

Appendix 2 – Comparison of LEP written instruments

Note: This schedule reflects LEP provisions applying in the City of Parramatta LGA, as at 1/05/2020.

Abbreviations used in this appendix:

Auburn LEP	Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010
Holroyd LEP	Holroyd Local Environmental Plan 2013
Hornsby LEP	Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013
Parramatta LEP	Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2011
The Hills LEP	Parramatta (former The Hills) Local Environmental Plan 2012
ARHSEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009
Coastal Management SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018
Codes SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Codes) 2008
DCP	Development control plan
Draft Environment SEPP	Draft State Environmental Planning Policy (Environment)
FSR	Floor space ratio
GFA	Gross floor area
HOB	Height of building
LEP	Local environmental plan
LGA	Local government area
MLS	Minimum lot size
PLEP	Parramatta Local Environmental Plan
RFB	Residential flat building
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
SREP 24	Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 24 - Homebush Bay Area
Vegetation SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017

Document versions

No.	Author	Version
1.	City of Parramatta Council	Pre-Gateway report to Local Planning Panel and Council
2.	City of Parramatta Council	Incorporates updates relating to amendments to the Planning Proposal adopted by Council at its meeting on 11 November 2019. Also incorporates updates relating to site-specific LEP amendments gazetted since July 2019.
3.	City of Parramatta Council	May 2020 – Reflects amendments to Planning Proposal required following Gateway determination issued on 16 April 2020.

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
PART 1 - PRELIMINARY						
<i>Name of Plan</i>	CI 1.1	CI 1.1	CI 1.1	CI 1.1	CI 1.1	Name of plan to be updated to reflect year of gazettal.
<i>Commencement</i>	CI 1.1AA	CI 1.1AA	CI 1.1AA	CI 1.1AA	CI 1.1AA	Standard clause – retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Aims of Plan</i>	CI 1.2	CI 1.2	CI 1.2	CI 1.2	CI 1.2	Objectives differ across LEPs, though there are themes in common. It is proposed to incorporate objectives as per the Parramatta LEP with minor updates as outlined in Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal.
<i>Land to which Plan applies</i>	CI 1.3 & map	CI 1.3 & map	CI 1.3 & map	CI 1.3 & map	CI 1.3 & map	All LEPs are consistent. The Land Application Map will be updated to reflect the new LGA boundary. A note will also be included that indicates which land is not subject to the LEP (i.e. Sydney Olympic Park).
<i>Definitions</i>	CI 1.4	CI 1.4	CI 1.4	CI 1.4	CI 1.4	There are some differences in the terms and definitions included in the Dictionary. The Dictionary will be updated to reflect LEP provisions and ensure map references are correct. Definitions will be consistent with the Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Notes</i>	CI 1.5	CI 1.5	CI 1.5	CI 1.5	CI 1.5	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Consent authority</i>	CI 1.6	CI 1.6	CI 1.6	CI 1.6	CI 1.6	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Maps</i>	CI 1.7	CI 1.7	CI 1.7	CI 1.7	CI 1.7	LEPs are consistent. LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP. Individual maps to be reviewed and updated separately.
<i>Repeal of planning instruments applying to land</i>	CI 1.8	CI 1.8	CI 1.8	CI 1.8	CI 1.8	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP. A note is proposed to be included to indicate which planning instruments will be repealed once the consolidated LEP is made.
<i>Savings provision relating to DAs</i>	CI 1.8A	CI 1.8A	CI 1.8A	CI 1.8A	CI 1.8A	LEPs generally consistent – it is proposed to retain this clause in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Application of SEPPs</i>	CI 1.9	CI 1.9	CI 1.9	CI 1.9	CI 1.9	LEPs generally consistent. There are some differences in the specific SEPPs listed as not applying. It is proposed to retain clause in the consolidated LEP and update list of SEPPs as necessary to reflect current SEPPs which do not apply to land in the City of Parramatta LGA.
<i>Suspension of covenants etc.</i>	CI 1.9A	CI 1.9A	CI 1.9A	CI 1.9A	CI 1.9A	All LEPs are consistent – it is proposed to retain this clause in the consolidated LEP.
PART 2 - PERMITTED OR PROHIBITED DEVELOPMENT						
<i>Land use zones</i>	CI 2.1	CI 2.1	CI 2.1	CI 2.1	CI 2.1	There are some differences in the land use zones applied by each LEP (as outlined below). It is proposed to not include the RU3 Forestry zone, R1 General Residential zone, E3 Environmental Management zone and E4 Environmental Living zone in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Zoning of land to which Plan applies</i>	CI 2.2 & Land Zoning Map	CI 2.2 & Land Zoning Map	CI 2.2 & Land Zoning Map	CI 2.2 & Land Zoning Map	CI 2.2 & Land Zoning Map	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP. The Land Zoning Map will be updated to reflect new LGA boundary.
