



IRF26/4172

Plan finalisation report – PP-2022-2790

Inner West Local Environment Plan 2022 – 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt

July 2026



Published by NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

dpie.nsw.gov.au

Title: Plan finalisation report – PP-2022-2790

Subtitle: Inner West Local Environment Plan 2022 – 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure 2026 You may copy, distribute, display, download and otherwise freely deal with this publication for any purpose, provided that you attribute the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure as the owner. However, you must obtain permission if you wish to charge others for access to the publication (other than at cost); include the publication in advertising or a product for sale; modify the publication; or republish the publication on a website. You may freely link to the publication on a departmental website.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing [July 26] and may not be accurate, current or complete. The State of New South Wales (including the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure), the author and the publisher take no responsibility, and will accept no liability, for the accuracy, currency, reliability or correctness of any information included in the document (including material provided by third parties). Readers should make their own inquiries and rely on their own advice when making decisions related to material contained in this publication.

Acknowledgment of Country

The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure acknowledges the Traditional Owners and Custodians of the land on which we live and work and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

Contents

Introduction.....	9
1.1 Overview	9
1.1.1 Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022 (Amendment No. 15).....	9
1.1.2 Site description	9
1.1.3 Purpose of plan	9
1.1.4 Parliamentary Representation	10
2 Rezoning Review and Gateway determination	11
3 Public exhibition	11
3.1 Summary of Submissions	12
3.1.1 Community submissions	12
3.1.2 Agencies and Council submissions.....	15
3.2 Post-exhibition changes.....	20
3.2.1 Planning proposal authority recommendation	20
4 Department Assessment	21
4.1 Additional Assessment	22
4.1.1 Draft Sydney Plan.....	23
4.1.2 Draft Statewide Industrial Lands Policy	23
5 Post-assessment consultation	23
6 Recommendation.....	24

Table 1. Summary of attachments

Attachment	Title
A	Gateway determination
B	Alteration of gateway determination
C	Post-exhibition Panel record of decision
D	Post-exhibition Panel report
E	Addendum Acoustic Report (September 2025)
F	Acoustic Report Peer Review (October 2025)
G	Light Spill Advice (July 2025)
H	Addendum Flood Risk Management Report (October 2024)
I	Gateway determination report

Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022 (Amendment No.15)

The Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022 (Amendment No.15) amends the land use zoning, built form controls and introduces site specific planning provisions for land at 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt.

1.1.2 Site description

The site, legally described as 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt (Lot 1 DP940543 and Lot 1 DP550608) has an area of approximately 10,617sqm and accommodates a range of light industrial and commercial uses including warehousing and storage facilities, small scale manufacturing, joinery, and furniture restoration businesses.

The site comprises of a series of low scale brick warehouse style buildings with hardstand areas used for vehicle access, parking and loading. The site also contains private recreation facilities. Existing access to the site is via two driveways from Lords Road. Site context can be seen in Error! Reference source not found. below.



Figure 1 - 2 Site context (source: Planning Proposal)

1.1.3 Purpose of plan

The draft LEP seeks to amend the Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022 (IWLEP) to provide high density residential housing for approximately 210 dwellings at 67-73 Lords Road, and publicly accessible open space at 75 Lords Road. This will involve rezoning approximately 10,000sqm of land from E4 General Industrial to R3 Medium Density Residential and RE2 Private Recreation.

The proposal includes a local provision requiring 5% floor space to be provided as affordable housing. Additionally, the proposal introduces a range of additional permitted uses including residential flat buildings and non-residential uses.

Tables 2 and 3 below outline the current and proposed planning controls for 67-73 Lords Road and 75 Lords Road.

Table 2. Current and proposed controls (67-73 Lords Road)

Control	Current	Proposed
Zone	E4 General Industrial	R3 Medium Density Residential
Maximum height of the building (HOB)	N/A	30m
Floor space ratio (FSR)	1:1	2.4:1
Additional permitted uses (APUs)	Nil	• Business premises • Industrial retail outlets • Light industries • Office premises • Recreation facilities (indoor) • Residential flat buildings • Restaurant or cafes
Affordable housing rate	Nil	5%

Table 3. Current and proposed controls (75 Lords Road)

Control	Current	Proposed
Zone	E4 General Industrial	RE2 Private Recreation
Floor space ratio (FSR)	1:1	Nil

1.1.4 Parliamentary Representation

The section below provides an outline of various representation received throughout the plan making process. There are no donations or gifts to disclose, and a political donation disclosure is not required.

