

Proposal Title :	45 Murray Street, Pyrmon	it			
Proposal Summary :			mend the Sydney Local Envi lurray Street, Pyrmont for a ²		
PP Number :	PP_2016_SYDNE_001_00	I	Dop File No :	16/04078	
Proposal Details					
Date Planning Proposal Received :	22-Mar-2016		LGA covered :	Sydney	
Region :	Metro(CBD)		RPA :	Council of the	e City of Sydney
State Electorate :	SYDNEY		Section of the Act :	55 - Planning	Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning				
Location Details					
Street : 45 I	Murray Street				
Suburb : Pyr	rmont Cit	ity :	Sydney	Postcode :	2009
Land Parcel : Lot	t 1 DP 507091				
DoP Planning Office	cer Contact Details				
Contact Name :	wayne williamson				
Contact Number :	0292286585				
Contact Email :	wayne.williamson@plannir	ng.nsw.ę	gov.au		
RPA Contact Detai	ils				
Contact Name :	Jonathon Carle				
Contact Number :	0292467736				
Contact Email :	jcarle@cityofsydney.nsw.g	gov.au			
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details				
Contact Name :					
Contact Number :					
Contact Email :					
Land Release Data	a				
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) :	0	
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created ;	30	
The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	Yes			
If No, comment :	communication and meetings has not met any lobbyists in	relation to this proposal, nor ha	ctice in relation to blied with. Sydney Region East as the A/Director been advised byists concerning this proposal.	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο			
If Yes, comment :				
upporting notes				
Internal Supporting				
Notes :	The subject site is located at square metres and is in singl	45 Murray Street, Pyrmont, has e ownership.	s a total area of approx. 398	
	The site currently contains a six storey commercial office building with a seventh storey element (lift shaft and services area). The ground level contains a café fronting Murray Street to the east, and car park access via Union Lane to the south.			
	The site is surrounded by a n	nix of residential, commercial a	and hotel uses.	
	The site is currently zoned B4 Mixed Use, has a maximum building height of 22 metres and FSR of 5:1.			
	It is noted the provisions for design excellence in the Sydney LEP 2012 and a site specific Development Control Plan are applicable if the building height is increased to 25 metres or more.			
	section 59 of the Environmen	n to carry out the Minister's pla Ital Planning and Assessment . Propriate as the matter is of loc	Act 1979 (the EP&A Act).	
External Supporting Notes :				
equacy Assessmer	nt			
Statement of the ob				
	pjectives provided? Yes			
Comment :	The objectives of the Prop	osal are to:		
		f a new mid-scale hotel to con ket, which is consistent with th		

I

45 Murray Street, Pyrmont · ensure a built form that is compatible with and limits impacts on surrounding development; • waive the requirement for a competitive design process if the development is an alteration and addition to the existing building for the purpose of 'hotel or motel accommodation' and any ancillary uses; and exclude that development from obtaining a design excellence bonus. Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b) Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes The proposal seeks to insert a part 6 local clause in Sydney LEP 2012 which: Comment : applies to development at 45 Murray Street, Pyrmont for 'hotel or motel accommodation' only: · allows development for 'hotel or motel accommodation' and ancillary uses to a maximum building height of 30 metres despite any other clauses of the LEP; • establishes that a competitive design process under 6.21 (5) is not required and that additional building height or floor space may not be awarded under 6.21(7) as the development is an alteration and addition to the existing building; and • excludes the operation of clause 4.6 in relation to this clause. Justification - s55 (2)(c) a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No **1.1 Business and Industrial Zones** b) S.117 directions identified by RPA : 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport * May need the Director General's agreement 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Is the Director General's agreement required? No c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? There are no State Environmental Planning Policies or Sydney Regional e) List any other Environmental Plans applicable to the Planning Proposal. matters that need to be considered : Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No The proposal is not considered to be inconsistent with any SEPPs and section 117 If No, explain : Directions. Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d) Is mapping provided? Yes No maps will be amended by this proposal. Comment : Community consultation - s55(2)(e) Has community consultation been proposed? Yes Public consultation will be undertaken in accordance with the Gateway determination. Comment : Council suggests an exhibition period of 14 days, which is considered acceptable. PROJECT TIMELINE

Council has provided an indicative project timeline with a completion date of October 2016. The Department considers a 9 month project timeline for completion is adequate.

