

Planning Team Report

Balmain Leagues Club site, Rozelle - Proposed rezoning from 'Business' to B2 Local Centre and introduction of site specific controls

Proposal Title :	Balmain Leagues Club site, R and introduction of site speci	•	ng from 'Business' to B2 Local Centre
Proposal Summary :	Leichhardt LEP 2013 by: • zoning the land B2 Local Ce • identifying the precinct on t • introducing a base floor spa development incorporating a incorporating a registered clu • introducing a site specific c commercial, retail and club u	entre; he key sites map; ice ratio of 1:1, with sepa ctive street frontage, and ib; lause which allocates a i ses on the site; and lause specifying the max	e Balmain Leagues Club precinct in arate incentives of 0.5:1 for mixed use I 0.9:1 for mixed use development range of gross floor area for residential, kimum building height and minimum
PP Number :	PP_2015_LEICH_003_00	Dop File No :	15/13033
Proposal Details			

Date Planning
Proposal Received:26-Aug-2015LGA covered :LeichhardtRegion :Metro(CBD)RPA :Leichhardt Municipal CouncilState Electorate :BALMAINSection of the Act :55 - Planning ProposalLEP Type :PrecinctFrecinctFrecinct

Location Details

Street :	138-152 Victoria Road		
Suburb :	Rozelle	City :	Postcode :
Land Parcel :	Lot 1 DP528045		
Street :	154-156 Victoria Road		
Suburb :	Rozelle	City :	Postcode :
Land Parcel :	Lot 1 DP109047		
Street :	697 Darling Street		
Suburb :	Rozelle	City :	Postcode :
Land Parcel :	Lot 104 DP733658		
Street :	1-7 Waterloo Street		
Suburb :	Rozelle	City :	Postcode :
Land Parcel :	Lots 101 and 102 DP629133, Lots 37 and 38 DP421 and Lot 36 DP190866		

DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

Contact Name :	Andrew Watkins
Contact Number :	0292286558
Contact Email :	andrew.watkins@planning.nsw.gov.au

RPA Contact Details

Contact Name :	Clare Harley
Contact Number :	0293679226
Contact Email :	clareha@lmc.nsw.gov.au

DoP Project Manager Contact Details

Contact Name :	Diane Sarkies
Contact Number :	0292286522
Contact Email :	diane.sarkies@planning.nsw.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) :	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?	Νο		
If Yes, comment :	The Department of Planning and Environment is not aware of any meetings or communications with registered lobbyists concerning this planning proposal.		
	The Department has met with rep Club on separate occasions to dis		_
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	 Whilst the Department supports the principle of including land within the Balmain Leagues Club precinct in Leichhardt LEP 2013 and the proposed B2 Local Centre zone, the site specific floor space ratio and height controls proposed are not supported as they: reduce the permissible density of the site for employment uses, representing an inconsistency with s117 Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Residential Zones; reduce the permissible residential density of the site, representing an inconsistency with 		