Registered Lobbyist – SPP Services Pty Ltd (Frank Sartor)

On 12 June 2025, Mr Sartor wrote to the Chief of Staff for the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces to raise concerns about issues relating to the urban design and incompatibility of the proposal.

On 2 December 2025, Mr Sartor wrote to the Sydney East Regional Planning Panel (Panel) raising concerns regarding potential land use conflicts, including noise and visual intrusion, and visual privacy impacts from the proposed apartments on Lambert Park.

On 24 December 2025, Mr Sartor wrote to the Deputy Secretary Planning, Land Use Strategy, Housing & Infrastructure to raise about the considerations made by the Panel in relation to acoustic matters. Mr Sartor provided an independent acoustic assessment and suggested alternative amendments to the LEP provisions.

State Representation – Ms Kobi Shetty MP

The site falls within the Balmain state electorate. Ms Kobi Shetty MP is the State Member.

Ms Kobi Shetty MP made a submission to the Department during the public exhibition period. The submission raised concerns in relation to the following matters:

- Loss of light industrial land
- Misalignment of strategic planning controls
- Poor design outcomes
- Unresolved infrastructure and servicing
- Insufficient affordable housing
- Planning issues deferred to development application stage

Ms Shetty also made representations to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces on 21 July 2025. Ms Shetty made these representations on behalf of the APIA Leichhardt FC, where she raised the club’s objection to the proposed development.

Federal Representation

The site falls within the Grayndler federal electorate. The Hon. Anthony Albanese MP is the Federal Member. To the team’s knowledge, The Hon. Anthony Albanese MP has not made any written representations regarding the proposal.

Department commentary

The proposal has been subject to a detailed assessment process through the Department’s Gateway determination and subsequent planning proposal and rezoning review processes. It has been subject to a high level of public consultation and engagement.

The Department is satisfied that the proposal, as amended, has addressed the concerns, and is suitable for finalisation.

2 Rezoning Review and Gateway determination

Table 4 below provides an overview of the key events throughout the planning proposal process.

Table 4. Summary of key events

Date	Event	Commentary
2 Sep 2024	Gateway determination issued	A Gateway determination is issued, subject to conditions (Attachment A)
6 August 2025	Gateway is altered	Extend timeframe of finalisation from 4 July 2025 to 27 February 2026 (Attachment B)
17 Dec 2025	Finalisation	The Panel recommends the proposal be made, subject to amendments (Attachment C). Following this decision, the proposal formally transitions from post-exhibition to finalisation phase. Consultation with agencies and the community has now been completed, all Gateway conditions have been met, and no agency issues are outstanding. The Department is satisfied that there are no outstanding issues relating to Gateway conditions which would prevent finalisation.

3 Public exhibition

In accordance with the Gateway determination, the planning proposal and supporting material was publicly exhibited on the NSW Planning Portal for 30 working days from 17 March to 7 May 2025.

A total of 198 submissions were received during the exhibition period:

- 187 community submissions
- 3 community submissions received after exhibition closed
- 7 agency submissions
- a submission from Inner West Council.

The post-exhibition report to the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel (**Attachment D**) provides responses to submissions and the Department is satisfied that all concerns raised have been adequately addressed.

3.1 Summary of Submissions

3.1.1 Community submissions

Table 5 below summarises key concerns raised by the community.

