

Planning

# Planning Team Report

#### Planning proposal to remove an additional use of permitting car parking at 69 Renwick Street, Drummoyne Planning proposal to remove an additional use of permitting car parking at 69 Renwick Street, Proposal Title : Drummoyne Proposal Summary : Planning proposal to remove an additional use in Schedule 1 of Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 for 69 Renwick Street, Drummoyne. The additional use permits a car park in association with an adjoining development at 162-166 Victoria Road, Drummoyne (former Drummoyne RSL club). **PP Number**: Dop File No : 13/18007 PP\_2013\_CANAD\_003\_00 Proposal Details LGA covered : **Canada Bay** Date Planning 29-Oct-2013 Proposal Received : RPA : **City of Canada Bay Council** Region : Sydney Region East Section of the Act 55 - Planning Proposal State Electorate : DRUMMOYNE LEP Type : Spot Rezoning **Location Details** Street : **69 Renwick Street** Postcode : 2047 Suburb : Drummoyne City : Sydney Land Parcel : Lot 203 DP 1059556 **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details** Contact Name : Nava Sedghi Contact Number : 0285754117 Contact Email : nava.sedghi@planning.nsw.gov.au **RPA Contact Details** Contact Name : Paul Dewar Contact Number : 0299116402 Contact Email : Paul.Dewar@canadabay.nsw.gov.au **DoP Project Manager Contact Details** Contact Name : Sandy Shewell Contact Number : 0285754115 Contact Email : sandy.shewell@planning.nsw.gov.au Land Release Data Release Area Name : Growth Centre : N/A N/A Regional / Sub Metro Inner West subregion Consistent with Strategy : Yes Regional Strategy :

MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
			N/A
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A
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 :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :			
	On 12 September 2013, a meeting Council Mayor and residents of Re about increased traffic in Renwick site was to be permitted via 69 Re	enwick Street. The Mayor an Street if vehicular access to	d residents raised concern
	At the meeting the Minister advise of the additional use and that the The Minister advised that RMS ap Victoria Street would be required t	planning proposal would be o proval for vehicular access to	considered on its merits. o the former RSL site from
	On 15 October 2013, Council reso seeking to remove the additional u		oposal to the Department,
	Prior to submitting the planning p planning proposal to RMS for com approve vehicular access to the fo	ment. RMS has confirmed it	s position that it will not
	Canada Bay Council has accepted functions under section 23 the En Act). Council is seeking delegation the EP&A Act 1979 to progress thi	vironmental Planning & Asse n to carry out the Minister's f	essment Act 1979 (EP&A

External Supporting Notes :	Council has submitted the planning proposal because it is not supportive of the Department's post exhibition amendment to Canada Bay LEP 2013, which allows vehicular access off 69 Renwick Street, Drummoyne, under Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Use.
	Council propose removal of vehicular access from 69 Renwick Street, Drummoyne for the following reasons:-
	- the property at 162-166 Victoria Road has an existing driveway which previously had vehicular access;
	- no other property on Victoria Street has vehicular access through to Renwick Street, Drummoyne; and
	<ul> <li>the intersection at Renwick Street and Edwin Street has limited visibility and increased traffic would make this intersection more dangerous.</li> </ul>

#### Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The objective of the planning proposal is to:

- reduce amenity impacts upon the residents of Renwick Street;

- reduce vehicular conflict with an established cycling route on Renwick Street; and
- reduce impacts on the Birkenhead and Dawson Estate Conservation Areas.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The amendment proposes to remove 69 Renwick Street, Drummoyne from Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses in the Canada Bay LEP 2013.

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

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :	
---	--

\* May need the Director General's agreement

- 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
- 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies
- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

Is the Director General's agreement required? No

c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007

e) List any other matters that need to be considered :

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

If No, explain :

The planning proposal is inconsistent with State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (Infrastructure SEPP). This inconsistency relates to Clause 101 -Development with frontage to classified road. This clause states that the consent authority must not grant consent to development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless:-

-	,				
		1. where practicable, vehicular access to the land is provid classified road; and	led by a road other than the		
		2. the safety, efficiency and ongoing operation of the class adversely affected.	ified road will not be		
		Victoria Road is considered a classified road under the Ro	ads Act 1993.		
		The planning proposal is inconsistent with the ISEPP beca	use:-		
		1. it aims to remove vehicular access to a site which fronts is currently provided to that site by a road other than the c 2. RMS has advised that if there was access to the former l there would be potential safety and traffic impacts on Victo	lassified road; and RSL site off Victoria Road		
		RMS advises that access to the former RSL site should be Street. RMS also states that it will deal with the issue of po the established cycle way by giving consideration to appro treatments and bicycle facilities to improve the safety of c	otential conflict of traffic and oppropriate traffic calming		
		The Department considers the planning proposal does not justification for the inconsistency with the Infrastructure S	•		
	Mapping Provided -	s55(2)(d)			
	Is mapping provided? N	0			
	Comment :	There are no amendments to maps associated with the Car	nada Bay LEP 2013.		
	Community consulta	ntion - s55(2)(e)			
þ.	Has community consultation been proposed? Yes				
	Comment : The planning proposal recommends a public exhibition period of 14 days.				
		Project Time Line The planning proposal contains an estimated project time l months (May 2014).	line for completion within 5		
Ē	Additional Director G	General's requirements			
	Are there any additional	Director General's requirements? No			
	If Yes, reasons :				
	Overall adequacy of	the proposal			
	Does the proposal meet	the adequacy criteria? No			
	If No, comment :	The planning proposal does not adequately address the ine Infrastructure SEPP.	consistency with the		
Pr	oposal Assessment				
	Principal LEP:				
	Due Date : August 2013				
3	Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	Draft Canada Bay LEP 2013 was publicly exhibited from 14 No 2012. A second exhibition followed from 20 August 2012 to 17 LEP 2013 commenced on 2 August 2013.			
		During the second exhibition of draft Canada Bay LEP 2013, C submissions objecting to the additional permitted use in Sche Drummoyne. As a result, on 6 November 2012, Council resolve	edule 1 for 69 Renwick Street,		
		Page 4 of 7	12 Dec 2013 05:56 pm		

Street, Drummoyne	
	permitted use, so as not to permit vehicular access through 69 Renwick Street, Drummoyne.
	The landowner of the former RSL site provided correspondence, dated 22 February 2013, from RMS advising of their refusal to grant concurrence for vehicle access from Victoria Road (see Tag 2). This decision was based on road safety impacts and maintenance of network efficiency. RMS indicated that access to 162-166 Victoria Road, Drummoyne shall be maintained from Renwick Street, and that it is unlikely that the development will result in traffic generation exceeding 300 vehicles per hour.
	The Department considered the advice from the RMS and included the additional use in draft Canada Bay LEP 2013. The inclusion of vehicular access from 69 Renwick Street enables the former RSL site to be developed and prevents the former RSL site being land locked. In recent correspondence, RMS maintains its objection to vehicular access via Victoria Road (refer Tag 1).
Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	Council has indicated there is a need for the planning proposal for the following reasons:-
	<ul> <li>the former RSL site has an existing driveway cutout leading onto Victoria Road and could be readily activated with RMS agreement;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>all other properties on Renwick Street are residential properties in keeping with the R2 Low Density zoning;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>no other property on Victoria Road has vehicular access through Renwick Street;</li> <li>Renwick Street is located within the Birkenhead and Dawson Estates Heritage</li> </ul>
	Conservation Area; - Renwick Street has a dedicated cycleway to and from the city; and
	- the intersection at Renwick Street and Edwin Street has limited visibility, which would become more dangerous with increased traffic.
	The Department is not satisfied that there is sufficient justification to warrant progressing the planning proposal. RMS has not granted its approval for the former RSL site to be accessed via Victoria Road.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The Metropolitan Plan for Sydney, draft Metropolitan Strategy and draft Inner West Subregional Strategy encourage planning for development along centres and corridors with good access to services and public transport.
	The site is located within the 600m walking catchment of Drummoyne Village. The site is in close proximity to shops and public transport. The planning proposal would potentially prevent development of the former Drummoyne RSL site. This is considered inconsistent with the objectives of the strategic planning framework.
Environmental social economic impacts :	The planning proposal is not supported by a traffic study that justifies that maintaining vehicle access to the former Drummoyne RSL site from 69 Renwick Street will result in adverse traffic implications.
	Preventing vehicle access from Renwick Street to the former RSL site would impact on the redevelopment of the former RSL site. This would potentially impact the ability to generate jobs and/or provide additional housing in a centre.

ssessment Proces	5				
Proposal type :	Inconsistent		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :	Transport for NS	W - Roads and	Maritime Services		
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	No			
If no, provide reasons :	The planning is n	iot supported f	for the following reasons:-		
	site via Victoria R - removing vehicu being land locked strategic planning transport, shops - no supporting in	ed to grant its o Road; ular access fro d and result in g framework, v and services; nformation has	concurrence to allow vehicula om 69 Renwick Street will res the site being undeveloped. which encourages developme	sult in the forme This is inconsis ent located near naintaining vehi	r RSL site stent with the r public
Resubmission - s56(2)(b	o) : <b>No</b>				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional st	tudies, if required.				
If Other, provide reason	S :				
Identify any internal con	sultations, if require	d:			
No internal consultatio	n required				
In the eventies and free	ding of state infrastru	ucture relevant	to this plan? <b>No</b>		
If Yes, reasons :				ALC: NO.	
If Yes, reasons :			DocumentType Na	ame	Is Public
If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name Council letter.pdf			Proposal Coverin		ls Public Yes Yes
If Yes, reasons : cuments Document File Name	February 2013.pdf				Yes
If Yes, reasons : <b>cuments</b> Document File Name Council letter.pdf Planning Proposal.pdf Tag 2 - RMS Letter 22 F	February 2013.pdf odf		Proposal Coverin Proposal Study		Yes Yes Yes
If Yes, reasons : <b>cuments</b> Document File Name Council letter.pdf Planning Proposal.pdf Tag 2 - RMS Letter 22 F Tag 1 RMS Response.p	February 2013.pdf odf mendation	rted at this stag	Proposal Coverin Proposal Study		Yes Yes Yes

Planning proposal to remove an additional use of permitting car parking	at 69 Renwick
Street, Drummoyne	

	<ul> <li>4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils</li> <li>5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies</li> <li>6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements</li> <li>6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes</li> <li>6.3 Site Specific Provisions</li> <li>7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036</li> </ul>		
Additional Information :	It is recommended that the planning proposal not proceed to a gateway because RMS has refused access from 162-166 Victoria Road, Drummoyne to the former Drummoyne RSL site and this would impact on the redevelopment of this site. The planning proposal is considered inconsistent with the aims of the Metro Plan, draft Metro Strategy, and draft Subregional Strategy.		
Supporting Reasons :	Redevelopment of the former Drummoyne RSL site has the potential to generate employment and/or provide additional dwellings within Canada Bay Local Government Area.		
Signature:	Thewelly		
Printed Name:	Sandy Shewell Date: 12.12.13		

.