Centre and introduction	on of site specific controls
	s117 Direction 3.1 Residential Zones;
	• reduce the permissible density of the site, located on a main transport corridor with good
	access to public transport, shops and services, representing an inconsistency with s117
	Direction 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport;
	 introduce unreasonably restrictive site specific development controls, representing an
	inconsistency with s117 Direction 6.3 Site Specific Provisions; and
	restrict the development potential of a site located within the 'Parramatta to Sydney CBD
	via Ryde' urban investigation corridor , identified in A Plan for Growing Sydney,
	representing an inconsistency with s117 Direction 7.1 Implementation of a Plan for
	Growing Sydney.
	The second base first successful of 4.4 second suith in continues allowing up to 4.0.4
	The proposed base floor space ratio of 1:1, coupled with incentives allowing up to 1.9:1,
	represents a significant reduction to the current floor space ratio of 3.9:1 applying to the
	site under Leichhardt LEP 2000. Similarly, the proposed 6-8 storey height control is
	significantly lower than the current 12 storey height control under Leichhardt LEP 2000.
	The site has been subject to a number of development and rezoning applications, and
	-
	previous development applications have been considered by the Sydney East Joint
	Regional Planning Panel (the JRPP) and Planning Assessment Commission (the
	Commission). Both applications were refused primarily based on scale, density and traffic
	impact. These proposals sought a development outcome significantly higher than that
	permissible under the Leichhardt LEP 2000. The JRPP refused a development application seeking an FSR of 4.49:1 and the Commission refused a Part 3A application with a
	-
	proposed floor space ratio of 6.7:1 and revised proposals at 5.3:1 and 4.5:1.
	The proposal is inconsistent with the Commission recommendation that the current
	provisions under Leichhardt LEP 2000 "provide an appropriate framework for the site's
	future development". This recommendation was made by the Commission in its 11 April
	2014 decision to refuse a Part 3A development application for mixed use development of
	the land which sought a maximum floor space ratio of 4.5:1 and height of 22 storeys.
	Furthermore, the proposal is inconsistent with the Departments advice to Council to
	prepare a planning proposal which has regard to the recommendation of the Commission.
	ho h
	The Department has been advised that a development application to redevelop the site
	was lodged with Council on 14 August 2015. The development application reflects the
	recommendation of the Commission by fully complying with the current controls for the
	Balmain Leagues Club precinct in Leichhardt LEP 2000.
	The above points are discussed later in this report.
External Supporting	The planning proposal reflects Council's most recent site specific policy position on the
Notes :	Balmain Leagues Club precinct to enable a mixed use development that potentially
10003.	provides a range of benefits, including:
	• an appropriate built form and scale;
	 an appropriate built form and scale, new housing opportunities within an area supported by services;
	• remediation of contaminated land;
	 remediation of contaminated fand, increased population and density within walking catchments of local centres; and
	• the return of the Balmain Leagues Club.
	The lefter of the paninghi pending and
	Council recommends that the following studies be carried out as a requirement of the
	Gateway Determination:
	• Urban Design Study;
	• Development Control Plan;
	Traffic and Active Transport Assessment;
	Contamination Study;
	• Infrastructure study;
	Social Impact Assessment; and
	Retail Study/Economic Assessment.
	-
	Council wishes to exercise its plan-making delegation for this planning proposal.

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : The objective of the planning proposal is to include the Balmain Leagues Club precinct, which is currently a deferred matter, in Leichhardt LEP 2013, by zoning the land B2 Local Centre and establishing floor space ratio and built form controls to facilitate redevelopment of the site.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

To achieve the objectives of the planning proposal, the following amendments to Leichhardt LEP 2013 are proposed:

Amend the Land Zoning Map to rezone the precinct from 'Business' to 'B2 Local Centre';
 Amend the Floor Space Ratio Map applying to the precinct to a base FSR of 1:1;
 Amend the Key Sites Map to identify the Balmain Leagues Club site as a Key Site;
 Amend existing clause 4.4A 'Exception to maximum floor space ratio for active street frontages' to include "Area 2", which would encompass the larger part of the precinct;
 Add a new clause, 4.4B 'Exception to maximum floor space ratio (Balmain Leagues Site)' to provide incentives for mixed use development that incorporates a registered club at the site. This clause would allocate a specific range of gross floor area for residential, commercial, retail and club uses (e.g. a club with a gross floor area of between 1,500sqm and 2,035sqm); and

6. Add a new clause to Part 6 'Additional Local Provisions' to specify controls relating to maximum heights and setbacks for buildings on the land (e.g. two residential towers of 6 and 8 storeys, setback 5 metres from Victoria Road).

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

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

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA :

* May need the Director General's agreement

- 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones
- 2.1 Environment Protection Zones
- 2.3 Heritage Conservation
- 3.1 Residential Zones
- 3.3 Home Occupations
- 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
- 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils
- 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements
- 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes
- 6.3 Site Specific Provisions
- 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney

Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes

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 (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009
e) List any other	

matters that need to be considered :

