

Fo change the zon Street, Turrella.	ning and amend development	t standards applying to I	and at 33 - 35 Cook	
Proposal Title :	To change the zoning and an Street, Turrella.	To change the zoning and amend development standards applying to land at 33 - 35 Cook Street, Turrella.		
Proposal Summa	amend height and floor spac under the Rockdale Local Er - rezone the site from R2 Lov - amend the height of buildin - amend the floor space ratio	The planning proposal seeks to change the zoning, remove minimum lot size requirement and amend height and floor space ratio controls applying to land at 33 and 35 Cook Street, Turrella under the Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011 (LEP). The proposal aims to: - rezone the site from R2 Low Density Residential to R4 High Density Residential zone; - amend the height of buildings map from 8.5m to 14.5m; - amend the floor space ratio map from 0.5:1 to 1.25:1; and - amend the lot size map to remove the minimum lot size requirement applying to the site.		
PP Number :	PP_2015_ROCKD_006_00	Dop File No :	15/12332	
Proposal Details				
Date Planning Proposal Receive	12-Aug-2015 id :	LGA covered :	Rockdale	
Region :	Metro(CBD)	RPA :	Rockdale City Council	
State Electorate :	ROCKDALE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
Street :	33-35 Cook Street			
Suburb :	Turrella City :	Sydney	Postcode : 2205	
Land Parcel :	Lot 17 DP 933980 and Lot 16 Sect	ion 4 DP 33396		
DoP Planning Officer Contact Details				
Contact Name :	Deewa Baral			
Contact Number	: 0292286572			
Contact Email :	deewa.baral@planning.nsw.g	jov.au		
RPA Contact D	etails			
Contact Name :	Josh Ford			
Contact Number	: 0295621634			
Contact Email :	jford@rockdale.nsw.gov.au			
DoP Project Ma	anager Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Charlene Nelson			
Contact Number	: 0292286570			
Contact Email :	charlene.nelson@planning.ns	sw.gov.au		

Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :		Consistent with Strategy :	
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) :	20
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 of Planning and communications with registered l		
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal is support - is consistent with State and Sub- encourage developments that will serviced by good public transpor - contributes towards the need for delivery of additional 20 dwellings - is consistent with the development	regional metropolitan strateg I facilitate increased housing t and close to jobs; r additional dwellings in Rocl s; and	provision in locations kdale LGA through the
External Supporting Notes :	The planning proposal reflects Re endorse a request to rezone and a Street, Turrella under the Rockda	amend development standard	
	Council has requested delegation Council's request of delegation is		this planning proposal.
Adequacy Assessmen	t		
Statement of the ob	jectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the ob	jectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	The objective of the planning p requirement and amend heigh will achieve the desired built fo	t and floor space ratio contro	Is applying to the site, which
Explanation of prov	isions provided - s55(2)(b)		
Is an explanation of pro	visions provided? Yes		
Comment :	To achieve the objective of the LEP are sought: 1. Land Zoning Map:	e planning proposal the follow	ving amendments to Rockdale

Street, Turrella.			
	2. Height of Buildings Ma - amend the height from	8.5 m to 14.5 m.	
	3. Floor Space Ratio Map - amend the floor space (4. Lot Size Map:		
	4. Lot Size Map: - remove the minimum lot size requirement for the site		
Justification - s55 (2)(c))		
a) Has Council's strategy be	een agreed to by the Direc	ctor General? No	
b) S.117 directions identified	d by RPA :	3.1 Residential Zones	
* May need the Director Ge	neral's agreement	3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney	
Is the Director General's	agreement required? No		
c) Consistent with Standard	I Instrument (LEPs) Order	2006 : Yes	
d) Which SEPPs have the F		SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land) SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land	
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :			
Have inconsistencies with it	tems a), b) and d) being a	dequately justified? Yes	
If No, explain :	Direction 4.1 Acid Sulf	ate Soils	
	soils as shown on Acid under Rockdale LEP A	when the proposed site has probability of containing acid sulfate d Sulfate Soils Planning Maps.The site is identified as Class 5 acid Sulfate Soils Map and in combination with the proposed on the site, the proposal is subject to this Direction.	
	The Direction requires a relevant planning authority to consider an acid sulfate soils study assessing the appropriateness of land use, if an intensification of land use is proposed on land identified as having a probability of containing acid sulfate soils.		
	To satisfy the inconsistency with the Direction, it is recommended that the Gateway determination include a condition requiring a preliminary acid sulfate soils study to determine the appropriateness of the land use intensification. Prior to public exhibition, Council should update the planning proposal to incorporate findings of the study, and include the acid soils assessment report with the exhibition documentation.		
	The planning proposal Directions.	l is not inconsistent with other applicable SEPPs and section 117	
Mapping Provided - s5	5(2)(d)		
Is mapping provided? Yes			
Comment :	The planning proposal includes maps showing the current and proposed zoning, lot size, building height and floor space ratio controls for the site. The maps are sufficient for community consultation.		
Community consultation	on - s55(2)(e)		
Has community consultatio	n been proposed? Yes		
Comment :	The planning proposal This is supported by th	recommends community consultation for a minimum of 28 days. ne Department.	

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 Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011 was notified on 5 December 2011. relation to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :

Need for planning proposal The planning proposal seeks to change the zoning and increase the building height and

floor space ratio controls to maximise the development capacity of the site. The planning proposal will enable an additional 20 dwellings on the site.

