

Proposal Title : Proposal Summary :	WEST GOSFORD Planning Proposal to amend Gosford LEP 2014 to delete reference to maximum floor area in Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses affecting land at 356 and 392 Manns Road The proposal seeks to delete reference to maximum floor space limits for the Additional Permitted Uses (APU), being bulky goods premises and business premises, on the subject site. The proposal would amend clause 10 and 11 of Schedule 1 APU under the Gosford Local Environmental Plan 2014 (GLEP).			
PP Number :	PP_2017_CCOAS_007_00	Dop File No :	17/08392	
Proposal Details			All Sector Readings	No se meje
Date Planning Proposal Received :	15-Jun-2017	LGA covered :	Central Coast	
Region :	Hunter	RPA :	Central Coast Council	
State Electorate :	GOSFORD	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal	
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning			
Location Details				
Street : Ma	anns Road			
Suburb : We	est Gosford City :		Postcode : 2250	
Land Parcel : Pa	rt Lot 1 and Lots 19 - 21 DP 27067	8, Lot 30 DP 1172968, part	SP 84324	
DoP Planning Offi	cer Contact Details			
Contact Name :	Corrine Manyweathers			
Contact Number :	0243454404			
Contact Email :	corrine.manyweathers@planning	g.nsw.gov.au		
RPA Contact Deta	ills			
Contact Name :	Michael Bowman			
Contact Number :	0243258222			
Contact Email :	michael.bowman@centralcoast.	nsw.gov.au		
DoP Project Mana	ger Contact Details			
Contact Name :				
Contact Number :				
Contact Email :				
Jonaol Linair.				

Land Release Data

Growth Centre :		Release Area Name :	
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Central Coast Regional Plan 2036	Consistent with Strategy :	Yes
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	No		

Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :

If Yes, comment :

Supporting notes

Internal Supporting The proposal was considered adequate on 15 June 2017. Notes : BACKGROUND The site is located in the southern part of the West Gosford industrial precinct and is located in the vicinity of major roadworks upgrades on the corner of Central Coast Highway and Manns Road. The site is currently zoned IN1 General Industrial (IN1). Commercial premises, including bulky goods premises and business premises, are prohibited in the zone. However, Council has allowed the development of both sites for bulky goods through enabling clauses and Schedule 1 APU, whilst retaining the IN1 zone. The current APU clauses allow bulky goods in the Hometown site capped at 12,000m2 and bulky goods capped at 10,700m2 and business premises capped at 1,560m2 on the Riverside site. The closure of Masters Home Improvement store (Masters) has left a large building unoccupied and created the stimulus for this planning proposal. Council is considering both of the sites as their development is similar in bulk and type, both sites are zoned IN1 and are subject to an APU. The site is identified in the Central Coast Regional Plan (CCRP) as being within the Southern Growth Corridor which is a designated for future jobs, services and business growth. The CCRP aims to capitalise on upgrades of the Central Coast Highway and Manns Road intersection through increased employment diversity and integrated land uses at West Gosford. Council has decided not to rezone the site at this stage as a strategic review will be undertaken as part of the CCRP to examine appropriate zoning that will facilitate economic development within the precinct. A precinct wide strategic review is supported.

As such, the proposal to delete reference to maximum floor area should be considered to

facilitate use of existing sites until a precinct would review is undertaken.

Council supports the proposal as it is consistent with the Central Coast Regional Plan, will facilitate employment in West Gosford and will facilitate use of the existing buildings prior to a strategic review of the Corridor.

External Supporting Notes :

Adequacy Assessment

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

Is a statement of the objectives provided? Yes

Comment : Council's stated objective is to delete all references to maximum floor space limitations on the additional permitted uses enabled on the subject sites.

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

Council seeks to achieve the objective by:

• Amending Gosford Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2014 Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses Clauses 10 and 11 by deleting all reference to 'maximum floor space limitations'.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

a) Has Council's strategy been agreed to by the Director General? Yes

b) S.117 directions identified by RPA : 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones 2.2 Coastal Protection * May need the Director General's agreement 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions Is the Director General's agreement required? Unknown c) Consistent with Standard Instrument (LEPs) Order 2006 : Yes d) Which SEPPs have the RPA identified? SEPP No 14—Coastal Wetlands SEPP No 19---Bushland in Urban Areas SEPP No 44-Koala Habitat Protection SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land SEPP No 71-Coastal Protection e) List any other **Draft SEPP Competition 2010** matters that need to Council's assessment considers the proposal is consistent with the objectives of the draft be considered : SEPP. Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? No If No, explain : S117 DIRECTIONS The proposal is consistent with all relevant S117 Directions, except as identified below. Inconsistency with the following Directions is considered to be of minor significance:

lanns Road	
	4.1 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land Council's mapping identified that part of the site has a medium potential to be unstable and this direction applies to the site. Given the site is already developed, inconsistency with this direction is considered to be of minor significance.
	4.3 Flood Prone Land Part of the site is identified as flood prone and this direction applies to the site. Given the site is developed inconsistency with this direction is considered to be of minor significance.
	Further consideration is required to demonstrated or to justify any inconsistency with the following S117 Directions:
	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport This Direction applies to the proposal as it has the potential to generate many trips and will provide large floor plates for a range of uses. Council's assessment does not adequately address the potential impacts relating to land use and transport that are generated by this proposal. Council should update the planning proposal to consider Improving Transport Choice - Guidelines for planning and development and The Right Place for Business and Services - Planning Policy as well as address the terms of the direction.
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection Part of the site is identified as bushfire prone. The majority of the site is developed with commercial premises, car parks and driveways. The NSW RFS provided comment on the original development application. Although the planning proposal is unlikely to result in an increased fire risk, referral to NSW RFS is required under this direction.
Mapping Provided	- s55(2)(d)
Is mapping provided?	No
Comment :	The proposal will not result in any changes to the GLEP 2014 mapping.
Community consu	ltation - s55(2)(e)
Has community consu	Itation been proposed? Yes
Comment :	A minimum exhibition period of 14 days is supported as the proposal is considered to be minor.
Additional Director	General's requirements
Are there any additior	al Director General's requirements? Yes
If Yes, reasons :	PROJECT TIMEFRAME Council's proposed timeframe is 9 months. However, a 6 month timeframe is recommended given the proposal is a minor amendment.
	DELEGATIONS Central Coast Council requested delegation to make the draft LEP. As the proposal is a minor amendment to the GLEP 2014 and is generally consistent with the Central Coast Regional Plan, Council should be granted delegation.
Overall adequacy of	of the proposal
Does the proposal me	et the adequacy criteria? Yes
If No, comment :	

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date : July 2017

Comments in relation to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Assessment Criteria	
Need for planning proposal :	Council has advised the planning proposal is not the result of a specific strategic study of report.
	Hometown and Riverside are generally characterised by large floor plate commercial buildings. Hometown mostly includes bulky goods use units. Riverside includes the previous Masters Home Improvement (Masters) store and a number of smaller scale units, generally used as business premises (including a gym, dentist and medical suites).
	BULKY GOODS Deletion of the maximum floor area requirement applying to the site will allow existing buildings, which are larger than the maximum limit, to be used as bulky goods premises. The proposal will specifically benefit the Masters building which has been vacant since it closed in 2016.
	The bulky goods component of the proposal will facilitate employment in the West Gosford area, particularly enabling a range of uses in the vacant Masters building. The proposal is in keeping with the existing development type and scale and would be consistent with the existing uses on site.
	West Gosford is located close to the Freeway and has appropriate car parking facilities for the type and scale of uses that would be permitted under the proposal. The proposal will also contribute to employment in the local area.
	BUSINESS PREMISES Riverside currently contains a number of business premises, of a smaller scale than the bulky goods units, that include a gym, dentist and medical suites. Business premises means 'an occupation, profession or trade (other than an industry) carried out for the provision of services directly to members of the public on a regular basis, or a service is provided directly to members of the public on a regular basis'.
	Deletion of the maximum floor space requirements for business premises may impact the strategic context of the industrial precinct given the large size of existing buildings and potential scale of future business uses. Council's assessment lacks detailed analysis of the potential impacts resulting from deletion of floor area requirements on the precinct and on the impacts on the viability and vitality of centres including Gosford CBD.
	Council's proposal should be updated to consider the potential impacts of changes to the maximum floor area for business premises, especially in relation to traffic, lack of public transport and impacts on the centres including Gosford CBD consistent with the requirements of S117 Direction 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport.
	Council's proposal should also address whether it would be appropriate to extend the APU of business premises to the Hometown site.

Consistency with strategic planning framework :	 CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL PLAN 2016 (CCRP) Council's assessment notes the proposal is consistent with the CCRP. Council has identified priority actions which are relevant to the planning proposal: Action 2.2 - Capitalise on improved access from the \$170 million upgrade of the Central Coast Highway, Brisbane Water Drive and Manns Road intersection to increase employment diversity and integrate land uses at West Gosford. Action 3.2 - Harness opportunities for business investment and employment by leveraging major public transport investment and projects. Action 4.1 - Enhance the competitive value of the region by encouraging business and employment activities that leverage the major inter-regional transport connections to Sydney and the Hunter regions. Action 7.1 - Facilitate economic development that will lead to more local employment opportunities on the Central Coast.
	The subject site is located within the Southern Growth Corridor in the West Gosford industrial precinct.
	The site is located within close proximity to the Central Coast Highway and Manns Road intersection, which has recently been upgraded. The proposal is unlikely to generate an unreasonable traffic impact on the road network, due to upgrades and it is well connected to surrounding areas.
	The existing development represents a significant economic investment in the area, however, Schedule 1 clause 10 and 11 limit the economic viability and employment potential of the site as a number of the existing buildings have an area greater than that detailed in the enabling clause. The proposal will facilitate a range of employment opportunities within the West Gosford industrial area.
	 COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLANS - GOSFORD 2025 (PLAN) Council's assessment indicates the proposal is consistent with the Plan's objectives to: C1.1 - Broaden range of business and industry sectors. C1.3 - Increase and broaden the range of local jobs across existing and emerging employment sectors.
	BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY (STRATEGY) Council's assessment notes the proposal is consistent with the Strategy.
Environmental social economic impacts :	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
	SOCIAL Council's assessment indicates that the proposal will facilitate employment on the site, particularly the vacant Masters building, which has a floor area greater than that permitted by the enabling clause.
	WATER AND SEWER The site is connected to water and sewer. The proposal will not impact supply.
	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT • Parking Council's assessment suggests the proposal will generate additional traffic due to increase in potential bulky goods and business premises uses.
	The Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) Guide to Traffic Generating Developments 2013 (Guide) undertook a number of surveys across metropolitan and regional areas to determine the traffic generation of certain development types. The Guide's results suggest that 'Major hardware and building supplies stores' generate on average 40% more traffic than 'Bulky goods retail stores'. As, such, deletion of the maximum floor area for bulky goods premises within the previous Masters building is unlikely to generate a significant increase to traffic.

	to traffic and parking on the traffic and parking on the second particle of the second participation of the second parking of the se		•	nises may result in an increase It are permissible and this has	
	intersection which ha	s recently . As part o	been upgraded to cope with of the upgrades RMS acquire	st Highway and Manns Road a anticipated traffic increases ed adjoining land. The Central	
	given the location adj	acent to re	ecently completed major roa	e been considered by the RMS, dworks and the nature of the r the proposal to NSW RMS for	
	and Manns Road. Cou	incil's ass	-	on the Central Coast Highway eased demand in the area could ed pedestrian connectivity	
	Part of the site is iden Land applies to the sit	tified as b te, howeve		117 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone eveloped inconsistency with	
	majority of the site is o unlikely to result in a r	developed negative b	eing bushfire prone land in with buildings, driveways c ushfire impact. However, th ler S117 Direction 4.4 Planni	or carparks and the proposal is e proposal requires	
	Environmental Planni	indicates ng Policy I	part of the site is mapped a No 14 - Coastal Wetlands (Sl	s being affected by State EPP 14). The wetland is outside npacted by the removal of the	
Assessment Process	5				
Proposal type :	Minor		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d) :	NSW Rural Fire Servic Transport for NSW - R		Maritime Services		
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 :

Documents

Document File Name	DocumentType Name	ls Public
Central Coast Council - Council Report.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Central Coast Council - Council Resolution.pdf	Proposal	Yes
Central Coast Council - Planning Proposal.pdf	Proposal	Yes

Planning Team Recommendation

Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions		
S.117 directions:	 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones 2.2 Coastal Protection 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 	
Additional Information :	 The planning proposal should proceed subject to the following conditions: 1. Council is to update the planning proposal prior to community consultation to: remove reference to Lot 18 DP 270678; investigate and include discussion on the effects of deleting the maximum floor space for business premises on the site; and discuss whether the Additional Permitted Use of business premises should also apply to the Hometown site. 2. Council is to update its consideration of the consistency with the following S117 	
	 Directions: 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 3. Minimum 14 day exhibitions period. 4. Consultation is required with the following public authorities: NSW Rural Fire Service 	

	NSW Roads and Maritime Services		
	5. A public hearing is not required to be held.		
	6. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 6 months.		
	7. Council be granted delegation to make the plan.		
	Inconsistency with the following S117 Directions is considered to be of minor significance:		
	 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land 4.3 Flood Prone Land 		
Supporting Reasons :	*		
Signature:	GP Mothins		
Printed Name:	GPHOPKINSDate: 28 June 2017.		

.