Have inconsistencies with i	tems a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No
If No, explain :	Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones:
	This Direction relates to planning proposals that affect land within an existing or proposed business zone. The Direction requires that planning proposals must not reduce the total potential floor space area for employment uses and related public services in business zones.
	The planning proposal argues it is consistent with this Direction as it will facilitate redevelopment of the site, at an appropriate density, for mixed use purposes.
	The Department does not support this argument and considers the planning proposal to be inconsistent with this Direction. The planning proposal reduces the overall gross floor area on the site from 28,515 sqm to 13,865 sqm by reducing the maximum floor space ratio from 3.9:1 to 1.9:1. The planning proposal significantly reduces the total potential floor space for employment uses in business zones by decreasing: • commercial floor area from 1,620 sqm (FSR 0.2:1) to 1,000 sqm (FSR 0.14:1); • retail floor area from 9,858 sqm (FSR 1.3:1) to 870 sqm (FSR 0.12:1); and • club floor area from 3,516 sqm (FSR 0.5:1) to 2,035 sqm (FSR 0.28:1).
	In relation to this Direction, the planning proposal does not provide sufficiently detailed justification for the proposed reduction in potential employment floorspace over and above stating that: • the proposed development density controls are appropriate; and • the current controls have been tested to "understand the traffic and transport impacts on Victoria Road and the surrounding streets in the vicinity"; and • in essence, that circumstances have changed since the current controls were adopted and there is no available Government policy in place to address the congestion on Victoria Road in the short to medium term.
	This inconsistency is not considered to be of 'minor significance' and despite the inclusion of a (Saturday) traffic modelling report, has not been sufficiently justified.
	Direction 3.1 Residential Zones:
	This Direction relates to planning proposals affecting land within any zone in which significant residential development is permitted or proposed to be permitted, and requires, amongst other things, that a planning proposal does not contain provisions which will reduce the permissible residential density of the land.
	The planning proposal argues it is consistent with this Direction as it will broaden housing choice and affordability and make more efficient use of existing infrastructure.
	The planning proposal is inconsistent with the Direction in that it would reduce the permissible residential density of the land. The current controls allow for 13,794 sqm of residential floor area on the site, equating to a maximum floor space ratio of 1.9:1. The planning proposal seeks to reduce the residential floor area on the site to 9,960 sqm, equating to a maximum floor area on the site residential floor area on the site residential floor area on the site to 9,960 sqm,
	This inconsistency is not considered to be of 'minor significance' and has not been sufficiently justified.
	Direction 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport
	This Direction seeks to ensure that development is located in areas that are accessible by walking, cycling or by public transport, to reduce dependence on cars, support the efficient and viable use of public transport, and provide for the efficient movement of freight. It applies to proposals that seek to create, alter or remove a zone relating to urban land, including land zoned for residential, business or industrial purposes.

The planning proposal argues it is consistent with this Direction in that the proposed density outcomes of the site are informed by the highly constrained nature of Victoria Road and designed to not impact the service level of roads and intersections. However, the planning proposal acknowledges the site is within walking distance to a range of retail and business services.

Whilst the Department acknowledges this argument, the planning proposal has not sufficiently justified inconsistency with this Direction. The site is located on a main transport corridor with good access to public transport links to jobs and services in the Sydney CBD. The planning proposal has not adequately demonstrated that the existing controls for the site under Leichhardt LEP 2000 will unreasonably impact on the service level of roads and intersections to warrant the reduction in permissible density on the site.

This inconsistency is not considered to be of 'minor significance' and has not been sufficiently justified.

Direction 6.3 Site Specific Provisions:

The objective of this Direction is to limit unnecessary site specific controls. It is a requirement of the Direction that, where a planning proposal seeks to amend an Environmental Planning Instrument to allow a particular development, the proposal must either:

a) Allow that land use to be carried out in the zone the land is situated on;b) Rezone the site to an existing zone that will not impose additional development standards; or

c) Allow that land use on the relevant land without imposing additional development standards.

The planning proposal argues it is consistent with this Direction as it does not include any unnecessarily restrictive development standards or requirements for the site.

The Department does not support this argument and considers the planning proposal to be inconsistent with this Direction. The planning proposal introduceS two new clauses (4.4B 'Exception to maximum floor space ratio (Balmain Leagues site)' and Clause 6.18 Development of land at the Balmain Leagues Site'), which respectively seek to limit particular uses to specified floor areas, and provide specified building height and setback limits.

It is considered that the proposed limits (particularly the proposed maximum FSR of 1.91:1) are unreasonably restrictive when considered against the strategic planning framework, and the decision of the Commission (11 April 2014) which noted that the existing controls applying to the site (including an FSR of 3.9:1) "still enable its redevelopment for a mix of uses, including residential development and a new club". The Commission's view was that the provisions in the Leichhardt LEP 2000 (as amended) "provide an appropriate framework for the site's future redevelopment."

