

## Planning Team Report

## Amendment of zoning and development controls for 87 and 89 The Avenue, Hurstville (Danebank School Campus)

Proposal Title :		Amendment of zoning and development controls for 87 and 89 The Avenue, Hurstville (Danebank School Campus)		
Proposal Summary	within the Daneba Hurstville Local E • rezoning the lot Establishments); :	The planning proposal seeks to rezone and amend development controls relating to two lots within the Danebank School Campus (No.87 and No. 89 The Avenue, Hurstville) under Hurstville Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP 2012) by: • rezoning the lots from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishments); and • removing development controls relating to maximum building height, maximum FSR and minimum lot size.		
	The proposal does	The proposal does not seek to delist or alter the heritage status of the two properties.		
	This amendment v site.	vill align the t	wo sites with the exist	ting controls across the wider Danebank
PP Number :	PP_2016_GRIVE_	002_00	Dop File No :	16/09801
Proposal Details	18-Jul-2016		LGA covered :	Georges River
Proposal Received Region :	l∶ Metro(CBD)		RPA :	Georges River Council
State Electorate :	KOGARAH		Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
Street :	87 The Avenue			
Suburb :	Hurstville	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2220
Land Parcel :	Lot 97 DP 1595			
Street :	89 The Avenue			
Suburb :	Hurstville	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2220
Land Parcel :	Lot 96 DP 663361			

## **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details**

Contact Name :	Douglas Cunningham
Contact Number :	0292286357
Contact Email :	douglas.cunningham@planning.nsw.gov.au

### **RPA Contact Details**

Contact Name :	Carina Gregory
Contact Number :	0293306257
Contact Email :	mail@georgesriver.nsw.gov.au

## **DoP Project Manager Contact Details**

Contact Name :	Martin Cooper
Contact Number :	0292286582
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) :	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? :	No		
If Yes, comment ;	The Department of Planning and I communications with registered I		
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal, submitted to the Department on 18 July 2016, proposes to: • rezone the two lots from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishments); and • remove development controls relating to maximum building height, maximum FSR and minimum lot size.		
	The planning proposal is recomm • unifies the zoning and developm • ensures the zoning and develop	ent standards across the Dar	

	<ul> <li>does not adversely affect the LGA's supply of residential accommodation;</li> <li>provides long-term certainty for the current and future needs of the LGA's educational facilities;</li> <li>is consistent with State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 and Planning Circular, Amended School Provision under State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, (PS 09-018); and</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>does not adversely affect the heritage listing of the two sites.</li> </ul>
External Supporting Notes :	Council resolved on 4 July 2016 to forward the planning proposal to the Department.
	The proposal will align controls across the Danebank School Campus, as well as the
	majority of other SP2 Infrastructure zoned sites in the Hurstville LGA.
	87 The Avenue, Hurstville is a detached single storey face brick federation cottage with local heritage significance for its aesthetic values and its contribution to the local
	streetscape character.
	89 The Avenue, Hurstville is a detached single storey dwelling with a tiled hipped roof.
	The site is of local heritage importance as it demonstrates the rapid development and
7	second phase subdivision of the area.
	The proposal does not seek to delist or alter the heritage status of the two properties.
	Council wishes to exercise its plan making delegation in relation to this proposal.

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The objective of the planning proposal is to rezone two lots within the Danebank School campus from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishment) and remove the principal development standards (minimum lot size, maximum building height and maximum floor space ratio), consistent with the zoning and planning controls for the majority of the Danebank School Campus. This will reflect the use of the land as an "educational establishment".

