Contact Name :                        | Patrice Grzelak   |                            |                         |
| Contact Number :                      | 0298430364  |                            |                         |
| Contact Email :                       | pgrzelak@thehills.nsw.gov.au  |                            |                         |
| DoP Project Manag                     |   |                            |                         |
| Contact Name :                        | Adrian Hohenzollern   |                            |                         |
| Contact Number :                      | 0298601505  |                            |                         |
| Contact Email :                       | adrian.hohenzollern@planning.ns   | w.gov.au                   |                         |
| Land Release Data                     |   |                            |                         |
| Growth Centre :                       |   | Release Area Name :        |                         |
| Regional / Sub<br>Regional Strategy : |   | Consistent with Strategy : |                         |

| Hills LEP 2012 - 4   | McCausland Place,                                  | , Kellyville   |                               |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| IDP Number :   |  | Date of Release :  |                               |
| rea of Release (Ha)  |  | Type of Release (eg<br>Residential /<br>Employment land) :   |                               |
| lo. of Lots :  | 0  | No. of Dwellings<br>(where relevant) :   | 0                             |
| Bross Floor Area :   | 0  | No of Jobs Created   | 0                             |
| The NSW Government<br>obbyists Code of<br>Conduct has been<br>omplied with :   | Yes  |  |                               |
| <sup>•</sup> No, comment :   |  |  |                               |
| lave there been<br>neetings or<br>ommunications with<br>egistered lobbyists? : | No   |  | x                             |
| Yes, comment :   |  |  |                               |
| upporting notes  |  |  |                               |
| nternal Supporting<br>lotes :  |  |  |                               |
| External Supporting<br>lotes :   | delivery of mixed apar<br>overall yield within the | I6 the Hills Shire Council agreed to a<br>rtment sizes whilst ensuring that Gov<br>e North-west corridor are achieved. Th<br>pply the methodology. | ernment expectations for      |
| quacy Assessmen  | it .   |  |                               |
| atement of the ob  | jectives - s55(2)(a)                               |  |                               |
| s a statement of the ob  | jectives provided? <b>Yes</b>                      |  |                               |
| Comment :  | The planning prope                                 | ; and  | f 15 townhouses and a 20-unit |

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The proposal's objectives are to be achieved by retaining the current R3 Medium Density Residential zoning and adding the site to Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses to permit residential flat buildings.

## Justification - s55 (2)(c)

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

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

6.3 Site Specific Provisions

\* May need the Director General's agreement

## The Hills LEP 2012 - 4 McCausland Place, Kellyville

Is the Director General's agreement required?

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

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

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

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

If No, explain :

S117 DIRECTION 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy

Direction 5.9 specifies that a planning proposal that applies to land located within the North West Rail Link (NWRL) Corridor must:

(b) be consistent with the proposals of the NWRL Corridor Strategy, including the growth projections and proposed future character for each of the NWRL precincts; and (c) promote the principles of transit-oriented development (TOD) of the NWRL Corridor Strategy.

The subject site is identified as "Medium Density Residential Density" with a potential yield of 15-17 townhouses.

Council notes that the site is 1.9km from Kellyville station, but justifies an increased density than that proposed in the Structure Plan based on the close proximity to the future local centre, bus services and improved road network.

Further, the extension of Arnold Road was identified in 2015, after the Strategy was released, therefore the Structure Plan for Kellyville did not account for the improved road network, and access to arterial roads that this extension provides. In light of the above, although the proposal is inconsistent with S117 Direction 5.9 North

West Rail Corridor Strategy, this inconsistency is of minor significance.

S117 DIRECTION 6.3 Site Specific Provisions

The objective of this Direction is to discourage unnecessarily restrictive site specific planning controls.

The Planning Proposal also includes identification of the subject site on the Key Sites Map, and the introduction of a local incentives clause providing that the proposed density, height and floor space ratio is subject to compliance with Council's apartment size/mix and car parking controls. Council propose that an additional local provision to be inserted into The Hills Local Environmental Plan 2012 ("7.10 Residential Development Yield") which would apply to the site.