<i>Zone objectives & Land Use Table</i>	CI 2.3	CI 2.3	CI 2.3	CI 2.3	CI 2.3	LEPs are consistent, with some minor differences to explanatory notes. It is proposed to retain the clause as per the Standard Instrument LEP. The explanatory notes will be updated as necessary to reflect final structure of consolidated LEP.
<i>Unzoned land</i>	CI 2.4	CI 2.4	CI 2.4	CI 2.4	CI 2.4	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Additional permitted uses for particular land</i>	Cl 2.5 & Schedule 1	Cl 2.5 & Schedule 1	Cl 2.5, map & Schedule 1	Cl 2.5, map & Schedule 1	Cl 2.5 & Schedule 1	Clause 2.5 is consistent across all LEPs. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP. Auburn, Parramatta, Hornsby and The Hills LEPs identify additional permitted uses for specific sites within the LGA. Schedule 1 of Holroyd LEP does not include any sites within the LGA. It is proposed to retain current Schedule 1 provisions relating to sites within the LGA, unless no longer required. Refer to section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal.
<i>Subdivision - consent requirements</i>	Cl 2.6	Cl 2.6	Cl 2.6	Cl 2.6	Cl 2.6	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Demolition requiring development consent</i>	Cl 2.7	Cl 2.7	Cl 2.7	Cl 2.7	Cl 2.7	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Temporary use of land</i>	Cl 2.8	Cl 2.8	Cl 2.8	Cl 2.8	Cl 2.8	Holroyd LEP and The Hills LEP apply this clause to temporary uses of up to 52 days. All other LEPs specify a duration of 28 days. It is proposed to adopt a time limit of 52 days in the consolidated LEP.
LAND USE TABLE						
<i>Zone RU3 Forestry</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	This zone is only applied to one site under The Hills LEP, which is currently occupied by the NSW Rural Fire Service. It is proposed to rezone this site to SP1 Special Activities and not include the RU3 zone in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Zone R1 General Residential</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	Applies	This zone is applied in two locations: the former Channel 7 site in Epping (under Parramatta LEP) and land within the Carlingford Precinct (under The Hills LEP). There are some differences between the Land Use Tables of these LEPs. The R1 zone is intended as a flexible zone to provide a mix of housing types and densities. In practice, the permitted uses and development outcomes in the zones reflect those of the R3 and R4 zone. Consequently, it is proposed to not include the R1 zone in the consolidated LEP. It is proposed to rezone the above sites to a mix of R3 and R4 to reflect the built or approved development in these locations. This would provide more certainty as to the desired future development and housing mix outcome in these areas.
<i>Zone R2 Low Density Residential</i>	N/A	Applies	Applies	Applies	Applies	There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including dual occupancies, places of public worship, neighbourhood shops, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities. It is proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP. There are some differences in the zone objectives applied by LEPs over and above those required by the Standard Instrument LEP. Parramatta LEP includes additional zone objective relating to the types of non-residential uses that can be carried out in the R2 zone. It is proposed to retain these in the consolidated LEP. It is also proposed to include the additional zone objective from The Hills LEP relating to maintaining the existing low density residential character of the area. A new objective relating to protecting and enhancing tree canopy and existing vegetation is also proposed.
<i>Zone R3 Medium Density Residential</i>	Applies	N/A	Applies	Applies	Applies	There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including dual occupancies, semi-detached dwellings, bed & breakfast accommodation, residential flat buildings, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities. It is proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						Parramatta LEP and The Hills LEP apply additional zone objectives. It is proposed to retain the Parramatta LEP objectives relating to non-residential land uses that can be carried out in the R3 zone. It is not proposed to include The Hills LEP objective relating to locating medium density housing near centres and public transport is not considered necessary to include as these issues would have already been considered during the rezoning process.
<i>Zone R4 High Density Residential</i>	Applies	Applies	Applies	Applies	Applies	<p>There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including dual occupancies, multi dwelling housing, hotel/motel accommodation, neighbourhood shops, bed & breakfast accommodation, indoor and outdoor recreation facilities. It is proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Auburn LEP, Parramatta LEP, and The Hills LEP include additional zone objectives. Those within Auburn and The Hills LEPs are similar to objectives in the Parramatta LEP. As such it is proposed to retain the Parramatta LEP zone objectives.</p>
<i>Zone B1 Neighbourhood Centre</i>	Applies	N/A	Applies	Applies	Applies	<p>There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including residential flat buildings, shop top housing, tourist & visitor accommodation, office premises, pubs, small bars, amusement centres, registered clubs, mechanics and panel beaters, service stations and advertising structures. It is proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>The Hills LEP and Auburn LEP include additional zone objectives. It is proposed to incorporate the additional objectives from The Hills LEP, with the exception of the objective relating to promoting commercial development in locations that encourage walking and cycling. This is a matter considered at the rezoning stage. The Auburn LEP zone objectives mirror those in The Hills LEP.</p>
<i>Zone B2 Local Centre</i>	Applies	N/A	Applies	Applies	Applies	<p>There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including multi dwelling housing, residential flat buildings, shop top housing, amusement centres, mechanics, panel beaters and advertising structures. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Auburn LEP and Parramatta LEP include additional zone objectives. It is proposed to adopt the Parramatta LEP objectives. The Auburn LEP objectives are not considered necessary as they either mirror Parramatta LEP/Standard Instrument LEP objectives or seek to encourage high density development which is not considered an appropriate outcome across all B2 zones in the LGA.</p>
<i>Zone B3 Commercial Core</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	This zone is only applied to land in the Parramatta CBD under Parramatta LEP. It is proposed to carry over, unchanged, the Land Use Table for this zone from the current Parramatta LEP.
