

# **Planning Team Report**

Planning proposal to rezone light industrial land at 15-33 Brighton Street, Croydon Park, to residential uses, and amend the planning controls.

Proposal Title:

Planning proposal to rezone light industrial land at 15-33 Brighton Street, Croydon Park, to

residential uses, and amend the planning controls.

Proposal Summary :

Planning proposal to rezone land at 15-33 Brighton Street, Croydon Park (Canterbury Council Croydon Park industrial precinct), from IN2 Light Industrial to R4 High Density Residential, increase the floor space ratio from 1:1 to 2:1, and introduce a maximum building height of 15

metres.

PP Number:

PP\_2015\_CANTE\_004\_00

Dop File No:

15/10659

**Proposal Details** 

Date Planning

Proposal Received:

02-Jul-2015

LGA covered :

Canterbury

Region:

Metro(CBD)

RPA:

Canterbury City Council

State Electorate:

**CANTERBURY** 

Section of the Act

55 - Planning Proposal

LEP Type:

Spot Rezoning

**Location Details** 

Street:

15 Brighton Avenue

Suburb:

**Croydon Park** 

City: Sydney

Postcode:

2133

Land Parcel:

Lot C DP 440959

Street:

17-19A Brighton Avenue

Suburb:

**Croydon Park** 

City:

Sydney

Postcode:

2133

Land Parcel:

Lot 2A DP 3010; Lot B DP333556

Street :

19 Brighton Avenue

Suburb :

**Croydon Park** 

City:

Sydney

Postcode:

2133

Land Parcel:

Lot A DP 333556
21 Brighton Avenue

Street : Suburb :

Croydon Park

City:

Sydney

Postcode:

2133

Land Parcel:

Lot 1 DP 123636

Street:

23-25 Brighton Avenue

Suburb:

Croydon Park

City:

Sydney

Postcode:

2133

Land Parcel:

Lot 11 DP 862370

Street :

27-33 Brighton Avenue

Suburb:

Croydon Park

City:

Sydney

Postcode:

2133

Land Parcel:

Lot 10 DP 1026819

## **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details**

Contact Name:

**Helen Wilkins** 

Contact Number:

0292286559

Contact Email:

helen.wilkins@planning.nsw.gov.au

### **RPA Contact Details**

Contact Name:

Richard Hulajko

Contact Number :

0297899368

Contact Email:

richardhu@canterbury.nsw.gov.au

## **DoP Project Manager Contact Details**

Contact Name:

**Diane Sarkies** 

Contact Number :

0292286522

Contact Email:

diane.sarkies@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

Type of Release (eg

Area oi Relea:

No. of Lots:

Residential /

(Ha):

Employment land):

No. of Dwellings

10

-

(where relevant):

U

Gross Floor Area:

0

No of Jobs Created:

0

The NSW Government Yes

Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with:

If No, comment:

Have there been

No

meetings or

communications with registered lobbyists?

If Yes, comment:

## **Supporting notes**

Internal Supporting

Notes :

The proponent initially sought from Council to rezone the Canterbury Council Croydon Park industrial precinct (the site) from IN2 Light Industrial to R4 High Density Residential to permit redevelopment as residential apartments with some associated retail/commercial space at ground level, a FSR of 2.5:1 and maximum building height of 26m (8 storeys).

Council subsequently engaged planning and economic consultants to undertake an independent peer review of the planning proposal, which concluded that the site could be redeveloped for non-employment uses, but that the density of the proposed development was consistent with development within centres and close to railway stations. The peer review recommended a FSR of 0.9:1 and maximum height of 11.5m. It also considered that

the provision of retail/commercial space to the amount sought (600 sqm) was not warranted at this location. The Council report supported the findings of the peer review and recommended a FSR of 0.9:1 and maximum height of 11.5m.

Council resolution consequently resolved to seek a FSR of 2:1 and maximum height of 15m, to achieve strategic planning goals to provide higher density residential development in an accessible location, and submitted the planning proposal seeking these changes.

