

PLANNING PROPOSAL

HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENT TO STRATHFIELD LEP 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
1.0 Objectives and Intended Outcomes	2
2.0 Explanation of Provisions	3
3.0 Justification	4
Section A: Need for the Planning Proposal	4
Section B: Relationship to Strategic Planning Framework	4
Section C: Environmental, Social and Economic impact	5
Section: D State and Commonwealth Interests	6
4.0 Mapping	7
5.0 Community Consultation	8
6.0 Project Timeline	9
Appendix A – Proposed Housekeeping LEP Amendments	10
Appendix B - SEPPs	30
Appendix C – Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)	33
Appendix D – Proposed LEP Maps in Standard Format	35

Introduction

The *Strathfield Local Environmental Plan 2012* (SLEP 2012) was gazetted on 15 March 2013. Since the commencement of SLEP 2012, Council Officers have become aware of several minor anomalies within the SLEP 2012 maps and written instrument. This housekeeping amendment to SLEP 2012 has been prepared to address these minor issues to improve the operation and accuracy of the plan.

A Section 73A amending environmental planning instrument was previously completed by Strathfield Council as the delegated authority from the Department of Planning & Environment (the Department) in January 2015. In accordance with the advice from the Department, some elements initially proposed to be included in that submission were postponed to this housekeeping amendment subject to Community Consultation.

In summary, this Housekeeping Planning Proposal intends to correct eight (8) minor anomalies, which are as follows:

- 1. Missing building height and Floor Space Ratio at southern end of Enfield Intermodal Logistics Centre (ILC)
- 2. Error in building height at 2-26 Telopea Avenue, Homebush West
- 3. Missing Floor Space Ratio at Weeroona Road Industrial Precinct
- 4. Missing Floor Space Ratio at 415 Liverpool Road, Strathfield
- 5. Error in Floor Space Ratio at 14 Rochester Street and 55 Rochester Street, Homebush
- 6. Error in identifying location of St. Columba's Anglican Church on Heritage Map
- 7. Error in incentive building height controls for Key Site 74 and Key Site 75
- 8. Discrepancy between written instrument and Parramatta Road Key Sites map due to previously removed key sites

1.0 Objectives and Intended Outcomes

The objective of this Planning Proposal is to correct minor anomalies within SLEP 2012, its associated maps and written instrument.

The intended outcomes of this Planning Proposal are:

- 1. To ensure that Strathfield Council's strategic intentions in relation to its planning controls are achieved;
- To ensure that the height of buildings (HOB) and/or Floor Space Ratio (FSR) controls are consistent with their zoning for the Enfield ILC site, 2-26 Telopea Avenue, Homebush, 415 Liverpool Road, Strathfield, 14 & 55 Rochester Street, Homebush;
- 3. To ensure the address and property description accurately reflect the heritage item for St Columba's Anglican Church (I61 in Schedule 5 Environmental Heritage);
- 4. To align the HOB maps with Clause 4.3A of the SLEP 2012; and
- 5. To amend Clause 4.4A to be consistent with earlier LEP Amendment No.2 for 222-242 Parramatta Road, Homebush West.

2.0 Explanation of Provisions

The table below outlines the anomalies to be addressed by this Planning Proposal (please also refer to Appendix A for more details).

