

Proposal Title :	Reclassification of land near	Church Street, Lilyfield from	Community to Operational Land
Proposal Summary		ind near Church Street, Lilyf	eichhardt Local Environmental Plan deld from 'Community' to 'Operation Montage' Function Centre.
		-	s a public reserve, nor to affect any ions, or covenants on the land, nor t
PP Number :	PP_2015_LEICH_001_00	Dop File No :	15/07505
oposal Details			
Date Planning Proposal Received :	11-May-2015	LGA covered :	Leichhardt
Region :	Metro(CBD)	RPA :	Leichhardt Municipal Council
State Electorate :	BALMAIN	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Reclassification		
ocation Details			
Street :			
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :
Land Parcel : Lot	B DP 159831 and part Lot 2 DP	599686	
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Andrew Watkins		
Contact Number :	0285754114		
Contact Email :	andrew.watkins@planning.nsw	/.gov.au	
RPA Contact Detai	ls		
Contact Name :	Katie Miles		
Contact Number :	0293679114		
Contact Email :	katiem@lmc.nsw.gov.au		
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Diane Sarkies		
Contact Number :	0285754111		

Reclassification of land near Church Street, Lilyfield from Community to Operational Land

In succession of the local division of the l			
Land Release Data			
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro Inner West subregion	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 :	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 :	The Department is not aware of a concerning this planning propose		ons with registered lobbyists
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	1. The land to be reclassified covers an area of approximately 380 square metres and is currently part of the car park of the 'Le Montage' Function Centre, providing approximately 8 parking spaces and circulation alsies. It has been used by the Centre to meet the minimum car parking requirements as specified in the development consent for the Centre. According to Council, it has been used for car parking since at least 1978 and prior to Le Montage, it was used by the former occupier, APIA club.		
	2. Lot B DP 159831 and part Lot 2 DP 599686 are Council-owned and currently zoned R1 General Residential and RE1 Public Recreation, respectively, under the LEP 2013. The part of the subject land that is zoned RE1 is not suitable for use as open space, given its size, and location and use as part of an existing car park. The balance of Lot 2 DP 599686 which is not part of the planning proposal, is to remain classified as 'Community' land and zoned RE1.		
	3. The planning proposal states that the adopted Plan of Management for the adjacent Leichhardt Park recommended the reclassification of this land to enable it to be leased at market rent.		
	A review of the Leichhardt Park F - the subject land is outside (but - there were issues of limited enc were "inadvertently permitted" by Council, the owners of the land a - the outcome of the above encro current LEP) was to be amended 'operational', and that the land we Centre at market rent.	immediately adjacent to) the roachment onto the adjacent y Council, but which have sin nd the Department of Lands; achment issues was that the to change the status of the 'c	boundary of Leichhardt Park; Crown land reserve that ice been resolved between LEP 2000 (being the then community' land to
	Council has advised that during t NSW Department of Primary Indu		

		by Le Montage Function Centre. At the time, and despite the ed to retain the controls as exhibited, and for the site to be subject v.
		he NSW Department of Primary Industries be consulted on the of the Gateway Determination.
	amendment, a public res "discharged from any tru covenants affecting the l proposed reclassification	al Government Act 1993 requires that if, as a result of the LEP serve ceases to be a public reserve, and if the land is to be usts, estates, interests, dedications, conditions, restrictions and land", the Governor has to approve the proposed provision. As the n does not seek to remove reservations, or change any other roposal does not require the Governor's approval under section 30 t Act 1993.
	•••	ernor is required before an amendment to Part 2 of Schedule 4 of 'interests changed'. The proposal seeks to amend Part 1 of
	minor nature of the plan	d that the plan-making function be delegated. Given the relatively ning proposal, and that the Governor's approval is not required, nd Council's request for delegation are supported.
External Supporting Notes :	1. Council has lodged the planning proposal to reclassify the land from 'Community' to 'Operational' land in order to enable the subject land to be leased as a car park, thereby raising revenue to finance Council-initiated projects, therefore 'compensating' the community for the private use of the land.	
	is unsuitable for use as an existing car park. It is	a land as a car park has been on-going for 40-50 years or more, and public open space, due to its location within, and surrounded by, currently used as part of the existing car park by the 'Le Montage' to meet parking requirements as specified in its development
	•	lanagement for the adjacent Leichhardt Park recommended the bigger bigge
equacy Assessme	nt	
Statement of the o	bjectives - s55(2)(a)	
Is a statement of the c	objectives provided? Yes	
Comment :	Montage Function Ce	lanning proposal is to allow Council to lease the car park to the Le ntre for car parking at market rent. The rent for the land can then be of other projects, as determined by Council.
	used for the funding (or other projects, as determined by Council.
Explanation of pro	visions provided - s55	
	visions provided - s55 rovisions provided? Yes The proposed reclass reclassified, as opera	(2)(b) ification will be identified in Schedule 4, Part 1 (Land classified, or
Is an explanation of pr Comment :	visions provided - s55 rovisions provided? Yes The proposed reclass reclassified, as opera changes to zoning, no reserve.	(2)(b) sification will be identified in Schedule 4, Part 1 (Land classified, or tional - no interests changed) of the LEP 2013. There are no proposed
Is an explanation of pr Comment : Justification - s55	visions provided - s55 rovisions provided? Yes The proposed reclass reclassified, as opera changes to zoning, no reserve.	(2)(b) sification will be identified in Schedule 4, Part 1 (Land classified, or tional - no interests changed) of the LEP 2013. There are no proposed or does the proposal seek to change the site's status as a public
Is an explanation of pr Comment : Justification - s55	visions provided - s55 rovisions provided? Yes The proposed reclass reclassified, as opera changes to zoning, no reserve. (2)(c) egy been agreed to by the D	(2)(b) sification will be identified in Schedule 4, Part 1 (Land classified, or tional - no interests changed) of the LEP 2013. There are no proposed or does the proposal seek to change the site's status as a public
Is an explanation of pr Comment : Justification - s55 a) Has Council's strate b) S.117 directions ide	visions provided - s55 rovisions provided? Yes The proposed reclass reclassified, as opera changes to zoning, no reserve. (2)(c) egy been agreed to by the D	(2)(b) sification will be identified in Schedule 4, Part 1 (Land classified, or tional - no interests changed) of the LEP 2013. There are no proposed or does the proposal seek to change the site's status as a public

	6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney		
Is the Director Gener	ral's agreement required? No		
c) Consistent with Stand	dard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes		
d) Which SEPPs have th	PPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land		
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	DEPARTMENT PRACTICE NOTES PN 09-003 'Classification and reclassification of public land through a local environmental plan': This Practice Note provides guidance on the classification and reclassification process, and includes general requirements for exhibition and public hearings.		
	The planning proposal generally accords with the Practice Note, but it is recommended that the Gateway Determination should draw Council's attention to the guidance and requirements relating to public exhibition and public hearings.		
Have inconsistencies wit	ith items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Yes		
f No, explain :	Direction 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils: This Direction seeks to avoid significant adverse impacts resulting from the use of land containing acid sulfate soils.		
	The land is identified as being located on Class 2 acid sulfate soil. There are no proposed changes to planning controls or uses, and the existing local provision (claus 6.1 Acid sulfate soils in Leichhardt LEP 2013) regulates development of land with Acid Sulfate Soils. The proposal is therefore consistent with this Direction.		
	Direction 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes: This Direction enables the reservation of land for public purposes and facilitates the removal of reservations where land is no longer required for this purpose.		
	The land is Council-owned and there are no proposed changes to planning controls, and the land is not required for public purposes. The proposal does not seek to chang the site's status as a 'public reserve'. The proposal is consistent with this Direction.		
	There are no inconsistencies with other SEPPs or s.117 Directions.		
apping Provided -	s55(2)(d)		
s mapping provided? Ye	es		
Comment :	The planning proposal includes an aerial photo and an annotated extract from its zonir map to indicate the location of the proposed reclassification. As no mapping changes are proposed or required, the map and aerial photo extracts provided are adequate for the purposes of the exhibition and assessment of this planning proposal.		
ommunity consulta	ation - s55(2)(e)		
las community consulta	ation been proposed? Yes		
Comment :	Council proposes a 28 day public exhibition period and, as required by the Local Government Act 1993, a public hearing. The Department's Practice Note PN 09-003 provides guidance on the requirements for public exhibition and public hearings.		
dditional Director G	General's requirements		
Are there any additional	Director General's requirements? Yes		
f Yes, reasons :	The Department's 'A Guide to Preparing Local Environmental Plans' details specific requirements regarding reclassifications. The planning proposal is consistent with		
	those requirements.		

	for finalisation is supported. Council has sought delegation of the plan-making functions, which is supported by the Department.
verall adequacy o	f the proposal
Does the proposal me	et the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	Council's explanation of the proposal and its objectives is adequate.
posal Assessmen	
rincipal LEP:	
Due Date :	
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	Leichhardt LEP 2013 was notified on 23 December 2013 and commenced on 3 February 2014.
ssessment Criteri	a
Need for planning proposal :	The proposal seeks to amend Schedule 4, Part 1 of the Leichhardt LEP 2013 by reclassifying the land from 'Community' to 'Operational' land in order to facilitate the leasing of the land for car parking, as it is not useable as open space, and as it has been used as a car park for around 50 years.
	The planning proposal is not a result of any specific strategic study or report, although Council's Plan of Management (2004) for the adjacent Leichhardt Park did recommend that the land be reclassified.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	A Plan for Growing Sydney (2014): There are no specific Actions or Directions in the Plan that relate to the planning proposal.
	Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy: Council has identified Objective F2 (Provide for a diverse mix of parks and public places) and Action G1.2 (Improve local planning and assessment) as relevant to the planning proposal.
	Council states that it has no records of the subject land being used for public open space, and that it is likely that the car park use has been on going for around fifty years. The reclassification will reflect this longstanding use. It is therefore considered that, despite the subject land being part-zoned RE1, Direction F2 does not apply to the proposal.
	With regard to Action G1.2, the planning proposal states that the reclassification will "regularise local planning by recognising that the site has historically been used for car parking and is unsultable for use as public open space." It is considered that the proposal is not inconsistent with this Action.
	Community Strategic Plan - Leichhardt 2025+ Council states that the proposal is consistent with goals and objectives relating to "Place where we live and work" and "Sustainable Service and Assets", but does not provide any explanation of the proposal's consistency with these goals and objectives.
	Notwithstanding, the proposal is considered not inconsistent with the goals and stated objectives, which seek to facilitate a socially, environmentally and economically liveable community; and an "accountable civic leadership that delivers services and assets to support the community now and in the future".
Environmental social economic ímpacts :	Environmental: Given the nature of the proposal, and the fact that the site is already part of a well-established hard surfaced car park, it is not anticipated that there will be any adverse environmental impacts. Furthermore, the site is not identified as containing any critical

Reclassification of land near Church Street, Lilyfield from Community to Operational Land

		eet, Enyneid nom community to t		
	classified as 'Com having the ability to	ceives little benefit from the site while it r munity' land. The proposed reclassificati o generate income from leasing the land, cil initiatives, thereby having the potentia	on would result in Council , and to devote that income to	
Assessment Process	5			
Proposal type :	Minor	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months	Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :	Other			
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
If no, provide reasons :				
Resubmission - s56(2)(b	o) : No			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional st	udies, if required.			
If Other, provide reasons	5 :			
Identify any internal cons	sultations, if required	:		
No internal consultatio	n required			
Is the provision and fund	ling of state infrastruc	ture relevant to this plan? No		
If Yes, reasons :				
Documents				
Document File Name		DocumentType Na	ame Is Public	
Planning Proposal.pdf Further info.pdf		Proposal Proposal	Yes Yes	

Planning Team Recommendation

Further Info 2.6.2015.pdf

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions

S.117 directions:	3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes
	4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
	4.3 Flood Prone Land
	6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
	6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
	7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney

Yes

Proposal

Reclassification of land	near Church Street, Lilyfield from Community to Operational Land
Additional Information :	Council has requested delegation of plan-making functions for this planning proposal. Section 30 (Reclassification of community land as operational) of the Local Government Act 1993 does not apply. Consequently, Governor's approval is not required and the requested delegation is supported.
	It is recommended that the planning proposal proceed subject to the following conditions:
	1. The planning proposal is exhibited for a minimum of 28 days, consistent with Council's intentions.
	2. Council is to consult NSW Primary Industries.
	3. A public hearing is required to be held on the reclassification of the subject land, under section 29 of the Local Government Act 1993.
	4. The planning proposal is to be completed within 6 months.
Supporting Reasons :	The planning proposal is supported for the following reasons: - it is not inconsistent with the NSW strategic planning framework and Council's strategic plans;
	 there will be no change to the physical state of the land; and the proposal will result in the potential for public benefit to be gained as a result of the generation of income for Council to spend on Council-initiated projects and initiatives.
Signature:	Tombris
Printed Name:	Diane Sarkies Date: 3/6/15