The planning proposal is the only mechanism that would allow for the consideration of rezoning and planning controls outside those currently prescribed under the Rockdale LEP.

Site characteristics

The site is irregular in shape comprising 2 allotments with a total area of 1,190 sq m. It has dual frontage along Cook and Reede Street and is bounded by high density residential zone towards the north and the east and low density residential zone towards the south and the west.

The site is a residual lot adjoining a large parcel of 6 storey residential development. The proposed increase in development controls for the site is considered to enable a development that will provide a transitioning built form for the low density developments across the road.

The site is about 150m south of Turrella Railway Station and is close to bus route servicing Rockdale and Campsie. It is in close proximity to other services such as child care centres, schools and shops. The proposed increase in density is consistent with the surrounding built form.

Street, Turrella.	
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	2014 NSW Population and Dwelling Projections – Rockdale LGA The population of Rockdale LGA is projected to increase by 30,850 for the period 2011-2031, equating to the need for an additional 13,500 dwellings. This indicates that Rockdale Council needs to plan for additional dwellings in the LGA to cater for population growth. This planning proposal will enable an additional 20 dwellings on the site, contributing towards the projected number of dwellings needed in the LGA.
	A Plan for Growing Sydney The following Directions under A Plan for Growing Sydney are considered relevant: - Direction 2.1: Accelerate housing supply across Sydney - Direction 2.3: Improve housing choice to suit different needs and lifestyles - Direction 3.1: Revitalise existing suburbs
	 Priorities for the South Subregion: Work with Council to identify suitable locations for housing intensification and urban renewal, particularly around Priority Precincts, established and new centres, and along key public transport corridors.
	The planning proposal is consistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney as it: - increases housing supply in close proximity to transport corridor, services and facilities; - improves housing choice and affordability; and - helps to revitalise existing suburbs.
	Rockdale City Community Strategic Plan 2013-2025 The proposal is consistent with the objectives and strategic outcomes set in the Rockdale Community Strategic Plan.
	Land zoning and planning controls The planning proposal is seeking to rezone the site from R2 Low Density Residential to R4 High Density Residential to allow development of Residential flat buildings. Residential flat buildings are not permissible under R2 Low Density Residential or R3 Medium Density Residential zone in Rockdale LEP 2011.
	The overall objective of the proposal is consistent with the application of a R4 High Density zone as it provides the housing needs of the community within a high density residential environment.
	The planning proposal is supported by an Urban Design report which identifies the proposed zoning and increase in the planning controls are consistent with the existing built form and desired future character of the locality.
Environmental social economic impacts :	There are no known critical habitats or threatened species populations or ecological communities, or their habitats affecting the site. There are no other likely environmental impacts resulting from the future development of the site.
	The proposed land use zoning will support additional housing opportunities which will have positive social and economic impact.
	Given the site's proxImIty to the train station, it Is considered that the impact of the proposal on the local roads will be minimal. Any issues relating to traffic and vehicular access can be approprlately addressed at the development application stage.

Proposal type : Routine Community Consultation Period : Timeframe to make 9 months Delegation : LEP : Public Authority Transport for NSW Consultation - 56(2) Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services (d) : 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 studies, if required . : If Other, provide reasons : If other, provide reasons : Identify any internal consultations, if required : No If other, provide reasons : If equired : If other, provide reasons : If other, provide reasons : Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : If yes, reasons :	28 Days	
LEP : Public Authority Transport for NSW Consultation - 56(2) Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services (d) : 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 studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 :		
Consultation - 56(2) Transport for NSW - Roads and Maritime Services (d) : 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 studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 :	RPA	
(2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? Yes If no, provide reasons : Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 :		
If no, provide reasons : Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 :		
Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 :		
If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 :		
Identify any additional studies, if required. : If Other, provide reasons : 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 :		
If Other, provide reasons : 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 :		
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 :		
No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons :		
Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons :		
If Yes, reasons :		
ocuments		
Document File Name DocumentType	Name Is Public	;
Cover Letter.pdf Proposal	Yes	
Planning Proposal.pdf Proposal	Yes	
Urban Design Report.pdf Study Council Report & Minutes_05.08.15.pdf Proposal	Yes Yes	
Attachment 4 - Evaluation criteria.pdf Proposal	No	

S.117 directions:	3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney
Additional Information :	It is recommended that the planning proposal proceed subject to the following: 1. Prior to public exhibition, the planning proposal is to be amended to include the
	a preliminary acid sulfate soils study to address the requirements of section 117

otreet, rurrena.		
	Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils. 2. The planning proposal is to be publicly exhibited for 28 days. 3. The planning proposal be completed within 9 months of the Gateway determination. 4. Consultation is required with the following public authorities: - Transport for NSW; and - Transport for NSW – Roads and Maritime Services. 5. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter.	
Supporting Reasons :	The planning proposal is supported as it: - is consistent with State and Subregional metropolitan strategy objectives; - contributes towards the need for additional dwellings in Rockdale LGA through the delivery of additional 20 dwellings; and - is consistent with the development controls on adjoining sites.	
-		
Signature:	R. Melson	
Printed Name:	CHARLENE NELSON. Date: 8/9/2015	

-