<i>Zone B4 Mixed Use</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	This zone is only applied by Parramatta LEP. It is proposed to carry over, unchanged, the Land Use Table for this zone from the current Parramatta LEP.
<i>Zone B5 Business Development</i>	N/A	Applies	Applies	Applies	N/A	There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including residential accommodation, tourist & visitor accommodation, major recreation facilities, business premises, office premises, entertainment facilities, function centres, registered clubs, restricted premises, light industry and

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						<p>advertising structures. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Holroyd LEP and Parramatta LEP include additional zone objectives. The Holroyd LEP objective mirrors that of the Parramatta LEP. It is therefore proposed to adopt the Parramatta LEP objectives in the consolidated LEP.</p>
<i>Zone B6 Enterprise Corridor</i>	Applies	Applies	N/A	Applies	Applies	<p>There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including residential accommodation, tourist & visitor accommodation, office premises, specialised retail premises, entertainment facilities, function centres, registered clubs, advertising structures and panel beaters. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Holroyd LEP includes an additional zone objective relating to providing for residential uses in the zone. As it is not proposed to permit residential accommodation in this zone it is not proposed to adopt this objective in the consolidated LEP.</p>
<i>Zone B7 Business Park</i>	Applies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>This zone is only applied to one site under Auburn LEP (Newington Business Park). It is proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP, as recommended in the <i>Parramatta Employment Lands Strategy 2016</i>. It is proposed to carry over, unchanged, the Land Use Table for this zone from Auburn LEP.</p>
<i>Zone IN1 General Industrial</i>	Applies	N/A	N/A	Applies	Applies	<p>There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including tourist & visitor accommodation, business premises, food & drink premises, centre-based child care facilities, pubs, small bars, hazardous storage establishments, offensive storage establishments, function centres, registered clubs, restricted premises, health services facilities, veterinary hospitals and animal boarding or training establishments. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Auburn LEP, Parramatta LEP and The Hills LEP include additional zone objectives. It is proposed to adopt the objectives from the Parramatta LEP in the consolidated LEP. It is also proposed to incorporate the objective from Auburn LEP relating to minimising adverse effects on the natural environment. The remaining objectives from Auburn and The Hills LEP either mirror those in Parramatta LEP or are not considered necessary to implement the Land Use Table.</p>
<i>Zone IN2 Light Industrial</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	<p>This zone is only applied to land in Rydalmere under Parramatta LEP and is proposed to be retained in the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Land Use Table to prohibit early education and care facilities (including child care centres) and respite day care centres due to concerns about noise, air pollution and safety. No other changes are proposed.</p>
<i>Zone IN3 Heavy Industrial</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	<p>This zone is only applied to land in Camellia under Parramatta LEP and is proposed to be retained in the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>It is proposed to make 'artisan food and drink industry' prohibited in this zone due to potential conflicts with heavy industrial zones. No other changes to the Land Use Table are proposed.</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Zone SP1 Special Activities</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	<p>This zone is currently applied to land under Parramatta LEP only. It is proposed to carry over, unchanged, the Land Use Table for this zone from the current Parramatta LEP.</p> <p>Note: It is proposed to prohibit places of public worship in R2 Low Density Residential zones. Existing places of public worship adjoining R2 zoned land and currently zoned SP1 under Parramatta LEP will be rezoned to R2, consistent with the approach taken under the majority of LEPs.</p>
<i>Zone SP2 Infrastructure</i>	Applies	Applies	Applies	Applies	Applies	<p>Land Use Tables for this zone are generally consistent across LEPs, with only minor differences. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Zone objectives are consistent across LEPs.</p> <p>Note. This zone has not been applied consistently to classified roads. The Hills LEP gives them the same zoning as adjoining land, whereas other LEPs zone them SP2. It is proposed consistently zone all classified roads SP2, which will include parts of Pennant Hills Road, James Rude Drive and Windsor Road. This approach is consistent with <i>Practice Note PN 10-001 Zoning for Infrastructure in LEPs</i> released by the then Department of Planning and Environment in 2010.</p>
<i>Zone RE1 Public Recreation</i>	Applies	Applies	Applies	Applies	Applies	<p>There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including restaurants, cafes, takeaway food & drink premises, markets, function centres, child care centres, cemeteries, information & education facilities, advertising structures, signage, building identification signs, business identification signs, water recreation structures, boat launching ramps, boat sheds and jetties. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Auburn LEP, Hornsby LEP and Parramatta LEP include additional objectives for this zone. It is proposed to adopt the Parramatta LEP objectives in the consolidated LEP, with a minor change substituting the reference to Parramatta Park with a more general reference to all parks and open spaces. Hornsby LEP objective relating to protecting bushland is not considered necessary as it is proposed to rezone all bushland to E2 Environmental Conservation. The Auburn LEP objectives mirror that within Parramatta LEP.</p>
<i>Zone RE2 Private Recreation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	Applies	<p>There are some differences between LEPs in the land uses permitted in this zone, including tourist & visitor accommodation, take-away food & drink premises, markets, centre-based child care facilities, entertainment facilities, function centres, registered clubs, and major recreation facilities. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full outline of the differences between the Land Use Tables of LEPs and recommendations for the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Parramatta LEP and The Hills LEP include additional zone objectives. It is proposed to adopt the Parramatta LEP objectives. The Hills LEP objective relating to promoting tourism and entertainment related activities is not considered necessary to implement the new Land Use Table.</p>
<i>Zone E2 Environmental Conservation</i>	Applies	N/A	N/A	Applies	Applies	<p>Land Use Tables for this zone are generally consistent across LEPs, with only minor differences. Key differences relate to research stations and building and business identification signage. It is proposed to adopt the objectives and Land Use Table under Parramatta LEP, without changes. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full comparison of Land Use Tables.</p> <p>Zone objectives are consistent across LEPs.</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						Note. This zoning is not applied consistently across LEPs, with some significant public bushland sites given an RE1 zoning under The Hills and Hornsby LEPs. It is proposed to consistently zone public bushland reserves E2 Environmental Conservation.
<i>Zone E3 Environmental Management</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	This zone is only applied to one site under Parramatta LEP (former Moxham Quarry, 166A Windsor Road, Northmead). It is not proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP. This site will be rezoned to E2 Environmental Conservation, consistent with the adjoining reserve.
<i>Zone E4 Environmental Living</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	This zone is only applied to two sites in the LGA under The Hills LEP. It is not proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP. These sites will be rezoned to reflect existing development/vegetation on the land (refer to Part 4 of the Planning Proposal).
<i>Zone W1 Natural Waterways</i>	Applies	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	<p>The W1 Zone is only applied in the LGA under Auburn LEP and Parramatta LEP. The Land Use Tables for this zone are generally consistent across LEPs, with the exception of building and business identification signs, environmental protection works and flood mitigation works. It is proposed to adopt the objectives and Land Use Table under Parramatta LEP, without changes. Refer to Appendix 3 for a full comparison of Land Use Tables.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt the objectives of Parramatta LEP in the consolidated LEP. Auburn LEP includes a zone objective relating to enabling the recreational enjoyment of the natural environment. Given the land uses proposed to be allowed in this zone, it is not considered necessary to include this objective in the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>Note. Natural waterways have not been zoned consistently across LEPs, with some being zoned RE1 under The Hills and Hornsby LEPs. It is proposed to rezone all natural waterways on public land W1 Natural Waterways, excluding parts of the Parramatta River currently zoned W2 Recreational Waterways.</p>
<i>Zone W2 Recreational Waterways</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Applies	N/A	<p>This zone is only applied to part of the Parramatta River, which falls under Parramatta LEP. It is proposed to retain this zone in the consolidated LEP, with no changes to the Land Use Table.</p> <p>Note. The zoning of this part of the Parramatta River will be reviewed following the finalisation of the <i>Draft Environment SEPP</i> by the State Government, which is proposing an alternate W3 Working Waterways zone for this part of the River.</p>
PART 3 - EXEMPT & COMPLYING DEVELOPMENT						
<i>Exempt development</i>	Cl 3.1 & Schedule 2	Cl 3.1 & Schedule 2	Cl 3.1 & Schedule 2	Cl 3.1 & Schedule 2	Cl 3.1 & Schedule 2	<p>Clause is consistent across LEPs. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.</p> <p>There are differences between LEPs in terms of the development identified as exempt under Schedule 2. Much of the development listed (i.e. signage or security grills) is covered by the <i>Codes SEPP</i>. The Hills LEP and Holroyd LEP also identify certain temporary events as exempt development, while Parramatta LEP identifies markets as exempt development. Holroyd LEP also identifies the removal of dead trees as exempt development.</p> <p>It is proposed to certain classify temporary events on council land (including markets) and certain advertising on bus shelters as exempt development. The other development included in Schedule 2 of the various LEPs, such as signage or security grills, are covered by the <i>Codes SEPP</i> and do not need to be</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						identified in the consolidated LEP. The removal of trees will continue to be governed by Council's tree protection controls in the DCP.
