

Planning Team Report

Amendment of zoning and development controls for 80 Park Road and 83 The Avenue, Hurstville (Danebank School Campus)

Proposal Title :	Amendment of zo Hurstville (Danet		elopment controls for 80 P ampus)	ark Road and 83 T	he Avenue,
Proposal Summary	within the Daneb Hurstville)under • to rezone the lo (Educational Es • to remove the b	 The planning proposal seeks to rezone and amend development controls relating to two lots within the Danebank School Campus (No.80 Park Road and No. 83 The Avenue, Hurstville)under Hurstville Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP 2012): to rezone the lots from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishments); and to remove the building controls relating to maximum building height, maximum FSR and minimum lot size. 			
This amendment will align the two sites with the existing controls across the wider Danebank site.					
PP Number :	PP_2016_HURST	_001_00	Dop File No :	16/04994	
roposal Details					
Date Planning Proposal Received	30-Mar-2016		LGA covered :	Hurstville	
Region :	Metro(CBD)		RPA :	Hurstville Cit	y Council
State Electorate :	KOGARAH		Section of the Act :	55 - Planning	Proposal
LEP Type :	Spot Rezoning				
Location Details					
Street : 8	80 Park Road				
Suburb :	lurstville	City :	Sydney	Postcode :	2220
Land Parcel :	_ot 2 DP319591				
Street : 8	3 The Avenue				
Suburb :	lurstville	City :	Sydney	Postcode :	2220
Land Parcel :	_ot 99 DP1595				

DoP Planning Officer Contact Details

Contact Name :	Douglas Cunningham
Contact Number :	0292286357
Contact Email :	douglas.cunningham@planning.nsw.gov.au

RPA Contact Details

Contact Name :	Kerry Longford
Contact Number :	0293306255

Contact Email :

DoP Project Manager Contact Details

Contact Name :	Martin Cooper
Contact Number :	0299286582
Contact Email :	martin.cooper@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 communications with registered		
Supporting notes			
Internal Supporting Notes :	 The planning proposal, submitted to the Department on 30 March 2016, propose to: rezone lots from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishments); and remove development controls relating to maximum building height, maximum FSR and minimum lot size. 		
	The planning proposal is recomn • unifies the zoning and developn • ensures the zoning and develop	nent standards across the Da	

	land;
	 does not adversely affect the LGA's supply of residential accommodation;
	 provides long-term certainty for the current and future needs of the LGA's
	educational facilities;
	 is consistent with State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007
	and Planning Circular, Amended School Provision under State Environmental
	Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, (PS 09-018); and
	 is consistent with the majority of other SP2 Infrastructure controls within
	the Hurstville LGA.
External Supporting	Council resolved on 2 March 2016 to forward the planning proposal to the Department.
Notes :	
	The proposal will align controls across the Danebank School Campus, as well as the
	majority of other SP2 Infrastructure zoned sites in the Hurstville LGA.
	80 Park Road currently includes part of the Danebank Senior School building.
	83 The Avenue currently includes an area used for open space and waste storage. The
	rear of the site is used to park a school bus and is used as a school playground and open
	space.
	Council wishes to exercise its plan making delegation in relation to this 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 rezone two lots within the Danebank School campus from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishment) and remove the principal development standards (minimum lot size, maximum building height and maximum floor space ratio), consistent with the zoning and planning controls for the majority of the Danebank School Campus. This will reflect the use of the land as an "educational establishment".

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

Is an explanation of provisions provided? Yes

Comment :

The following provisions are suggested:

- amend the Land Zoning Map for the subject sites from R2 Low Density Residential to SP2 Infrastructure (Educational Establishment);
- amend the Lot Size Map to remove the minimal lot size applicable to the subject land;
- amend the Height of Buildings Map to remove the maximum building height applicable to the subject land; and
- amend the Floor Space Ratio Map to remove the maximum floor space ratio applicable to the subject land.

3.1 Residential Zones

The explanation of the proposal's provisions is clear.

Justification - s55 (2)(c)

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

* May need the Director General's agreement	3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 7.4 Implementation of A Blan for Cruwing Sydney
	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 (Infrastructure) 2007 A PLAN FOR GROWING SYDNEY e) List any other The proposal is considered to be generally consistent with goals and guiding principles matters that need to relating to the growth and development of strategic centres outlined in the A Plan for be considered : Growing Sydney. The aspects which are inconsistent discussed below are considered justifiable due to their minor nature. Planning Principle 1: Increasing Housing Choice Around All Centres Through Urban Renewal in Established Areas. This planning principle seeks to increase housing in centres and near stations to enable greater connectivity and access to jobs and services. The planning proposal is considered inconsistent with this principle as the proposed amendments would take away the availability of land zoned R2 Low Density Residential in a strategic centre. However, this inconsistency is minor in nature, as the land is already used for educational purposes. Direction 1.10 Plan for Education and Health Services to meet Sydney's Growing Needs The delivery of education facilities is a key objective of this direction. The objective aims to expand school facilities in urban growth areas, whilst delivering planning controls that can accommodate appropriate and timely developments at private schools. Under this direction, one action is relevant to this planning proposal - Action 1.10.1: Assist the Department of Education and Communities, the Catholic Education Commissions and the Association of Independent Schools of NSW to identify and plan for new school sites throughout Sydney. This action aims to create the opportunity to deliver facilities to meet Sydney's future school needs. The planning proposal is consistent with this action as it will help to facilitate the delivery of future private school facilities and align controls allowing assessment under the SEPP. Direction 2.2 Accelerate Urban Renewal Across Sydney – Providing Homes Closer to Jobs The direction aims to support housing growth and supply, urban renewal in centres and public transport corridors. Under this direction, one action is relevant to this planning proposal – Action 2.2.2: Undertake urban renewal in transport corridors which are being transformed by investment, and around strategic centres. The planning proposal is considered inconsistent with this action, as the proposed rezoning would reduce the amount of residential land within a strategic centre. However, it is considered this inconsistency is minor in nature, has been justified within the proposal and the land is already used for educational purposes. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICES The planning proposals is consistent will all relevant SEPPs. It is noted SEPP(Infrastructure 2007 is particularly relevant because it aims to facilitate the effective delivery of infrastructure across the State. The proposal is considered to be consistent with the relevant educational establishment provisions. Also a Planning Circular, Amended School Provision under State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, (PS 09-018), was issued regarding the assessment of schools under the Infrastructure SEPP. The proposal is consistent with this circular. SECTION 117 DIRECTIONS The planning proposal is consistent with all directions except the following, with which

it is justifiably inconsistent.

3.1 Residential Zones

The objectives of this direction are to encourage a variety of housing types, make efficient use of existing infrastructure, and minimise the impact of residential development on the environment and resource lands. The proposal is considered to be inconsistent with this direction because it reduces the total amount of residentially zoned land available within the LGA. The planning proposals inconsistency with this direction has been justified because the reduction is only minor (2 lots) and reflects the existing use of land.

7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney

Minor inconsistencies with this direction have been justified, as explained in the section of this report above dealing with that document.

HURSTVILLE COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN 2025

The planning proposal is considered to be consistent with strategic plan as it:

- provides economic prosperity to the LGA and providing quality school
- facilities for the well-being and benefit of current and future residents; and
- ensures sufficient educational establishments are provided for the existing and future residents.

HERITAGE

The subject site is not identified as a heritage item or located within a heritage conservation area. A number of heritage items are located in close proximity to the subject site. However, there will be no impact upon these heritage items as a consequence of the planning proposal.

EXISTING USES

80 Park Road currently includes part of the Danebank Senior School building. 83 The Avenue currently includes an area used for open space and waste storage. The rear of the site is used to park a school bus and is used as a school playground and open space.

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

If No, explain :

Mapping Provided - s55(2)(d)

Is mapping provided? Yes

Comment :

Comment :

The mapping provided clearly illustrates existing planning controls as well as requested development controls.

Community consultation - s55(2)(e)

Has community consultation been proposed? Yes

Should the planning proposal receive a Gateway determination, the proposal recommends a 28 day public exhibition period, which is supported. Notification of the public exhibition will be through:

- Newspaper advertisement in The St George and Sutherland Shire Leader
- Exhibition notice on the Council's website
- Notices in Council offices and libraries
- Letters to State and Commonwealth Government agencies
- Letters to adjoining landowners

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 :

The proposal is considered adequate and sufficient detail has been provided.

Proposal Assessment

Principal LEP:

Due Date : December 2012

Comments in relation to Principal LEP :

Assessment Criteria

Need for planning proposal :	The planning proposal, which does not involve a specific strategic study or report, comes from a decision made by Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation and Danebank School, seeking consistency in regards to zoning throughout their campus.			
	Council prepared this planning March 2016. A planning proposa subject site to be consistent wit Campus. These controls are cor sites across the LGA.	Il is necessary to align the de h those applicable to the rest	evelopment controls of the t of the Danebank School	
Consistency with strategic planning framework :	The planning proposal states it some minor inconsistencies bet Plan for Growing Sydney (and a Direction 3.1 Residential Zones,	ween the proposed amendm ssociated Section 117 Direct	ents and the directions of A ion 7.1)and Section 117	
Environmental social economic impacts :	It is agreed with Council there are no known critical habitats or threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats which will be affected by the proposal. Other environmental effects (bushfires, land slips and flooding) are unlikely in Hurstville LGA and the proposal will not impact or enhance environmental risks.			
	There will be no adverse social and economic effects as a consequence of the planning proposal. Any future school facilities would be a benefit to both Hurstville and the wider community.			
Assessment Process	5			
Proposal type :	Routine	Community Consultation Period :	28 Days	
Timeframe to make LEP :	6 months	Delegation :	RPA	
Public Authority Consultation - 56(2)(d)	Department of Education and C	ommunities		

Amendment of zoning and development controls for 80 Park Road and 83 The Avenue, Hurstville (Danebank School Campus) No Is Public Hearing by the PAC required? Yes (2)(a) Should the matter proceed ? 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 Is Public DocumentType Name **Document File Name** Planning Team Recommendation Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions **3.1 Residential Zones** S.117 directions: 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney It is recommended the planning proposal proceeds subject to the following: Additional Information : 1. Prior to public exhibition, the planning proposal is updated to include a plain English explanation of the intended effect of the proposed provisions. 2. Consultation with the Department of Education and Community is required. 3. The planning proposal is to be publicly exhibited for a minimum of 28 days. 4. A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter. The planning proposal is to be completed within 6 months of the Gateway Determination. The planning proposal is supported as it: Supporting Reasons : · provides uniformity in the zoning and development standards across the Danebank School Campus: · ensures the zoning and development standards reflect the existing use of the land: · provides consistency with other SP2 zoned land within Hurstville; and • ensures consistency with State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 and planning circular Amended School Provision under State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (PS 09-018).

Amendment of zoning and development controls for 80 Park Road and 83 The Ave	nue,
Hurstville (Danebank School Campus)	

Signature:

Millahod MKokot

Printed Name:

Date:

8/4/2016