The Department considers that, in its current form, the planning proposal does not demonstrate adequate strategic merit or demonstrate that the proposal would not have adverse economic and social impacts, by effecting the removal of the Croydon Park Industrial Precinct. It does not provide adequate justification for loss of a functioning industrial precinct, which is capable of providing local services and jobs. It does not provide adequate justification for the rationale that underpins the proposal, that local services can be relocated to Western Sydney and that the additional distance to then access the services by the local community will not adversely impact on Sydney's social and environmental sustainability. It does not provide adequate justification for the need for additional R4 zoned land in an area that currently has significant developmental capacity for, and so take-up of, RFB development under the current planning controls. Wholesale loss of the the Croydon Park Industrial Estate to predominantly residential uses would result in an irreversible loss of access to local light industrial services and businesses by a growing community.

The Council report supplementary information states that the applicant had expressed a wish to have the matter considered as a proposed B5 Business Development zone in lieu of the proposed R4 zone, but that this was not pursued by Council due to a lack of information at the time of submission of the planning proposal to support a proposed B5 rezoning. The Department considers that a B5 zoning option should be further investigated.

A B5 Business Development zone would permit bulky goods premises; food and drink premises; garden centres; hardware and building supplies; shop top housing; vehicle sales or hire premises; and warehouse and distribution centres. Permissibility of these uses on the subject site, in addition to shop top housing, would ensure continuity of access to local services by the growing local community and achieve the intention of the planning proposal to facilitate high density residential development on the subject site.

External Supporting Notes:

The planning proposal actions a resolution of Council of 11 December 2014, to rezone Croydon Park industrial precinct from IN2 Light Industrial to R4 High Density Residential, increase the FSR from 1:1 to 2:1 and introduce a maximum building height of 15 metres.

# Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment:

The objective of the planning proposal is to facilitate high density residential development on the subject site.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The planning proposal explains that an amendment to Canterbury LEP 2012 will need to be made for the subject site to:

- 1. amend the Land Zoning Map (Sheet LZN\_006) from IN2 Light Industrial to R4 High Density Residential:
- 2. amend the FSR Map (Sheet FSR\_006) to increase the FSR from 1:1 to 2:1; and
- amend the Height of Building Map (Sheet HOB\_010) to introduce a maximum building height from of 15 metres.

### Justification - s55 (2)(c)

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

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA:

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones

\* May need the Director General's agreement

3.1 Residential Zones

3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport

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

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 (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004

e) List any other matters that need to be considered : Direction 4.1 Acid Sulphate Soils requires that a relevant planning authority must not prepare a planning proposal that proposes an intensification of land uses on land identified as having a probability of containing acid sulfate soils on the Acid Sulfate Soils Planning Maps unless the relevant planning authority has considered an acid sulphate soils study assessing the appropriateness of the change of land use given the presence of acid sulfate soils.

The proposal is not consistent with the Direction as it will result in an intensification of land that is identified as Class 5 on the Acid Sulfate Soils Map in Canterbury LEP 2012. However, Canterbury LEP 2012 contains the Acid Sulphate Soils model clause which is considered sufficient to prevent any significant adverse environmental impacts arising from the development of the land or intensification of its use.

The inconsistency is considered to be minor and justifiable.

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No

If No, explain:

State Environmental Planning Policy 55 - Remediation of Land (SEPP 55): The relevant planning authority that is proposing a change of use of land that is likely to

be contaminated is required to obtain, and have regard to, a report specifying the findings of a preliminary investigation of the land carried out in accordance with the contaminated land planning guidelines. The planning proposal is inconsistent with the SEPP as the site has a known history of industrial use and the proponent has not demonstrated that the land is, or can be made, suitable for the proposed residential use, instead stating that this "can be adequately dealt with through the DA process". Inconsistency with the SEPP is not adequately justified. It is recommended that, should the planning proposal proceed to Gateway, the proponent be required to undertake a preliminary investigation of the land carried out in accordance with the contaminated land planning guidelines and exhibit the report with the planning proposal.

**Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones:** 

This Direction seeks to encourage employment growth in suitable locations and protect employment land in business and industrial zones. Planning proposals must retain areas and locations of existing business and industrial zones, and not reduce the total floor space area for industrial uses in industrial zones.

The proposal is not consistent with this Direction as it seeks to rezone the IN2 Light Industrial zoned Croydon Park Industrial Precinct to residential uses.

