

Proposal Title : Proposed rezoning of 100-102 Elliott Street, Balmain. Planning proposal to amend Leichhardt Local Environmental Plan 2013 (LEP 2013) by rezoning Proposal Summary 100-102 Elliott Street, Balmain from B2 Local Centre to part R1 General Residential, part B7 Business Park, part RE1 Public Recreation, with the rest of the site remaining B2 Local Centre. PP_2016_LEICH_001_00 16/04464 PP Number : Dop File No : **Proposal Details** Date Planning 04-Mar-2016 LGA covered : Leichhardt Proposal Received : RPA : Leichhardt Municipal Council Region : Metro(CBD) Section of the Act : State Electorate : BALMAIN 55 - Planning Proposal LEP Type : Spot Rezoning **Location Details** 100-102 Elliott Street Street : Suburb : Balmain City : Postcode : Lot 6 DP 617944 and Lot 1 DP 619996 Land Parcel : **DoP Planning Officer Contact Details Andrew Watkins** Contact Name : 0292286558 Contact Number : Contact Email : andrew.watkins@planning.nsw.gov.au **RPA Contact Details Steve Roseland** Contact Name : 0293679279 Contact Number : stever@lmc.nsw.gov.au Contact Email : **DoP Project Manager Contact Details** Contact Name : **Martin Cooper** Contact Number : 0202926582 Contact Email : martin.cooper@planning.nsw.gov.au Land Release Data

Growth Centre	N/A	Release Area Name :
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with Strategy
rtegional otrategy		

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) :	121
Gross Floor Area :	0	No of Jobs Created	49
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 :	-	ng and Environment is not aware istered lobbyists concerning this	
supporting notes			2
Internal Supporting Notes :	 demonstrates consistent objectives of A Plan for 0 residential development potential of land within a is generally consistent w Environmental Planning 	vith relevant s117 Directions and S	loyment-related Iditional yment generating
	The whole site is owned b other property or owners	y the proponent and therefore the nip rights.	ere are no impacts upon any
External Supporting Notes :	R1 General Residential. C State and local planning f employment-generating la	ginally forwarded to Council prop ouncil did not support this, as it v rameworks, and would have resul and. Consequently, the planning both residential and commercial	vas considered inconsistent with ted in a loss of proposal was revised to provide
	use development compris	RPP development approval (references sing eight buildings ranging betwee es, 19 serviced apartments and 16	en 3-5 storeys, with ground
	The current proposed zon supported by Council, as:	ing reflects the spread of approve	ed uses across the site and is
	 it is consistent with the l it will best reflect curren there will be no adverse 	local and state level strategic plan t approved land uses; amenity impacts; and	-
		per to convert the approved servic t a future development application	
	Council has confirmed its supported by the Departm	intention to exercise its plan-mainent.	king delegations, which is

Statement of the objectives - s55(2)(a)			
Is a statement of the object	Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	The objective of the planning proposal is to rezone the site to allow the conversion of the approved serviced apartments to provide additional residential accommodation and to preserve the site's employment generating potential, as endorsed by Council as part of its assessment of the JRPP-approved development application.		
	prevented by clause 6. unless the building cor	oning, the conversion of the 19 approved serviced apartments is 11A Residential Accommodation in Zone B1 and B2 of LEP 2013, nprises mixed use development, including residential ne building will have an active street frontage.	
	The proposal does not have an active street frontage, preventing the conversion of the serviced apartments to residential accommodation.		
Explanation of provisi	Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b)		
Is an explanation of provis	ions provided? Yes		
Comment :	The proposal would an	nend LEP 2013 by an amendment to the current Land Zoning Map.	
Justification - s55 (2)(c)		
a) Has Council's strategy l	been agreed to by the Dir	ector General? No	
b) S.117 directions identifi	ed by RPA :	1.1 Business and Industrial Zones	
* May need the Director General's agreement		 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 4.3 Flood Prone Land 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 	
		7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney	
Is the Director General	Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes		
c) Consistent with Standa	c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes		
d) Which SEPPs have the 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 SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005	
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	Leichhardt Council development application D/2013/406 and Joint Regional Planning Panel approval 2013SYE089 for the mixed use development of 100-102 Elliott Street, Balmain.		
Have inconsistencies with	Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes		
If No, explain :	Section 117 Directions Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones: The area of land, and therefore total potential floorspace, that is currently zoned B2 Local Centre will be significantly reduced as a result of this planning proposal, which is therefore inconsistent with the objectives of the Direction.		
	However, the planning proposal refers to an Economic Report (prepared by SGS Economics and Planning in support of the DA) which states that the previous occupier of the site was not operating at full capacity, nor utilising all of its buildings, and their layout was unsuitable for many other business purposes.		
	The proposal will maintain employment potential by way of the proposed B2 and B7		

zoned portions of the site, an area which corresponds with that part of the approved development which provides for commercial (including intended 'live/work' units) and retail uses.

The inconsistency is therefore considered of minor significance.

Direction 2.3 Heritage Conservation:

The site is not a heritage item, but is within a Heritage Conservation Area and is in the vicinity of a number of heritage items. However, heritage-related impacts have been satisfactorily addressed through the planning proposal and the approved development application assessment. The proposal is therefore considered consistent with this Direction.

Direction 3.1 Residential Zones

The planning proposal is consistent with this Direction, as it will facilitate a broader choice of residential accommodation, making use of existing infrastructure in an existing urban area.

Direction 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport:

The planning proposal provides for a mixed use development located in reasonable proximity to public transport (buses) along Darling Street, which provides good access to Balmain Town Centre and the CBD, amongst other areas. The proposal is therefore consistent with this Direction.

Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils:

The site is identified in the Leichhardt LEP 2013 as Class 5 Acid Sulfate Soils. The proposal would facilitate an increase in the intensity of use due to the conversion of 19 serviced apartments to residential.

Council's assessment of the approved DA considers the presence of Acid Sulfate Soils against clause 6.1 Acid Sulfate Soils of LEP 2013, and states that a report was provided by Douglas Partners (February 2014), which concluded that "the proposed development works are not expected to disturb acid sulfate soil and/or impact upon water levels in Iron Cove Bay" and that it was considered "no additional testing or future management is necessary in this regard."

The planning proposal is technically inconsistent with this Direction, as it does not directly address its requirements. However, given Class 5 is the lowest level of acidity, the increased intensity of use would be relatively minor, and that potential disturbance of A.S.S has been addressed by the DA assessment, this inconsistency is considered to be of minor significance.

Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land:

A portion of the site is identified as a Flood Control Lot in the Leichhardt DCP 2013. This matter has been addressed during the DA process against clause 6.3 Flood Planning of LEP 2013, and is considered consistent with this Direction.

The proposal is considered consistent with all other relevant Directions, namely Direction 6.3 Site Specific Controls, and Direction 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney.

State Environmental Planning Policies

SEPP 55 Remediation of Land:

As part of the DA, a 'Remedial Action Plan' was prepared by Douglas Partners (August 2013), which was reviewed by Council's Environmental Health Officer. The RAP concluded the site can be made suitable for the currently DA-approved uses. The proposal is therefore considered consistent with this SEPP.

The proposal is also considered consistent with other relevant SEPPs, namely SEPP 32 Urban Consolidation (Re-development of Urban Land), SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007, and deemed SEPP, SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

The planning proposal includes limited extracts of both the current and proposed Land Zoning Maps, which are adequate for the purposes of assessing this proposal. However, it is recommended that full current and proposed Land Zoning Maps are exhibited with the planning proposal.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment : The planning proposal states that community consultation will be undertaken in accordance with the Department's Guide to preparing local environmental plans, but does not specify a timeframe for consultation or public exhibition.

A public consultation/exhibition period of 28 days is considered appropriate for this planning proposal.

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 relationLeichhardt LEP 2013 was notified on 23 December 2013 and commenced on 3 Februaryto Principal LEP :2014.

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	This proposal is a revision of the proponent's originally submitted planning proposal to Council in November 2015, which proposed rezoning the whole site to R1 General Residential, to allow the conversion of 19 serviced apartments approved under a DA by the JRPP on 6 June 2014 (2013SYE089) to residential accommodation.
	Council did not support a 'blanket' R1 rezoning due to the resulting loss of the site's employment generating potential, and revised the the proposal accordingly.
	The rezoning is required because the site's current B2 zoning cannot facilitate the conversion of the DA approved ground floor serviced apartments because clause 6.11A (Residential Development in Zones B1 and B2)of LEP 2013 prevents residential development in the B2 zone unless there is active street frontage at ground floor level. A modified DA to seek approval for the conversion of the serviced apartments is to be submitted following the rezoning.
	Whilst not a direct result of any studies, a number of local strategies are relevant, as discussed below.
	A planning proposal is the only mechanism for Council to rezone the site.

e)

Consistency with strategic planning framework :	A Plan for Growing Sydney: The planning proposal demonstrates consistency with both the housing and employment-related directions and objectives of A Plan for Growing Sydney, by facilitating additional residential development capacity and choice, whilst retaining employment-generating potential of land within an existing urban area.
	The proposal will also add to the amount of public open space available to the community and future incoming residents by zoning to RE1 the land being dedicated to council for open space under the approved DA.
	Council's local strategies: The planning proposal demonstrates consistency with 'Leichhardt 2025+', Leichhardt Community and Cultural Plan 2011-2021, Leichhardt Employment and Economic Development Plan 2013-2023 and Leichhardt Employment Lands Study 2011. Together, these strategies seek to enhance community well-being, create accessible and sustainable environments and economic benefits, and maintain the employment-generating potential of former employment/industrial land in the LGA.
Environmental social economic impacts :	Environmental: • Given the previously developed nature of the site and its location within an existing urban area, it is considered unlikely there are any critical habitats, threatened species, populations, or ecological communities or their habitats present on the site.
	 An Assessment of Traffic and Parking Implications by CBHK concluded traffic impacts would be likely to be negligible and the existing amenity of the surrounding area would not be affected by the proposal because: appropriate parking provision will be made for the residential apartments; traffic generation will be low and similar to the approved serviced apartments; traffic effects will not be noticeable; and the site is well serviced by public transport services.
	Whilst the DA for the redevelopment of the site has been approved, and traffic related matters have been considered, the traffic assessment has not been included in the planning proposal materials submitted to the Department. It is therefore recommended the planning proposal, including any relevant traffic and parking assessment, be forwarded to NSW Roads and Maritime Services as part of the required consultation process.
	• The site is identified as Acid Sulfate Soils Class 5. In relation to the approved DA, the applicant provided Council with a document prepared by Douglas Partners (February 2014) titled "Potential for Disturbance of Acid Sulfate Soils" for 100-102 Elliott Street, Balmain. The summary and conclusion indicates that the [proposed] development works are not expected to disturb acid sulfate soil and/or impact upon water levels in the Iron Cove Bay.
	Social: • The planning proposal is likely to result in an increased demand for local facilities and services resulting from an increased resident population, but does not address this issue. It is therefore recommended the proposal be updated prior to exhibition, to address the social impact of the proposal, and that consultation with appropriate agencies and State government departments to ascertain the capacity of existing education, social housing, health and emergency services in Balmain and surrounding areas.
	Economic: • By rezoning part of the site to B7 Business Park and maintaining part of the site as B2 Local Centre, the proposal will maintain an element of employment generating potential, by collectively permitting business, commercial and light industrial land uses, including 'live/work' enterprises. This is considered a positive outcome following the vacation of the site by the previous occupier, cosmetics company 'Nutri-Metrics', which was not, according to the SGS Economic Report prepared in support of the DA, operating to its, or the site's full potential.
	 Being a discrete local centre zoning a considerable distance from the Darling Street

commercial areas, the proposal is not considered likely to have any adverse impact in relation to those more significant commercial areas.

Assessment Process

Proposal type	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months	Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Energy Australia Fire and Rescue NSW Department of Health NSW Police Force Transport for NSW - R	ion and Communities y Services - Housing NSW	our Foreshore Authority	
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
If no, provide reasons :				
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional st	udies, if required. :			
If Other, provide reasons	5 :			
Identify any internal con	sultations, if required :			
No internal consultation	n required			
Is the provision and fund	ling of state infrastructure	e relevant to this plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :				
Documents				
Document File Name		DocumentType N	Name Is Public	-
Planning Team Recom	mendation			
Preparation of the plann	ing proposal supported a	at this stage : Recommended with Co	onditions	
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Inc 2.3 Heritage Conser 3.1 Residential Zone 3.4 Integrating Land 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soil 4.3 Flood Prone Lan 6.3 Site Specific Pro	vation es Use and Transport s d		

Proposed rezoning of 1	00-102 Elliott Street, Balmain.
	7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney
Additional Information :	It is recommended the planning proposal should proceed, subject to the following conditions:
	1. Prior to public exhibition, the planning proposal is to be updated to:
	a) address the social impact of the proposal, including consideration of the capacity of existing education, health and emergency services; and
	b) include current and proposed Land Zoning Maps (in accordance with the Standard Technical Requirements for LEP Mapping).
	2. Community consultation is required and the planning proposal must be made publicly available for a minimum of 28 days.
	3. Consultation is required with the following agencies, which should be given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal:
	 NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS), including provision of the Assessment of Traffic and Parking Implications NSW Department of Education and Communities (DEC) NSW Health
	- NSW Department of Family and Community Services - Ambulance Service of NSW
	- NSW Police Force - Fire and Rescue NSW
	- Sydney Water - Energy Australia.
	4. Should any consultees identified under Condition 3 request any additional information, or specify any additional matters to be addressed, the planning proposal is to be updated to respond to any such submission, a copy of which is to be included with the updated planning proposal.
	5. A public hearing is not required to be held into this matter.
	6. The time frame for completing this LEP is to be 9 months.
Supporting Reasons :	The planning proposal is supported, subject to conditions, because it: - meets the objectives and directions of A Plan for Growing Sydney by facilitating urban renewal and new housing opportunities within reasonable proximity to local services, facilities and bus routes (along Darling Street); - will increase and improve Sydney's housing supply; - facilitates mixed use outcomes for the site; - maintains the site's employment-generating potential; and
	 increases the amount of public open space available to the community and future residents.
Signature:	Mittho
Printed Name:	MRokot Date: 2/4-12016