This inconsistency is not considered to be of 'minor significance' and has not been sufficiently justified.

Direction 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney:

The Direction gives legal effect to A Plan for Growing Sydney and requires planning proposals to be consistent with the Plan.

The planning proposal argues it is consistent with this Direction in that the service level of Victoria Road is not impacted as a result of the planning proposal.

The Department considered this argument is not sufficient to determine that the

centre and introduction o	r site specific controls
	planning proposal is consistent with this Direction. The site is located within the identified 'Parramatta to Sydney CBD via Ryde' urban renewal investigation corridor, which provides development opportunities due to its location as a cross-city corridor and its accessibility to transport infrastructure. The proposal would significantly reduce the potential of the site's contribution to the renewal of this corridor and is therefore inconsistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney and this Direction.
	This inconsistency is not considered to be of 'minor significance' and has not been sufficiently justified.
	SEPP 32 Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land):
	The SEPP requires that: (1) Each council must, when preparing environmental planning instruments or considering development applications relating to urban land, implement the aims and objectives of this Policy to the fullest extent practicable. (2) The Minister must, when considering the making of environmental planning instruments relating to urban land, implement the aims and objectives of this Policy to the fullest extent practicable.
	The planning proposal represents a significant reduction in development potential of the site, when compared to existing controls. Specifically the proposal reduces: • gross floor area from 28,515 sqm to 13,865 sqm; • floor space ratio from 3.9:1 to 1.9:1;
	height of buildings from 12 storeys to 6-8 storeys;
	 parking spaces from 412 to 329; residential floor area from 13,794 sqm (FSR 1.9:1) to 9,960 sqm (FSR 1.37:1); commercial floor area from 1,620 sqm (FSR 0.2:1) to 1,000 sqm (FSR 0.14:1); retail floor area from 9,858 sqm (FSR 1.3:1) to 870 sqm (FSR 0.12:1); and club floor area from 3,516 sqm (FSR 0.5:1) to 2,035 sqm (FSR 0.28:1).
	The planning proposal is inconsistent with this SEPP as its aims and objectives will not be implemented to the fullest extent possible.
	The planning proposal is considered to be consitent with the remaining applicable s.117 Direction and SEPPs.
Mapping Provided - s5	5(2)(d)
Is mapping provided? Yes	
Comment :	The planning proposal includes proposed applicable Land Zoning, Key Sites, and Floor Space Ratio Maps. The Maps are sufficient for community consultation.
Community consultation	on - s55(2)(e)
Has community consultation	n been proposed? Yes
Comment :	The planning proposal recommends a public exhibition period of 28 days, and specifies numerous elements Council's 'community engagement plan' for the proposal. Should the planning proposal be approved, this is supported by the Department.
Additional Director Ger	neral's requirements
Are there any additional Dir	rector General's requirements? No
If Yes, reasons :	
Overall adequacy of the	e proposal
Does the proposal meet the	e adequacy criteria? Yes

If No, comment :

Proposal Assessment	
Principal LEP:	
Due Date :	
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The Leichhardt Local Environmental Plan 2013 was notified on 23 December 2013 and commenced on 3 February 2014.
	The Balmain Leagues Club precinct is a deferred matter under Leichhardt LEP 2013 and is zoned 'Business' under Leichhardt LEP 2000. The principle of the precinct's redevelopment is generally consistent with the aims of the LEP.
Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	Council indicates that the planning proposal is a result of the need to facilitate the redevelopment of the site for mixed use purposes, stating that it will provide the added benefit of providing new housing stock within an established urban area serviced by existing infrastructure and public transport.
	The site is a 'deferred matter' under the Leichhardt LEP 2013. The Department made a post exhibition change to defer the site from Leichhardt LEP 2013 as the proposed base FSR of 1:1 with a 1.5:1 bonus represented a 'down zoning' from the controls in Leichhardt LEP 2000, and it was considered premature to consider any change to the controls until the Part 3A application had been finalised.
	Following the Commission's refusal of that development application, the Department advised Council that it was then appropriate that controls applying to the site be brought up to date and included within the current LEP.

