

Bankstown CBD

Proposal Title :	Bankstown CBD		·
Proposal Summary :	To update the planning controls Council's strategic plan for its n		Business District (CBD) to implement CBD Local Area Plan 2011).
PP Number :	PP_2012_BANKS_002_00	Dop File No :	11/22536
Proposal Details	·······		
Date Planning Proposal Received :	02-Jul-2012	LGA covered :	Bankstown
Region :	Sydney Region West	RPA :	Bankstown City Council
State Electorate :	BANKSTOWN	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Precinct		
Location Details			
Street :			
Suburb :	City :		Postcode :
Hu an	e planning proposal applies to the i ime Highway to the south, Stacey S d Oxford Ave and Brancourt Ave to the planning proposal.	it to the east, Shenton and I	loskins Avenues to the south,
DoP Planning Offi	icer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Tim Archer		
Contact Number :	0298601568		
Contact Email :	tim.archer@planning.nsw.gov.au		
RPA Contact Deta	ils		
Contact Name :	Mauricio Tapia		
Contact Number :	0297079923		
Contact Email :	mauricio.tapia@bankstown.nsw.g	jov.au	
DoP Project Mana	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :			
Contact Number :			
Contact Email :			
Land Release Dat	a		
Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Metro West Central subregion	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes

13 Jul 2012 02:50 pm

Bankstown CBD			
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 :	CODE OF CONDUCT At this point in time, to the best o is compliant with the Department relation to communications and n	of Planning and Infrastruc	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	POLITICAL DONATIONS DISCLOS The political donation disclosure requires public disclosure of dona planning system.	laws commenced on 1 Oc	
	The disclosure requirements under relevant planning applications and	=	
	The term relevant planning applic "A formal request to the Minister, an environmental planning instru	a council or the Director (	General to initiate the making of
	Planning Circular PS08-009 specif Minister or Director General is req any).		
	No disclosures were provided for	this planning proposal.	
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	No		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	Council is keen to progress the Ba Therefore Council prefers that the to existing Bankstown LEP 2001.		
External Supporting Notes :			
Adequacy Assessmen	t.		
Statement of the obj			
Is a statement of the ob			
Comment :	,		

.

## Explanation of provisions provided - s55(2)(b) Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes The explanation is generally adequate. Comment : However, it is noted that the proposal includes a number of reclassifications from community to operational land (see points numbers 10 and 11 on p.9 of the planning proposal). This part should be clearer in terms of the whether the classifications will discharge any interests, trusts etc from the relevant sites. The discharge of interests etc should be made clear towards the front of the planning proposal. As such, Part 2 should be revised to include words relating to the proposed discharge of any trusts, estates, interests, dedications, conditions or restrictions and covenants affecting the land or any part of the land. Additionally, point number 10 (p. 9) indicates that Attachment 4 contains the biodiversity model provision and the map, but the provision is missing. Council should ensure the Department's most recent model provision for biodiversity is attached to the planning proposal. This could be provided as an attachment to the letter from the Director General if a gateway determination to proceed is issued. Justification - s55 (2)(c) a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? No 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones b) S.117 directions identified by RPA : 2.1 Environment Protection Zones \* May need the Director General's agreement 2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.1 Residential Zones 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 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 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 7.1 Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 Is the Director General's agreement required? Yes c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 1-Development Standards SEPP No 4-Development Without Consent and Miscellaneous **Exempt and Complying Development** SEPP No 6-Number of Storevs in a Building SEPP No 19—Bushland in Urban Areas SEPP No 21—Caravan Parks **SEPP No 22—Shops and Commercial Premises** SEPP No 32-Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land) SEPP No 33—Hazardous and Offensive Development SEPP No 50-Canal Estate Development SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land

13 Jul 2012 02:50 pm

SEPP No 62—Sustainable Aquaculture SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage

SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development SEPP No 70—Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004 SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004

Bankstown CBD	
	SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007
	SEPP (Major Projects) 2005 SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007 SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008
	SEPP (Temporary Structures and Places of Public Entertainment) 2007 GMREP No. 2 - Georges River Catchment
e) List any other matters that need to be considered :	
Have inconsistencies w	vith items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? <b>No</b>
If No, explain :	No - Council is unable to justify the proposal's inconsistency with s117 direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land at this time.
	Please see the assessment section for more information.
Mapping Provided -	s55(2)(d)
Is mapping provided? Y	/es
Comment :	The maps provided are adequate, however: 1. Council should ensure that the maps exhibited are of a high enough resolution and size to allow the community to easily review proposed proposed on a site-by-site basis. 2. The zoning map requires a key.
Community consult	ation - s55(2)(e)
Has community consulta	ation been proposed? <b>Yes</b>
Comment :	Council recommends that the planning proposal be exhibited for 28 days. This is consistent with the Department's "A Guide to Local Environmental Plans", and 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	t the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	
Proposal Assessment	
Principal LEP:	
Due Date : December 2	012
Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	A gateway determination to allow the draft Principal LEP to be exhibited was issued recently. Council are yet to begin the public exhibition.
Assessment Criteria	
	The key matters addressed by the planning proposal include:
Need for planning proposal :	ne koy matters addressed by the planning proposal include.

## Bankstown CBD

p to tf s s p ci ai ai w p ci ai s c c i ai s c s S S	The purpose of the planning proposal is to amend the existing Bankstown LEP 2001. It is envisaged that the Principal LEP will continue to progress separately. Council wish to rogress its proposals for the CBD as soon as possible, and considers that it will be quicker to do this as a separate process to the Principal LEP. Please note that a certificate to allow the draft Principal LEP to be exhibited was issued recently. The LEP will be based on the CBD Local Area Plan (LAP) as adopted by Council in eptember 2011. The LAP provides actions to: inform changes to the statutory framework, rovide priorities for infrastructure, create more jobs and dwellings within the CBD in, or lose to, accessible areas, encourage housing choice, and protect the existing cultural and rchitectural history of the City of Bankstown. The LAP also envisages 5 distinct precincts within the CBD to be in place by 2031. For more information, see pages 3 - 5 of the lanning proposal. Council has prepared maps for zoning, height, floor space ratio, and biodiversity. hese are attached to the planning proposal. The planning proposal includes a number of proposed rezonings, as well as stroducing a new zone for medium density residential development. The majority of ezonings will allow for greater development potential on the subject lands. It also introduces as provisions to protect biodiversity.
in It	formation. is considered that a planning proposal is the best way to implement and deliver ouncil's proposals for the Bankstown CBD.

Consistency with	METROPOLITAN AND SUBREGIONAL STRATEGIES
strategic planning	The following strategies are relevant to the draft LEP:
amework :	<ul> <li>Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 and</li> </ul>
	Draft West Central Subregional Strategy
	Council has considered the planning proposal against the relevant strategic planning
	framework. The LEP will be capable of facilitating additional population and employment
	growth as identified in the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 and draft West Central
	Subregional Strategy. Further, the proposal contains new planning and development
	controls which would provide opportunity for the Bankstown CBD to grow as a major
	centre.
	The planning proposal is not considered to be inconsistent with any action of the
	Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036 or the draft West Central Subregional Strategy.
	SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS
	Council identifies a number of section 117 directions (pages 17-20) that are applicable to
	this planning proposal.
	The planning proposal is inconsistent with:
	Direction 1.1 – Business and industrial zones – Council proposes to reduce the floor
	space potential on the southern side of Bankstown City Plaza (ie. 12-38 Bankstown City
	Plaza) to protect "townscape character" and potential heritage significance at this
	location.
	The inconsistency with the direction is considered to be of a minor nature.
	Direction 3.1 – Residential zones – Council proposes to reduce the permissible
	residential density of a small number of sites on Vimy and Oxford Streets by rezoning the
	land from high density to medium density residential, and revising the current floor space
	ratio from 0.75:1 to 0.5:1 and building height from 12 to 9 metres. Council has proposed
	the lower controls to protect "townscape character" and provide a transition between the existing high and low density residential zones.
	Council also proposes to downzone within a lot in Conway Road as it currently contains a split FSR and height.
	The downzonings are considered to be of a minor nature, plus Council is proposing a number of upzonings as part of the planning proposal.
	However, within its justification of the inconsistency with this direction (p. 18 of the
	planning proposal) it is noted that Council does not discuss the proposed downzoning
	along the blocks fronting Oscar Street. The planning proposal should be revised to
	address this matter under the discussion on this direction.
	Direction 3.5 – Development Near Licensed Aerodromes – The direction requires that
	Council obtain permission from the relevant Department of the Commonwealth, or a
	delegate, if the introduction of the height of buildings map permits development that
	encroaches above the Obstacle Limitation Surface. Council consulted with the
	Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and Transport and Bankstown Airport Limited and has not received a response that satisfies the direction.
	This is an ongoing issue with the direction as the Commonwealth has the view that it will not address the above issue at the zoning stage but rather on a DA-by-DA basis.
	Direction 4.1 – Acid Sulfate Soils – Council proposes to intensify land uses on land
	potentially containing acid sulphate soils, and there hasn't been a formal assessment (as required to be consistent with the direction). Given the class of the land and the minor
	upzoning proposed, the inconsistency is considered minor.
	Direction 4.3 – Flood Prone Land – Council proposes to increase residential densities