A planning proposal may be inconsistent with the Direction if the inconsistency is justified by a study which gives consideration to the objective of the Direction. The proponent has supplied an Industrial Rezoning Economic Justification study in support of the proposal. However, the study does not adequately justify the proposed rezoning, nor specifically discuss the key objectives of the Direction, including encouraging employment growth, protecting employment land and supporting the viability of

> centres. Inconsistency with the Direction is not adequately justified. It is recommended that, should the planning proposal proceed to Gateway, the proponent be required to update the planning proposal to further justify the inconsistency and, as the inconsistency has not yet been approved, Council should be requested to make a submission to the Department seeking approval prior to finalisation.

> Direction 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney. Whilst the planning proposal is consistent with the housing directions of the Plan, it is not consistent with ensuring sufficient provision of well-located and well-serviced industrial land, will result in removal of currently active local businesses and is not consistent with protecting strategically important industrial-zoned land. Inconsistency with the Direction is not adequately justified. It is recommended that, should the planning proposal proceed to Gateway, the proponent be required to update the planning proposal to further justify the inconsistency and, as the inconsistency has not yet been approved, Council should be requested to make a submission to the Department seeking approval prior to finalisation.

#### Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment:

The planning proposal includes adequate mapping showing the existing and proposed:

- Land Zoning Map;
- Floor Space Ratio Map; and
- Height of Buildings Map.

#### Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment:

Given the nature of the planning proposal a community consultation period of 28 days is proposed by Council. This is considered 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? No

If No. comment :

The planning proposal has not justified inconsistency with:

- · SEPP 55 Remediation of land; and
- s117 Directions 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones, and 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney.

### Proposal Assessment

## Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation to Principal Canterbury LEP 2012 was published on 21 December 2012.

## Assessment Criteria

Need for planning

proposal:

The planning proposal is required to assist in achieving Council's intention to rezone the land and permit high density residential development. A planning proposal is the only means of achieving the type of development being sought.

The planning proposal is not a result of any specific strategic study or report and is partially seeking to depart from the findings of Council's Residential Development Strategy.

Consistency with strategic planning framework:

The planning proposal is not consistent with the employment Directions of A Plan for Growing Sydney.

• Direction 1.9: Support Priority Economic Sectors; and Action 1.9.2 - support key industrial precincts with appropriate planning controls. The Direction aims to ensure the provision of sufficient well-located and well-serviced land to support priority industries and the Action guides the assessment of proposed rezonings of industrial lands under the Industrial Lands Strategic Assessment Checklist.

The proponent has provided only a partially completed Industrial Lands Strategic Assessment Checklist, which guides the assessment of proposed rezonings of industrial land (Action 1.9.2 of the Plan). The proponent has not addressed the two questions that assess whether the land can be used for an industrial purpose now, or in the future, to support new forms of industrial land uses such as high-tech or creative industries, or if the site is critical to meeting the need for land for an alternative purpose identified in other NSW Government or endorsed council planning strategies. The Proponent's justification for the reduction in industrial land is therefore not complete.

Council's independent peer review of the proposal does include a completed Industrial Lands Strategic Assessment Checklist. Its states that there are vacancies on the site, that employment within the precinct has been declining and that the precinct is not suitable for creative industries or office uses due to its location outside of a commercial centre. It also states that there is likely to be an increase in the housing target for the Canterbury LGA within the Subregional Delivery Plan for the South Subregion and refers to the Residential Development Strategy recommendation that a review of residential land be undertaken in the event of significantly increased housing targets. However, the peer review states elsewhere that the precinct is suitable for population-serving industrial uses and low impact manufacturing uses.

The Department's assessment against the rationale underpinning the Industrial Lands Strategic Assessment Checklist is that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the loss of the Croydon Park industrial precinct will not be a significant and irreversible loss to the LGA and to the wider region. The proposed rezoning is not consistent with State or Council strategies, it would impact on industrial land stocks in the region, and the site is currently demonstrating that it has capacity to accommodate industrial uses now and into the future. Further, whilst the precinct is not part of an important industry cluster, it services the local community, without which the community would have to access services further afield.

In January 2014, the Canterbury LGA contained approximately 1.0% of Sydney's employment land stock and 3.1% of Sydney's population. Canterbury currently has approximately 149.5ha of industrial land and has lost 17.8ha since January 2012. The proposal seeks to reduce the availability of industrial land within the Canterbury LGA by approximately 14,763sqm (approximately 1%). Whilst the planning proposal would have the effect of reducing the stock of industrial land in the Canterbury LGA by only approximately 1%, there are only three other IN2 zones within the wider area (Tag A):

- Canterbury Council Ashbury industrial precinct, Milton Street, Ashbury, which is located within a Heritage Conservation Area and which Canterbury Residential Development Strategy 2013 recommends to be rezoned to residential;
- Burwood Council Flower Power Site, Mitchell Street, Croydon Park, which is subject to a planning proposal that is seeking to rezone the site to R1 General Residential; and
- Ashfield Council, several small adjacent individual lots in Milton Street North.
- The planning proposal is consistent with the housing objectives of A Plan for Growing Sydney, in particular Direction 2.1: Accelerate housing supply across Sydney; and Action 2.1.1: Accelerate housing supply, by rezoning to residential land. However, rezoning in itself does not guarantee redevelopment, but would necessitate existing businesses having to rely on existing use rights, which would constrain redevelopment of the land to support new forms of industrial uses, such as high tech or creative industries.

- The planning proposal is partly consistent with Direction 3.1: Revitalise Existing Suburbs. The Direction aims to facilitate the concentration of new housing in established suburbs to lower infrastructure costs, reduce commuting times, improve access to jobs and services, and enhance liveability. The proposal is partly consistent with the Direction, as it seeks to facilitate new housing in an established suburb and that is serviced by good public bus services. However, the proposal is not consistent with the Direction, as it will result in the removal of currently active local businesses from the area.
- The planning proposal is not consistent with the economic priorities for the South Subregion in A Plan for Growing Sydney. The priorities include identification and protection of strategically important industrial-zoned land. The proposal has not adequately demonstrated that the site is no longer strategically important for industrial uses.

The planning proposal is not consistent with Council's studies, strategies or plans:

- Canterbury Residential Development Strategy (2013)
- Recommends retaining the existing zoning and planning controls.
- Recommends a review of all IN2 land between Brighton Avenue and Croydon Avenue (to the east and which includes R4 High Density Residential zoned land) in the event of significantly increased housing targets for the LGA. Council has not undertaken any such review to date.
- Towards 2032 City of Canterbury Economic Development & Employment Strategy (2009)
- Notes that Croydon Park industrial precinct is a fragmented precinct.
- Recommends preserving and nurturing local businesses and employment lands at Croydon Park industrial precinct.

The Department considers that the loss of the Croydon Park Industrial precinct and redevelopment of the land as residential would have the effect of irreversibly removing light industrial zoned land. The proposal would necessitate an increasing local population having to travel further distances to access local light industrial services and would remove the potential to redevelop the land to support new forms of industrial uses to service the local community.

The possibility of redeveloping the land as B5 Business Development zone has not been adequately explored. B5 zoning may ensure continuity of access to local services by the growing local community and achieve the intention of the planning proposal to facilitate high density residential development on the subject site.

Environmental social economic impacts :

#### Environmental:

The planning proposal will not result in any impact on critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats, given the site's known history of industrial usage and location within a fully urbanised environment. The site may be contaminated and/or contain acid sulfate soils (as previously discussed).

#### Social:

Public transport – There is no railway station within the vicinity of the site, the nearest being Campsie station at 1.8km, Ashfield station at 2.4km and Burwood station at 2.7km. The site is, however, serviced by Sydney buses, which link the site to the above railway stations and indirectly connect the site to Bankstown and Burwood Strategic Centres, and Sydney CBD. The Campsie-Burwood bus route runs past the site and the Ashfield bus route runs along Georges River Road, which is 230m from the site. ABS data show that only 15.2% of Canterbury residents live and work within the LGA, whilst 68.4% work outside of the LGA (11.0% in the CBD). Given the site's location away from modes of transport that are capable of moving large numbers of people, the planning proposal is not consistent with the government's intention to provide more jobs closer to homes. It would have the effect of increasing the number of residents who travel long distances for work, travel to work by multiple modes of public transport, and travel by car.