Consistency with strategic planning	A Plan for Growing Sydney:
framework :	The site is located within the identified 'Parramatta to Sydney CBD via Ryde' urban renewal investigation corridor, which provides development opportunities due to its location as a cross-city corridor and its accessibility to transport infrastructure.
	The proposal would significantly reduce the site's potential contribution to the renewal of this corridor and is therefore inconsistent with Direction 2.1 (Accelerate urban renewal across Sydney - providing homes closer to jobs) and Action 2.2.2 (Undertake urban renewal in transport corridors which are being transformed by investment, and around strategic centres) of A Plan for Growing Sydney.
	NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan (2012):
	Victoria Road is identified as one of the most congested road corridors in Sydney. One of the Plan's long term (10-20 years) Actions is to introduce Bus Rapid Transit on key established corridors including Victoria Road. The corridor from Parramatta to the CBD via Victoria Road "will be investigated for potential BRT or light rail development", and opportunities for the creation of more dedicated bus lanes will be created by WestConnex.
	The planning proposal states that there is no short to medium term Government policy to address congestion on Victoria Road. The only long term goal is the investigation of BRT and consequently urban renewal cannot be investigated until the BRT is in place, or it is at least subject to a funding and approval commitment. The proposal also states that current controls applying to the site/precinct are outdated, and were predicated on short to medium term investment in the Victoria Road transport corridor between Ryde and Sydney CBD.
	Sydney's Bus Future (December 2013):
	The planning proposal's consideration of this document states that there is no short to medium term Government commitment to improve public transport links along Victoria Road; only a long term commitment to the 'investigation' of improvements. Whilst the stated longer term commitments are for 'investigation', key actions for the 'Parramatta to Sydney CBD via Ryde' corridor are identified, including bus priority projects and the extension of bus lane operating hours. The planning proposal does not provide sufficient justification in relation to, or consideration of, these proposed actions.
	Relationship to Leichhardt LEP 2013:
	The site was deferred from LEP 2013, for the reason stated above. The site remains deferred until the site and any applicable controls/provisions are included in the LEP 2013. Until such a time, the controls of LEP 2000 continue to apply to the site/precinct.
	Community Strategic Plan - 'Leichhardt 2025+' and the Leichhardt 'Community and Cultural Plan 2011 to 2021':
	The principle of the planning proposal, and the site's/precinct's redevelopment is not inconsistent with the aims of these Plans.
	Leichhardt Employment and Economic Development Plan 2013-2023 (EEDP):
	This Plan seeks to improve the vitality and viability of the local economy and identifies a number of 'opportunities', the most relevant of which are: • Council's encouragement of appropriate redevelopment of strategic sites and under-utilised land to provide affordable housing for key workers and students; and • residential and commercial development increasing the numbers of consumers and expenditure levels to create new business opportunities.
	The Plan also identifies a number of 'threats' and 'weaknesses' in the LGA such as:

	the threat of inappropriate development;
	 the appearance of its centres and corridors; and
	negative perceptions of parking availability.
	Given that the site is currently vacant and derelict/unsightly, the principle of the proposal is not inconsistent with the EEDP.
	Leichhardt Integrated Transport Plan 2014-2024:
	This Plan was developed to assist in the reduction of car dependency and improving safety for the community, and identifies a number of objectives including improving accessibility; the provision of a safe and efficient road network; the integration of land use, transport and community. The planning proposal is not inconsistent with the objectives of this Plan.
	Leichhardt Environmental Sustainability Plan 2015-2025:
	This plan "guides Council's actions towards an environmentally sustainable and liveable community". The planning proposal is not inconsistent with this Plan.
	The planning proposal demonstrates 'in principle' consistency with the strategic planning framework. However, it does not make a compelling case for the proposals's inconsistencies with:
	• A Plan for Growing Sydney;
	• s.117 Directions 1.1, 3.1, 3.4, 6.3 and 7.1;
	 SEPP 32 Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land); and
	 insufficient justification against the NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan.
Environmental social economic impacts :	There are no known critical habitat or threatened species populations or ecological communities, or their habitats affecting this precinct, and there are no other likely environmental impacts that cannot be managed or mitigated through the development application process.
	Traffic Impact: The planning proposal argues that the current development outcomes as a result of the current Leichhardt LEP 2000 controls will have a negative impact in terms of of traffic and parking and demand for public transport on Victoria Road and the surrounding streets.
	The planning proposal includes a "Saturday Traffic Model" which indicates that the proposal would have a negligible impact upon the travel and waiting times during the Saturday peak. Potential traffic-related impacts have been a significant issue for the redevelopment of the site.
	However, no justification has been provided in terms of weekday impacts, nor for the proposed controls being so much lower than current controls, particularly in light of the Commission's opinion, and the Department's advice to Council, that the current controls provide an appropriate framework for the redevelopment of the site.
	Urban Design: The planning proposal states Council's Design Advisory Group were engaged to review the building envelope and other built form controls to address best practice and the Commission's view that the provisions of the Leichhardt LEP 2000 provide an appropriate framework for the future development of the site.
	The resultant Design Principles do not sufficiently demonstrate that the proposed height and setback controls will achieve a superior built form outcome for the site. The planning proposal provides limited information as to how the best practice principles were arrived at. Whilst the planning proposal indicates the scale and intensity of the built form will need to be tested through additional urban design analysis, the Department considers insufficient justification has been provided to support the reduction in permissible density on the site.

