

laximum height of buildings - 2-4 Epping Road, Epping					
Proposal Title :	Maximum height	of buildings -	2-4 Epping Road, Epping		
Proposal Summ	ary To increase the r 17.5 metres to 26	-	ht of buildings for 2-4 Epp	ing Road, Epping, (inclusiv	/e) from
PP Number :	PP_2015_HORNS	S_001_00	Dop File No :	15/04450	
roposal Details					
Date Planning Proposal Receiv	04-Mar-2015 red :		LGA covered :	Hornsby	
Region :	Metro(Parra)		RPA :	The Council of the St	nire of Horn
State Electorate	EPPING		Section of the Act	55 - Planning Propos	al
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning				
Location Details	S				
Street :	2 Epping Road				
Suburb :	Epping	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2121	
Land Parcel :	Lot 1, DP 1192833				
Street :	4 Epping Road				
Suburb :	Epping	City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2121	
Land Parcel :	Lot 1, SP 16921				
DoP Planning	Officer Contact Deta	ils			
Contact Name :	Shane Nugent				
Contact Number	: 0298601173				
Contact Email :	shane.nugent@pla	anning.nsw.go	ov.au		
RPA Contact [Details				
Contact Name :	Lisa Newell				
Contact Number	0298476945				24
Contact Email :	inewell@hornsby.	nsw.gov.au			
DoP Project M	anager Contact Deta	-			
Contact Name :	Terry Doran				
Contact Number					<u>e</u>)
Contact Email :	terry.doran@plan		211		

Maximum height of buildings - 2-4 Epping Road, Epping

Land Release Data

Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro North subregion	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	ж.
No. of Lots :	0	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	35
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 regional planning team is no relation to this planning proposa		registered lobbyists in
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	In view of the previous rezoning proposal was discussed with the raised to the proposal proceeding	department's urban renewal	
External Supporting Notes :			
dequacy Assessmen	t		
Statement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a)		

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The intended outcomes of the proposal are to:

- resolve a planning anomaly that arose from the final Epping Town Centre Urban Activation Precinct Structure Plan and subsequent SEPP Amendment;
- provide a building height consistent with the outcomes for the subject properties identified in Council's adopted Epping Town Centre Study 2011, which is consistent with adjoining properties along Epping Road; and

- encourage redevelopment, avoid site isolation risk and maximise opportunities for better urban form and vehicle access opportunities.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment : The proposal is to amend the Height of Buildings Map of Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013 to increase the maximum building height for property nos 2-4 Epping Road, Epping, from the current 17.5 metres (approximately 5 storeys) to 26.5 metres (approximately 8 storeys).

Maximum height of buil	dings - 2-4 Epping F	Road, Epping
	permissible height, ar	ovisions does not make it clear that the height in metres is the legal nd the number of storeys is only an approximation. It is e clarified by Council prior to public exhibition.
	this or most other res	Environmental Plan 2013 does not apply floor space ratio controls to identially zoned land. As a result the increased height will permit a elopment - amendments to floor space ratio controls are not required.
Justification - s55 (2)	(c)	
a) Has Council's strategy	been agreed to by the D	irector General? No
b) S.117 directions identif	ied by RPA :	3.1 Residential Zones
* May need the Director G	Seneral's agreement	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney
Is the Director Genera	I's agreement required?	No
c) Consistent with Standa	rd Instrument (LEPs) Or	der 2006 : Yes
d) Which SEPPs have the	e 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 SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :		sal refers to the former S.117 Direction 7.1 requiring consistency n Plan for Sydney to 2036.
	Growing Sydney'. W	.1 requires consistency with the current Strategy, 'A Plan for /hile the proposal is not inconsistent with the revised Direction, it is roposal be amended by Council to address this prior to public
Have inconsistencies with	n items a), b) and d) bein	g adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :	-	of the above, the proposal is not inconsistent with any Section 117 Environmental Planning Policies.
Mapping Provided - s	55(2)(d)	
Is mapping provided? Yes	5	
Comm e nt :	•	ig proposal includes a location map and an extract from the Height proposed to be amended by the planning proposal.
	•	ired to produce maps consistent with the Department's Technical inalisation of the proposal.
Community consultat	tion - s55(2)(e)	
Has community consultat	ion been proposed? Yes	5
Comment :	Community consult	ation is proposed for a period of 28 days.
	This is supported.	
Additional Director G	eneral's requiremen	nts
Are there any additional I	Director General's require	ements? No
If Yes, reasons :		