kstown CBD			
	in an area identified as	a medium flood risk area.	
	Council is currently pre satisfy the inconsisten	eparing a floodplain risk managemen cy with this direction.	t plan for Salt Pan Creek to
		e inconsistencies with directions 1.1, s provided, and that the Director-Gen s are justified.	
	floodplain risk manage	3, the inconsistency can not be approment plan for Salt Pan Creek. While roval to the inconsistency is given, t bition.	the planning proposal can not
		AL PLANNING POLICIES	
	Council has considered planning proposal). The	l the planning proposal against relev e planning proposal is not considere	ant SEPPs (page 17 of the d inconsistent with any SEPPs.
	SEPP No. 1 – Deve SEPP No. 4 – Deve Development;	SEPPs will no longer apply to the Cl lopment Standards; lopment Without Consent and Misce mpt and Complying Development;	
		mends that the planning proposal ar s and REPs (deemed SEPPs).	ed draft instrument be exhibited
Environmental social economic impacts :	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS The CBD is largely an urban area.		
	Notwithstanding, the planning proposal contains new provisions to protect natural resources in the subject area (namely Ruse Park) by adopting the Department's draft model clause for biodiversity and a map to identify where this clause applies.		
	SOCIAL The planning proposal provides a strategic fra accessible area close to	will implement Council's Local Area mework to provide new housing, gre o public transport.	Plan for the CBD which en space and facilities in an
ssessment Proces	5		
Proposal type :	Precinct	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days
imeframe to make	9 Month	Delegation :	DG
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Transport for NSW NSW Police Force Transport for NSW Origin Energy Transport for NSW - Ra Transport for NSW - Ro	Services - Housing NSW ilCorp ads and Maritime Services	
	State Emergency Servic Sydney Water Telstra		

nkstown CBD				
Is Public Hearing by the	PAC required?	No		
(2)(a) Should the matter	proceed ?	Yes		
If no, provide reasons :				
Resubmission - s56(2)(b	) : <b>No</b>			
If Yes, reasons :				
Identify any additional stu	udies, if required. :			
If Other, provide reasons	::			
Identify any internal cons	sultations, if required	:		
No internal consultation	1 required			
Is the provision and fund	ing of state infrastru	cture relevant to	this plan? <b>No</b>	
If Yes, reasons :				
·······		······		
cuments				
Document File Name			DocumentType Name	Is Public
Bankstown City Counci	02-07-2012		Proposal	Yes
nning Team Recomn Preparation of the planni		ed at this stage :	Recommended with Conditions	
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and	I Industrial Zone	S	
	2.1 Environment			
	2.3 Heritage Cons			
	3.1 Residential Zo		ured Home Estates	
	3.3 Home Occupa		area nome estates	
	3.4 Integrating La		nsport	
	3.5 Development		Aerodromes	
	4.1 Acid Sulfate S 4.3 Flood Prone L			
	6.1 Approval and		rements	
	6.2 Reserving La	•		
	6.3 Site Specific I			
Additional Information :	•	•	olitan Plan for Sydney 2036 Ing proposal proceed, subject to the	following
Additional anormasors .	conditions:	u mat ure praim	nng proposal proceed, subject to the	ionowing
	a) revise Part 2 - I proposal, when fi	Explanation in t inalised, will dis trictions and co	oposal prior to exhibition as follows: he planning proposal to include a cla charge any trusts, estates, interests, venants affecting the land or any par	rification that the dedications,
			der the discussion on the proposal's proposed downzoning of the land fro	-
	c) Council should	l ensure the Dep	partment's most recent model provisi	on for biodiversity is

ikstown CBD	
	attached to the planning proposal (as indicated in point number 10 on page 9 of the planning proposal).
	2. Council revise the planning proposal's attached maps prior to exhibition as follows: a) Council should ensure that the maps exhibited are of a high enough resolution and size to enable the community's review of proposed controls on a site-by-site basis (eg. A3)
	b) The zoning map requires a key.
	3. The planning proposal should proceed on the understanding that Council will continue to undertake work to address the proposal's inconsistency with s117 direction 4.3, and that the proposal can not be finalised until this inconsistency is approved.
	4. Council consult with the following agencies:- >> Transport for NSW (including RMS, Transport NSW and Railcorp) >> NSW State Emergency Service >> Sydney Water
	>> Office of Environment and Heritage >> NSW Police >> Telstra
	>> Housing NSW >> Origin (Integral Energy) >> Adjoining local councils
	This consultation can occur concurrently with the public exhibition of the proposal.
	5. The planning proposal be publicly exhibited for 28 days.
	6. The timeframe for the making of the LEP is to be 9 months from the week following the gateway determination.
Supporting Reasons :	The planning proposal is supported as: 1. it will implement Council's strategic plan for Bankstown CBD, 2. it will provide a greater development potential within the centre,
	<ol> <li>It will provide a greater development potential within the centrel;</li> <li>the Principal LEP (which is mostly a translation/rollover of current controls) and the Bankstown CBD LEP will be able to progress separately,</li> <li>the intended outcomes, explanation of provisions and justification of the planning proposal are consistent with the criteria outlined in the Guide to Preparing Local</li> </ol>
	Environmental Plan, and 5. it will meet the aims of Sydney Metropolitan Plan 2036 by allowing Bankstown CBD to continue to grow as a major centre.
Signature:	Zik
Printed Name:	-1im Archer Date: 13/7/12