

Proposal Title :	Rezone land at E	Bowral St & Mo	ss Vale Rd, Bowral from B	4 to R3		
Proposal Summ	Bowral from B4	Rezone Lot 1, DP 406617, Lot 15, DP 740276, Lot 6 Section E, DP 3807, and Lot 1, DP 513337 Bowral from B4 Mixed Use to R3 Medium Density Residential; apply a 700sqm lot size; and remove floor space ratios and height of building limitations from the site.				
PP Number :	PP_2013_WING	E_008_00	Dop File No :	13/10615-1		
oposal Details			i.			
Date Planning Proposal Receiv	28-Aug-2013		LGA covered :	Wingecarrib	ee	
Region :	Southern		RPA :	Wingecarrib	ee Shire Council	
State Electorate	GOULBURN	-\$1	Section of the Act	55 - Planning	g Proposal	
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning					
ocation Detai	s					
Street :	53 Bowral Street					
Suburb :	Bowral	City :		Postcode :	2576	
Land Parcel :	Lot 1, DP 406617					
Street :	444 Moss Vale Road					
Suburb :	Bowral	City :		Postcode :	2576	
Land Parcel :	Lot 15, DP 740276					
Street :	446 Moss Vale Road					
Suburb :	Bowral	City :		Postcode :	2576	
Land Parcel :	Lot 6 Section E, DP 38	807				
Street :	448 Moss Vale Road					
Suburb :	Bowral	City :		Postcode :	2576	
Land Parcel :	Lot 1, DP 513337					

# **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details**

Contact Name :	Meredith McIntyre
Contact Number :	0262297912
Contact Email :	meredith.mcintyre@gmail.com

## **RPA Contact Details**

Contact Name :	Susan Stannard
Contact Number :	0248680854
Contact Email :	susan.stannard@wsc.nsw.gov.au

## **DoP Project Manager Contact Details**

Contact Name :	Mark Parker
Contact Number :	0242249468
Contact Email :	mark.parker@planning.nsw.gov.au

## Land Release Data

Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Sydney-Canberra Corridor Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
MDP Number :		Date of Release :	
Area of Release (Ha) :		Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) :	N/A
No. of Lots :	4	No. of Dwellings (where relevant) :	20
Gross Floor Area	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
	4 V		

The NSW Government Yes Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :

If No, comment :

Have there been No meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :

If Yes, comment :

# Supporting notes

Internal Supporting Notes :	
External Supporting Notes :	In 2012, Council had a development application for a K-Mart development on the site. After negotiations with Council, the proposal included a 4,000sqm K-Mart plus warehouse and storage area, seven specialty stores, 5 residential dwellings (provided as shop-top affordable housing), and a basement carpark.
	On 27 February 2013, Council refused the development application as it believed the proposal did not provide a transition between the existing residential and commercial areas; it was out of character with surrounding development as well as other commercial

development in the township; it didn't provide enough residential development to satisfy the residential sub-area character; and it wasn't complementary to the adjoining residential development as it would have presented a hard boundary between residential and commercial uses - contrary to the DCP requirements.

On 12 June 2013, Council resolved to rezone the subject land to ensure that more appropriately scaled and compatible residential development is permissible on the site. Council submitted a planning proposal but the Department sent back advice in July requesting further information in the Planning Proposal and suggesting that Council wait to see the outcome of a Court appeal before proceeding.

Court proceedings have been finalised.

Council resubmitted the planning proposal on 28 August 2013. This is considered the date of receipt for the review of the planning proposal and for processing.

#### Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : The objective is to "ensure that any future redevelopment of the site is consistent with and enhances the predominantly residential nature of the existing surrounding development".

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

- The explanation of provisions is to:
- amend LZN\_007F for the subject land by removing the B4 Mixed Use Zone and replace it with R3 Medium Density Residential Zone,
- Amend LSZ\_007F by changing the lot size to 'Q' (700sqm) for the subject land,
- Amend FSR\_007B by removing floor space ratio 'O' from the subject land, and
- Amend HOB\_007C by removing height of buildings 'J' from the subject land.

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

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

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
* May need the Director General's agreement	3.1 Residential Zones 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchments 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
Is the Director General's agreement required? Ye	es
c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Orde	er 2006 : <b>Yes</b>

d) Which SEPPs have	the RPA identified?	SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 Drinking Water Catchments Regional Environmental Plan No. 1 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009
e) List any other	Council identified	that the following s117 Directions apply to the proposal:

matters that need to be considered :

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones. This Direction applies as it affects an existing business zone. The Direction requires that business areas be retained and that potential floor space not be reduced. The proposal will be INCONSISTENT with this Direction.