Table 5. Community submissions

Concern	Submission	Response
Built form and land use conflict	Submissions raised concern the scale of development at 6-8 storeys was excessive for the area, particularly in contrast to the surrounding low-rise residential character. Some submissions suggest the proposed height and FSR are not consistent with the R3 Medium Residential zone. With regards to the interface and interaction with Lambert Park, concerns were raised that potential land use conflicts may restrict operations of APIA Leichardt FC. The main concern relates to noise and light spill complaints from future occupants which will impact ongoing operations of the club. This was reiterated in the Hon. Kobi Shetty MP representations to the Hon. Paul Scully Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, as well as Mr Frank Sartor's representations to the Department.	PPA Response The subject site is located within the Taverners Hill Precinct of the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS). The PRCUTS Planning and Design Guidelines recommends a maximum height limit of 30m and an FSR of 2.4:1. The planning proposal is consistent with these controls. Strategic planning for the area, including PRCUTS, Council's Our Fairer Future Plan (OFF) and the Department's planning investigations for Parramatta Road is likely to result in changes to the low-rise residential character irrespective of the outcomes of this planning proposal. The built form responds to the evolving nature of the area and is considered appropriate in this context. To provide certainty to APIA Club, Council and the community, it is recommended a different local provision clause be adopted to address the concerns raised surrounding the potential land use conflicts between Lambert Park and the residential development. The PPA team recommends that the proposal incorporate a provision with the intent to avoid, minimise and reduce

Concern	Submission	Response
		potential land use conflict issues at the northern portion of the site. The proposed draft DCP included controls for minimising and avoiding impacts on Lambert Park. The PPA team is satisfied that the proposal can be made suitable to address the issues raised about the land use conflicts with Lambert Park via the additional local provision and the future adoption of the DCP by Inner West Council. These matters do not prevent the proposal progressing to finalisation. Department Response The recommended provision from the PPA team was endorsed by the Panel in their December 2025 decision which recommended the proposal to be made subject to amendments. The Department has recommended the environmental considerations form part of the proposed amendments. Further detail is contained in <i>Section 3.2 Post-exhibition changes</i> below.
Site suitability	Some submissions questioned the suitability of the site, raising concerns about the impact on the character of the surrounding areas. Submissions noted there were more suitable vacant or underutilized sites along Parramatta Road that would be better suited for this form of development. Other locations suggested include the corner of Parramatta Road and Mallett Street and the “Best and Less” site given better access to arterial road routes and public transport options.	PPA Response: The PPA team notes that most submissions received on this issue support the proposal for uplift. In August 2023, the Panel recommended the proposal progress as it had demonstrated strategic merit and site-specific merit, subject to amendments. The merits of the proposal were further supported by the Department with a Gateway determination being issued on 2 September 2024. During exhibition, relevant infrastructure and service providers were consulted, and no concerns were raised in relation to impacts on the capacity of existing infrastructure and services. Since exhibition, the Department has commenced a State-led rezoning of the Inner West Precinct, a stretch of land along Parramatta Road and other key roads around Leichardt to deliver up to

Concern	Submission	Response
		8,000 new dwellings. The site is also located within the Taverners Hill precinct of PRCUTS, which identifies the site for residential uplift. Inner West Council's Our Fairer Future (OFF) Plan also aims to provide uplift for new housing around town centres and transport hubs, proposes uplift in Davies Street, which borders this site. The PPA team are satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to support the proposal progressing to Finalisation. Department Response: With both the State-led Inner West Precinct and Council's OFF Plan being progressed and considered, it is envisaged that the character of the surrounding area will evolve, aligning with the outcomes sought within this proposal.
Loss of industrial land	Submissions objected to the loss of industrial and employment land.	PPA Response: The PPA is satisfied that the change of use and the resulting loss of industrial land is merited and the issues raised do not prevent the proposal from proceeding to finalisation. Department Response: There is reasonable justification to support changing the proposed land use of the site. See <i>Section 4.1.2 Draft Statewide Industrial Lands Policy</i> for more detail.
Open Space and Biodiversity	Submissions state that the rezoning of 75 Lords Road for open space is not a genuine attempt to provide open space, and if there is open space provided it should be increased. Submissions also noted that there are a number of threatened wildlife and the removal of trees on site will result in a loss of habitat for these species.	PPA Response: The NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water's Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation (CPHR) Group have advised that the proposal is unlikely to impact any threatened entities. CPHR also supported the provision of the proposed open space on the site. To ensure that open space is delivered on site and made publicly accessible, the PPA team recommended to the Panel that 75 Lords Road is zoned RE2 Private Recreation, with a with a suitable

Concern	Submission	Response
		mechanism in place requiring this land to remain publicly accessible. The change to RE2 zone will allow the planning proposal to progress to finalisation and addresses concerns about open space not being provided on site. Department Response: The recommended provision was endorsed by the Panel in December 2025. The recommended provision relating to publicly accessible open space forms part of the proposed amendments. Further detail is contained in <i>Section 3.2 Post-exhibition changes</i> below.