Traffic and parking – The planning proposal includes a preliminary traffic review that is based on an assumption of a change of use from light industrial to approximately 340 high density residential apartments and 600sqm of non-residential retail uses, such as local convenience stores, cafes and businesses. The preliminary review concludes that the proposed development would optimistically generate approximately 30% less traffic than is currently generated and reduce traffic conflict with the established residential use of the area. A detailed traffic and parking impact assessment would be prepared and submitted with any future development application.

Demographic and cultural – Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data highlight that Croydon Park has undergone a period of gentrification relative to Canterbury LGA generally. Since 2006, there has been a marked increase in professionals as a percentage of the suburb population, and a decrease in heavy industrial workers. Also since 2006, there has been a marked increase in the number of new high density dwellings that have been delivered annually, a small increase in the number of new detached houses, and a marked decrease in the number of new medium density dwellings.

The site is located within an expansive R4 High Density Residential area, which is largely undeveloped to the precinct's developmental potential, being comprised of low density detached dwellings of 1-2 storeys and some 2-3 storey RFBs to the immediate east of the site. Council's Residential Development Strategy (2013) notes the lack of developmental take-up of the R4 zoning, stating that there is substantial capacity for further dwellings to be created in the area, of a further 280,000 dwellings, 8,000 of which are 'development ready' opportunities. The Strategy further states that this 'bank' of dwellings is sufficient to meet the LGA's housing targets to 2031. The Strategy has mapped potentially developable land across the LGA, which indicates that Croydon Park has a significant number of larger sites that are amenable to amalgamation and redevelopment.

The planning proposal states that, as the precinct is comprised of larger sites, it avoids the need for amalgamation. The Department considers that, in view of the large volume of R4 land in Croydon Park that is not developed at, or near, full potential and the significant number of larger amalgamatable sites, the removal of capacity to provide local services in order to create additional high density residential development is not adequately justified.

#### **Economic**

The loss of the Croydon Park industrial precinct would result in an immediate loss of a diminishing supply of industrial land within the area. The proponent's Economic Justification states that broader market conditions are leading to the decline of fragmented industrial estates in central Sydney and to the growth of new large scale high tech industry, warehousing and logistics centres in western Sydney. The proposal argues that the larger, newer industrial precincts in western Sydney is a satisfactory alternative to the provision of services on the site. However, this does not give adequate consideration to social and environmental sustainability principles. Requiring central Sydney residents to travel to western Sydney to access local services and light industrial businesses would contribute to road congestion and air pollution and loss of efficiency and productivity. Also, inner city precincts that provide local services remain viable regardless of size. For example, the Ashfield Council, Milton Street North precinct, which is only approximately 3000 sqm is viable and accommodates vehicle repair and servicing businesses.

The Departments' Employment Lands Development Program (2014) Update Report tracks industrial land stock over time to assess if there is enough land available, or in the pipeline, to meet likely future demand. The findings of the Report note that there is a consistent undersupply of zoned and serviced land to meet supply standards and that this illustrates a need to focus on servicing existing zoned land to meet the needs of industry growth (and change).

The Department considers that the proposal has not adequately addressed the needs of the local population regarding access to local services. Regardless of the local population having undergone industry sector employment change - notably from transport, postal and warehousing; and information media and telecommunications, to public administration

and safety; education and training; and health care and social assistance - the local population still needs to be able to access local light industrial services, such as car repair and maintenance, hardware and building supplies. The proposal has also not adequately addressed the site's potential for diversified and/or alternate uses.

Council's Residential Development Strategy (2013) states that, whilst it is important to recognise redundant uses, a redundant use should not automatically lead to a rezoning, particularly if existing buildings are capable of adaptation or use by new occupiers.

The economic priorities for the South Subregion in A Plan for Growing Sydney include the identification and protection of strategically important industrial-zoned land. The proposal has not adequately demonstrated that the site is no longer strategically important for industrial uses. Also, Council's Residential Development Strategy (2013) recommends the precinct be retained and Council's Economic Development and Employment Strategy (2009) recommends to preserve and nurture these local businesses and employment lands.