ltem	Section of SLEP 2012	Site Address	Description of Proposed Amendments
4	Height of Buildings and Floor Space Ratio Maps Sheets 3 and 6	Enfield ILC	Amend the height of buildings controls and FSR controls that follow the zoning boundary of IN1 Industrial & RE2 Private Recreation zoning.
			Amend Height of Buildings (HOB) maps by inserting label 'M' for height of 12m consistent with other IN1 zones.
			Amend Floor Space Ratio (FSR) maps by inserting label 'N' for FSR of 1:1 consistent with other IN1 zones.
2	Height of Buildings Map Sheet 1	2-26 Telopea Avenue, Homebush West	Amend HOB map by inserting label 'J' for height of 9.5m consistent with the other surrounding R3-zoned properties.
3	Floor Space Ratio Map Sheet 2	1-36 Weeroona Road, Strathfield	Amend FSR maps by inserting 'N' for FSR of 1:1 consistent with the standard FSR controls on other IN1 zoned properties.
4	Floor Space Ratio Map Sheet 6	415 Liverpool Road, Strathfield	Amend FSR map for 415 Liverpool Rd by inserting label "G" for FSR of 0.65:1 consistent with the surrounding properties.
5	Floor Space Ratio Map Sheet 5	14 and 55 Rochester Street, Homebush	Amend FSR map for 14 Rochester St and 55 Rochester St by inserting label "P" for FSR of 1.2:1 consistent with the surrounding properties.
6	Heritage Map Sheet 1 and Schedule 5	11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West	Amend the Heritage Map and associated Schedule 5 to reflect the correct location of Heritage Item I61 (i.e. 11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West instead of 13 Hornsey Road, Homebush West).
7	Height of Buildings Map	17-22 Loftus Crescent,	Amend the incentive HOB controls

	Sheet 4 and Clause 4.3A	Homebush	boundary applicable to 17-19 Loftus Crescent, Homebush and associated Clause 4.3A description.
8	Written Instrument Clause 4.4A	N/A	Remove reference to the deleted Key Sites 34, 35 and 36 from Clause 4.4A <i>Exceptions to Floor Space Ratio</i> (<i>Parramatta Road Corridor</i>) in the written instrument.

3.0 Justification

Section A: Need for the Planning Proposal

3.1 Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

The Planning Proposal is a housekeeping LEP amendment, therefore it is not based on a specific strategic study or report. The Planning Proposal results from Council staff implementing and reviewing SLEP 2012 and identifying minor anomalies in the written instrument and its associated maps and tables.

The proposed amendment to Schedule 5 Environment & Heritage and associated Heritage map is based on the Heritage inventory sheet extracted from the Heritage Study undertaken by Council in the mid 1980s. This amendment intends to rectify the incorrect site address and to align the heritage listing with the heritage inventory sheet.

3.2 Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

This Housekeeping Planning Proposal is considered to be the best means of achieving the objectives and intended outcomes. The Planning Proposal process addresses these anomalies in the most appropriate, efficient and time effective way.

No other alternative approaches could be reasonably identified to amend the SLEP 2012.

Section B: Relationship to Strategic Planning Framework

3.3 Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions contained within the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?

The SLEP 2012 has addressed all of the objectives and actions as outlined in A Plan for Growing Sydney (*Sydney's Metropolitan Strategy*) and the draft Inner West *Subregional Strategy*. The proposed amendments contained in this Housekeeping Planning Proposals are considered administrative and minor in nature.

These proposed amendments will further strengthen the operation of SLEP 2012 and assist in achieving the objectives and priorities set in the Metropolitan Strategy and the draft subregional strategy.

3.4 Is the planning proposal consistent with a local council's local strategy, or other local strategic plan?

Strathfield's current strategic plan, Strathfield 2025 Community Strategic Plan, was formulated based on five (5) broad themes, including connectivity, community wellbeing, prosperity and opportunities, liveable neighbourhoods and responsible leadership.

The Planning Proposal is consistent with Strathfield's Community Strategic Plan (*Strathfield 2025*), particularly having regard to the following two goals under liveable neighbourhoods theme:

- Goal 4.1.1 Strathfield's planned environment is highly liveable with quality and sustainable development incorporating best practice design
- Goal 4.1.2 Council offers informative and accessible planning services and programs that streamline service delivery.

The Housekeeping amendment is a result of the continuous review of Council planning controls to ensure improved clarity and smooth implementation. This will assist in achieving the intended outcome as outlined in Goal 4.1.1 consistently across the local government area. It also assists Council Officers in providing a consistent and accurate interpretation of the policy as directed in Goal 4.1.2.

3.5 Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable state environmental planning policies?

The Planning Proposal is generally consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies. Please see Appendix B, which addresses this issue in full.

3.6 Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions?)

The Planning Proposal is generally consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions). Please see Appendix C, which addresses this issue in full.