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 : December 2012

Comments in relation The Sydney LEP 2012 was gazetted in December 2012. to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	The proposal was initiated by the landowner rather than being the direct result of a strategic study or report. The proposal is consistent with Council's Visitor Accommodation Action Plan (2015).
	A proposal is the best means of facilitating the provision of new hotel development and ensuring the development responds appropriately to its context while limiting impacts on neighbouring properties.
	Urban design analysis indicates the site can accommodate a built form to a height of 30 metres without any unacceptable impacts to surrounding properties. This height cannot be achieved using a clause 4.6 exception. Instead, the maximum building height applying to the site for the development needs to be amended.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The proposal is consistent with relevant goals, directions and actions of A Plan for Growing Sydney, in particular, Direction 1.9 – Support priority economic sectors. The direction identifies the 'visitor economy (tourism)' as a priority industry.
	The site is located within the Global Sydney Centre. An overarching priority is to provide capacity for additional mixed use development in precincts for offices, retail, tourism, arts, culture, services and housing. The site is also within walking distance of Barangaroo, Darling Harbour and the CBD Arts Precinct.
	The proposal is consistent with the key directions of City of Sydney's Sustainable Sydney 2030.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The proposal will not affect any critical habitats, populations or ecological communities.
	Potential environmental effects have been considered by the proponent and Council. Specific environmental effects include:
i.	Overshadowing To support the proposal, the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 will be amended to provide a building envelope that ensures acceptable solar access to neighbouring residential properties. Solar access impacts of the proposed building envelope have been modelled by Hassell. The modelling indicates less than 70% of

surrounding apartments currently receive at least 2 hours of direct sunlight between 9 am and 3 pm at mid-winter.

The modelling indicates six apartments at 32-34 Bunn Street will lose between 8 and 28 minutes of sunlight to habitable spaces during mid-winter. Two of the affected apartments currently receive less than 10 minutes of sunlight in mid-winter. This sunlight is only received in June and July and the apartments receive no sunlight at other times of the year due to the existing impacts of other buildings. Under the Apartment Design Guide, sunlight must be received for at least 15 minutes to be recognised. As the two apartments currently receive less than 10 minutes of sunlight, the proposed envelope's impact on their solar access is measurable by the Apartment Design Guide.

The proposed building envelope ensures solar access to neighbouring properties is not reduced by more than 20% in accordance with the Apartment Design Guide. The impact of the proposed maximum building envelope on surrounding properties' solar access is therefore considered to be within acceptable limits.

Views

The proposal is accompanied by a view impact analysis (Hassell) which indicates the proposed building envelope will affect views from 12 apartments in three neighbouring apartment buildings:

• 2 apartments at 1-9 Pyrmont Bridge Road, adjoining the site to the west;

• 2 apartments at 32-34 Bunn Street, to the south west, on the opposite corner of Union Lane and Harwood Lane; and

• 8 apartments at 1-5 Harwood Street, slightly further west, on the opposite side of Harwood Lane.

Views are not protected in the Sydney LEP 2012, Sydney DCP 2012 or the Apartment Design Guide. Therefore, the proposal's effect on views has been assessed against the NSW Land and Environment Court's 'Planning Principle' for view sharing. In all cases, the level of view sharing and impact is considered acceptable.

Privacy

The site adjoins a residential flat building at 1-9 Pyrmont Bridge Road. A second residential flat building at 32-34 Bunn Street is located to the south west of the site on the opposite corner of Union Lane and Harwood Lane.

The indicative floor plan does not include any windows on the building's western and southern sides, looking towards the nearby residential flat buildings. This indicates the proposed development will not have any privacy impacts on any nearby residential properties. Privacy impacts will be further assessed at the development application stage.

Social and economic

The proposal will support increased supply of hotel and visitor accommodation consistent with various local and state strategies. The increased visitor numbers and expenditure will provide a number of social and economic benefits including increased employment in the sector and a more diverse and robust economy.

Assessment Process					
Proposal type :	Minor		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make	9 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)					
Is Public Hearing by the P	AC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter p	roceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :					
Resubmission - s56(2)(b)	: No				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional stu	dies, if required. :				
If Other, provide reasons	:				
Identify any internal consu					
No internal consultation	required				
Is the provision and fundir	ng of state infrastructure	e relevant	to this plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :	Existing infrastructu development.	re servici	ng the site has the capacity t	o accommodate fut	ure
Documents					
Document File Name			DocumentType Na	me	Is Public
Planning Proposal - 45 N CouncilLetter.pdf	lurray St, Pyrmont.pdf	F	Proposal Proposal Covering	j Letter	Yes Yes
Planning Team Recomm	nendation				
Preparation of the plannin	ng proposal supported a	at this stag	e : Recommended with Conc	litions	
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Inc 3.4 Integrating Land 7.1 Implementation o	Use and	Fransport		
Additional Information :	It is recommended t conditions:	hat the pla	anning proposal proceed, sul	bject to the followin	g
	1. The planning prop	oosal be p	ublicly exhibited for a period	of not less than 14	days.
	2. Council is not req	uired to c	onsult with State agencies.		
	3. A public hearing i	s not requ	ired.		

	4. The planning proposal is to be finalised within 9 months from the date of the gateway determination.	
Supporting Reasons :	The proposal is supported as it represents an opportunity to deliver mid-level visito accommodation in a location ideally suited to this use.	
Signature:	Chappel	
Printed Name:	Sandy Chappel Date: 12.4.16	