The Department considers that rezoning of this industrial precinct to primarily residential uses is not justified and the planning proposal should not be supported in its current form. Rezoning proposals should give consideration to the retention and possible expansion of the site's capacity to provide for local light industrial businesses and ensure continuing provision of local services to the growing residential population. Council's report indicates that the proponent may wish to consider seeking rezoning of the site to B5 Business Development in lieu of the proposed R4 zone. This may ensure continuity of access to local services by the growing local community and achieve the intention of the planning proposal to facilitate high density residential development on the subject site. It is recommended that, should the planning proposal proceed to Gateway, a condition should be included requiring further consideration of an alternate B5 zone and a revised planning proposal be submitted to the Department.

#### **Assessment Process**

Proposal type:

Inconsistent

**Community Consultation** 

28 Days

Period:

Timeframe to make

9 months

Delegation:

RPA

Public Authority
Consultation - 56(2)

(d):

LEP:

Is Public Hearing by the PAC required?

No

(2)(a) Should the matter proceed?

No

If no, provide reasons:

The planning proposal should not proceed in its current form for the following reasons:

- it does not demonstrate justification for inconsistencies with SEPP 55 Remediation of land; and s117 Directions 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones, and 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney;
- it does not demonstrate justification for inconsistencies with Council's Canterbury Residential Development Strategy (2013), which was carried out under the Department of Planning and Environment's Planning Reform Fund program, and Towards 2032 City of Canterbury Economic Development & Employment Strategy (2009);
- it does not provide adequate justification for loss of a functioning industrial precinct, which is capable of providing local services and jobs;
- it does not provide adequate justification for the rationale that underpins the proposal, that local services can be relocated to Western Sydney and that the additional distance to then access the services by the local community will not adversely impact on Sydney's social and environmental sustainability;

- it does not provide adequate justification for the need for additional R4 zoned land in an area that currently has significant developmental capacity for RFB development under the current planning controls; and
- wholesale loss of the the Croydon Park Industrial Estate to predominantly residential uses would result in an irreversible loss of access to local light industrial services and businesses by a growing community.

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:

#### **Documents**

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	ls Public
Covering letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Planning Proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Maps.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Council Report and Resolution.pdf	Proposai	Yes
Councils Peer Review by SGS.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Proponents preliminary traffic review.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Proponents economic justification - Part 1.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Proponents economic justification - Part 2.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Proponents planning proposal submission to	Proposal	Yes
Council.pdf		
Attachment 1 - Information Checklist.pdf	Proposal	No
Attachment 4 - Evaluation Criteria for Delegation.pdf	Proposal	No

### Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage: Not Recommended

S.117 directions:

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones

3.1 Residential Zones

3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport

7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney

Additional Information

It is recommended that the planning proposal not proceed in its current form.

Supporting Reasons:

It is recommended that the planning proposal not proceed on the basis that the proposal:

1. Does not adequately justify the loss of employment land;

2. Does not adequately justify the need to rezone additional land to R4 in an R4 zoned area that has significant developmental capacity for high density development;
3. Is inconsistent with s117 Directions 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones, and 7.1

Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney;

4. Is inconsistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney employment Directions;

5. Is inconsistent with Council's Canterbury Residential Development Strategy (2013) and Towards 2032 – City of Canterbury Economic Development & Employment Strategy

(2009); and

6. Is inconsistent with SEPP 55 – Remediation of land as the site has a known history of industrial use and the proponent has failed to prove that the land is, or can be made,

Planning proposal to rezone light industrial land at 15-33 Brighton Street, Croydon Park, to residential uses, and amend the planning controls.

Suitable for the proposed residential use.
7. Should Council be willing to consider a B5 zoning, it is recommended that the proposal be revised and resubmitted, noting that the above issues will still need to be addressed.
Council should also consider the future of the industrial precinct in a strategic manner and whether the whole precinct should be considered for rezoning, including its role supporting the Croydon Park B2 Local Centre zone and surrounding high density residential area.

Signature:

Diane Sarkies

Date: 3/8/15