3.1.2 Agencies and Council submissions

Tables 6 and 7 below summarises the agency and council submissions, providing relevant commentary as required.

Table 6. Agency concerns

Agency	Submission	Response
Ausgrid	Ausgrid raised several matters which will require consideration at development application (DA stage): • Electrocutation • Fire • Electric and Magnetic Fields • Noise • Visual amenity	PPA Response: The PPA are satisfied that Ausgrid matters raised do not prevent the progression of the planning proposal to finalisation. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that these matters can be addressed during the DA stage of any future redevelopment.
Jemena	Jemena raises no objection to the planning proposal.	PPA Response: The PPA are satisfied that there are no matters raised by Jemena that prevent the progression of the proposal to finalisation. Department Response: Noted.
NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment	The CPHR Group noted: • The proposed open space at 75 Lords Road would be affected by flooding • 67-73 Lords Road is classified as a flood fringe area and would	PPA Response: The flood impact and risk assessment (FIRA) shows that 75 Lords Road will be impacted by flooding in the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability and Probable Maximum Flood events.

Agency	Submission	Response
and Water (DCCEEW)	experience minimal flood impacts. The site is not expected to be isolated during a flood event.	The site is proposed to be developed and used as open space. While the development of 65 – 73 Lords Road will marginally change flood dynamics on 75 Lords Road, the increase is considered minor and acceptable given the future use of the site. Department Response: The Department notes that CPHR raised no objections in relation to the planning proposal.
NSW Department of Education	The NSW Department of Education has no comments in response to the planning proposal.	PPA Response: Noted. Department Response: Noted.
NSW Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)	Raised issues relating to contamination and noise and vibration, recommending the proponent: - Undertake monitoring closer to sensitive receivers. - Undertake a vibration assessment	PPA Response: The PPA is satisfied that the issues raised by EPA do not prevent the progression of the proposal to finalisation. Department Response: The proponent has identified that a detailed site investigation (DSI) will be undertaken as part of any future DAs. Further, they have provided addendum reports which addresses EPA's concerns (Attachment E - F). The Department is satisfied that at the conclusion of the DSI, the site can be made suitable for the proposed uses.
NSW State Emergency Services (SES)	Provided the following recommendations: - reconsider residential development on the western portion of the site - Seek the advice of NSW DCCEEW on the proposal - pursue site design which minimises flood risks - consider the impacts of climate change.	PPA Response: The FIRA and reference scheme demonstrate that evacuation from the residential dwellings on site is achievable, via the eastern portion of the site. The proponent has also proposed an alternative strategy of sheltering in place. The PPA team also notes CPHR raised no concern with the flooding risks or flood management approach proposed on site. The PPA team area satisfied that the proposal has demonstrated an appropriate evacuation strategy for the site and that the matters raised by SES do

Agency	Submission	Response
		not prevent the progression of the planning proposal to finalisation. Department Response: NSW DCCEEW did not object to the planning proposal, noting that 75 Lords Road would be rezoned to recreational land, and that 67-73 Lords Road is not predicted to become isolated under a flood event. Furthermore, the Department is satisfied that detailed design matters can be addressed during the assessment of any future DAs. The Department is satisfied that the comments raised by NSW SES have been adequately responded to.
Sydney Water	Sydney Water noted that: - Water and wastewater servicing should be available for future demands. Amplifications, adjustments, and or minor extensions may be required for future development works. - Further detail on the necessary servicing requirements will be made available at DA stage.	PPA Response: The PPA are satisfied that matters raised by Sydney Water do not prevent the progression of the planning proposal to finalisation. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that these matters can be addressed during the DA stage of any future redevelopment.
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	TfNSW noted that: - redevelopment of the subject site is unlikely to result in significant traffic generation. 75 Lords Road is subject to an easement which has been imposed for drainage, electrical, and maintenance access purposes. - The need for all future works on the site to retain the integrity and accessibility of these easements.	PPA Response: As part of the future development and design of the open space on site as part of the DA stage, TfNSW can be consulted. The PPA noted given the sites proximity to the rail corridor, any future development will need to address this interface. PPA agree with TfNSW conclusion that the proposal on its own merits is unlikely to result in significant traffic generation. The PPA is satisfied that the proposal has addressed the TfNSW comments and do not prevent the progression of the planning proposal to finalisation. Department Response: The Department is satisfied that the amendments contained within the

Agency	Submission	Response
		planning proposal, would not preclude the relevant authorities from accessing the easements on the site. The Department considers easement access to be a matter which can be addressed within the detailed design of any future development application. The Department notes the comment from TfNSW about traffic generation.