Section C: Environmental, Social and Economic impact

3.7 Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

Given the nature of these housekeeping amendments, it is highly unlikely that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats will be adversely affected as a result of this Planning Proposal.

3.8 Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

No other likely environmental effects as a result of this Planning Proposal are identified.

3.9 How has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

As the changes are minor and largely administrative in nature, it is not considered that the Planning Proposal will have any adverse social and/or economic effects. Notwithstanding, the housekeeping amendments will ensure effective operation of the SLEP 2012, therefore providing positive social and economic outcomes as originally intended by the SLEP 2012.

Section: D State and Commonwealth Interests

3.10 Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

This Planning Proposal does not create additional demand on public utilities or services. Therefore, it is considered that there is adequate public infrastructure for the outcomes of the Planning Proposal.

3.11 What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination?

Given the nature of this Planning Proposal, specific preliminary consultation with State and Commonwealth public authorities has not yet been undertaken. Consultation with relevant public agencies and subject landowners will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Gateway Determination.

4.0 Mapping

This Planning Proposal addresses seven (7) specific sites within Strathfield Council that require mapping amendments as outlined in Section 2.0 Explanation of Provisions.

Relevant supporting mapping information such as aerial photographs, existing LEP maps and proposed LEP amendment map extracts are also included with the relevant amendment item in **Appendix A**.

In summary, the proposed mapping amendments relate to the following nine (9) LEP maps:

- HOB Sheet 1
- HOB Sheet 3
- HOB Sheet 4
- HOB Sheet 6
- FSR Sheet 2
- FSR Sheet 3
- FSR Sheet 5
- FSR Sheet 6
- HER Sheet 1

The proposed LEP mapping amendments have been prepared in accordance with the Department's Guidelines *Standard Technical Requirements for LEP maps*. Please see **Appendix D** for Proposed LEP Map Sheets in the standard format.

5.0 Community Consultation

The Housekeeping Planning proposal is considered to be low impact as defined in section 4.5 Community Consultation of the Department of Planning's guidelines to preparing a Local Environmental Plan. The proposed amendments are administrative in nature, are consistent with the existing strategic planning framework and present no issues with regard to infrastructure servicing. Therefore it is recommended the Planning Proposal (PP) be placed on public exhibition for a period of 14 days.

Following the Gateway Determination, it is suggested that the public exhibition will be generally undertaken as follows:

- Notification in a regional newspaper (e.g. Inner West Courier);
- Notification on Council's website providing electronic copy of the PP and relevant information;
- Hard copy of PP available at Council administration building, Strathfield Main Library and High Street Community Library;
- Notification letter to affected landowners where practical; and
- Any other consultation requirement as per the Gateway Determination.

6.0 Project Timeline

MILESTONE	May – 16	Jun – 16	Jul – 16	Aug – 16	Sep – 16	Oct – 16	Nov – 16
Anticipated submission to the Department							
Anticipated commencement date (date of Gateway determination)							
Anticipated timeframe for the completion of required technical information				N/A			
Timeframe for government agency consultation (pre and post exhibition as required by Gateway determination)							
Commencement and completion dates for public exhibition period							
Dates for public hearing (if required)				N/A			
Timeframe for consideration of submissions							
Timeframe for the consideration of a proposal post exhibition							
Date of submission to the department to finalise the LEP							
Anticipated date Council will make the plan (if delegated)							
Anticipated date Council will forward to the department for notification							

Appendix A – Proposed Housekeeping LEP Amendments

Item 1 – Align HOB	and FSR boundaries for southern section of Enfield ILC
Intended Outcomes	Amend HOB and FSR maps to match existing zone boundaries between RE2 Private Recreation and IN1 General Industrial for the southern section of the Enfield Intermodal Logistics Centre (ILC) site
Site Address	Southern section of the Enfield ILC site (Lot 19 DP 1183316 and part Lot 12 DP 1183316) – see below locality map for details
Comment	In Council's Section 68 submission for the draft LEP 2011, Council recommended minor adjustments be made to boundary between IN1 zone and RE1 zone (then subsequently changed to RE2 by the Department) to more accurately reflect the southern extent of the Warehouse Distribution Areas and Empty Storage Areas in the Enfield ILC Part 3A Project Approval modifications to date. However, the associated changes to alignment of HOB and FSR were not incorporated in the final LEP 2012.
	Therefore, this amendment will correct this oversight and ensure the consistency between the zoning and its associated applicable HOB and FSR.
Drafting recommendations	Adjust the HOB and FSR boundaries on the Map Sheet 3 and 6 respectively to match the existing IN1 and RE2 zoning boundary
Locality Map	enter ente enter enter







Item 2 – Correct HC	DB Map for 2-26 Telopea Avenue, Homebush West
Intended Outcomes	Amend HOB map to align with the height of buildings controls of the surrounding R3 Medium Residential zoned sites
Site Address	2-26 Telopea Avenue, Homebush (Lot 104-116, DP 11427) – see below locality plan for details
Comment	As a result of community consultation, in Council's Section 68 submission for the draft LEP 2011, Council recommended the proposed zoning IN2 Light Industrial for Telopea Ave precinct be reverted back to R3 Medium Density Residential and associated HOB and FSR controls be amended accordingly (e.g. 9.5m and 0.65:1 FSR).
	The Department carried forward most of the above changes in finalising the SLEP 2012 except the HOB controls for 2-26 Telopea Avenue, Homebush West.
	Therefore, this amendment will ensure the HOB for 2-26 Telopea Ave is consistent with the surrounding R3 zoned sites and the original Section 68 submission for the SLEP 2012.
Drafting recommendations	Amend HOB Map Sheet 1 by inserting label 'J' for height of 9.5m consistent with the other surrounding R3 zoned sites.
Locality Map	



Item 3 – Correct FS	R Map for 1-36 Weeroona Road, Strathfield
Intended Outcomes	Apply standard FSR of 1:1 to IN1 General Industrial zoned site at 1-36 Weeroona Road, Strathfield
Site Address	1-36 Weeroona Road, Strathfield (Lot 70, DP 1140766; Lot 5, DP 786128 & Lot 234, DP 786128) – see below locality plan for details
Comment	Weeroona Road Precinct is one of the Industrial Precincts in the Strathfield LGA. The Council's depot and Australia Post's Distributions Centre are located in this precinct.
	Currently, no FSR is applicable for the subject sites zoned as IN1 General Industrial. However, SLEP 2012 provides standard FSR control of 1:1 for IN1 zoned properties across the LGA to ensure the industrial redevelopment is appropriately scaled.
	Therefore, this amendment will ensure the FSR is consistently applied across all IN1 zoned sites.
Drafting recommendations	Amend FSR map Sheet 2 by inserting 'N' for FSR of 1:1 consistent with the standard FSR controls in other IN1 zoned sites across the LGA.
Locality Map	



Item 4 – Correct FS	R Map for 415 Liverpool Road, Strathfield
Intended Outcomes	Apply FSR of 0:65 to the existing 2-story multi-unit dwelling site at 415 Liverpool Road, Strathfield
Site Address	415 Liverpool Road, Strathfield (SP 7275) – see below locality plan for details
Comment	The residential precinct along the north & western side of Liverpool Road containing the subject site is currently zoned R3 Medium Density Residential with an associated height of 9.5m and FSR of 0.65:1.
	A drafting error occurred in the formulation of SLEP 2012 resulting in the subject site being zoned R3 with a height of 9.5m, whilst no FSR is applicable.
	This amendment intends to correct this drafting error.
Drafting recommendations	Amend the FSR Map Sheet 6 for 415 Liverpool Rd, Strathfield by inserting label "G" for an FSR of 0.65:1 consistent with the surrounding properties.
Locality Map	



Item 5 – Correct FS	R Map for 14, 55 Rochester Street, Homebush
Intended Outcomes	Apply FSR of 1.2:1 to the R3 zoned sites at 14 and 55 Rochester Street, Homebush consistent with the adjoining R3 zoned properties.
Site Address	14 and 55 Rochester Street, Homebush (Lot F, DP 435796 and Lot A, DP 900294) – see below locality plan for details
Comment	The subject properties are located at the southern fringe of the Homebush Village Centre which is currently zoned R3 Medium Density Residential with an associated height of 11m, and FSR 1.2:1.
	A drafting error occurred in the formulation of SLEP 2012 resulting in the subject site being zoned R3 with a height of 9.5m, whilst no FSR is applicable.
	This amendment intends to correct this drafting error.
Drafting recommendations	Amend the FSR Map Sheet 5 by inserting label "P" for an FSR of 1.2:1 consistent with the adjoining R3 zoned properties.
Locality Map	





Item 6 – Correct He	ritage Map for 11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West
Intended Outcomes	To reflect the accurate location of the heritage item named St Columba's Anglican Church.
Site Address	Corrected address: 11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West (Lot 13 Section 11 DP 827)
Comment	The item of St Columba's Anglican Church was identified by Council's Heritage Study (1986-1988) by heritage consultants Michael Fox & Associates.
	As a result of this study, a heritage inventory sheet was prepared and this item, together with other heritage items, was included in Schedule 9 of the previous Strathfield Planning Scheme Ordinance 1969.
	Based on the property description provided in the heritage inventory sheet (see below), the item address of 13 Hornsey Road, Homebush West in Schedule 5 of SLEP 2012 was incorrect.
	13 Hornsey Road, Homebush West is a one storey double-brick rectory site (see photograph below).
	The correct location of the item should be 11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West, which reflects the significance of the heritage item as described in the inventory sheet (see photograph below).
	On 22 September 2015, a site visit was undertaken by Council's Heritage consultant (Lester Tropman) with the property owner, confirming the heritage significance of 11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West and reiterating his support of the heritage listing (see minutes below).
	This amendment intends to rectify the item address and associated LEP Heritage mapping to ensure the location of the item is accurately mapped.
Drafting recommendations	Amend the Heritage Map and related Schedule 5 description to reflect the correct location of Heritage Item I61.

Inventory Sheet &			
Minutes	STRATHFIELD HERITAGE STUDY ITEM IDENTIFICATION SHEET	INVENIORY ITEM NO.	
	NAME ST. COLUMBA'S ANGLICAN CHURCH.	MAP REF.	Tropman & Tropman Architects
	ADDRESS 13 Hornbey Road, Homebush West	SITE INFORMATION	Woong House 55 Lower Fon Dines Sydney NOW 2000 www.mbomarasheads.com.au Fax: (02) 0291 6109 Phone: (02) 9291 3260 E-mail tropman@bigpont.net.au
	OWNERS / OCCUPANTS		MEMORANDUM
	DESCRIPTION, HISTORY, SIGNIFICANCE IN 1009 Strathiold Natia population of approximately 1,002, About Holf the population was ampliess and Columbus, on the correct of Destate Road, was con- structed of brick with a galie life reaf. It was built in contrasting backward, burlet constrained by the contrasting backward, burlet constrained by the population of the second state of the constraint in the second state of the second state of the population of the second state of the second state burlet burlets and a brick fence. The fundation of the second state of the second state of the second function of second state of the second state of the second state of second state of the second	TYPE OF ITEM Church PERIOD	PROJECT 11 Homsey Road, Homebush West DATE 20 October 2015 ATTENTION REF. L155
	Columba's, on the corper of Exeter Road, was con- structed of brick with a gable tile roof. It was built in 1905, Elements include atched too windows with	IBL7 - 13/5 THEMATIC CONTEXT	ATTENTION Subject Heritage Advisory Notes Broughton Road, PROJECT 0607 No. No.
	contrasting brickwork, brick tower with a copper spire brick buttesses and a brick fence. The foundation forme was laid by Frederick M. Darley, Linutanan former for a the brockmone that so	" Suborban Development	FROM Lester Tropman TOTAL PAGES 1
	local significance as a small church that served the early Church of Snyland Posish in the Homebush West locality, it helps in illustrain the Suburban develop		Strathfield Heritage Advisory - Site Visit 22 nd September 2015 Atlanded by Sarah Baker, Strategic Planner, and Lester Tropman, Heritage Advisory.
		and the second se	Address: St. Columba's Church, 11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West Item: Strathled LEP Item 161 – St. Columbis's Anglican Church Représenting Ownet: Thes and Sue (St. Anim's Anglican Church)
	REFERENCES	PREVIOUS LISTINGS State Heritage	 The main question was regarding the heritage listing of the church building, and heritage expert's advice regarding de-listing the property (i.e. to facilitate sale)
	density $W_{\rm es}=-^{0}\Omega_{\rm H}$ in the West-T, 1905.	P.V.0	 Letter has advised on this matter in the past, and reiterated his support of the heritage listing. He said that despite necessary maintenance and repart, the building is stractive, structurally sound and does not appear to be affected by dame.
	PHOTOGRAPH Film No. (1754) Segative No. 22	National Estate	 Discussion about the main church building, particularly its relationship to the addition and the secondary building on the west end of the site.
		National Trust Classified	Finding a suitable use for the space was discussed
		Dther BAIA	
	1 0 2 11 1	P.W.D	Lesser Tropman
		SIGNIFICANCE	
		State	
		DATE	
	UNDERTAREN FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND STRATHFIELD MUNICIPAL COUNCIL FOX & ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS/PLANNERS SYDNEY	AND PLANNING, BY 1021 27 1544	
Locality Map			