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The following provisions are suggested: • amend the Land Zoning Map for the subject sites from R2 Low Density R Infrastructure (Educational Establishment); • amend the Lot Size Map to remove the minimal lot size applicable to the • amend the Height of Buildings Map to remove the maximum building hei to the subject land; and • amend the Floor Space Ratio Map to remove the maximum floor space ratio to the subject land.		g Map for the subject sites from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 nal Establishment); p to remove the minimal lot size applicable to the subject land; uildings Map to remove the maximum building height applicable
The proposal does not seek to delist or alter the heritage status of the two proper		seek to delist or alter the heritage status of the two properties.
The explanation of the proposal's provisions is clear.		proposal's provisions is clear.
Justification - s55 (2)(c)		
a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No		
b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :		2.3 Heritage Conservation
* May need the Director General's agreement		3.1 Residential Zones 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes

(Danebank School Campl			
	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 F	RPA identified? SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007		
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	A PLAN FOR GROWING SYDNEY The proposal is considered to be generally consistent with goals and guiding principles relating to the growth and development of strategic centres outlined in the A Plan for Growing Sydney.		
	GOAL 1 - A COMPETITIVE ECONOMY WITH WORLD-CLASS SERVICES AND TRANSPORT The direction of this goal is to support commerce, business and investment within Sydney, which will be achieved through the delivery of infrastructure, services within strategic centres.		
	Direction 1.10 aims to expand school facilities in urban growth areas, whilst delivering planning controls that can accommodate appropriate and timely developments at private schools. The planning proposal is consistent with this action as it will help to facilitate the delivery of future private school facilities and align controls, allowing assessment under the SEPP.		
	GOAL 2 - A CITY OF HOUSING CHOICE, WITH HOMES THAT MEET OUR NEEDS AND LIFESTYLES The purpose of this goal is to focus on providing more housing within strategic centres and well serviced locations.		
	The planning proposal is considered inconsistent with this goal as the rezoning would result in a reduction of residential land in a strategic centre. In particular, the planning proposal is inconsistent with directions 2.1 Accelerate Housing Supply Across Sydney and 2.2 Accelerate Urban Renewal Across Sydney – Providing Homes Closer to Jobs as the proposal will reduce the amount of residential zoned land within a strategic centre.		
	However, it is considered these inconsistencies are minor in nature and have been adequately been justified within the proposal. The land is currently being used for educational purposes and will not directly result in the loss of residential dwellings.		
	GOAL 3 – A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE WITH COMMUNITIES THAT ARE STRONG, HEALTHY AND WELL CONNECTED		
	The direction of this goal is to revitalise existing suburbs through a network of multipurpose green open and green spaces whilst promoting and protecting Sydney's heritage, arts and culture.		
	The planning proposal is consistent with this goal as the proposal will protect the heritage status of the two sites, whilst allowing the sites to continue to operate as education establishments.		
	STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICES The planning proposals is consistent will all relevant SEPPs.		
	It is noted SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 is relevant to this proposal as it relates to the delivery of infrastructure, including educational establishments, across the State. The proposal is considered to be consistent with the relevant educational establishment provisions. Also a Planning Circular, Amended School Provision under State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, (PS 09-018), was issued regarding the assessment of schools under the Infrastructure SEPP. The proposal is consistent with this circular.		
	SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS		

78

#### 2.3 Heritage Conservation

The objectives of this direction are to conserve items, areas, objects and places of environmental heritage and indigenous heritage significance. The proposal is considered to be consistent with this direction as the proposal does not seek to delist or alter the heritage status of the two properties.

#### 3.1 Residential Zones

The objectives of this direction are to encourage a variety of housing types, make efficient use of existing infrastructure, and minimise the impact of residential development on the environment and resource lands. The proposal is considered to be inconsistent with this direction because it reduces the total amount of residentially zoned land available within the LGA. The planning proposals inconsistency with this direction has been justified because the reduction is only minor (2 lots) and reflects the existing use of land.

#### 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney

Minor inconsistencies with this direction have been justified, as explained in the section of this report above dealing with that document.

#### HURSTVILLE COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN 2025

The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with strategic plan as it: • provides economic prosperity to the LGA and providing quality school facilities for the well-being and benefit of current and future residents; and • ensures sufficient educational establishments are provided for the existing and future residents.

#### HERITAGE

Both sites are locally listed heritage items. The proposal does not seek to delist or alter the heritage status of the two properties. There will be no impact upon the heritage items as a consequence of the planning proposal.

#### PN 10-001 ZONING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE IN LEPS

The proposal is considered to be inconsistent with this practice note as the proposal will result in more restrictive zoning being applied to the land. The inconsistencies are considered minor and justifiable as the planning proposal:

- is the result of a request from the land owner;
- reflects the existing use of land as an educational establishment;
- · provides a consistent zoning across the school campus;
- · provides flexibility to the school by removing the planning controls; and
- provides certainty long-term certainty for the future of the Danebank School.

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

If No, explain :

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

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :	
-----------	--

The mapping provided clearly illustrates existing planning controls as well as requested development controls.

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

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :	Should the planning proposal receive a Gateway determination, the proposal recommends a 28 day public exhibition period, which is supported. Notification of the public exhibition will be through:
	Newspaper advertisement in the St George and Sutherland Shire Leader
	<ul> <li>Exhibition notice on the Council's website</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Notices in Council offices and libraries</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Letters to State and Commonwealth Government agencies</li> </ul>

### Letters to adjoining landowners

### 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 : The proposal is considered adequate and sufficient detail has been provided.

## **Proposal Assessment**

### Principal LEP:

Due Date : December 2012

Comments in relation to Principal LEP :

#### **Assessment Criteria**

Need for planning proposal :	The planning proposal, which does not involve a specific strategic study or report, comes from a decision made by Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation and Danebank School, seeking consistency in regards to zoning throughout their campus.
	Council prepared this planning proposal in response to a Council meeting resolution on 4 July 2016. A planning proposal is necessary to align the development controls of the subject site to be consistent with those applicable to the rest of the Danebank School Campus. These controls are consistent with those found in most SP2 Infrastructure zoned sites across the LGA.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The planning proposal states it is consistent with key policies. While the Department notes some minor inconsistencies between the proposed amendments and the directions of A Plan for Growing Sydney (and associated Section 117 Direction 7.1) and Section 117 Direction 3.1 Residential Zones, these are considered justifiable.
Environmental social economic impacts :	It is agreed with Council there are no known critical habitats or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats which will be affected by the proposal. Other environmental effects (bushfires, land slips and flooding) are unlikely in Hurstville LGA and the proposal will not impact or enhance environmental risks.
	There will be no adverse social and economic effects as a consequence of the planning proposal. Any future school facilities would be a benefit to both Hurstville and the wider community.

## **Assessment Process** Routine Community Consultation 28 Days Proposal type : Period : RPA Delegation : 6 months Timeframe to make LEP : Public Authority **Department of Education and Communities** Consultation - 56(2)(d) Office of Environment and Heritage 1 No Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? Yes (2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? If no, provide reasons : 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 Is Public DocumentType Name **Document File Name Proposal Covering Letter** Yes Cover Letter.pdf Yes Proposal Planning Proposal.pdf Planning Team Recommendation Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions S.117 directions: 2.3 Heritage Conservation **3.1 Residential Zones** 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney It is recommended the planning proposal proceeds subject to the following: Additional Information : 1. Prior to public exhibition, the planning proposal is updated to include a plain English explanation of the intended effect of the proposed provisions. 2. Consultation is required with: Department of Education; and • Office of Environment and Heritage. 3. The planning proposal is to be publicly exhibited for a minimum of 28 days.

The second se		
	4. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter.	
	The planning proposal is to be completed within 6 months of the Gateway Determination.	
Supporting Reasons :	<ul> <li>The planning proposal is recommended to proceed, as it:</li> <li>unifies the zoning and development standards across the Danebank School Campus;</li> <li>ensures the zoning and development standards reflect the existing use of the land;</li> <li>does not adversely affect the LGA's supply of residential accommodation;</li> <li>provides long-term certainty for the current and future needs of the LGA's educational facilities;</li> <li>is consistent with State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 and Planning Circular, Amended School Provision under State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, (PS 09-018); and</li> <li>does not adversely affect the heritage listing of the two sites.</li> </ul>	
Signature:	Ul.Le	
Printed Name:	MARTIN COOPER Date: 19/08/2016	