

LISAROW, Pacific Hi Premises and Office	ighway - Lot 1 DP862725 Addi Premises	tional Permitted Uses fo	or Bulky Goods
Proposal Title :	LISAROW, Pacific Highway - Lot Premises and Office Premises	1 DP862725 Additional Perm	nitted Uses for Bulky Goods
Proposal Summary :	The proposal seeks to add bulky maximum floor area capped at 5 Pacific Highway, Lisarow.		
PP Number	PP_2014_GOSFO_016_00	Dop File No :	14/15031
Proposal Details			
Date Planning Proposal Received :	03-Sep-2014	LGA covered :	Gosford
Region :	Hunter	RPA :	Gosford City Council
State Electorate :	THE ENTRANCE	Section of the Act :	55 - Planning Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning		
Location Details			
Street : 900	) Pacific Highway		
Suburb : Lis	arow City :		Postcode : 2250
Land Parcel : Lot	1 DP862725		
DoP Planning Offic	cer Contact Details		
Contact Name :	Glenn Hornal		
Contact Number :	0243485009		
Contact Email :	glenn.hornal@planning.nsw.gov.a	IU	
RPA Contact Detai	ils		
Contact Name :	Bruce Ronan		
Contact Number :	0243258176		
Contact Email :	bruce.ronan@gosford.nsw.gov.au		
DoP Project Manag	ger Contact Details		
Contact Name :			
Contact Number :			
Contact Email :			
Land Release Data	ı		
Growth Centre :	N/A	Release Area Name :	N/A
Regional / Sub Regional Strategy :	Central Coast Regional Strategy	Consistent with Strategy :	Νο

# LISAROW, Pacific Highway - Lot 1 DP862725 Additional Permitted Uses for Bulky Goods Premises and Office Premises

Premises and Office	Premises		
MDP Number :		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) :	0
Gross Floor Area	0	No of Jobs Created :	0
The NSW Governmen Lobbyists Code of Conduct has been complied with :	t Yes		
If No, comment :			
Have there been meetings or communications with registered lobbyists? :	Νο		
If Yes, comment :			
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :			
External Supporting Notes :			
Adequacy Assessme	nt		
Statement of the ob	ojectives - s55(2)(a)		
Is a statement of the o	bjectives provided? Yes		
Comment :	The statement of object	ctives is adequate.	
Explanation of prov	visions provided - s55(	2)(b)	
Is an explanation of pro	ovisions provided? Yes		
Comment :	bulky goods premises	nieve the objective by: 1 of Gosford LEP 2014 by including and office premises (capped at 55 he Additional Permitted Uses Map	500m2) on the subject lot.
	The explanation of pro	ovisions provided is considered ad	lequate.
Justification - s55 (	2)(c)		
a) Has Council's strate	gy been agreed to by the Di	rector General? No	
b) S.117 directions ide	ntified by RPA :	1.1 Business and Industrial Zo	nes
* May need the Directo	or General's agreement	2.3 Heritage Conservation 3.4 Integrating Land Use and T 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Prote 5.1 Implementation of Regiona	ection

k

(A

## LISAROW, Pacific Highway - Lot 1 DP862725 Additional Permitted Uses for Bulky Goods Premises and Office Premises

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 55—Remediation of Land SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007

e) List any other matters that need to be considered :

Have inconsistencies with items a), b) and d) being adequately justified? Unknown

If No, explain 🗄

S117 DIRECTIONS

The proposal is consistent will all relevant S117 Directions except where discussed below:

1.1 Business and Industrial Zones

The proposal could be considered inconsistent with the direction as it will permit prohibited non-industrial uses on industrial zoned land. However, the underlying IN1 zone will not change therefore the total potential floor space for industrial uses would technically not be reduced. The Secretary could agree that the inconsistency with this direction is of minor significance.

#### 4.3 Flood Prone Land

The proposal is inconsistent with the direction as it has the potential to permit a significant increase in the development of the land through the additional uses for bulky goods and office premises. Council has advised the site is subject to local overland flooding and there is higher potential risk from moving from an industrial to a commercial land use. Council has not addressed the inconsistency with the direction and has simply stated any future works or site use should comply with Council's DCP in relation to Water Cycle Management. Council is required to address the requirements of the direction and justify any inconsistency.

4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection

The lot is identified as being bushfire prone and consultation with NSW Rural Fire Service is required before consistency with the direction can be determined.

5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies

The planning proposal is inconsistent with some actions in the CCRS in regard to locating bulky goods premises on industrial land. However given the additional use will not alter the underlying industrial zone and industrial uses will still be permitted on the land the Secretary could agree the inconsistency with the direction is of minor significance.

#### 6.3 Site Specific Provisions

The proposal is inconsistent with the direction as it imposes a floor space cap on the site for the additional uses. Council suggests the inconsistency is minor and justified as the overall integrity of the industrial zone is not compromised given the limitation on floor area as proposed. The availability of industrial land at Lisarow and maintaining the dominant industrial activity on the site is not considered to create a precedent given the site is sufficiently large to accommodate the additional uses. The Secretary could agree the inconsistency with the direction is of minor significance.

#### SEPPs

SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land

Council had advised the site is unlikely to be contaminated however in accordance with the SEPP will require a preliminary contamination report to be prepared.

Is mapping provided?	Yes	
Comment :	The mapping provided is sufficient for assessment.	
Community consul	tation - s55(2)(e)	
Has community consu	Itation been proposed? Yes	
Comment :	Council proposes 14 or 28 days. The planning proposal should be exhibited for a minimum period of 14 days.	
Additional Director	General's requirements	
Are there any addition	al Director General's requirements? <b>Yes</b>	
If Yes, reasons :	TIMELINE Council anticipates the plan to be finalised in June 2015 (approximately 9 months) and this is supported.	
	DELEGATIONS Council resolved to seek delegations for this planning proposal. Given the planning proposal is of local planning significance it is recommended Council be granted delegation to make the plan.	
Overall adequacy o	of the proposal	
Does the proposal me	et the adequacy criteria? <b>Yes</b>	
If No, comment :		
oposal Assessmen Principal LEP:	t	
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal	t The planning proposal will amend Gosford LEP 2014.	
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in	The planning proposal will amend Gosford LEP 2014.	
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP :	The planning proposal will amend Gosford LEP 2014. ia Council has advised the planning proposal is not the result of a strategic study or report.	
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Assessment Criteri Need for planning	The planning proposal will amend Gosford LEP 2014.	
Principal LEP: Due Date : Comments in relation to Principal LEP : Assessment Criteri Need for planning	The planning proposal will amend Gosford LEP 2014. To Council has advised the planning proposal is not the result of a strategic study or report. Council makes reference to its Employment Lands Investigation (2010) which is generally not supportive of the loss of industrial land and recommended bulky goods premises be discouraged within industrial areas. Council has sought to justify the inconsistency and advised bulky goods premises are generally not suitable on smaller industrial lots given the floor space and parking requirements needed. Consequently the only industrial land	

## LISAROW, Pacific Highway - Lot 1 DP862725 Additional Permitted Uses for Bulky Goods Premises and Office Premises

	planning proposal progressing.
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	Central Coast Regional Strategy (CCRS) Council has identified an inconsistency with Action 5.9 which stated 'Ensure that bulky goods retailing is not located on industrial land and is located in centres and nominated nodes'.
	Council has sought to justify this inconsistency by advising: - there is approximately 9.6ha of vacant industrial zoned land at Lisarow (including parts of large lots that are undeveloped). - building coverage within Lisarow precinct is lower than other precincts in Gosford LGA creating opportunities for businesses to expand their operation. - the use of 5500m2 for bulky goods and office premises represents 6% of the available IN1 zoned land in Lisarow and Council considers this is minimal and would not lead to a shortage of available industrial land in the area.
	Although there is an inconsistency with the CCRS in terms of where bulky goods are located the proposal would still generate additional employment opportunities in close proximity to an identified village centre with good access links to public transport while retaining the industrial zoning and future employment lands potential of the site.
	Employment Lands Investigation (2010) Council undertook an Employment Lands Investigation in 2010. The ELI said, inter alia,
	"There appears to be no opportunity for expansion of the precinct though there does appear to be opportunities for intensification and maximisation of development potential. This could include sub-dividing some lots to create multiple smaller lots. The building coverage within the precinct is also relatively lower than other precincts in the Gosford LGA creating opportunities for business to expand operations onsite in the future." (p.82)
	Given the large lot industrial site, restriction of floor area and location attributes as discussed above Council does not consider it inappropriate to locate the additional uses on the site. Council also refers to consistency with a similar approach for a previous LEP amendment (PP_2012_GOSFO_005_00) which permitted bulky goods on industrial land at West Gosford.
	The Department considers it appropriate that Council undertake a strategic review of land use zonings and planning controls in and around Lisarow Village Centre, including Lisarow train station, and explore opportunities for better connectivity between the existing and future land uses in the vicinity.
Environmental social economic impacts :	ENVIRONMENTAL Council has advised the site has sufficient on site parking to accommodate the additional uses. Council should consult with the Roads and Maritime Services given the site is located adjacent to the Pacific Highway and Transport NSW - Sydney Trains given the the site is located next to to a rail corridor.
	ECONOMIC Council has advised of its commitment to the revitalization of Gosford Regional Centre and locating office premises away from Gosford could be seen as contrary to that purpose. Council further advised that bulky goods premises are not readily located in Gosford on account of the large floor areas required and on-site vehicle accessibility requirements. However Council identified the planning proposal will have beneficial economic impacts on the local economy and result in an increase in jobs.
	Council has indicated an economic study is required to ascertain the need for such uses (bulky goods and office premises) in Lisarow as well as the broader economic effects of the proposal. Given the additional office space is located on the fringe of an existing centre and Council consider the potential economic impacts for the additional uses are unknown an economic study may provide some benefit to Council. However the economic

## LISAROW, Pacific Highway - Lot 1 DP862725 Additional Permitted Uses for Bulky Goods Premises and Office Premises

# study is considered to be a matter for Council to negotiate with the proponent rather than as a condition of the Gateway determination.

### **Assessment Process**

Proposal type :	Minor		Community Consultation Period :	14 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	9 months		Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority	NSW Rural Fire S	ervice			
Consultation - 56(2)	Transport for NS				
(d) :	I ransport for NSV	N - Roads and	Maritime Services		
ls Public Hearing by th	e PAC required?	No			
(2)(a) Should the matte	er proceed ?	Yes			
lf no, provide reasons	:				
Resubmission - s56(2)	(b) : <b>No</b>				
If Yes, reasons :					
Identify any additional	studies, if required.				
lf Other, provide reaso	ns :				
Identify any internal co	nsultations, if required	:			
No internal consultati	on required				
ls the provision and fur	nding of state infrastru	icture relevant	to this plan? <b>No</b>		
If Yes, reasons :	lang of state influence				
cuments					
Document File Name			DocumentType Na	ame	ls Public
Council Letter.pdf			Proposal Coverin	ig Letter	Yes
Planning Proposal.pd			Proposal		Yes
Council Resolution.pc	lf		Proposal		Yes
Council Report.pdf			Proposal		Yes
nning Team Recon	nmendation				
			-		
Preparation of the plan	ning proposal suppor	ted at this stag	e : Recommended with Con	ditions	
S.117 directions:	1.1 Business and	d Industrial Zo	ones		
	2.3 Heritage Con				
	3.4 Integrating L		Fransport		
	4.3 Flood Prone		<b>f</b> i - m		
	4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies				
	6.1 Approval and				
	6.3 Site Specific				

Additional Information :	The Planning Proposal should proceed subject to the following conditions:
	<ol> <li>Council is to update the planning proposal to include sufficient information to adequately demonstrate consistency with S117 Directions 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection.</li> </ol>
	2. Council is to update the planning proposal to include sufficient information to adequately demonstrate consistency with S117 Directions 4.3 Flood Prone Land.
	3. Council is to satisfy the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 55 - Remediation of Land and demonstrate the site is suitable for rezoning once information on contamination has been obtained.
	4. The planning proposal be made publicly available for a minimum of 14 days.
	5. Consultation is required with: - NSW Rural Fire Service,
	- Roads and Maritime Services - Transport NSW - Sydney Trains
	6. A public hearing is not required.
	7. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be 9 months from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.
	8. Plan-making delegation should be delegated to Council for this planning proposal.
Supporting Reasons	*

Mothers

Date: 17-9-2019

G HOPKINS

Signature:

Printed Name:

120