The Gateway determination has been conditioned to require amendment of the planning proposal to be consistent with the agreed methodology for residential development as discussed below and therefore the inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANING POLICY NO 65 Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development.

The Department has recognised that the North-West Rail Corridor will be subject to significant change and growth. Extensive strategic planning has been undertaken by both the Council and the Department to assist in identifying suitable dwelling yields and mix of apartment sizes. The Department and Council have worked collaboratively to identify an appropriate methodology that will ensure dwelling yields are achieved within the North-West Rail Corridor whilst providing a framework for Council to achieve its objectives in relation to dwelling mix in an environment that will be subject to significant change.

|  | The methodology includes the identification of a base FSR and bonus FSR for each site<br>based on walkable catchment from the train station. The provisions of SEPP 65 will<br>apply to the base FSR. Where the bonus FSR is utilised 40% of 2 and 3 bedroom<br>apartments will have a minimum floor area of 110 and 135 square metres respectively.<br>The Gateway determination has been conditioned to require amendment of the<br>planning proposal to comply with the agreed methodology. |  |
|--|--|--|
| Mapping Provided -   | s55(2)(d)  |  |
| Is mapping provided? Y   | /es  |  |
| Comment :  | Council has provided extracts of the relevant existing and proposed maps. Council has also provided an aerial photograph clearly identifying the site in context, as well as a concept plan showing the proposed subdivision and dwelling layout.  |  |
|  | Council has provided adequate mapping to identify the site and Council's intentions for the site.  |  |
| Community consult  | ation - s55(2)(e)  |  |
| Has community consult  | ation been proposed? Yes   |  |
| Comment :  | Council has described the means of its intended community consultation and has suggested a 28-day exhibition period.   |  |
|  | 28 days is an appropriate timeframe for community consultation.  |  |
| Additional Director  | General's requirements   |  |
|  |  |  |
| A 46 1 PP  |  |  |
| -  | I Director General's requirements? <b>No</b>   |  |
| Are there any additiona<br>If Yes, reasons :   | I Director General's requirements? <b>No</b>   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :  |  |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br>Overall adequacy of   |  |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br>Overall adequacy of   | the proposal   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Overall adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :   | f <b>the proposal</b><br>t the adequacy criteria? <b>Yes</b>   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br>Overall adequacy of<br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :<br>oposal Assessment   | f <b>the proposal</b><br>t the adequacy criteria? <b>Yes</b>   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br>Overall adequacy of<br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :<br>Oposal Assessment<br>Principal LEP:   | f <b>the proposal</b><br>t the adequacy criteria? <b>Yes</b>   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Dverall adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :<br><b>Dposal Assessment</b><br><b>Principal LEP:</b><br>Due Date :  | f the proposal<br>t the adequacy criteria? Yes   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br>Overall adequacy of<br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :<br>oposal Assessment<br>Principal LEP:   | f <b>the proposal</b><br>t the adequacy criteria? <b>Yes</b>   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Dverall adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :<br><b>Dposal Assessment</b><br><b>Principal LEP:</b><br>Due Date :<br>Comments in relation  | t the adequacy criteria? Yes   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Dverall adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :<br><b>Dposal Assessment</b><br><b>Principal LEP:</b><br>Due Date :<br>Comments in relation<br>to Principal LEP :  | t the adequacy criteria? Yes   |  |
| If Yes, reasons :<br><b>Dverall adequacy of</b><br>Does the proposal mee<br>If No, comment :<br><b>Dposal Assessment</b><br><b>Principal LEP:</b><br>Due Date :<br>Comments in relation<br>to Principal LEP :<br><b>Assessment Criteria</b><br>Need for planning | t the adequacy criteria? Yes<br>The Hills LEP 2012 is a Standard Instrument LEP.<br>The objective of the planning proposal is to facilitate additional residential development<br>by inserting residential flat buildings as an additional permitted use on the subject site and   |  |

## The Hills LEP 2012 - 4 McCausland Place, Kellyville

The concept design submitted to Council includes a four storey residential flat building at the south eastern corner of the site and 2 storey townhouses located adjacent to the north and west boundaries.

The concept design addresses the transition from the residential flat building to the townhouses reducing the impact on existing development to the north. The residential flat building component addresses Memorial Ave providing an appropriate interface.

