

Planning proposal to Hurlstone Park.	o include new local heritage i	items and heritage con	servation areas in	
Proposal Title :	Planning proposal to include new local heritage items and heritage conservation areas in Hurlstone Park.			
Proposal Summary :	Include new local heritage items and heritage conservation areas in Hurlstone Park.			
PP Number :	PP_2016_CBANK_003_00	Dop File No :	16/14786	
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Received :	21-Nov-2016	LGA covered :	Canterbury-Bankstown	
Region :	Metro(CBD)	RPA :	Canterbury-Bankstown Council	
State Electorate :	CANTERBURY	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
LEP Type :	Precinct			
Location Details				
Street : Wh	ole of Hurlstone Park suburb			
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :	
Land Parcel : Wh	ole of Hurlstone Park suburb			
DoP Planning Office	cer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Helen Wilkins			
Contact Number :	0292746559			
Contact Email :	helen.wilkins@planning.nsw.gov	v.au		
RPA Contact Deta	ils			
Contact Name :	Allan Shooter			
Contact Number :	0297899364			
Contact Email :	allan.shooter@cbcity.nsw.gov.a	u		
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Martin Cooper			
Contact Number :	0292746582			
Contact Email :	martin.cooper@planning.nsw.go	ov.au		
Land Release Data	3			
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :		
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with Strategy	:	

Planning proposal to include new local heritage items and heritage conservation areas in Hurlstone Park.

Hurlstone Park.			
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 :	The Department's Code of Condu	ct has been complied with.	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :	Sydney Region East Section has in relation to this planning propos		nmunicated with any lobbyist
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal is support • the NSW strategic planning fram • Council policy and the Hurlstone • advice from the Department's Ur phase of the Sydenham to Bankst the results of the Hurlstone Park H because • inconsistencies with section 117 and 4.3 Flood Prone Land are con The Hurlstone Park Heritage Asse and 7 Heritage Conservation Area work may result in a change to the will be advised prior to public exh and DCP controls will be exhibited Heritage Orders on items in privat	ework, all SEPPs and the Dra Park Heritage Assessment S ban Renewal Team, who has own Urban Renewal Corridor deritage Assessment Study (t Directions 3.1 Residential Zo sidered to be minor and justif ssment Study has identified S s (HCAs) (Tab Map). The prop e number of listed items, in wi ibition of the planning proposal.	It South District Plan; tudy; advised that the next (URC) Strategy will include he proposal); and also nes, 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils, iable. If potential heritage items osal states that the review hich case the Department cal, and that the SHI forms Council has placed Interim
	buildings until the proposed draft		
	The proposal states that further we the proposal: • Stage 2 - review of the proposed Heritage Inventory (SHI) forms for conservation areas identified in S and • Stage 3 - preparation of a Develo items and HCAs, and the preparat the Stage 1 report (the Hurlstone I draft heritage planning controls.	heritage items and HCAs and potential heritage items and tage 1 (the Hurlstone Park He pment Control Plan (DCP) for ion of a consultation strategy Park Heritage Assessment Stu	I preparation of State potential heritage ritage Assessment Study); recommended heritage for the public exhibition of udy), Stage 2 SHI forms, and on requiring the
	Department to be sent a copy of the exhibition.	ie reviseu planning proposal	απα πιαρς μποι το
	Council has requested delegation Park Heritage Assessment Study		_

Planning proposal to include new local heritage items and heritage conservation areas in Hurlstone Park.

	one of the Department's criteria for delegation, as the proposal is localised in nature. The Regional Team supports the delegation of the proposal to Council because of the localised nature of the issues and because the proposal is in line with endorsed Council policy. On 25 February 2016, the former Canterbury Council resolved not to support increases in density in Hurlstone Park, which were proposed for increased densities under the Sydenham to Bankstown URC Strategy, until a heritage study had been completed.
External Supporting Notes :	The intention of the planning proposal is to protect and conserve key buildings and areas in Hurlstone Park that have heritage significance. It adds to existing heritage listed properties in Hurlstone Park already identified within CLEP 2012. The planning proposal is based on recommendations in the Hurlstone Park Heritage Assessment Study prepared by Paul Davies Pty Ltd in September 2016. It will form part of the future planning of the area in the context of the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy and has been prepared collaboratively with the Department of Planning and Environment's Urban Renewal Team.

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

The objectives of this planning proposal are:

1. to recognise the local heritage significance of various properties and areas in Hurlstone Park;

 to provide statutory protection for these properties and areas through their identification as local heritage items and HCAs in Canterbury Local Environmental Plan 2012; and
 to provide for the conservation of these local heritage items and HCAs.

This is considered adequate.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The objectives of the planning proposal will be achieved by: 1. listing identified local heritage items and HCAs in Schedule 5 of Canterbury LEP 2012; and 2. showing the items and conservation areas in the Canterbury LEP 2012 Heritage maps.

This is considered adequate.

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

2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones

Is the Director General's agreement required?

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

d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified?

SEPP No 19—Bushland in Urban Areas SEPP No 21—Caravan Parks SEPP No 30—Intensive Agriculture SEPP No 33—Hazardous and Offensive Development SEPP No 50—Canal Estate Development SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP No 62—Sustainable Aquaculture SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development SEPP No 70—Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)

Planning proposal to in	clude new local	heritage items a	and heritage c	onservation areas in
Hurlstone Park.				

	SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	
Have inconsistencies with it	ems a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes
If No, explain :	The planning proposal is consistent with all State Environmental Planning Policies.
	The planning proposal is not consistent with Direction 3.1 Residential Zones as it seeks to preserve an existing housing type (low density residential development) which does not make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services in an area that is well serviced by mass public transport. The area is directly adjacent to Hurlstone Park train station, which is on the T3 Bankstown Line and which is proposed to be upgraded as part of the new Sydney Metro Southwest. However, as the area also forms part of the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor, which will generate significant new high density residential flat development, the proposal will result in creating housing choices by preserving an alternate housing form to that proposed under the Strategy. The inconsistency is therefore considered to be minor and justifiable.
	The planning proposal is not consistent with Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils and Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land as it relates to an area of land that is partly Class 2 acid sulfate soils and partly flood affected. However, the proposal is not seeking to intensify uses on the land and the Canterbury LEP 2012 contains the Acid Sulfate Soils model clause and a flood planning clause. The impacts from any future development proposals are therefore able to be dealt with at DA assessment stage.
	The inconsistencies are therefore considered to be minor and justifiable.
	The planning proposal is consistent with Direction 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney, notably Action 3.4: Promote Sydney's heritage, arts and culture.
Mapping Provided - s5	5(2)(d)
Is mapping provided? Yes	
Comment :	The planning proposal includes a map of the 51 identified local heritage items and 7 identified HCAs that have been included in the planning proposal. This is adequate for assessment purposes. However, it is recommended the Gateway determination include a condition requiring current and proposed maps in accordance with the Standard Technical Requirements for LEP Mapping and that the revised maps be sent to the Department prior to exhibition.
Community consultation	on - s55(2)(e)
Has community consultation	n been proposed? Yes

Comment :Given the nature of the planning proposal a community consultation period of 28 days is
considered appropriate. Council has proposed an exhibition period of 6 weeks.

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 :

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date :

Comments in relation Canterbury LEP 2012 was published on 21 December 2012. to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	The planning proposal is the best way to implement the findings of Council's Hurlstone Park Heritage Assessment Study.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The planning proposal is consistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney: Action 3.4: Promote Sydney's heritage, arts and culture promotes the identification, protection and management of areas of heritage significance. It also promotes the involvement of the NSW Heritage Council in providing guidance to local government on local heritage studies, identifying buildings and places to be listed as heritage items and HCAs in a Local Environmental Plan to enable their ongoing protection and management. The proposal states that the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) will be consulted. It is recommended that the Gateway determination include a condition requiring consultation with OEH.
	The planning proposal is consistent with the Draft South District Plan: Action L13: Conserve and enhance environmental heritage, including the District's Aboriginal, European and natural heritage, and support the identification, assessment, management and protection of heritage by relevant planning authorities to underpin the community's pride of place.
	Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy: The proposal states that, as it has heritage implications for new development in Hurlstone Park in the context of the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy, it has been developed in close collaboration with the Department's Urban Renewal Team, who were provided with a copy of the Hurlstone Park Heritage Assessment Study. The Urban Renewal Team was consulted on the planning proposal and has advised that they are supportive of the proposal and that the next iteration of the Sydenham to Bankstown Corridor Strategy will show the proposed HCAs.
Environmental social economic impacts :	Environmental: The planning proposal will not result in any impact on critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats, as it will not result in any development activity.
	Social: The planning proposal states that the proposal will have a positive social effect on residents living in Hurlstone Park and other people who have an association with the area, through the retention of key heritage buildings and areas and conservation of a connection with the original development and history of the suburb. The creation of heritage items and HCAs is likely to encourage the trend towards restoration of period buildings in the area, which will have social benefits by enhancing pride of place.
	The Hurlstone Park Station Precinct chapter of the Sydenham to Bankstown URC Strategy Community Workshop Outcomes Report (August 2016), states that most participants

Planning proposal to ir Hurlstone Park.	nclude new local h	eritage it	ems and heritage conse	rvation areas in	
	housing (Federation area. Also that some	n houses/Ca e participan	ne character of Hurlstone Par alifornian Bungalow style hou its commented that (Canterb e Park as a heritage precinct	uses) and 'village nature' of the ury Bankstown) Council is	
	Economic: The proposal is not	likely to res	sult in any direct economic e	ffects.	
Assessment Process	S				
Proposal type :	Precinct		Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	12 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	Department of Education and Communities Office of Environment and Heritage Adjoining LGAs Other				
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes			
If no, provide reasons :		2 Floss Str	epartment of Education (owr eet), and Inner West Council	ner of 6-20 Burnett Street), (Council adjoining Hurlstone	
Resubmission - s56(2)(b	o) : No				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional st	udies, if required. :				
If Other, provide reasons	s :				
Identify any internal cons	sultations, if required :				
Metropolitan and Regio	onal Strategy				
Is the provision and func	ding of state infrastruct	ure relevant	to this plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :					
Documents					

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	Is Public
Covering letter.pdf	Proposal Covering Letter	Yes
Planning Proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Attachment 1. Hurlstone Park Heritage Assessment Study (Part 1).pdf	Proposal	Yes
Attachment 1. Hurlstone Park Heritage Assessment Study (Part 2).pdf	Proposal	Yes
Attachment 2. Council Report and Minutes - 27 Sept 2016.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Attachments 3 and 4. Proposed Local Heritage Items and Heritage Conservation Areas.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Attachments 5 and 6. Consistency with SEPPs and s117 Directions.pdf	Proposal	Yes

	Evaluation Criteria for the Delegation of Plan Making Proposal No					
Functions .pdf Delegated plan making r Gateway Determination	reporting template.pdf PP 2016 CBANK 003.pdf	Proposal Determination Document	No Yes			
lanning Team Recommendation						
Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions						
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones	5				
Additional Information :	It is recommended that the planning proposal proceed subject to the following conditions:					
	 be consistent with Stage 2 of the and preparation of State Heritage potential heritage conservation and - include current and proposed m 	ncil is to amend the planning proposal e work and the review of the proposed Inventory (SHI) forms for potential her reas identified in Stage 1; and laps in accordance with the Standard 1 consistent with Stage 2 of the work.	heritage items itage items and			
	2. Council is to send a copy of the documentation to the Department	e revised planning proposal, maps and t prior to exhibition.	supporting			
	3. Community consultation is req	uired for a minimum of 28 days.				
	4. Consultation is required with the	ne following public authorities:				
	 Office of Environment and Heri Department of Education and C Ausgrid. Inner West Council. 	-				
	5. A public hearing is not required	d to be held into the matter.				
	6. The timeframe for completing t date of the Gateway determination	he LEP is to be 12 months from the we n.	ek following the			
Supporting Reasons :	 the NSW strategic planning fram Council policy and the Hurlston advice from the Department's Upphase of the Sydenham to Banks 	ing proposal proceed because it is con nework, all SEPPs and the Draft South e Park Heritage Assessment Study; an rban Renewal Team, who has advised town Urban Renewal Corridor (URC) S ne Park Heritage Assessment Study (th	District Plan; d that the next trategy will			

Date: