

l

| Proposal Title : | Canterbury L | ocal Environment | al Plan 2012 Amendment 2 | 2 | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| Proposal Summa | - 30 Trenevar - 436 and 440 - 591-605 Car | To allow a greater density of residential development at: - 30 Trenevar Street, Ashbury - 436 and 446-454 Canterbury Road, Campsie - 591-605 Canterbury Road, Belmore - 754-794 Canterbury Road and 1A Trafalgar Street, Belmore | | | | |
| PP Number : | PP_2013_CA | NTE_001_00 | Dop File No : | 13/06390 | | |
| roposal Details | | | | | | |
| Date Planning Proposal Receiv | 28-Mar-2013 ed | | LGA covered : | Canterbury | | |
| Region : | Sydney Regior | n East | RPA : | Canterbury C | ity Council | |
| State Electorate | CANTERBURY LAKEMBA OATLEY | | Section of the Act : | 55 - Planning | Proposal | |
| LEP Type : | Spot Rezoning | | | | | |
| ocation Details | 5 | | | | | |
| Street : | 30 Trenevar Street | | | | | |
| Suburb : | Ashbury | City : | Canterbury | Postcode : | 2193 | |
| Land Parcel : | | | | | | |
| Street : | 436 & 446-454 Cant | terbury Road | | | | |
| Suburb : | Campsie | City : | Canterbury | Postcode : | 2194 | |
| Land Parcel : | | | | | | |
| Street : | 591-605 Canterbury | y Road | | | | |
| Suburb : | Belmore | City : | Canterbury | Postcode : | 2192 | |
| Land Parcel : | | | | | | |
| Street : | 754-794 Canterbury Road & 1A Trafalgar Street | | | | | |
| Suburb : | Belmore | City : | Canterbury | Postcode : | 2192 | |
| Land Parcel : | | | | | | |

DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

| Contact Name : | Michael Kokot |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Contact Number : | 9228623900 |
| Contact Email : | michael.kokot@planning.nsw.gov.au |

RPA Contact Details

| Contact Name : | Allan Shooter |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| Contact Number : | 9879936400 |
| Contact Email : | allans@canterbury.nsw.gov.au |

DoP Project Manager Contact Details

Contact Name :

Contact Number :

Contact Email :

Land Release Data

| Growth Centre : | N/A | Release Area Name : | N/A |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Regional / Sub Regional Strategy : | Metro East subregion | Consistent with Strategy | N/A |
| MDP Number : | 0 | Date of Release : | |
| Area of Release (Ha) : | 0.00 | Type of Release (eg Residential / Employment land) : | N/A |
| No. of Lots : | 0 | No. of Dwellings (where relevant) : | 203 |
| Gross Floor Area | 0 | No of Jobs Created : | 0 |
| The NSW Government Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with : | Yes | | |
| If No, comment : | 10 1 | | |
| Have there been meetings or communications with | Νο | | |

If Yes, comment :

registered lobbyists? :

Supporting notes

| Internal Supporting Notes : | Council currently has delegation to make the plan and has submitted Attachment 4 - Evaluation Criteria for the Delegation of Plan Making functions in relation to the planning proposal. Council's request for delegation is supported. |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Council has supplied a timeline proposing a 5 month completion period. However, as this has not included all the steps involved (eg liaison with PC), a 9 month period is considered to be more realistic. |
| External Supporting Notes : | The Department is not aware of any meetings or communications with registered lobbyists concerning this planning proposal. |

| The planning proposal will assist the provision of potentially up to 203 dwellings towards |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| the draft South Subregional Strategy dwellings target. |

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment :

Council states that the objectives of the planning proposal are to amend Canterbury LEP 2012 to allow greater density of development on the four subject sites via amendments relating to zoning, floor space ratio and height controls. This statement of objectives is considered adequate.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

Council has explained that the amendments to Canterbury LEP 2012 will involve alterations to the zoning, floor space ratio and height maps. It will not be necessary to amend the written instrument. Council's explanation is acceptable.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No

| b) S.117 directions identified by RPA : | 2.3 Heritage Conservation |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| * May need the Director General's agreement | 3.1 Residential Zones |
| May need the Director General's agreement | 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport |
| | 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 |

Is the Director General's agreement required? No

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

| d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? | SEPP No 6—Number of Storeys in a Building |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| | SEPP No 22—Shops and Commercial Premises |
| | SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land |
| | SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage |
| | SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development |
| | SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 |
| | SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 |
| | |

Council has advised that the planning proposal is not inconsistent with the above applicable SEPPs.

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? N/A

If No, explain :

e) List any other matters that need to

be considered :

Council has provided an assessment of the consistency of the planning proposal with the S117 Directions considered to be relevant. Council's assessment is supported.

Following receipt of the planning proposal, Council advised that S117 Direction 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 is also relevant to this planning proposal. The planning proposal is consistent with this Direction as it will provide 203 additional dwellings in suitable locations to assist with the Strategy's social and economic objectives.

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes
Comment : Where relevant for each site, Council has provided the following maps:
- Locality plan
- Current zoning

- Existing FRS controls
- Proposed FSR controls
- Existing height controls
- Proposed height controls

While these maps are not in full Standard Instrument mapping format, they accurately identify the subject land and current and proposed planning controls. The Gateway Determination should require Council to prepare full Standard Instrument compliant maps for exhibition purposes.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Comment :

- Council advised that it intends to advertise the planning proposal as follows:
- Council's column in the local papers and Council's website
- notification letters to relevant State agencies and any authorities nominated by the Department
- letters to all owners/occupies of adjoining/directly affected landowners
- exhibition notice displayed at Council's Offices, with available copies.

Council's timeline proposes a 28 day exhibition period. Given the minor nature of the planning proposal, 14 days is considered to be sufficient time.

Council's proposed approach is supported.

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 notified in December 2012. to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

| Need for planning proposal : | The land covered by the planning proposal was subject of submissions to the exhibition of Canterbury LEP 2012 seeking greater density of development, together with several other similar submissions. Following discussion with the Department, Council agreed to not propose any post-exhibition changes to the LEP to avoid re-exhibition concerns, but rather to deal with any matters through a planning proposal. |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Council resolved to undertake a Residential Development Strategy to deal with the bulk of such submissions. Following an initial assessment, Council concluded that the four subject sites had merit to proceed now because of minimal implications on the future zoning of similarly zoned land and any other policy matters. |
| | 30 Trenevar Street Ashbury |

This vacant surplus Ausgrid site is currently zoned R2 Low Density Residential, with an 8.5 m height control and no FSR under Canterbury LEP 2012. The site is also within the Ashbury Heritage Conservation Area covering the suburb.

Its previous 2(a) zoning under Canterbury LEP 138 allowed town house and villa development similar to the current R3 Medium Density Development zone of Canterbury LEP 2012, but not the site's current R2 zoning. Ausgrid's submission to the draft LEP objected to this anomaly and requested an R3 zoning to reinstate its former development right.

Council proposes to rezone the site to R3 Medium Density Residential, with a 0.5:1 FSR, similar to other R3 zones, as well as dual occupancies in R2 and R3 zones. This will not have an adverse impact on the Heritage Conservation Area, as the property does not have any contributory heritage value and is a battle-axe lot hidden from the surrounding streetscape. Council's proposal is supported.

436 and 466-454 Canterbury Road, Campsie

These properties are currently zoned R4 High Density Residential under Canterbury LEP 2012, with an 18 m height control and a 0.9:1 FSR. No. 436 is owned by the NSW Land and Housing Corporation (Department of Housing) and contains a three storey residential flat building.

Council proposes to increase the FSR of these properties to 1.6:1 consistent with all other R4 zones with an 18 m height control to correct this anomaly, as requested by the Department of Housing's submission for its property to the draft LEP. Council's proposal is supported.

591-605 Canterbury Road, Belmore

This land is zoned R3 Medium Density Residential, with typical 8.5 m height and 0.5:1 FSR controls under Canterbury LEP 2012. Council proposes to rezone the land to R4 High Density Residential, with a corresponding increase in the height control to 18 metres and the FSR to 1.6:1.

This proposal is in keeping with the draft Canterbury Road Master Plan, which was used as a basis to similarly rezone other surrounding areas along Canterbury Road under Canterbury LEP 2012. Council perceived the exclusion of the subject land at the time as an anomaly. Council's proposal is supported.

754-794 Canterbury Road and 1A Trafalgar Street, Belmore

This land is zoned identically to 591-605 Canterbury Road, Belmore and has similar planning issues. For the same reasons, Council proposed to rezone the land to R4 High Density Residential, with a height control of 18 m and FSR of 1.6:1. While a submission in favour of such controls only related to 776-784 Centerbury Road, Council is proposing to amend the controls for the whole block for completeness. Council's proposal is supported.

| Consistency with strategic planning framework : | The planning proposal is consistent with the objectives and actions of the draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031 and the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 by increasing housing supply in Canterbury and for the Metropolitan area. | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| | | | meet the dwelling targets in p to 203 additional dwelling | | Subregional |
| | helps to achieve the At | ttractive C to achieve | tent with the Canterbury Co ity objective by revitalising the Balanced Urban Develo sing. | part of the Cant | erbury Road |
| | Land Use Zoning Strat | egy funde | tent with the draft Canterbu d by the Department, by rez h the proposed zoning/dens | coning subject la | |
| Environmental social economic impacts : | more efficient use of la | and and h | development potential, the as a positive social and eco 3 dwellings for the commun | nomic impact b | |
| | The planning proposal | l has no k | nown adverse environmenta | al impacts. | |
| Assessment Process | 5 | | | | |
| Proposal type : | Minor | | Community Consultation Period : | 14 Days | |
| Timeframe to make LEP : | 9 Month | | Delegation : | | |
| 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 |) : No | | | | |
| If Yes, reasons : | | | | | |
| Identify any additional st | udies, if required. : | | | | |
| If Other, provide reasons | | | | 2 | |
| Identify any internal cons | sultations, if required : | | | | |
| No internal consultation | | | | | |
| Is the provision and fund | ling of state infrastructure | e relevant i | to this plan? No | | |
| If Yes, reasons : | | | | | |
| Documents | | | | | |
| Document File Name | | | DocumentType Na | ame | Is Public |

14

| Canterbury Amendment | 2 delegations.doc | Proposal | Yes |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| nning Team Recomn | nendation | | |
| Preparation of the planni | ng proposal supported at this | stage : Recommended with Condition | S |
| S.117 directions: | 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.4 Integrating Land Use a 7.1 Implementation of the | | 8 |
| Additional Information : | It is recommended that th conditions: | e planning proposal proceed subject t | o the following |
| | 1. The planning proposal | is exhibited for 14 days. | |
| | 2. The planning proposal | is completed within 9 months. | |
| | | t be prepared consistent with the requ for LEP Maps guideline document. | irements of the Standard |
| | submitted Attachment 4 | ogress the planning proposal under de - Evaluation Criteria for the Delegatio s considered to be of local significance supported. | n of Plan Making |
| | The RPA should be advise | ed that: | |
| | Directions, including 7. | is considered to be consistent with th I Implementation of the Metropolitan S not need to address these further. | |
| | - | rid and the NSW Land and Housing Co and in their ownership affected by the | |
| | 3. No further studies are I | required to be carried out. | |
| Supporting Reasons : | to submissions/anomalie | considered to be minor in nature and s arising in the course of the preparati Il have social and economic benefits t d is supported. | ion of Canterbury LEP 2012 |
| | | | |
| Signature: | DPitna | X | |
| | WID DITAK | 12/4/1 | R |