The proposal includes a minor increase in the maximum height from 10 metre to 12 metres which would allow development of a 4 storey residential flat building. The Department considers that potential impacts can be address by Council in the DCP and at development application stage.

## **Assessment Process**

D

Р

| Proposal type :                             | Routine  |              | Community Consultation Period : | 28 Days   |            |   |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|---|
| Timeframe to make<br>LEP :                  | 12 months  |              | Delegation :                    | RPA       |            |   |
| Public Authority<br>Consultation - 56(2)(d) | Sydney Water                                     |              | Δ.                              |           |            |   |
| Is Public Hearing by the                    | e PAC required?                                  | No           |                                 |           |            |   |
| (2)(a) Should the matte                     | r proceed ?                                      | Yes          |                                 |           |            |   |
| If no, provide reasons :                    |  |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| Resubmission - s56(2)                       | (b) : <b>No</b>                                  |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| If Yes, reasons :                           |  |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| Identify any additional                     | studies, if required.                            |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| If Other, provide reaso                     | ns :   |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| Identify any internal co                    | nsultations, if required :                       |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| No internal consultati                      | on required                                      |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| Is the provision and fur                    | nding of state infrastructu                      | re relevant  | to this plan? <b>No</b>         |           |            |   |
| If Yes, reasons :                           |  |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| ocuments                                    |  |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| Document File Name                          | с.<br>   |              | DocumentType N                  | ame       | Is Public  |   |
| 4 McCausland Place -                        | -  |              | Proposal Coverin                | ng Letter | Yes        |   |
|   | Planning proposal.pdf<br>Council report 26 April | 2016.ndf     | Proposal<br>Proposal            |           | Yes<br>Yes |   |
|   |  |              |                                 |           |            | = |
| lanning Team Recon                          | nmendation                                       |              |                                 |           |            |   |
| Preparation of the plan                     | ning proposal supported                          | at this stag | ge : Recommended with Con       | ditions   |            |   |

| S.117 directions:      | 6.3 Site Specific Provisions  |  |  |
|------------------------|---|--|--|
| Additional Information | The amendment to The Hills Local Environmental Plan 2012, to include a new clause in<br>Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses to permit residential flat buildings, increase the<br>maximum building height to 12 metres and the inclusion of a new local incentives<br>provision should proceed subject to the following conditions:  |  |  |
|                        | <ol> <li>Prior to community consultation, the planning proposal is to be amended         <ul> <li>to be consistent with the attached methodology for Local Residential Development</li> <li>Clause at Tab A. Please note that the planning proposal should be amended to state that</li> <li>clause attached to the methodology is indicative only and may be subject change as a</li> <li>result of legal drafting, and</li> <li>correct the reference to increase in the maximum building height to 12 metres.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |  |  |
|                        | A copy of the amended planning proposal is to be forwarded to the Department for information prior to the commencement of community consultation.   |  |  |
|                        | 2. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the Act as follows:   |  |  |
|                        | (a) the planning proposal must be made publicly available for a minimum of 28 days;<br>and  |  |  |
|                        | (b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public<br>exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for material that must be made<br>publicly available along with planning proposals as identified in section 5.5.2 of A Guide<br>to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning and Environment 2016).   |  |  |
|                        | 3. Consultation is required with the following public authorities under section 56(2)(d) the Act and/or to comply with the requirements of relevant S117 Directions:  |  |  |
|                        | <ul> <li>Office of Environment and Heritage</li> <li>Transport for NSW</li> <li>Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services</li> <li>Integral Energy</li> <li>Sydney Water</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|                        | Each public authority is to be provided with a copy of the planning proposal and any relevant supporting material, and given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal.   |  |  |
|                        | <ol> <li>A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the Act. This does not discharge Council from any obligation if may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a submission or if reclassifying land).</li> <li>The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 12 months from the week following th date of the Gateway determination</li> </ol>   |  |  |
| Supporting Reasons :   | The proposal is supported as it will provide housing in close proximity to a future town centre, and with established bus connections to major centres.   |  |  |
|                        |   |  |  |
|                        | 1 Sent :  |  |  |