Social and Economic:

The planning proposal provides little consideration of social and economic impacts, except to state that it is expected that a social impact assessment and a retail study/Economic Assessment would be required as a condition of the Gateway Determination.

The Department considers that the proposal would provide positive social and economic outcomes for the community. Notwithstanding this, the proposal significantly reduces the potential positive outcomes when considered against the current controls.

Assessment Process

Proposal type :	Precinct		Community Consultation Period :	Nil	
Timeframe to make LEP :	0 months		Delegation :	Nil	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2) (d) :					
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matter proceed ?		Νο			
If no, provide reasons :	Leagues Club precinct the floor space ratio at • reduce the permissib inconsistency with s11 • reduce the permissib with s117 Direction 3.1 • reduce the permissib good access to public with s117 Direction 3.4 • introduce unreasona inconsistency with s11 • restrict the developm CBD via Ryde' urban representing an incon Growing Sydney.	t in Leichł nd height ole density 17 Directio ole residen 1 Residen 1 Residen 1 Residen 1 Residen 1 Residen 1 Integrati bly restric 17 Directio nent poter investigat sistency v	y of the site, located on a main b, shops and services, represent ng Land Use and Transport; ctive site specific developme on 6.3 Site Specific Provision that of a site located within the con corridor, identified in A with s117 Direction 7.1 Imple	osed B2 Local Centre zone, upported as they: uses, representing an al Residential Zones; senting an inconsistency in transport corridor with enting an inconsistency nt controls, representing an ns; and ne 'Parramatta to Sydney Plan for Growing Sydney, ementation of a Plan for	
	that the current provis framework for the site the Commission, a dev	ions unde 's future o velopmen 2015. The	th the Commission's recommer the Leichhardt LEP 2000 "prov development". Consistent wi t application to redevelop the e development application co dt LEP 2000.	/ide and appropriate ith the recommendation of e site was lodged with	
	achieve a significant r principle of reducing r	reduction			
	space on the site is po component of the plan	otentially on the second se	hat any nett reduction in com offset by increasing the resid posal. This recommendation intensive traffic generator co	is made on the premise of	