Submission from Inner West Council

Inner West Council provided a submission on 8 May 2025. Council expressed general support for the proposal, apart from the following concerns which is summarised in **Table 6**.

Table 7. Summary of Council's concerns

Issue	Submission	Responses
Tree Canopy Coverage	Council recommends that both the proposed site-specific provision and the draft DCP are amended to afford protections to the existing tree canopy coverage on the site.	PPA Response: Council's request to embed minimum tree canopy targets within the Local Environmental Plan (LEP) is not considered suitable in this instance. It is considered that these matters would be more appropriately addressed within the site-specific DCP. Given Council are the responsible party for preparing and implementing a DCP on site, it can implement the changes regarding tree canopy targets, tree retention and tree size outlined in their submission. The PPA are satisfied that the issues raised by Council do not prevent the progression of the planning proposal to finalisation. Department Response: This matter should be addressed via the DCP and as Council is the relevant body to adopt the DCP, any required amendments can be addressed by Council.
Deep Soil	Council recommends that the draft DCP provided in support of the proposal, be amended to ensure future development includes contiguous areas of deep soil across the site.	PPA Response: As noted above, Council is responsible for preparing and implementing a site specific DCP and can adopt the changes to the DCP they seek without the need for Panel approval.

Issue	Submission	Responses
		The PPA are satisfied that the issues raised by Council relating to deep soil can be addressed as part of a future DCP and do not prevent the progression of the planning proposal. Department Response: Council may consider provisions relating to deep soil as part of a site specific DCP.
Building Sustainability	The BASIX targets contained within the proposal for 67-73 Lords Road, are notably lower than the targets proposed for the nearby PRCUTS stage 1 planning proposal. Although 67-73 Lords Road is located outside of the stage 1 implementation area, the site is identified as being within the broader PRCUTS application area.	PPA Response: Council's request to amend the planning proposal to include BASIX targets is not considered suitable in this instance. The inclusion of BASIX targets would duplicate the controls proposed under PRC - Stage 1 and therefore not supported. As stated above, it is considered that these matters would be more appropriately addressed within the site-specific DCP, which Council can prepare and address. Department Response: The Department is satisfied the existing clause 6.15(4)(l) within the IWLEP, provides adequate assurance that redevelopment of 67-73 Lords Road would result in an ecologically sustainable development outcome.
Excessive Car Parking	Council does not support a maximum car parking rate in excess of the 130 spaces which would be permissible under PRCUTS and recommends amending the proposed site-specific provision and the draft DCP to apply a maximum parking rate provision to the site. Council also does not support the ground-level vehicular access component of the proposed concept design. Council recommends amending the draft DCP to limit all vehicular access to the basement level of the site.	PPA Response: The PPA team are satisfied that the issues raised by Council relating to car parking rates, flooding, through-site link design, and setback requirements have been adequately addressed by the proponent and do not prevent the progression of this planning proposal to finalisation. Department Response: These comments pertain to the DCP which has been drafted in support of the planning proposal. The Department concludes that these matters should not prevent the finalisation of the planning proposal, noting that the is DCP is a matter for Council.
Flooding	Council does not support the sunken garden component of the concept design in its current form. Modifying	

Issue	Submission	Responses
	the design to include better drainage infrastructure is recommended. Council also recommends the removal of the drainage and stormwater section of the site-specific DCP, noting that drainage matters can instead be addressed through the broader Leichhardt DCP.	
Through-site Link Design	Council recommends amending the draft DCP to provide further detail of the design specifications for the proposed east-west through-site link.	
Setback Requirements	Council recommends amending the draft DCP to provide minimum setbacks from Lords Road, Lambert Park, and the laneway adjoining the site to the east.	
Public Works	Council is supportive of the through-link shared path proposed for 75 Lords Road. Council emphasises that it will not be responsible for funding any of the public works proposed by the proponent, nor do the works proposed preclude the proponent from section 7.1 and 7.12 contributions.	PPA Response: Noted. Department Response: Noted.
Affordable Housing Rate	Council supports the 5% affordable housing contribution commitment included within the planning proposal and requests that this commitment be enshrined through the proposed site-specific provision.	PPA Response: The PPA Team are satisfied that the proponent's agreement to include a requirement for 5% affordable housing within a site-specific LEP provision satisfies Council's expectations. Department Response: An affordable housing provision is proposed as part of the environmental planning instrument supporting the proposal.

3.2 Post-exhibition changes

3.2.1 Planning proposal authority recommendation

In the final post-exhibition PPA meeting (**Attachment C**), the Panel recommended for the proposal to be made, subject to the following changes:

- Introduce a local provision with the intent to avoid, minimise and reduce potential land use conflict issues at the northern portion of the site along the lines of:

“Prior to any development consent being issued, the consent authority must be satisfied that all reasonable steps have been taken to reduce, mitigate and avoid any potential light spill and acoustic noise impacts generated from adjoining land uses.”

- Amend the proposed zone of 75 Lords Road from RE1 Public Recreation to RE2 Private Recreation. This amendment would not require an additional public exhibition as this option was included in the Planning Proposal that was previously exhibited.

These recommendations are addressed below.

Clause 6.15 Development control plans for certain development

This LEP clause is proposed to be amended to ensure the site specific DCP for the site will address light spill and noise from adjoining development. This approach was considered the most appropriate solution rather than a site specific clause/ local provision due to the fact that as the site is a ‘key site’ under the LEP, a site specific DCP must be prepared.

75 Lords Road – RE2 Private Recreation

The site is proposed to be zoned RE2 Private Recreation and a LEP clause is recommended to ensure public access to the site. This access is linked to any future development application across the ‘site’ (67-73 and 75 Lords Road) as any future development must provide publicly accessible open space of any area of at least 1,500sqm (the approximate area of 75 Lords Road).

4 Department Assessment

The proposal has been subject to detailed review through the Department’s gateway assessment (**Attachment I**) and subsequent planning proposal processes. It has also been subject to a high level of public consultation and engagement.

Table 8 and 9 below reassesses the strategic and site-specific merits of the proposal.

Table 8. Summary of strategic assessment

Strategy	Consistency with Gateway report	
Regional Plan	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1
District Plan	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1
Local Strategic Planning Statement	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1
Section 9.1 Ministerial Directions	☐ Yes	☒ No, refer to section 4.1
State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs)	☐ Yes	☒ No, refer to section 4.1

Table 9. Summary of site-specific assessment

Site-specific assessment	Consistent with Gateway determination report Assessment	
Social and economic impacts	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1
Environmental impacts	☒ Yes	☐ No, refer to section 4.1

Site-specific assessment	Consistent with Gateway determination report Assessment
Infrastructure	☒ Yes ☐ No, refer to section 4.1

4.1 Additional Assessment

The following section provides commentary on any remaining strategic or site-specific inconsistencies within the proposal.

Table 10. Summary of inconsistencies

Item	Commentary
Ministerial Direction 1.4 – Site specific provisions	Condition 1(f) of the Gateway determination required for the post-exhibition planning proposal to include an assessment against Ministerial Direction 1.4 Site Specific Provisions. The proponent has updated the planning proposal to include an assessment against Direction 1.4. The Department is satisfied by the proponent's justification which outline the site-specific provisions are the most appropriate mechanism to facilitate the proposed additional permitted uses and affordable housing contributions.
Ministerial Direction 4.1 – Flooding	Condition 1(g) required for the proponent to further address Direction 4.1 and provide an assessment for the basement flood storage. The post-exhibition proposal has provided acceptable justification for this Direction. It is also supported by a Flood Impact and Risk Assessment and an updated Flood Risk Management Report which concludes that flood hazards can be appropriately managed for this site through future building design (Attachment H).
SEPP – Transport and Infrastructure 2021	Condition 1(j) required the proponent to further address clauses in the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP which details referral and concurrence requirements for certain development. The proposal has been updated to address the SEPP, outlining that future applications will be referred at the DA stage. This justification is considered acceptable.
SEPP – Housing 2021	Condition 1(l) required the proponent to include an assessment against this SEPP, specifically Chapter 4 – Design of residential apartment development. The post-exhibition proposal has been updated and references the submitted Urban Design Study which demonstrates that the proposal is capable of achieving the key requirements of the Apartment Design Guide. This response is considered acceptable.
SEPP – Resilience and Hazards 2021	Condition 1(m) required the proponent to include an assessment against this SEPP, specifically Chapter 4 – Remediation of Land. The post-exhibition proposal has been updated and references the submitted Detailed Site Investigation which concludes the site can be made suitable for the proposed use, subject to further assessment at the DA stage. This response is considered acceptable.

4.1.1 Draft Sydney Plan

The draft region plan (Sydney Plan) sets out how the NSW Government will address growth in Sydney over the next 20 years. Once finalised, the Sydney Plan will replace the Greater Sydney Region Plan (2018) and the associated district plans.

The proposal is generally consistent with the draft Sydney Plan as shown in **Table 11** below.

Table 11. Assessment of Draft Sydney Plan

Item	Commentary
Housed	The proposal will provide housing in an inner-city area undergoing change and an increase in residential density. It is close to transport and services, will provide 5% affordable housing in perpetuity and is therefore consistent with this priority.
Prosperous	The land is currently zoned for industrial purposes, and industrial land remains in high demand across Sydney. However, as detailed in Section 4.1.2 below, the area is undergoing changes with multiple strategic planning projects underway. The mixed use development proposed for the site will still enable some employment – 105 jobs proposed, down from 147 existing. The inconsistency with this priority justified.
Liveable	The proposal is consistent with this priority. It supports housing and employment in an area that is well serviced by amenities and transport links.
Coordinated	The proposal is consistent with this priority because it is infill housing taking advantage of existing social and essential infrastructure.

4.1.2 Draft Statewide Industrial Lands Policy

The draft Statewide Policy for Industrial Lands seeks to retain and protect industrial land of state and regional significance, while allowing for alternative employment outcomes where they do not compromise industrial uses. The draft policy is relevant as the proposal seeks to rezone the site from E4 General Industrial to R3 Medium Density Residential and RE2 Private Recreation.

However, there is reasonable justification to support the proposed rezoning against the draft policy. Strategic planning for the area, including PRCUTS, Council's Our Fairer Future Plan, and the Department-led Inner West Precinct Investigation Area, seeks to deliver residential uplift on and surrounding the site.

Further, both the Panel the Department have previously determined that there is strategic and site-specific merit in changing the proposed land use of the site. The Department is satisfied that the site, which has a clear pathway to a change of use demonstrates sufficient merit. The potential impacts arising from the loss of industrial land are not considered to preclude the proposal from being finalised.

5 Post-assessment consultation

Table 10 below provides a summary of the stakeholders consulted post-assessment.

Table 10. Consultation following the Department's assessment

Stakeholder	Consultation
Mapping	Digital mapping has been prepared by Council and finalised by the Department's GIS team.
Panel	The Panel, as PPA, was consulted on the terms of the draft instrument and mapping under clause 3.36(1) of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> (Act). The Panel confirmed on 15 May 2026 that the maps and instrument are satisfactory.
Council	Council was consulted on the terms of the draft instrument and mapping, minor drafting issues were raised but overall Council confirmed on 18 May 2026 that the maps and draft instrument are satisfactory.
Parliamentary Counsel Certificate	On 2/06/2026 , Parliamentary Counsel provided the Certificate that the draft LEP could legally be made.

6 Recommendation

It is recommended that the Minister's delegate as the local plan-making authority determine to make the draft LEP under clause 3.36(2)(a) of the Act as:

- The proposal has strategic merit and will facilitate the delivery of new housing including affordable housing.
- The proposal is consistent with the Gateway Determination.
- Issues raised during consultation have been addressed, and there are no outstanding agency objections to the proposal.



Eleanor Robertson

A/Director, Local Planning (North, East and Central Coast)

10 July 2026

Sarah Waterworth

Manager, Local Planning

Assessment Officer

Andy Ng

Senior Planning Officer, Local Planning