Overall adequacy o	f the proposal				
Does the proposal mee	et the adequacy criteria?	? Yes			
If No, comment :					
oposal Assessment	t -			1	2
Principal LEP:					
Due Date :					
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	Hornsby LEP 2013	was notifie	d in 2013.		
Assessment Criteri	а				
Need for planning proposal :			naly in the current Hornsby L ject sites is less than that per		n
	A planning proposa	ıl is the oni	y way to increase the permitte	ed building height on the site	es.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	Epping Railway Sta	tion and a	ng Urban Activation Precinct wide range of public transpor isistent with the strategic pla	t opportunities. High density	,
Environmental social economic impacts :	habitats, threatened proposal permits a	d species, p modest inc	an established urban area w populations or ecological com rease in development density mental, economic or social in	munities, or their habitats. T y on the site, which is unlike	The
	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any signific	d species, p modest inc	oopulations or ecological con rease in development density	munities, or their habitats. T y on the site, which is unlike	The
economic impacts :	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any signific	d species, p modest inc	oopulations or ecological con rease in development density	munities, or their habitats. T y on the site, which is unlike	The
economic impacts : Assessment Proces	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any significa SS	d species, p modest inc	populations or ecological comp rease in development density mental, economic or social in Community Consultation	munities, or their habitats. ٦ on the site, which is unlike npacts.	The
economic impacts : Assessment Proces Proposal type : Timeframe to make	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any significa SS Consistent	d species, p modest inc	copulations or ecological compresses in development density mental, economic or social in Community Consultation Period :	munities, or their habitats. T on the site, which is unlike npacts. 28 Days	The
economic impacts : Assessment Proces Proposal type : Timeframe to make LEP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any signific SS Consistent 6 months	d species, p modest inc	copulations or ecological compresses in development density mental, economic or social in Community Consultation Period :	munities, or their habitats. T on the site, which is unlike npacts. 28 Days	The
economic impacts : Assessment Proces Proposal type : Timeframe to make LEP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any significa SS Consistent 6 months e PAC required?	d species, p modest ind ant environ	copulations or ecological compresses in development density mental, economic or social in Community Consultation Period :	munities, or their habitats. T on the site, which is unlike npacts. 28 Days	The
economic impacts : Assessment Proces Proposal type : Timeframe to make LEP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) : Is Public Hearing by the	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any signific SS Consistent 6 months e PAC required? er proceed ?	d species, p modest ind ant environ	copulations or ecological compresses in development density mental, economic or social in Community Consultation Period :	munities, or their habitats. T on the site, which is unlike npacts. 28 Days	The
economic impacts : Assessment Process Proposal type : Timeframe to make LEP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) : Is Public Hearing by the (2)(a) Should the matter	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any significa SS Consistent 6 months e PAC required? er proceed ?	d species, p modest ind ant environ	copulations or ecological compresses in development density mental, economic or social in Community Consultation Period :	munities, or their habitats. T on the site, which is unlike npacts. 28 Days	The
economic impacts : Assessment Process Proposal type : Timeframe to make LEP : Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) : Is Public Hearing by the (2)(a) Should the matter If no, provide reasons :	habitats, threatened proposal permits a to hold any significa SS Consistent 6 months e PAC required? er proceed ?	d species, p modest ind ant environ	copulations or ecological compresses in development density mental, economic or social in Community Consultation Period :	munities, or their habitats. T on the site, which is unlike npacts. 28 Days	The

No additional studies are 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
Hornsby cover letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Hornsby plannig proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Hornsby Council report and minutes.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Hornsby Gateway.pdf	Determination Document	Yes

Planning Team Recommendation

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

	S.117 directions:	3.1 Residential Zones
		3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
		6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
		7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney
	Additional Information :	DELEGATION OF GATEWAY DETERMINATION
		The proposal is of local significance, and the recommendation is consistent with Council's position. It does not require further justification in relation to the strategic planning framework. Hence, in view of the delegation arrangements for the caretaker period, it is recommended that the Gateway determination function be exercised by the A/General Manager, Metropolitan Region, Planning Services.
		GATEWAY DETERMINATION AND CONDITIONS
		It is recommended that the proposal proceeds subject to the following conditions:
		1. The following amendments to the planning proposal are required prior to public exhibition:
		(a) the Explanation of Provisions in Part 2 of the planning proposal is to be amended to include the property descriptions (lot and DP numbers) for the subject properties;
		(b) the Explanation of Provisions in Part 2 of the planning proposal is to
		be amended to make it clear that the maximum height is set in metres,
		not number of storeys, and that the number of storeys is an
		approximation only (similar amendments should also be made in the
		Background and other parts of the planning proposal); and
		(c) Appendix B of the planning proposal is to be amended to address the
11		consistency of the proposal with the revised s117 Direction 7.1,
		Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney, with amendments also to
		Part 3 of the proposal to address consistency with the current
		Metropolitan Strategy as set out in 'A Plan for Growing Sydney'.
		2. Prior to finalisation of the proposal, an amended Height of Buildings Map
		consistent with the Department's 'Standard Technical Requirements for LEP
		Maps' is to be included as part of the planning proposal.
		3. Consultation with government agencies is not required.

ximum height of bui	ldings - 2-4 Epping Road, Epping
	4. The planning proposal is to be placed on public exhibition for a period of 28 days.
	DELEGATION OF PLAN MAKING FUNCTION
	Hornsby Shire Council has requested delegation of the plan-making function in relation to this proposal. As it is of local significance, it is recommended that the plan-making function be delegated to Council.
Supporting Reasons :	The proposed increase in height limits for the two sites corrects an anomaly where these sites have lower permitted heights than adjoining lots. The proposed increase is not inconsistent with the strategic planning framework for the Epping Urban Activation Precinct.
Signature:	Delan
Printed Name:	<u>TORAN</u> Date: <u>23/3/15.</u>