	n of site specific control		
	needs to be verified.		
	by: • a commercial feasibility a space for the site will yield • a traffic and access study	he floor space ratio controls for the site need ssessment that demonstrates the proposed n a commercially viable development; and and report which has regard to the proposed fic generation and access into and out of the	nix of floor I floor space
Resubmission - s56(2)(b): No		
If Yes, reasons :			
Identify any additional stu	udies, if required. :		
lf Other, provide reasons			
Identify any internal cons	ultations, if required :		
No internal consultatior	n required		
Is the provision and fund	ing of state infrastructure rele	vant to this plan? No	
If Yes, reasons :			
cuments			v
Document File Name		DocumentType Name	Is Public
BLPP.pdf		Proposal	Yes
Preparation of the planni	ng proposal supported at this	stage : Not Recommended	
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Industri	al Zones	
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and Industri 2.1 Environment Protection		
S.117 directions:		on Zones	
S.117 directions:	2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones	on Zones	
S.117 directions:	2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations	on Zones	
S.117 directions:	2.1 Environment Protectio 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use	on Zones	
S.117 directions:	2.1 Environment Protectio 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use a 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils	and Transport	
S.117 directions:	2.1 Environment Protectio 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use a 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral	on Zones and Transport Requirements	
S.117 directions:	2.1 Environment Protectio 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use a 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrat 6.2 Reserving Land for Put	on Zones and Transport Requirements Iblic Purposes	
S.117 directions:	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use at 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrance 6.2 Reserving Land for Put 6.3 Site Specific Provision 	and Transport Requirements Iblic Purposes	
S.117 directions: Additional Information :	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Uses 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrance 6.2 Reserving Land for Put 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A F 	and Transport Requirements Iblic Purposes	
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use at 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrance 6.2 Reserving Land for Put 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A Put Put Put Put Put Put Put Put Put Put	on Zones and Transport Requirements Iblic Purposes Is Ian for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons:	
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use at 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrance 6.2 Reserving Land for Put 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A Put Put Put Put Put Put Put Put Put Put	on Zones and Transport Requirements ublic Purposes as lan for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions:	
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Uses 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrance 6.2 Reserving Land for Put 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A P The planning proposal is 1. It is inconsistent with the 	on Zones and Transport Requirements ublic Purposes as lan for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions:	
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use at 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrance 6.2 Reserving Land for Put 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A Pit The planning proposal is 1. It is inconsistent with the at 1.1 Business and Indust 	on Zones and Transport Requirements ublic Purposes as Plan for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions:	
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use at 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referration 6.2 Reserving Land for Put 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A Pit The planning proposal is 1. It is inconsistent with the 1.1 Business and Industry b) 3.1 Residential Zones; 	and Transport Requirements ablic Purposes as lan for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions: atrial Zones	
	 2.1 Environment Protectio 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use a 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referral 6.2 Reserving Land for Pu 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A P The planning proposal is 1. It is inconsistent with th a) 1.1 Business and Indus b) 3.1 Residential Zones; c) 3.4 Integrating Land Use d) 6.3 Site Specific Provision 	and Transport Requirements ablic Purposes as lan for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions: atrial Zones	
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Uses 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 6.1 Approval and Referrance 6.2 Reserving Land for Protection 6.3 Site Specific Provision 7.1 Implementation of A F The planning proposal is 1.1 It is inconsistent with th a) 1.1 Business and Industion b) 3.1 Residential Zones; c) 3.4 Integrating Land Use d) 6.3 Site Specific Provision e) 7.1 Implementation of A 	and Transport Requirements ablic Purposes as lan for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions: atrial Zones	t of Urban Land).
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use at the environment of the environment	and Transport Requirements ablic Purposes as Plan for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions: atrial Zones are and Transport; atrial Zones atrial Zones at	
	 2.1 Environment Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use at the environment of the environment	and Transport Requirements ablic Purposes as and for Growing Sydney not supported for the following reasons: the following s.117 Ministerial Directions: atrial Zones are and Transport; alons; and A Plan for Growing Sydney.	onsistent with A

4. The planning proposal does not provide compelling justification for a reduction in development capacity, particularly when considered against the advice of the Planning Assessment Commission in its April 2014 refusal of a Part 3A development application for the site. Supporting Reasons : The RPA should be advised that: 1. The principle of including land within the Balmain Leagues Club precinct in Leichhardt LEP 2013 and the proposed B2 Local Centre zone is supported, however the site specific floor space ratio and height controls proposed are not supported as they significantly reduce development potential of the site. 2. The proposal is inconsistent with s.117 Directions 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones; 3.1 Residential Zones; 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport; 6.3 Site Specific Provisions; 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney; and SEPP 32 Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land). 2. The strategic justification given to support the reduction of development standards on the Balmain Leagues Club precinct is insufficient. 3. The planning proposal is inconsistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney in that it significantly reduces the sites potential contribution to the renewal of the Parramatta to Sydney CBD via Ryde urban renewal corridor, as identified in the Plan. The proposal is therefore inconsistent with: • Direction 2.1 (Accelerate urban renewal across Sydney - providing homes closer to jobs); and Action 2.2.2 (Undertake urban renewal in transport corridors which are being transformed by investment, and around strategic centres). Signature: Date: Printed Name: