

31 March 2017

Director, Industry and Infrastructure Policy
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam,

Draft Education and Child Care SEPP

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on *Draft State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017*.

Council, at its meeting on 12 April 2017, will consider Group Manager's Report No. PL 15/17 concerning the Draft Education and Childcare SEPP. The report (copy attached) recommends (in part) that a submission be forwarded to the Department of Planning and Environment raising concern with *Draft SEPP (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017*, and addressing the major issues for Hornsby Shire identified in Group Managers Report No.PL15/17, including:

1. Ensuring the planning controls are consistent with the priorities in the Draft North District Plan to discourage urban development in the primary production rural areas;
2. Requiring that significant private school developments are subject to an independent merit assessment to ensure works respond to the existing or desired future character of the locality;
3. Amending the design controls for exempt and complying school developments to appropriately respond to a low density residential and rural environment;
4. Limiting the extent of school intensification as complying development that has the potential to impact on local road infrastructure; and
5. Avoiding and mitigating the clearing of native vegetation.

Given the date for the receipt of submissions closes on 7 April 2017, this draft submission is provided in advance of Council's consideration of the matter. Council will forward a copy of the meeting minutes to confirm the submission after its meeting.

Should you require further information or clarification on any matters raised in this submission, please contact me on 9847 6744.

Yours faithfully



Fletcher Rayner
Manager
Strategic Planning Branch

TRIM Reference: F2004/07599

Hornsby Shire Council

ABN 20 706 996 972
296 Peats Ferry Rd, Hornsby 2077

PO Box 37, Hornsby NSW 1630

Phone 02 9847 6666
Fax 02 9847 6999

Email hsc@hornsby.nsw.gov.au
Web hornsby.nsw.gov.au

7 DRAFT STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS AND CHILDCARE FACILITIES) 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- In February 2017, the Department of Planning and Environment commenced exhibition of *Draft State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017*. Submissions are invited until April 2017.
- The Draft SEPP proposes changes to make it easier for childcare providers, schools and Tertiary Education facilities to build new facilities.
- Key issues for schools relate to extending the range of exempt and complying development to include buildings up to 22 metres in height, treating non-government schools as public authorities and permitting works as complying development that currently require merit assessment. Key issues for childcare centres include introduction of non-discretionary development standards and the implementation of State-wide design guidelines.
- The Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013 should be amended to be consistent with the Draft SEPP when it is finalised.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT:

1. A submission be forwarded to the Department of Planning and Environment raising concern with Draft SEPP (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017, and addressing the major issues for Hornsby Shire identified in Group Managers Report No.PL15/17, including:
 - a) Ensuring the planning controls are consistent with the priorities in the Draft North District Plan to discourage urban development in the primary production rural areas;
 - b) Requiring that significant private school developments are subject to an independent merit assessment to ensure works respond to the existing or desired future character of the locality;
 - c) Amending the design controls for exempt and complying school developments to appropriately respond to a low density residential and rural environment;
 - d) Limiting the extent of school intensification as complying development that has the potential to impact on local road infrastructure; and
 - e) Avoiding and mitigating the clearing of native vegetation.
2. Council prepare and exhibit a modification to the Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013 to provide consistency with SEPP (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017 as gazetted, including removal of the existing cap on the size of child care facilities.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to outline the Draft Education and Childcare SEPP, identify implications for Hornsby Shire and provide recommendations for a submission to the Department of Planning and Environment.

BACKGROUND

Currently, planning provisions for schools and tertiary institutions are contained within State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (*SEPP Infrastructure*). Early childhood education and care facilities are regulated through several policies, including national regulations, State requirements and localised provisions in Local Environmental Plans (LEPs) and Development Control Plans (DCPs).

New South Wales is experiencing significant population growth and subsequent increased school enrolments both in public and non-government schools. To assist in delivering additional school capacity, the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E) is proposing changes to the planning framework applying to child care and school development through *Draft State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017*.

In February 2017, the DP&E released the Draft Education and Childcare SEPP for exhibition until April 2017. This includes the concurrent exhibition of amendments to *SEPP Infrastructure* and the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, to facilitate the implementation of the new Policy.

DISCUSSION

This section provides an overview of the Draft SEPP and identifies key implications for Hornsby Shire.

1. CONTEXT

The Draft Education and Childcare SEPP provides statutory planning controls to simplify and standardise the approval process for childcare centres, schools, TAFEs and universities and broaden the range of developments that can be undertaken as exempt and complying development.

- The key changes for educational establishments are:
 - Extending the permissibility of schools to include the *RU1 Primary Production Zone*;
 - Allowing all new schools and extensions to existing schools to be approved as complying development (up to 22 metres and four storeys);
 - Treating an existing non-government school site as a *public authority* for the purposes of exempt development and development without consent;
 - Lowering the threshold for State significant development to \$20 million for schools;
 - Permitting State significant development to contravene a development standard in a local environmental plan; and
 - Introducing a certificate of compliance from Roads and Maritime Services in relation to traffic for school expansion under complying development.
- The key changes for childcare facilities are:
 - Enabling school-based childcare to be approved as exempt or complying development;
 - Mandating the permissibility of childcare centres in all R2 and IN2 Zones;

- Introducing non-discretionary development standards for childcare centres;
- Identifying that DCP controls cannot limit the number or mix of children; and
- Applying a State-wide planning guideline for childcare centres subject to a DA.

2. ISSUES

The DP&E is seeking feedback on the Draft SEPP including proposed amendments to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and Regulations, the LEP template and associated assessment and design guidelines. Accordingly, it is recommended that Council's submission be based on the following issues in accordance with the suite of documents that form part of the Draft SEPP.

2.1 Extending School Permissibility

SEPP (Infrastructure) currently permits schools with consent in the RU2 and RU4 Rural Zones. These land use zones in Hornsby Shire comprise 2 hectare lots. The Draft SEPP proposes to permit schools in the *RU1 Primary Production Zone*. In the Hornsby Local Government Area, the RU1 Zone is generally located north of Galston, with a 10 hectare minimum lot control.

- a) The provision of dispersed private schools through the RU1 rural area would be contrary to the priorities of the draft North District Plan that seek to discourage urban development in the Metropolitan Rural Areas and protect sustainable primary industry.

Recommend: Clause 27 should be amended to delete reference to the RU1 Primary Production Zone.

- b) The Draft SEPP proposes to enable Planning Panels to issue *Site Compatibility Certificates* to permit schools and child care centres on land where they are prohibited, if the land adjoins a zone that permits these uses. The Draft SEPP advises that this does not apply to land that is zoned for conservation purposes. This approach is inconsistent with the *Standard Instrument LEP* and the *Hornsby LEP 2013* where Clause 5.3 provides land use flexibility for property adjacent to a zone boundary. Clause 5.3 does not apply to land zoned RE1 Public Recreation, Zone E1 National Parks and Nature Reserves, Zone E2 Environmental Conservation, Zone E3 Environmental Management or Zone W1 Natural Waterways, or land within the coastal zone. The steep bushland areas within the rural areas of the Shire are generally zoned E3 Environmental Management.

Recommend: Clause 14 should be amended so that it does not apply to environmentally sensitive zones, as listed in Clause 5.3 of the Standard Instrument LEP, including the E3 Environmental Management Zone.

2.2 Amending the Consent Authority for Schools

The Draft SEPP allows registered non-government schools to undertake development without consent utilising Part 5 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*, and significantly widens the scope of exempt and complying development. For complying development, the modifications to the Regulation requires that a certifying authority must not issue a complying development certificate unless it has been provided with a written statement by a qualified designer that verifies the development achieves the *design qualities principles* set out in Schedule 4 of the draft SEPP. If a school expansion is not exempt or complying development, it would then likely become State Significant Development. While the Draft SEPP requires some consultation with Local Government, the Policy largely removes the assessment function of councils.

- a) The scope of exempt school development is extended to apply to non-government schools and to widen the range of works permitted. Some of the works may have significant impacts and the setback controls do not differentiate between low and high density residential areas. Furthermore, the setback controls are inadequate for schools in rural zones where larger setbacks are required to minimise landuse conflict.

Recommend: Clause 32 be amended to delete works that require a merit assessment to enable mitigation measures to be considered including the construction of buildings in close proximity to a boundary in a rural zone, the clearing of 2 hectares of native vegetation to facilitate a recreation facility with no locational requirements, and the use of existing facilities for profit based community purposes (the scope of which is undefined).

- b) Development permitted without consent includes administration, classroom buildings, and carparks that are not more than 1 storey high, and modifications to external façades. The DP&E has developed a Code of Practice for the assessment of these works by private schools. This approach permits a private organisation to undertake its own merit assessment, with no public accountability.

Recommend:

- Merit assessments should not be undertaken by a private school.
- The prescribed building height of 1 storey be defined as 4 metres between natural ground and the highest point of the building.
- Development without consent be limited or removed for heritage items and conservation areas, as this necessarily requires a site specific assessment.

- c) The draft SEPP requires some consultation and notification to council for development carried out without consent. This requires local council resources to review the application documentation and provide advice without the costs incurred being funded.

Recommend: That councils be funded for any assessment services they provide.

- d) The draft SEPP permits new school buildings up to four storeys (or 22 metres) in height, to be approved as complying development. The *EP&A Regulations* are to be amended to require a certifying authority to be issued with a complying development certificate by a qualified designer verifying that the *design quality principles* have been achieved, for buildings in excess of 12 metres in height.

The *design quality principles* involve a merit assessment, such as requiring schools to be designed to respond to the positive qualities of its setting, that would be completed by the applicant's architect. The Department's explanatory notes indicate an option being considered is that complying development certificates for school infrastructure should only be issued by council certifiers. There is no design quality assessment required for buildings up to 12 metres in height, which is equivalent to a 3 storey apartment building.

Recommend:

- Complying development should be limited to works that do not require merit assessment.
- Council should not be appointed the sole certifier for complying development for school infrastructure, as the community may assume that this gives the Council a merit assessment function.

- All private school buildings in excess of 2 storey (8.5 metres) in height should be required to comply with the design quality principles in Schedule 4 of the Draft SEPP and be subject to a merit assessment, through a development application process.
- e) The draft SEPP requires a certificate to be issued by the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) for complying development that will result in a school being able to accommodate 50 or more additional students. The RMS is the roads authority for State and Classified Regional Roads, while Council is the roads authority for local and unclassified regional roads. The inability of Council to consider the impact of the development on the local road network may result in necessary road work ancillary to the school expansion such as intersection upgrades, improved footpaths or pedestrian crossings, failing to occur.

Recommend: The scale of complying development should be limited to not more than 50 additional students, to enable an assessment of the need for upgrades to local road infrastructure.

- f) The complying development controls do not make provision for consideration of site contamination. The provisions allow for significant expansion of existing schools on rural and industrial land that would ordinarily require a preliminary contamination assessment and possibly a remediation action plan.

Recommend: That all works in potentially contaminated zones require a development application to enable a merit assessment to be undertaken and appropriate consent conditions for remediation applied.

- g) The complying development controls allow for stormwater drainage to be conveyed by gravity or a charged system. A charged system results in stormwater being directed to a catchment that would not naturally accept that water, and may result in wider stormwater catchment issues. The controls also require that drainage systems obtain an approval under Section 68 of the Local Government Act or comply with the controls in a DCP. Some applications may require a Section 68 approval for a new stormwater connection but should also comply with DCP controls in relation to stormwater detention and water quality measures.

Recommend: That Schedule 2 (10) Drainage be amended to limit stormwater for complying development to a gravity fed system, and require on-site stormwater detention and water quality control in accordance with DCP controls.

- h) The Draft SEPP proposes to classify all new schools (regardless of capital investment value) and all major expansions of existing schools with a value of \$20 million or more as State Significant development. The State has identified the need to pursue this path due to the urgency in delivering more facilities. As a result, development assessment reports will not be prepared by Council officers with detailed local knowledge.

Recommend: That the classification of schools as 'State Significant' should be determined based on a significant increase in school capacity of more than 200 children.

- i) The Draft Policy does not include any savings provisions for applications currently being assessed by Council or the JRPP.

Recommend: That savings provisions be included for undetermined development applications.

2.3 Local Character Impacts from Enlarged Schools

The Draft SEPP permits school buildings up to four storeys (or 22 metres) in height, to be approved as complying development, with limited design controls. The complying development controls do not adequately respond to a low density residential or rural environment. The most important contributor to urban character is the relationship of built form to surrounding space, a relationship that is created by building height, setbacks and landscaping. The draft controls are not compatible with a low density residential or rural environment where the character of the area is dominated by the landscape setting. Furthermore, complying development does not require the massing or design of development be planned to reduce external impacts.

- a) The complying development building height controls do not differentiate between a low density residential or rural environment and a high density residential area.

Recommend: That Schedule 2 Clause 2 Building Height be amended to reduce the building height controls for R2 Low Density Residential Zones and Rural Zones, to introduce a maximum height of 2 storeys or 8.5 metres, whichever is the greater.

- b) The setback controls do not differentiate between a low density residential or rural environment and a high density residential area. For example, the complying controls allow a 12 metre high building, similar in scale to a 3 storey residential flat building, to be setback 5 metres to any residential zone or 1 metre to any other zone. In contrast, SEPP 65 Guidelines has interface controls that require an additional 3 metre boundary setback where a 3 storey apartment building adjoins a low density residential area. Furthermore, the 1 metre setback control would have a significant impact on land within Council's rural zones, or where a school adjoins a local park or local shopping centre.

Recommend: That Schedule 2 Clause 3 Side and Rear Setbacks be amended to include:

- A 10m setback for all buildings within or adjoining a Rural Zone;
- A 5m setback for land adjoining an R2 Zone, for building heights up to 8.5m;
- A 1m setback for land adjoining a B1 or B2 Zone, for building heights up to 8.5m; and
- A 3m setback for land adjoining a B1 or B2 Zone, for building heights up to 12m;

- c) There are no front setback controls for schools in the Draft SEPP, such as those for complying dwellings where the front setbacks are required to respond to the existing building line.

Recommend: That Schedule be amended to include a front setback control that the building must have a setback from the road that is the average distance of the setbacks of the nearest buildings having the same primary road boundary and located within 40m of the lot on which the building is erected.

- d) The Design and Materials element permits the erection of unarticulated walls without any consideration of good design principles for buildings up to 12 metres in height.

Recommend: That Schedule 2 Clause 4 Design and Materials be amended to require all new external walls greater than 4m in height that face a side or rear boundary to include façade articulation, including windows, unless the façade is obscured by a landscape screen on the school site that is equivalent in height to the new building. All external walls that face a public road or reserve must contain articulation and windows.

- e) The privacy provisions do not require consideration of the location of windows or private open space on an adjacent residential property. The controls do not afford the same level of privacy protection between properties that is expected of residential development.

Recommend: That Schedule 2 Clause 6 Privacy be amended to include the requirement that a new window be separated by at least 12 metres to a habitable room window or principal private open space area on adjoining residential land.

- f) The Landscaping controls do not require canopy trees to be planted within the vicinity of significant buildings to be constructed as complying development. The controls are inner-city centric and do not respond to low density residential areas or rural areas where the character of the locality is dominated by the landscape setting.

Recommend: That Schedule 2, Clause 7 Landscape be amended to require:

- 3m wide landscape area along the front and side boundary in a residential zone, for the full length of the new building;
 - 5m wide landscape area along the rear boundary in a residential zone, for the full length of the new building, that contains small trees/shrubs 3m in height and also canopy trees capable of growing to a mature height of 10 metres;
 - landscaping 6m wide along all boundaries of a Rural Zoned property, and contain canopy trees capable of growing to a mature height of 10 metres; and
 - landscaping of the 3m setback with screening shrubs to the boundary of a B1 or B2 Zone, for buildings with a height between 8.5m and 12m.
- g) The Earthwork controls permit significant land modification that has the potential to impact on the streetscape and character of the locality.

Recommend: That Schedule 9 Clause 3 Earthworks be amended to reduce the extent of fill permitted as complying development from 2 metres to 1 metre.

- h) There is no requirement to consider the potential acoustic impacts from recreation facilities permitted as complying development, which is inconsistent with the approach proposed for Tertiary Establishments.

Recommend: That Schedule 2 Schools include Noise provisions similar to those proposed for Universities in Schedule 3 Clause 7.

2.4 Bushland Impacts from Enlarged Schools

The Draft SEPP permits exempt and complying school buildings and sporting fields to be constructed that requires the removal of bushland.

- a) The exempt development provisions permit sporting fields, tennis courts and the like to be constructed as exempt development if the work does not involve the clearing of more than 2 hectares of native vegetation. This may result in significant impacts on the landscape character of the locality and biodiversity.

Recommend: That Clause 32 Existing Schools – exempt development Clause 1(g) be removed.

- b) When complying development requires an enlarged Asset Protection Zone (APZ) to comply with *Planning for Bush Fire Protection*, there is no requirement to consider the impact on bushland from the enlarged APZ or how siting of the new building should be located to reduce impacts.

Recommend: That Schedule 11 - Bush fire prone land, be amended to not permit complying development where it requires an enlarged Asset Protection Zone (APZ) into bushland. This would enable the impact on the bushland to be assessed and impacts mitigated.

2.5 Non-discretionary Development Standards for Childcare Centres

The Draft SEPP prescribes non-discretionary development standards for centre based childcare centres. A consent authority is not to require more onerous standards. Some of the controls of concern are noted below:

- The draft Policy proposes that development may cover any part of the site. This is inconsistent with the scale controls at 7.1.2 of the HDCP that prescribes site coverage controls that otherwise apply to the zone, and 7.1.4 that prescribes the minimum landscaped area.

Recommend: That Clause 23(2)(c) be modified to delete reference to “cover any part of the site” as the development of appropriate site coverage and landscape controls are important elements in the character of an area.

- The draft Policy requires that the design is to satisfy the design criteria in the Childcare Planning Guideline, as a non-discretionary development standard. The inclusion of this provision in Clause 23 is problematic as the guideline is extensive and many of the controls may be incompatible with each other. Including this provision is unnecessary as Clause 21 requires consideration of the guideline prior to the determination of the application.

Recommend: That Clause 23(2)(e) be deleted, as this is required to be addressed by Clause 21 of the Draft SEPP.

2.6 Design Criteria for Childcare Centres

The Draft Childcare Planning Guideline includes extensive design controls for the construction of childcare centres. Within Hornsby Shire, childcare centres are commonly proposed within low density residential areas, with residential interfaces. Concern with these applications typically include local character, noise and parking.

- a) The design controls do not adequately address the inter-relationship between building design and acoustic mitigation. In residential areas with low background noise levels, acoustic reports often recommend the erection of acoustic fencing in excess of 2m in height. In contrast, the Design Criteria requires a 2m high acoustic fence to a residential property boundary. To achieve appropriate noise levels with a 2m high fence in a residential area with low background noise levels, this typically requires an operational management plan that limits outdoor play time, where a small number of children (often 10 to 12 children) are permitted outside at any one time. The restricted play time approach limits the ability of children to play and may become an ongoing compliance and enforcement matter. In addition, the Code adopts the NSW Industrial Noise Policy levels for child care centres that is inconsistent with noise levels accepted by the Land and Environment Court.

Recommend: That the Design Code be reviewed to address:

- the inter-relationship between design and acoustic mitigation;
- encourage and include examples of how centres could be developed on corner sites to function as an acoustic barrier to avoid high acoustic fences;
- amend the fencing controls at Design Criteria 3E to address secondary frontages; and
- that Appendix 3 Checklist of Specialist Studies require an acoustic assessment to address the noise generated by a childcare facility.

- b) The building envelope controls state that building height should be limited in accordance with an LEP or DCP, or if no controls apply, 8.5 metres on residential zoned land. The Code also identifies that basement parking is not to project more than 1 metre above ground. All of the examples in the Code assume a single storey child care centre, on a relatively flat block of land, with at grade parking. The Code does not identify what is the acceptable form of a 8.5 metre (2 storey) childcare centre in a residential zone.

Recommend: Provide clarification where and how a 2 storey building comprising a ground level carpark and first storey child centre is able to be constructed. That the Code discourage second storey play areas in low density residential zones.

- c) The design controls allow small childcare centres to provide for parking on-street, rather than on site, where this does not affect the safety and amenity of the adjacent area. The Hornsby DCP provides a similar dispensation for dwelling-house conversions, not for purpose built centres in residential zones. The Code also introduces a rate of 1 parking space per 10 children for sites within 400m of a metropolitan train station. Appendix 3 Checklist of Specialist Studies requires a traffic study for centres in residential or industrial zones with places for 90 or more children and not for rural zoned land.

Recommend:

- That the off-street parking dispensation at Design Criteria 3L(4) be deleted. Alternatively, if the clause is retained, to include a definition of a small centre to comprise a maximum of 30 children, with at least half of the required parking provided on-site for parent drop off/ pick up.
- That the Design Code be reviewed to require a traffic study to be submitted for centres within rural zones.

2.7 Impact on Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013

The draft SEPP provides that any requirement of a development control plan that is inconsistent with the Policy, does not apply for the purpose of a childcare centre. Therefore, if finalised, the draft SEPP would require an amendment to the HDCP to address the following areas of inconsistency:

- That the development may be located any distance from an existing or proposed childcare centre. This is inconsistent with 7.1.2(d) of the HCP that limits the number of childcare centres to one per allotment.
- That the ages, age ratios, or numbers of children is not a matter for consideration in the Draft SEPP or Guideline. This is inconsistent with 7.1.2 of the HDCP that provides intensity controls to limit the size of childcare centres.
- That the indoor and outdoor space provisions comply with the Education and Care Services National Regulations. This is inconsistent with 7.1.2 of the HCP that requires a larger play space ratio for centres with more than 40 children.

On 8 March 2017, Council considered Group Manager's Report No. PL8/17 on DA/1109/2016 for the construction of a 136 place childcare centre at Quarry Road Dural. Council resolved to defer the determination of the application to undertake a site inspection. Council also resolved that a report be prepared outlining the background and objective of the existing limit on child numbers for childcare centres contained within the Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013 and addressing the merits of retaining the control in light of the State Government's *Draft State Environmental Planning Policy*

(Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017 which does not include a maximum total for child placements.

The *Hornsby Childcare Planning Review 2006* addressed the required size of a centre to be viable. The review recommended a maximum size for childcare centres in residential areas of 60 children and rural areas of 90 children which is a requirement of Council's HDCP. Since the completion of the above review, there have been various reforms to National and State controls for child care centres, including the requirement for higher quality facilities, qualified staff, and lower staff to children ratios. These reforms, in addition to other development cost factors, are now generating the need for larger childcare centres to be viable.

The objective of the Draft SEPP is to respond to the demand for quality childcare centres and to require centres to be assessed on their merits, and not be constrained by an artificial cap on the scale of facilities. The explanatory notes for the Draft SEPP report that an additional 2,700 long day care centres would be required by 2036 to address shortages and meet projected demand. Council officers recently attended workshops with the Department of Planning and Environment regarding the Draft SEPP and were advised that on the gazettal of the SEPP, any cap within a DCP would have no effect. Therefore, when the SEPP is finalised, Council will no longer be able to mandate a maximum centre size and should amend the HDCP to be consistent with the SEPP.

Recommend: Upon finalisation of the SEPP, relevant controls in the HDCP be amended to ensure consistency with the SEPP (*Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities*) 2017, as gazetted, including removal of the existing cap on the size of child care facilities.

BUDGET

There are no budgetary implications associated with this report.

POLICY

The *Draft SEPP (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017* is to be considered as a Draft Planning Instrument during the assessment of development applications, pursuant to Section 79C of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act*. If the Draft SEPP is gazetted, the Policy will come into effect and supersede Council's planning controls as discussed in this report.

CONCLUSION

In February 2017, the NSW Government placed the *Draft SEPP (Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities) 2017* on public exhibition until April 2017. The draft policy includes provisions to amend the approval process for a number of school developments to remove assessment and determination by Local Councils and develop alternative planning controls for schools and childcare facilities that over-ride local considerations.

It is recommended that a submission be made to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment supporting the intent of the Policy to rationalise the controls for childcare providers, schools and Tertiary Education facilities, and suggesting amendments to maintain independent merit address of applications and consideration of local character.

If progressed, the draft SEPP will require amendments to the HDCP to ensure consistency. Accordingly, it is also recommended that an amendment to the HDCP be progressed upon finalisation of the draft SEPP to harmonise our local requirements.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER

The officer responsible for the preparation of this Report is the Manager, Strategic Planning – Fletcher Rayner – who can be contacted on 9847 6744.

FLETCHER RAYNER
Manager - Strategic Planning
Planning Division

JAMES FARRINGTON
Group Manager
Planning Division

Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

File Reference: F2004/07599
Document Number: D07163017