The proposal is not justified by a strategy or study, is not in accordance with the Regional Strategy, however, the Director General may be satisfied that the proposal is

considered of minor significance. The subject land is only 7,800sqm. In an adjoining location, there is a significant area zoned B4 Mixed Use. 3.1 Residential Zones. This Direction applies because the proposal seeks to rezone land to a residential use. The proposal will be CONSISTENT with the Direction. 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies. This Direction requires planning proposals to be consistent with the Regional Strategy. The proposal will be CONSISTENT with the Direction as the Strategy identifies the need to provide opportunities for population and housing. 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements. The proposal is CONSISTENT with the Direction as it does not introduce concurrence or referral requirements. 6.3 Site Specific Provisions. This Direction applies as the proposal involves the rezoning of a parcel of land. This proposal is CONSISTENT with the Direction. Council also failed to identify that Direction 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport applies to the proposal. The proposal would be CONSISTENT with this Direction. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes If No, explain : The proposal is only inconsistent with Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones as it proposes to rezone business land to residential uses. The subject land is considered a relatively minor scale and there are other ample areas in the general location that provide for mixed use development.

#### Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? No

Comment :

Some context maps have been provided, but Council will need to prepare suitable maps consistent with the Standard technical requirements for LEP maps prior to exhibition.

#### Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :Council has proposed to exhibit the draft plan for 28 days, on Council's website, at the<br/>customer service centre and at Bowral library. It also intends to notify the property<br/>owners notified during the exhibition of the K-Mart development application.

#### Additional Director General's requirements

Are there any additional Director General's requirements? No

If Yes, reasons : Council has provided an adequate timeline for the completion of this planning proposal.

#### Overall adequacy of the proposal

Does the proposal meet the adequacy criteria? Yes

If No, comment : The proposal is generally adequate. Council has identified a concern with its B4 zoning in this particular location as it doesn't want large-scale developments, like the K-Mart complex, on this site. The site was intended as a transition from the medium density area to the B2 Local Centre area of Bowral town centre. As such, the character of the area and the supporting development control plan envisaged development far more residential in nature than the application lodged (and refused) for the subject land. Council has resolved to more clearly reflect its intentions for the site by rezoning the site to R3 Medium Density Residential.

#### Proposal Assessment

#### **Principal LEP:**

Due Date :

Comments in relation to Principal LEP :

Council's Principal LEP was notified in 2010.

#### **Assessment Criteria**

Need for planning proposal :

Council refused a proposed K-Mart on the subject land in 2012 on the basis that the 'big box' style of the development was inappropriate in terms of bulk and scale and therefore unsympathetic to the surrounding residential land use.

To avoid similar outcomes and community anxiety in the future for this site, Council has considered a range of options.

1. Rely on improved DCP controls. The current DCP controls will be reviewed, however, Council considers it preferable to exclude certain types of development that would create a conflict between the LEP and the DCP. These restrictions are considered more appropriate through a rezoning to resolve any certainty about what is permissible (and preferred) land use in the zone.

2. Rezone the land to R3 Medium Density Residential. This is the most obvious rezoning choice given the location of the subject land adjoining similar R3 land to the south and east. The R3 Zone permits the same range of residential accommodation as the B4 Mixed Use Zone, however it does not permit hotel or motel accommodation, function centres, or any commercial premises (excluding neighbourhood shops).

Council considers this zone provides more opportunity for appropriate scaled and type of development. Under the previous LEP, this site was zoned 2(b) Medium Density and is therefore not considered a major policy change. Council has also 'back zoned' a similar area on Lackey Road that was previously zoned 2(b) Medium Density, upzoned to B4 Mixed Use and then rezoned to R3 Medium Density Residential.

3. Rezone part of the site to R3 Medium Density Residential and part B4 Mixed Use Development. The size of the subject land does not easily lend itself to identifying part of it for R3 and part B4 zonings. Council considers retaining any part of the site as B4 could still result in potential conflict with the surrounding R3 area.

Therefore, Council considers option 2 to be the most appropriate and will provide the most certainty for development outcomes.

When Council zoned the subject land (and the adjoining land on the western side of Moss Vale Road) as B4, it was considered to provide some strategic benefit as a transition between the residential areas and the local business centre. It has generally worked well and the B4 area west of Moss Vale Road is intended to be retained. However that site is considered to provide more strategic scale and location than the subject land.

Whilst the recent Court case upheld Council's concerns and objections to the proposed K-Mart development, Council is of the view that the Bowral DCP is not sufficient to deter what it considers to be inappropriate development on the subject land.

The proposal is generally consistent with the goals of the local strategy and the Regional Strategy in providing for increased housing opportunities and choice.

Environmental social economic impacts :

Consistency with

strategic planning framework :

Given the current B4 Mixed Use Zone has a residential component, rezoning the subject land to just R3 Medium Density Residential is not considered a major land use change

		of some permitted commercial land ocial impacts will be limited.	uses from the zon	e. Therefore,
	parts of Bowral in this lo	e perceived transition between the r ocation, however Council considers able to better control scale, bulk a	this appropriate g	iven the
Assessment Proces	S			
Proposal type :	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months	Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :	Sydney Catchment Auth	ority	5	
Is Public Hearing by the	e PAC required?	lo		12
(2)(a) Should the matte	r proceed ? Y	/es		
If no, provide reasons :	The matter is appropriat	e and considered of a minor nature		
Resubmission - s56(2)(	b) : <b>No</b>			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional s	studies, if required.			
If Other, provide reasor	IS :			
Identify any internal cor	nsultations, if required :			
No internal consultation	on required			
Is the provision and fun	ding of state infrastructure n	elevant to this plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :				
ocuments		a la serie Dens		
Document File Name		DocumentType Na	ame	Is Public
Council report - Bowra Council report - KMari Planning Proposal_De Bowral B4 SCA comm	B4 Report 12 June 2013.pd al B4 Minutes 12 June 2013 DA 27 February 2013.pdf legation_Bowral B4.pdf ents.pdf Planning_Proposal_Bowral	.pdf Proposal Proposal Proposal Proposal Proposal	v	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
anning Team Recom	mendation			
Preparation of the plan	ning proposal supported at t	his stage : Recommended with Con	ditions	
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Indus	strial Zones		
	3.1 Residential Zones			

	5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchments 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
Additional Information :	It is recommended that the delegate of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure determine under section 56(2) of the EP&A Act, that an amendment to the Wingecarribee LEP 2010 to provide for a rezoning of Lot 1, DP 406617, Lot 15, DP 740276, Lot 6, Section E, DP 3807, and Lot 1, DP 513337, Bowral from B4 Mixed Use to R3 Medium Density Residential, should proceed subject to the following conditions:
6	1.(a) the planning proposal is to be made publicly available for 14 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 along with planning proposals as identified in section 5.5.2 of A guide to preparing local environmental plans (Department of Planning and Infrastructure 2013).
	2. Consultation is required with the following public authority under section 56(2)(d) of the EP&A Act:
	* Sydney Catchment Authority (s117 Direction 5.2)
	The public authority is to be provided with a copy of the planning proposal and any relevant supporting material. The authority is to be given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal or to indicate that it will require additional time to comment on the proposal. The authority may request additional information or additional matters to be addressed in the planning proposal.
	3. No public hearing required to be held into the matter 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.
	4. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 6 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.
	5. Council be offered the Minister's plan making delegation under sections 59(2),(3)&(4) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
	6. SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS - It is recommended that:
	(a) The Director General can be satisfied that the planning proposal is consistent with s117 Direction 3.1 Residential Zones, 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport, 5.1
	Regional Strategies and 5.2 Sydney Drinking Water Catchment (when the above consultation has ocurred), 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements, 6.3 Site Specific
	Provisions; (b) The Director General can be satisfied that inconsistencies with the s117 Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones is justified as it is considered of minor significance; (c) The Director General can be satisfied that inconsistencies with any other relevant s117 Directions are only of minor significance; and
	(c)no further consultation or referral is required in relation to s117 Directions while the planning proposal remains in its current form.
	7. The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with all relevant SEPPs.
Supporting Reasons	The proposal is considered minor and should be delegated back to council. The inconsistency with S117 Direction 1.1 is considered justifiable and minor.

gnature:	MAN	ah		
nted Name:	Mark Parke	Date:	13th September 20	1/3