

Planning Team Report

Amendments to Lane Cove LEP 2009 zoning, height and FSR controls, and amendment to Schedule 1 to allow a 400sqm-1000sqm neighbourhood shop.

Proposal Title :		Amendments to Lane Cove LEP 2009 zoning, height and FSR controls, and amendment to Schedule 1 to allow a 400sqm-1000sqm neighbourhood shop.		
Proposal Summary	the Proposal seeks to following:	The Proposal seeks to provide for mixed use re-development of the site, by way of the following:		
	(Neighbourhood Centre b) The rezoning of a por (Neighbourhood Centre c) Amend current LEP F maximum of 2.25:1 acro d) Amend current LEP F whole site, and;); rtion of the site fr); FSR controls for t oss the whole site neight controls fro Additional Permitt	om R4 (High Densi he site from 1:1 (B' ; om 9.5m (B1 zone) red Uses) of the LE	ntal Conservation) to B1 ty Residential) to B1 1 zone) and 0.8:1 (R4 zone) to a and 12m (R4 zone) to 18m for the P to allow a neighbourhood shop
PP Number :	PP_2013_LANEC_001_(00 Dop F	ile No :	13/01146
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received	30-Jan-2013	LGA c	overed :	Lane Cove
Region :	Sydney Region East	RPA :		Lane Cove Municipal Council
State Electorate :	LANE COVE	Sectio	n of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
Street : 2	74 & 274A Longueville Road			
Suburb : L	ane Cove	City :		Postcode :
Land Parcel : L	ots 1 and 2 DP 857133			
Street : 4	-16 Northwood Road		9	
Suburb : L	ane Cove	City :		Postcode :
Land Parcel : L	ot1 DP 663462, Lot 4 DP 321	048, Lots A, B, C,	D and G DP 30789	9, Lots 1-2 DP 445348

DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

Contact Name :	Andrew Watkins
Contact Number :	0292286225
Contact Email :	andrew.watkins@planning.nsw.gov.au

RPA Contact Details

Contact Name :	Stephanie Bashford
Contact Number :	0299113612
Contact Email :	sbashford@lanecove.nsw.gov.au

DoP Project Manager Contact Details

Contact Name :

Contact Number :

Contact Email :

Land Release Data

Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro Inner North subregion	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
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? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The Department of Planning and I communications and lobbyists ha with any lobbyists in relation to th advised of any meetings between proposal.	s been complied with. Sydno is proposal, nor has the the l	ey Region East has not met Regional Director been
2	Initially, submitted maps were ina per the Guide to Preparing Planni		

January respectively).

and the necessary maps and timeline were received by the Department (25 January and 29

30 Jan 2013: Received written request for completion of this proposed LEP amendment to be delegated to Council's General Manager.

31 Jan 2013: Council advised regarding missing pages from the submitted traffic assessment report. Council provided missing pages on 1 Feb 2013.

4 Feb 2013: Council advised of missing pages from Economic Impact Assessment, and missing pages received same day.

External Supporting Notes :

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The statement of objectives is considered adequate:

to facilitate the future redevelopment of the site as a new mixed-use precinct;
to enable the complete revitalisation of the site to better reflect its modern context and desired future character as well as that of the Northwood locality as a neighbourhood centre;

- to standardise the zoning across the site: and

- to increase density to initiate a process of redevelopment in the locality.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The Planning Proposal explains the provisions as follows:

(a) the rezoning of a portion of the site from E2 Environmental Conservation to B1
 Neighbourhood Centre;
 (b) the rezoning of a portion of the site from R4 High Density Residential to B1

(b) the rezoning of a portion of the site from R4 High Density Residential to B1 Neighbourhood Centre;

(c) amending the FSR map to reflect a maximum possible FSR of 2.25:1 for the site;(d) amending the Height of Building map to reflect a maximum possible building height of 18m for the site;

(e) amendment of Schedule 1 to allow a neighbourhood shop to exceed the current 400sqm limit, up to a maximum of 1000sqm.

Indicative current LEP 2009 and proposed Zoning, FSR and Height of Buildings maps have been provided (received 25 January 2013).

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	2.1 Environment Protection Zones
May need the Director General's agreement	3.1 Residential Zones
	3.3 Home Occupations
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
	6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
	6.3 Site Specific Provisions
	7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Is the Director General's	s agreement required? Ye	98
c) Consistent with Standard	d Instrument (LEPs) Orde	er 2006 : Yes
d) Which SEPPs have the	RPA identified?	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 i	items a), b) and d) being	adequately justified? Yes
lf No, explain :	The Planning Propos provision for residen	ality of Residential Flat Buildings: al is inconsistent with Clause 28 as it does not provide any tial flat development to be consistent with the SEPP's design quality sidential Flat Design Code (DoP).
	Therefore, such a pro Gateway Determination	vision is recommended to be required as a condition of the on.
		on of Land: al is considered inconsistent with the SEPP, as a preliminary igation report has not been prepared.
	petrol station use on	al advises that any contamination issues arising from the current part of the site would be addressed at the DA stage. For this ency is considered to be justified as of minor significance.
Mapping Provided - s5	5(2)(d)	
Is mapping provided? Yes		
Comment :	The maps provided a	re considered inadequate.
	clearly indicate the pr the Standard Technic it is necessary to requ Buildings maps that a	proposed (and current) Zoning, FSR and Height of Buildings maps roposed amendments to LEP 2009, they do not strictly comply with al Requirements for LEP Maps (DP&I, November 2012). Therefore, uire Council to exhibit proposed Zoning, FSR and Height of are fully compliant with the Standard Technical Requirements for tion of the Gateway Determination.
	outside and to the no exhibited. A conditio	sed Zoning Map indicates the incorrect zoning of a parcel of land rth of the site. This should be corrected by Council before it is n to ensure relevant maps show correct zoning etc of adjoining cluded in the recommendation.
Community consultation	on - s55(2)(e)	
Has community consultatio	on been proposed? Yes	
Comment :	newspapers and on L	al states that consultation would be by way of public notice in local ane Cove Council's website and/or that of the DP&I, in addition to being notified in writing.
	additional consultation	al also states that "it is anticipated" the proponents would carry out on "using established methods set out and recommended by Lane e are not clear, but the Gateway Determination can specify nents.

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 : Note: In the original submission, a number of required items were missing and so the PP was incomplete when originally lodged. These items have now been received.

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation The Lane Cove LEP 2009 was notified in February 2010. to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal : The Planning Proposal indicates that it is a result of Lane Cove DCP 2009 which identifies the Northwood precinct areas as "fragmented" with no strong sense of place and little activation of street frontages. The DCP suggests that residential development of up to 4 storeys could be permitted in this area, but LEP 2009 does not reflect this. LEP 2009 includes an FSR of 1:1 and a 9.5m height control (in the B1-zoned land); and an FSR of 0.8:1 and a 12.5m height control (in the R4-zoned land), effectively limiting development to 3 storeys. The Planning Proposal would:

- contribute to implementing the desired outcomes of the draft INSS, including delivery of more housing with good access to shops, recreation, transport and open space; and - contribute to the implementation of the DCP, facilitating a greater activation of street frontages and generally creating a sense of place that does not currently exist.

Therefore, the proposed controls for the precinct should be supported as they will assist Council in achieving greater development potential consistent with the affordable housing objectives of the INSS and its DCP 2009.

Consistency with strategic planning	1. Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 (Metro Plan) and draft Inner North Subregional Strategy (INSS):
framework :	
	For the Metro Plan -
	Action B1.1 acknowledges that centres can grow and change over time to provide
	additional housing, employment and services, and development will occur within the
	walking catchments of centres. LEPs will be used to provide the mechanism for the
	desired growth.
	Comment:
	With the exception of the two residential lots at its northern end, the site is located in the
	Northwood Neighbourhood Centre (identified by Lane Cove DCP 2009). The Planning
	Proposal would allow the centre to change and grow, facilitating additional housing,
	employment and services, as well as improved amenity.
	Action B1.3 aims to locate 80% of all new housing within the walking catchments of
	existing and planned centres of all sizes with good public transport.
	Comment:
	The site is within an existing identified centre, and is located in close proximity to Sydney
	Buses routes 253 and 254, providing access to St Leonards and Artarmon railway stations.
	Buses routes 255 and 254, providing access to 51 Leonards and Artamion ranway stations.
	For the INSS -
	The INSS identifies 6,500 additional jobs and 3,900 new dwellings would be required for
	the Lane Cove LGA by 2031. Action C1.3.1 requires Inner North councils to plan for
	sufficient zoned land to accommodate their LGA housing targets through Principal LEPs.
	Commont.
	Comment:
	The rezoning of the identified portions of the site and the amendments to FSR and height
	controls would facilitate a significant contribution towards meeting the INSS housing
	targets.
	Action C2.1.2 requires Councils to ensure that the majority of new dwellings are located in
	strategic and local centres; and Action C2.3.2 requires the provision of a range of
	residential zones to cater for changing housing needs.
	Comment:
	The site is within an existing identified centre and the Planning Proposal would facilitate
	opportunities for residential development to accommodate the housing needs of Sydney's
	increasing population and variety of household types and sizes.
	Action C3.1.1 peaks to appour and improvement and appropriate renewal of local centers
	Action C3.1.1 seeks to encourage improvement and appropriate renewal of local centres.
	Comment:
	The Planning Proposal would facilitate an opportunity to improve and renew the centre by
	the creation of a sense of place, improvements to amenity, the provision of new housing
	and a variety of other land uses to meet the day to day needs of the local population.
	Therefore, the Planning Proposal is consistent with the above Metro Plan and INSS Actions
	as it would:
	- result in change and growth of an existing centre, providing additional housing and
	amenities/services;
	- contribute to meeting INSS housing targets, and to meeting changing housing needs;
	- contribute to meeting INSS employment targets (construction and on-going retail opportunities);
	- result in development within walking catchment of a centre;
	- be located in close proximity to public transport; and
	- have the potential to improve and renew an existing centre.

2. Local strategic Plans:

The Planning Proposal is considered consistent with the Draft Lane Cove Community Strategic Plan, the Lane Cove Social Plan (2005), the Lane Cove Cultural Plan (2004) and the Lane Cove Sustainability Plan.

3.Section 117 Directions:

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones

The Planning Proposal is considered consistent with this Direction as it involves increasing the current FSR and height controls, but does not involve any change to the current B1 zoning, other than the extension of it. The proposed increases in FSR and height controls will allow an intensification of business use and an increase in commercial and retail floorspace, potentially providing an increase in employment opportunities.

2.1 Environment Protection Zones:

The Planning Proposal is inconsistent with this Direction, as it does not include provisions that facilitate the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas. The submitted Ecology Assessment (EA) concludes there are no threatened plants on the site or within the adjoining open space reserve, and where not covered by concrete, the site is infested with exotic weeds. The EA also concludes that the land is not environmentally sensitive. Therefore, the inconsistency is justified.

3.1 Residential Zones

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction, as it will encourage the provision of housing and housing choice in accordance with the requirements and objectives of the Direction.

3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction due to the site's accessible location, enabling it to achieve the objectives of this Direction.

4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction as it facilitates an appropriate Asset Protection Zone (APZ) providing bushfire protection to adjoining properties, which is currently lacking. The submitted Ecological Assessment concludes that any post-LEP amendment development could be constructed in accordance with current ecological and bushfire legislation, and the Planning Proposal complies with all necessary bushfire requirements.

6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements

The Planning Proposal is considered consistent with this Direction as it is not intended to provide any additional approval or referral requirements as specified in the Direction.

6.3 Site Specific Provisions

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with this Direction, as it is not proposing any unnecessarily restrictive site-specific planning controls. Whilst the Planning Proposal seeks to amend Schedule 1 of the LEP, this site-specific provision is not restrictive, as it would allow an increase in the provision of retail floorspace from the current maximum of 400sqm up to a maximum of 1,000sqm.

7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with the Direction, as discussed in relation to the proposal's consistency with the Metro Plan and INSS above.

1. Environmental Impacts:

a) Critical habitats:

Environmental social

economic impacts :

Given the largely developed state of the site, it is unlikely the Proposal will adversely affect critical habitats, threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats. The submitted Ecology Assessment confirms that the proposed development would result in a positive ecological outcome.

b) Flood-related issues:

The site is not located in close proximity to an existing watercourse and is shown as outside of an area of riparian land on Council's Environmental Proection/Foreshore Building Line/Riparian Land Map.

c) Contamination:

Refer to the proposal's consistency with SEPP 55 above.

d) Traffic generation:

The Planning Proposal includes a supportive Traffic Assessment and a letter from NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS). The Traffic Assessment advises that the impacts associated with the proposal, including impacts upon nearby intersections, are considered moderate and manageable. The RMS letter confirms "in principle agreement" to the construction and signalisation of a fourth leg of the Kenneth Street/Northwood Road intersection, subject to certain technical requirements to be met at the DA stage.

e)Land Use/Amenity conflicts:

It is likely that the amenity of future occupiers of residential development on the site will be of a reasonable standard. However, there may be potential for adverse impacts upon neighbouring/nearby residential properties, such as overshadowing. Such impacts will need to be addressed at the DA stage, and are unlikely to be significant.

f) Heritage

The Planning Proposal does not refer to any heritage impacts. Given that there could be potential for heritage (aboriginal) impacts within the E2 zoned land, a heritage impact assessment should be carried out, as a condition of the Gateway Determination.

2. Economic impacts:

Impact on existing nearby centres:

An Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) and a Northwood Centre Analysis (NCA) have been provided with the Planning Proposal, and justify the provision of a medium sized supermarket. The NCA states that the presence of a medium sized supermarket at the site will improve the level of supermarket convenience for the LGA without impact upon Council's established retail hierarchy, and which will not compromise the economic viability of the the Lane Cove town centre.

3. Social Impacts:

The rezoning of the site would enable a contribution towards meeting the demand for residential accommodation resulting from Sydney's increasing population, with potential to broaden the range of housing stock in the LGA. With an appropriate level and mix of commercial, residential and community uses permissible on the site, there will be potential to provide for the day to day needs of both any incoming population and the existing local population. The Planning Proposal would also facilitate improvements to the level of activity and amenity of the site and the surrounding area.

Assessment Process

Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
Timeframe to make LEP :	12 Month	Delegation :	RPA
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Sydney Metropolitan Catchmen Office of Environment and Herit Fire and Rescue NSW NSW Rural Fire Service Transport for NSW - Roads and Sydney Water Adjoining LGAs	tage	

Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? No	
(2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? Yes	
If no, provide reasons :	
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No	
If Yes, reasons :	
Identify any additional studies, if required. :	
Heritage	
Other - provide details below If Other, provide reasons :	a į
Contamination Investigation/Assessment:	
As a petrol service station is currently located on the site, the land could potentially be contaminated. The	
Planning Proposal indicates that such an investigation could be carried out if required.	
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
Council request for delegation.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	No
49196 12 Northwood Centre Economic Feasibility	Study	No
Study, Jumar.pdf		
64118 12 Covering letter to Department for Northwood	Proposal Covering Letter	No
planni.pdf		
Planning Proposal - 4-16 Northwood Road 274 and 274a	Proposal	No
Longuev.pdf		
PR108802-01-005a Northwood LEP - Proposed Floor	Мар	No
Space Ratio Map - Final for Panel Feb 2013.pdf		
PR108802-01-005a Northwood LEP - Proposed Height of	Мар	No
Buildings Map - Final for Panel Feb 2013.pdf		
PR108802-01-005a Northwood LEP - Proposed Zoning	Мар	No
Map - Final for Panel Feb 2013.pdf		
Planning Proposal - Appendix B.pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix C (part 1).pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix C (part 2).pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix C (part 3).pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix C (part 4).pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix D.pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix E - Traffic Assessment in	Study	No
full recd 1 Feb 2013.pdf		
Planning Proposal - Appendix F.pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix F - Missing pages	Study	No
rec'dpdf		
Planning Proposal - Appendix G.pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix H.pdf	Study	No
Planning Proposal - Appendix I.pdf	Drawing	No

Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions

- S.117 directions:
- 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
- 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
- 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.3 Home Occupations
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection
- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Additional Information :

The Planning Proposal should be supported, and Council be given the Director-General's delegation. The Planning Proposal should proceed with the following conditions:

1. Council is to comply with the requirements of clause 28 of State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 - Design Quality of Residential Flat Development and ensure that the required provision(s) is/are publicly exhibited with the Planning Proposal in accordance with the consultation requirements below.

2. Council is to provide a heritage impact assessment addressing any potential heritage impacts (including impacts on aboriginal heritage) and ensure that the study is publicly exhibited with the Planning Proposal in accordance with the consultation requirements below.

3. Council is to prepare the necessary proposed zoning, floor space ratios and height of building maps in accordance with the Standard Technical Requirements for LEP Maps (DP&I, November 2012), and correct the proposed zoning map to indicate zoning of adjoining and nearby land is consistent with the gazetted Lane Cove LEP 2009. Council is to ensure that these maps are exhibited with the Planning Proposal in accordance with the consultation requirements below.

4. Comunity consultation is required under sections 56(2) and 57 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ('EP&A Act') as follows:

(a) the Planning Proposal and all associated studies/assessment reports must be made publicly available for 28 days; and

(b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for material that must be made publicly available as identified in the current A Guide to Preparing LEPs (DP&I).

5. Consultation is required with the following public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the EP&A Act:

- Sydney Metropolitan Catchment Management Authority
- Office of Environment and Heritage
- Fire and Rescue NSW
- NSW Rural Fire Service
- Transport for NSW Roads and Maritime Services
- Sydney Water
- Adjoining LGAs

Each public authority is to be provided with a copy of the Planning Proposal and any relevant supporting material. Each public authority is to be given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal, or to indicate that they will require additional time to comment on the proposal. Public authorities may request additional information or additional matters to be addressed in the planning proposal.

6. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the EP&A Act. This does not discharge Council from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing.

	7.The timeframe for completing the LEP is 12 months from week following the date of the Gateway Determination.
Supporting Reasons	Delegations:
	Council has confirmed its intention to exercise the Department's delegations relating to the finalisation of LEPs, and has formally requested that Council be permitted to exercise delegation for this Planning Proposal and that Council be permitted to sub-delegate the plan-making responsibility to the General Manager. Council has submitted a completed 'Evaluation criteria for the issuing of an Authorisation', the responses to which have been assessed and agreed by the Regional Team. Furthermore, the Planning Proposal is considered a matter of local planning significance.
	Therefore, it is recommended that Council be permitted to exercise this delegation.
Signature:	Malderswint
	Marca 1/2/12/2013
Printed Name:	110000000 + 100000000000000000000000000

1