Item 7 – Correct HC	OB Map of incentive controls for Key Site 74, 75
Intended Outcomes	To amend the incentive HOB controls boundary applicable to 18-19 Loftus Crescent, Homebush (part KS 75) only.
Site Address	18-19 Loftus Crescent, Homebush
Comment	The subject site at 17-19 Loftus Crescent, Homebush forms Key Site 75. It is intended to provide incentive height controls for Key Site 75 should all the lots be consolidated for re-development. The zero metre height limit on 17 Loftus Crescent continues to apply with the strategic intent to improve Subway Lane access and to provide opportunities for public domain upgrade.
	The current incentive HOB control which is applicable to 18-20 Loftus Crescent is an obvious error as 20 Loftus Crescent is not part of Key Site 75. The revised incentive control should only apply to 18-19 Loftus Crescent, Homebush.
	This amendment is intended to align the incentive HOB controls boundary with the Key Site boundary between 74 and 75, whilst the 0m height limit is retained.
Locality Plan	



Item 8 – Remove Certain Key Sites reference		
Intended Outcomes	To amend Clause 4.4A to be consistent with earlier LEP Amendment No.2.	
Site Address	222-242 Parramatta Road, Homebush West	
Comment	LEP Amendment No.2 relates to the rezoning of certain Sydney Markets owned sites at the above address. It also included deletion of Key Sites 34, 35, 36 associated with the zoning changes. LEP Amendment No.2 included the Key Site map changes, however these Key Site references remain in Clause 4.4A. This amendment is intended to edit Clause 4.4A and to remove the	
	associated Key Site references resulting from the LEP Amendment No.2.	
Drafting recommendations	Remove reference to the deleted Key Sites 34, 35 and 36 from Clause 4.4A <i>Exceptions to Floor Space Ratio (Parramatta Road Corridor)</i> from the written instrument.	

Appendix B - SEPPs

SEPP Title	Comment
	Not applicable
o ,	
Development Standards	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 14-	Not applicable
Coastal Wetlands	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 15-	Not applicable
Rural Landsharing Communities	
· ······	
Olata Environmental Dispusing Dalian No. 40	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 19-	Not applicable
Bushland in Urban Areas	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 21-	Not applicable
Caravan Parks	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 26-	Not applicable
Littoral Rainforests	
State Environmental Planning Deliev No. 20	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy No 29-	not applicable
Western Sydney Recreation Area	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 30-	Not applicable
Intensive Agriculture	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 32-	
Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban	
Land)	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 33-	Not applicable
Hazardous and Offensive Development	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 36-	Not applicable
Manufactured Home Estates	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 39-	Not applicable
0, 1	
Spit Island Bird Habitat	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 44-	Not applicable
Koala Habitat Protection	
Ctate Environmental Dispring Delias No. 47	Natanaliashla
State Environmental Planning Policy No 47-	inot applicable
Moore Park Showground	
	۱

State Environmental Planning Policy No 50— Canal Estate Development	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy No 52— Farm Dams and Other Works in Land and Water Management Plan Areas	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 55— Remediation of Land	This Planning Proposal does not hinder the application of this SEPP.
State Environmental Planning Policy No 59– Central Western Sydney Regional Open Space and Residential	
State Environmental Planning Policy No 62— Sustainable Aquaculture	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy No 64— Advertising and Signage	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy No 65— Design Quality of Residential Flat Development	J
State Environmental Planning Policy No 70— Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy No 71— Coastal Protection	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009	This Planning Proposal does not hinder the application of this SEPP.
State Environmental Planning Policy (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004	This Planning Proposal does not hinder the application of this SEPP.
State Environmental Planning Policy (Exemption and Complying Development Codes) 2008	This Planning Proposal does not hinder the application of this SEPP.
State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007	Consistent.
State Environmental Planning Policy (Kosciuszko National Park—Alpine Resorts) 2007	Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy (Kurnel Peninsula) 1989	Not applicable

State Environmental Planning Policy (Major This Planning Proposal does not hinder the application of this SEPP. State Environmental Planning Policy (Mining, Not applicable
State Environmental Planning Policy (Mining Not applicable
Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007
State Environmental Planning PolicyNot applicable (Miscellaneous Consent Provisions) 2007
State Environmental Planning Policy (PenrithNot applicable Lakes Scheme) 1989
State Environmental Planning Policy (RuralNot applicable Lands) 2008
State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP 53Not applicable Transitional Provisions) 2011
State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Not applicable Regional Development) 2011
State Environmental Planning Policy (SydneyNot applicable Drinking Water Catchment) 2011
State Environmental Planning Policy (SydneyNot applicable Region Growth Centres) 2006
State Environmental Planning Policy (ThreeNot applicable Ports) 2013
State Environmental Planning Policy (Urban Not applicable Renewal) 2010
State Environmental Planning Policy (WesternNot applicable Sydney Employment Area) 2009
State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Not applicable Sydney Parklands) 2009

Appendix C – Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)

No.	Title	Comment
1	Employment & Resources	
1.1	Business and Industrial Zones	Consistent.
		This amendment does not involve rezoning that affect the areas or locations of existing business zones. It does seek to apply the standard FSR control 1:1 to Weeroona Road Industrial precinct which is consistent with other IN1 zoned industrial sites.
1.2	Rural Zones	Not applicable
1.3	Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries	Not applicable
1.5	Oyster Aquaculture	Not applicable
2	Environmental and Heritage	
2.1	Environment Protection Zones	Not applicable
2.2	Coastal Protection	Not applicable
2.3	Heritage Conservation	Consistent.
		This amendment seeks to provide heritage protection on the heritage item of St Columba's Anglican Church at 11 Hornsey Road, Homebush West, which was incorrectly identified on the Heritage LEP map and written instrument as 13 Hornsey Road, Homebush West.
2.4	Recreation Vehicle Areas	Not applicable
3	Housing, Infrastructure and Urban	
3.1	Residential Zones	Consistent.
		This amendment will not result in a loss of the net amount of land zoned residential nor affect the permissible residential density of the land. However, the proposed FSR changes in residential zoned land is intended to provide better clarity and consistency in the SLEP, and are minor in nature.
3.2	Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates	Not applicable
3.3	Home Occupations	Not applicable
3.4	Integrating Land Use and Transport	Not applicable
3.5	Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	Not applicable
3.6	Shooting Ranges	Not applicable
4	Hazard and Risk	
4.1	Acid Sulfate Soils	Not applicable as the subject site is not affected by Acid Sulfate Soils
4.2	Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	Not applicable
4.3	Flood Prone Land	Not applicable
4.4	Planning for Bushfire Protection	Not applicable
5	Regional Planning	
5.1	Implementation of Regional Strategies	Not applicable
5.2	Sydney Drinking Water Catchments	Not applicable
5.3	Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast	Not applicable

Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast Not applicable 5.5 Development in the vicinity of Ellalong, Paxton and Millfield (Cessnock LGA) Not applicable 5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.	54	Ormanial Datail	Nist sur Paskis
Highway, North Coast 5.5 Development in the vicinity of Ellalong, Paxton and Millfield (Cessnock LGA) Not applicable 5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Consistent. 6.1 Approval and Requirements Referral Purposes Consistent. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.	5.4	Commercial and Retail	Not applicable
5.5 Development in the vicinity of Ellalong, Paxton and Millfield (Cessnock LGA) Not applicable 5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6.1 Approval and Requirements Referral Purposes Consistent. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.			
Ellalong, Paxton and Milífield (Cessnock LGA) Not applicable 5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Consistent. 6.1 Approval and Requirements Referral Purposes Consistent. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.			
(Cessnock LGA) 5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Not applicable 6.1 Approval and Requirements Referral Consistent. Consistent. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.	5.5	Development in the vicinity of	Not applicable
5.6 Sydney to Canberra Corridor (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Consistent. Requirements Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.		Ellalong, Paxton and Millfield	
(Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Consistent. 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements Consistent. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.		(Cessnock LGA)	
amended Direction 5.1) 5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Consistent. 7 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent.	5.6	Sydney to Canberra Corridor	Not applicable
5.7 Central Coast (Revoked 10 July 2008. See amended Direction 5.1) Not applicable 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making Consistent. 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements Consistent. 7 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.		(Revoked 10 July 2008. See	
2008. See amended Direction 5.1 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy 6 Local Plan Making 6.1 Approval and Requirements 6.1 Approval and Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney		amended Direction 5.1)	
2008. See amended Direction 5.1 5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Badgerys Creek 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy 6 Local Plan Making 6.1 Approval and Requirements 6.1 Approval and Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney	5.7	Central Coast (Revoked 10 July	Not applicable
5.8 Second Sydney Airport: Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making 6 Local Plan Making 6 6.1 Approval and Referral Consistent. Requirements This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent. Consistent.		2008. See amended Direction	
Badgerys Creek Not applicable 5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements Consistent. 6.1 Reserving Land for Public Purposes This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.		5.1)	
5.9 North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Not applicable 6 Local Plan Making 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements Consistent. 6.1 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Consistent. 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.	5.8	Second Sydney Airport:	Not applicable
Strategy Image: Strategy 6 Local Plan Making 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. This planning direction. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.		Badgerys Creek	
6 Local Plan Making 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.	5.9	North West Rail Link Corridor	Not applicable
6.1Approval Requirementsand Referral RequirementsReferral Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction.6.2Reserving PurposesLand for Public PurposesNot applicable6.3Site Specific ProvisionsConsistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction.7Metropolitan Planning7.1Implementation of A Plan for Growing SydneyConsistent.			
Requirements This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This plann for Growing Sydney		Local Plan Making	
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not application of this local planning direction. 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning This plan for Growing Sydney	6.1	Approval and Referral	Consistent.
application of this local planning direction. 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. 7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney		Requirements	
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.			This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes Not applicable 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. 7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.			application of this local planning direction.
Purposes Consistent. 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Consistent. This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder application of this local planning direction. This planning direction. 7 Metropolitan Planning Consistent. 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney Consistent.	6.2	Reserving Land for Public	
7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney			
7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney	6.3	Site Specific Provisions	Consistent.
application of this local planning direction. 7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney			
application of this local planning direction. 7 Metropolitan Planning 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney			This planning proposal does not contradict or hinder
7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Consistent. Growing Sydney			
7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Consistent. Growing Sydney	7		
	7.1		Consistent.
This planning proposal is consistent with A Plan for Growing		Growing Sydney	
			This planning proposal is consistent with A Plan for Growing
Sydney.			

Appendix D – Proposed LEP Maps in Standard Format





BURWOOD LGA

CANTERBURY LGA





BURWOOD LGA











BURWOOD LGA

CANADA BAY LGA