<i>Complying development</i>	Cl 3.2 & Schedule 3	Cl 3.2 & Schedule 3	Cl 3.2 & Schedule 3	Cl 3.2 & Schedule 3	Cl 3.2 & Schedule 3	<p>Clause is consistent across LEPs. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.</p> <p>There are differences between LEPs in term of the development identified as complying development under Schedule 3. Holroyd LEP classifies the subdivision of approved dual occupancy development as complying development, while Parramatta LEP limits this to strata subdivision. Hornsby LEP identifies small dams as complying development. No other LEPs applying in the LGA identify any complying development in Schedule 3.</p> <p>It is not proposed to identify any development as complying development under Schedule 3 of the consolidated LEP. The <i>Low Rise Medium Density Design Code</i> (in the <i>Codes SEPP</i>) will cover the subdivision of dual occupancies once these provisions come into effect in the LGA. It is not considered necessary to identify dams as complying development, given the urban context of the LGA.</p>
<i>Environmentally sensitive areas excluded</i>	Cl 3.3	Cl 3.3	Cl 3.3	Cl 3.3	Cl 3.3	<p>This clause is consistent across LEPs with the exception of Holroyd LEP which includes a subclause that applies to 'Remnant Native Vegetation' identified on that LEP's Biodiversity Map.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt provisions consistent with the Holroyd LEP, including 'Biodiversity' land mapped in the LEP as environmentally sensitive areas. This will ensure the impact of development proposed on sites with remnant native vegetation is given due consideration through the development application process.</p>
PART 4 - PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS						
<i>Minimum subdivision lot size</i>	Cl 4.1 & Lot Size Map	Cl 4.1 & Lot Size Map	Cl 4.1 & Lot Size Map	Cl 4.1 & Lot Size Map	Cl 4.1 & Lot Size Map	<p>The minimum subdivision lot size (MLS) requirements vary across LEPs. In the R2 Low Density Residential zone, the MLS varies from 450sqm to 700sqm. Parramatta LEP applies the same MLS requirement to all residential zones, while The Hills LEP and Holroyd LEP vary the requirement by zone. Hornsby LEP and Auburn LEP only apply a MLS to R2 zones however, Auburn LEP includes a general MLS requirement of 450sqm for dwelling houses. The Hills and Auburn LEPs also assign a MLS to non-residential zones, whereas the other LEPs do not.</p> <p>There are also differences in the application of MLS to battle-axe lots. Parramatta LEP requires a MLS of 670sqm (excluding the access handle). Hornsby and Auburn LEPs apply the MLS on the Lot Size Map to battle-axe lots (excluding the access handle). Other LEPs do not have any specific provisions.</p> <p>Across all LEPs, the MLS for subdivision controls do not apply to individual lots in a Community Title or Strata Plan subdivision. Parramatta LEP does not apply the MLS requirement to dual occupancy subdivision in R2, R3 or R4 zones.</p> <p>It is proposed to apply a MLS control of 550sqm across all residential zones, consistent with Parramatta LEP. The exception will be low density neighbourhoods to which The Hills LEP applies a MLS of 700sqm, which is proposed to be retained. A MLS will not be applied to non-residential zones however, existing controls will be retained for B6, B7 and IN1 zoned land under Auburn LEP and The Hills LEP until further strategic investigations of employment lands are completed.</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						<p>It is also proposed to adopt the current Parramatta LEP requirement for battleaxe lots to be a minimum of 670sqm (excluding the access handle) to subdivide. This requirement will not apply to areas where the LEP Lot Size Map identifies a MLS greater than 670sqm.</p> <p>Consistent with Parramatta LEP version of this clause, it is proposed to exempt the subdivision of dual occupancies in residential zones from meeting the MLS shown on the LEP Lot Size Map (provided one dwelling will be situated on each lot resulting from the subdivision).</p> <p>The stated objectives for this clause vary across LEPs however, there are consistent themes relating to protecting prevailing character, preventing fragmentation and isolation of land, and ensuring future development can provide a high level of amenity and meet landscaping, open space and parking requirements. Clause objectives are proposed relating to these themes.</p>
<i>Exceptions to minimum lot sizes for certain residential development</i>	N/A	CI 4.1A	N/A	N/A	CI 4.1B	<p>This clause is only applied under The Hills LEP and Holroyd LEP. The stated objectives of this clause are consistent between LEPs. The provision provides exceptions to the minimum subdivision lot size for medium density housing forms.</p> <p>The Hills LEP clause applies to the R3 and R4 zones only and permits lots to be subdivided to a minimum of 240sqm if a development application is for both the subdivision of land and includes the plans for the dwellings that will be built on each proposed new lot.</p> <p>Holroyd LEP applies the clause to all zones and permits lots created from the subdivision of dual occupancy, multi-dwelling housing or a semi-detached dwelling to be smaller than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map. No minimum lot size is prescribed.</p> <p>It is proposed to include a similar provision in the consolidated LEP, but applying it to R3 and R4 zones only. The intention of this clause is to allow medium density housing to be subdivided into lots smaller than that technically required by the LEP Lot Size Map. This will only be considered when the proposed subdivision forms part of the development application for the associated housing to be built on each lot. It is not proposed to specify a minimum lot size as per The Hills LEP, as this will be considered on merit based on achieving other development standards including setback, site width and landscaping requirements.</p> <p>Subdivision and minimum lot size controls for dual occupancies are proposed to be covered by a separate clause within the LEP.</p>
<i>Minimum subdivision lot size for community title schemes</i>	N/A	CI 4.1AA	CI 4.1AA	N/A	CI 4.1AA	<p>The Hills LEP, Holroyd LEP and Hornsby LEP include this optional clause. The intent of the clause is consistent across LEPs - to require community title scheme subdivisions in certain zones to comply with the minimum lot size map. All LEPs apply to clause to the R2 zone however, The Hills and Hornsby LEPs also apply it to a range of other zones.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt this clause in the consolidated LEP, and apply it to Community Title subdivision in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone to control Community Title subdivision in low density areas.</p> <p>It is also proposed to include a subclause that requires battle-axe lots resulting from Community Title Subdivision to be a minimum of 670sqm (excluding the access handle). However, this requirement will not apply to areas where the LEP Lot Size Map identifies a MLS requirement greater than 670sqm. This approach is consistent with the requirements of the general minimum subdivision lot size clause, and echoes the approach taken in Hornsby LEP.</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						While the intent of the clause is consistent, there is some variation between LEPs in the stated objectives. The principal themes of the objectives are avoiding fragmenting land from inappropriate subdivision and ensuring development occurs at an appropriate density. Clause objectives are proposed that reflect these aims.
<i>Minimum subdivision lot size for strata plan schemes in certain zones</i>	N/A	N/A	Cl 4.1A	N/A	N/A	<p>Hornsby LEP includes a provision prohibiting strata subdivision of residential accommodation or tourist and visitor accommodation in certain zones unless it complies with minimum lot size shown on the LEP's Lot Size Map. Within the City of Parramatta LGA, this clause applies to land zoned R2 Low Density Residential.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt this clause in the consolidated LEP, and apply it to all land in the LGA zoned R2. This will have the effect of requiring any proposed strata subdivision of such land (for example as part of seniors housing) to comply with the MLS shown on the LEP Lot Size Map (with the exception of any lot comprising common property). This will help protect the character and amenity of low density neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Consistent with the other proposed clauses relating to subdivision, it is proposed to include a subclause that requires battle-axe lots resulting from Strata Title Subdivision to be a minimum of 670sqm (excluding the access handle). This requirement will not apply to areas where the LEP Lot Size Map identifies a MLS requirement greater than 670sqm.</p>
<i>Subdivision of dual occupancies</i>	Cl 6.6	Cl 4.1A	N/A	Cl 4.1 Cl 6.15	Cl 4.1C	<p>There are significant differences across LEPs. The subdivision of dual occupancies is permitted under both Holroyd LEP and Parramatta LEP (except within the South Parramatta Conservation Area, where Torrens Title subdivision is prohibited under clause 6.15 of Parramatta LEP). Both LEPs do not require subdivision of dual occupancies to meet the MLS shown on the LEP Lot Size Map.</p> <p>Subdivision of dual occupancies is generally not permitted under The Hills LEP (unless both lots meet the MLS shown on the LEP Lot Size Map). Auburn LEP only permits Strata Plan or Community Title subdivision. There is no equivalent clause within Hornsby LEP as it does not permit dual occupancies in any zone.</p> <p>It is proposed to permit all types of subdivision of dual occupancies under the consolidated LEP. A provision is proposed to be included as part of clause 4.1, exempting the subdivision of dual occupancies from needing to comply with the LEP Lot Size Map.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the provision limiting subdivision of dual occupancy developments in South Parramatta Conservation Area to Strata or Community Title only. It is proposed to prohibit dual occupancy development in all other heritage conservation areas in the LGA.</p>
<i>Minimum lot sizes for multi dwelling housing and residential flat buildings</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Cl 4.1A	<p>The Hills LEP includes a clause requiring sites to be a particular size to develop different types of housing. Generally, multi-dwelling housing requires a development site of at least 1,800sqm and residential flat buildings (RFBs) require a site of at least 4,000sqm. However, the clause allows smaller sized sites to be developed if certain design principles are met, including the development being compatible with adjoining buildings and retaining significant existing vegetation.</p> <p>No other LEPs includes a similar clause for multi-dwelling housing or RFBs. However, some do prescribe minimum lot sizes for dual occupancy development - this issue is dealt with separately below.</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						<p>It is not proposed to retain this provision in the consolidated LEP. Prescribing a minimum site area for development of multi-dwelling housing and RFBs is not considered necessary as other site factors, such as site width, are more critical determinants of a good design outcome. A large minimum lot size could also act as barrier to the delivery of housing in the LGA as it would require sites to be consolidated before development can take place.</p> <p>The exception will be for manor houses (two storey apartments containing 3 or 4 dwellings), where a minimum lot size requirement of 600sqm is proposed to ensure good design and amenity outcomes are achieved. This is consistent with the NSW Government's <i>Low Rise Medium Density Housing Code</i>.</p>
<i>Height of buildings</i>	Cl 4.3 & Height of Buildings Map	Cl 4.3 & Height of Buildings Map	Cl 4.3 & Height of Buildings Map	Cl 4.3 & Height of Buildings Map Cl 6.16	Cl 4.3 & Height of Buildings Map	<p>While the stated clause objectives differ across LEPs, the general intent of the clause is consistent – to set appropriate maximum building heights for land using a Height of Buildings Map.</p> <p>There are some differences in heights assigned to the same zone across the LGA. The R2 Low Density Residential Zone has a height limit of 9 metres across much of the LGA, except land covered by Hornsby LEP, which applies an 8.5 metres height limit. Parramatta LEP also applies different height controls to certain R2 zoned land at Harris Park, Rosehill and in the South Parramatta Conservation Area, as well as the former Eastwood Brickworks site.</p> <p>Height limits also vary between 9 metres and 12 metres across the R3 Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>It is proposed to apply a maximum height limit of 9 metres to land in the R2 zone and 11 metres to the R3 zone (refer to Section 2.3 and Part 4 of the Planning Proposal). The current site-specific height controls will be retained for R2 zoned land in the Harris Park/Rosehill area, South Parramatta Conservation Area and former Eastwood Brickworks site, as well as lower height controls applying to some R3 zoned land in parts of the former Parramatta council area, as these reflect the unique circumstances of these locations.</p> <p>Some LEPs also include site-specific height provisions applying to land in the Silverwater Road Precinct (clause 4.3(2A) of Auburn LEP); Granville Precinct (clause 4.3(2A) of Parramatta LEP); and certain land in the Telopea Precinct (clause 6.16 of Parramatta LEP). It is proposed to retain the site-specific provisions relating to land in Granville and Telopea. It is proposed to include the provisions relating to Telopea as a subclause to clause 4.3 of the consolidated LEP, rather than a standalone clause as is currently the case.</p> <p>It is not proposed to retain the Auburn LEP provision relating to the Silverwater Road Precinct in the consolidated LEP as this provision duplicates the height limit for this land shown on the current Height of Buildings Map and is therefore not considered necessary.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the existing variable height controls applying to land zoned R4 High Density Residential to reflect the unique circumstances of these locations. However, it is proposed to apply a height limit of 14 metres (3-4 storeys) to R4 zoned land south of Boundary Road, Parramatta to bring consistency to the controls applying to the R4 zone in this location.</p> <p>Further details of other proposed changes to heights are outlined in Section 2.3 and Part 4 of the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>While different LEPs include different stated objectives for clause 4.3, they are generally consistent in respect of the themes addressed. It is proposed to adopt the Parramatta LEP clause objectives, with the</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						addition of an objective from The Hills LEP relating to ensuring the height of buildings is compatible with that of existing and ensure future surrounding development and the overall streetscape.
<i>Floor space ratio</i>	CI 4.4 & Floor Space Ratio Map	CI 4.4 & Floor Space Ratio Map	CI 4.4 & Floor Space Ratio Map	CI 4.4 & Floor Space Ratio Map CI 6.10A CI 6.17	CI 4.4 & Floor Space Ratio Map	<p>While the stated clause objectives differ across LEPs, the general intent of the clause is consistent – to regulate bulk and scale of development by setting appropriate maximum floor space ratio (FSR) controls through a Floor Space Ratio Map.</p> <p>There are differences between LEPs in what zones have an FSR control applied. Holroyd LEP and Parramatta LEP apply an FSR (of 0.5:1) to the R2 Low Density Residential Zone, whereas Hornsby LEP and The Hills LEP do not apply an FSR. Only Auburn LEP and Parramatta LEP apply an FSR to the R3 Medium Density Zone, and the FSR applied varies between the two instruments. FSR controls also vary across other zones.</p> <p>It is proposed to apply an FSR of 0.5:1 to R2 zoned land in the former Hornsby and The Hills Council areas. An FSR of 0.6:1 is proposed to be applied to R3 zoned in these locations, plus in the suburb of Silverwater. The current FSR of 0.75:1 will be retained in Newington reflecting the unique existing built form pattern of this area.</p> <p>It is proposed to apply an FSR to R4 zones sites that do not currently have one applied under Hornsby and The Hills LEPs. This will be matched to the site's current height limit.</p> <p>Some LEPs include site-specific FSR provisions relating to certain sites, including land within the Silverwater Road Precinct (clause 4.4(2C) of Auburn LEP); 821 – 845 Pennant Hills Road (clause 4.4(2C) of Hornsby LEP); various sites in Granville (clauses 4.4(2A), 6.19 and 6.20 of Parramatta LEP); 24-26 Railway Parade, Westmead (clause 6.10A of Parramatta LEP); and Telopea Precinct (clause 6.17 of Parramatta LEP). It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP and incorporate them as subclauses to clause 4.4.</p> <p>Clause 4.4 of Auburn LEP also includes a provision that sets a maximum FSR for multi-dwelling housing based on the size of the development site: 0.75:1 for sites less than 1,300sqm, 0.8:1 for sites between 1,300sqm and 1,800sqm and 0.85:1 for sites greater than 1800sqm. It is not proposed to retain this provision in the consolidated LEP as it is not considered appropriate in the context of the other provisions proposed to be included.</p> <p>It is not proposed to apply an FSR to sites in Harris Park/Rosehill which do not currently have one applied, as future precinct-level investigations are required in this area to inform appropriate controls.</p> <p>Further details of other proposed changes to FSR controls are outlined in Section 2.3 and Part 4 of the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>While different LEPs include different stated objectives for clause 4.4, there is much overlap in the themes addressed. It is proposed to adopt the Parramatta LEP clause objectives, with the addition of an objective from The Hills LEP relating to ensuring the development is compatible with the bulk, scale and character of existing and desired future surrounding development.</p>
<i>Calculation of FSR and site area</i>	CI 4.5	CI 4.5	CI 4.5	CI 4.5	CI 4.5	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Exceptions to development standards</i>	CI 4.6	CI 4.6	CI 4.6	CI 4.6	CI 4.6	<p>This clause is generally consistent across LEPs. Some LEPs identify additional development standards (under subclause 8) as being excluded from the application of clause 4.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auburn LEP excludes clause 6.8, which requires satisfactory arrangements to be put in place for the delivery of State public infrastructure in the Precinct. • Parramatta LEP specifies that height and FSR controls in the Parramatta City Centre Precinct (as referred to in clause 7.1(1)) cannot be varied by more than 5%. • Parramatta LEP also excludes the provisions at clause 8.1 or 8.2, relating to arrangements for designated State public infrastructure and public utility infrastructure in the Telopea Precinct. • The Hills LEP also identifies additional provisions that cannot be varied, but none of these relate to land within the City of Parramatta LGA. <p>It is proposed to include the following exclusions in clause 4.6 of the consolidated LEP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain exclusion relating to FSR and HOB controls in the Parramatta CBD Precinct, • Retain exclusions relating to satisfactory arrangements for State public infrastructure in the Carter Street Precinct, Telopea Precinct and certain land in Granville, and • Retain exclusion relating to ensuring the availability of essential public utility infrastructure. <p>Note. Council has submitted a separate Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment to insert a subclause into clause 4.6 of Parramatta LEP and Hornsby LEP relating to the Epping Town Centre. Should these amendments be made prior to the finalisation of this Planning Proposal, the exclusions relating to Epping Town Centre will be inserted into the consolidated LEP as appropriate.</p>
<i>Erection of dwelling houses or dual occupancies on land in certain rural and environmental protection zones</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 4.2A	<p>This clause is only adopted by The Hills LEP and applies to sites in a rural zone or sites zoned E3 Environmental Management or E4 Environmental Living.</p> <p>It is not proposed to retain this clause in the consolidated LEP. The City of Parramatta LGA includes very few sites with a rural, E3 or E4 zone. These sites are either already build out with residential development and/or are proposed to be rezoned to other zones not covered by this clause.</p>
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS						
<i>Relevant acquisition authority</i>	CI 5.1 & Land Reservation Acquisition Map	CI 5.1 & Land Reservation Acquisition Map	CI 5.1 & Land Reservation Acquisition Map	CI 5.1 & Land Reservation Acquisition Map	CI 5.1 & Land Reservation Acquisition Map	<p>This is a mandatory clause required to be included in all Standard Instrument LEPs. LEPs are generally consistent, with some minor differences in the naming conventions used for different land reservation types. The particular land use zones referenced in this clause also vary across LEPs however, this is determined by what land reservations are identified in each LEP and where they are located and does not reflect a difference in policy intent.</p> <p>This clause will be retained in the consolidated LEP. Consistent terminology is proposed to refer to each type of land reservation. Consequently, it is proposed that “Strategic bus corridor” reservations identified under Parramatta LEP will be referred to as “Public transport corridor”, consistent with the terminology used in The Hills LEP.</p> <p>The Land Reservation and Acquisitions Map will be consolidated to incorporate current land reservations. It is proposed to amend the map to remove land reservations that have been already been acquired.</p>
<i>Development on land intended to be</i>	CI 5.1A & Land Reservation	CI 5.1A & Land Reservation	CI 5.1A & Land Reservation	CI 5.1A & Land Reservation	CI 5.1A & Land Reservation	<p>This clause is generally consistent across LEPs, with the exception of The Hills LEP, which adopts a shortened version. It is proposed to adopt the version of the clause included in Auburn, Holroyd, Hornsby</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub Acquisition Map	Hol Acquisition Map	Hor Acquisition Map	Par Acquisition Map	Hil Acquisition Map	
<i>acquired for public purposes</i>						and Parramatta LEPs, which is more specific in terms of development considered appropriate on sites subject to a land reservation. Refer to Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for detail of the proposed provision.
<i>Classification and reclassification of public land</i>	CI 5.2	CI 5.2	CI 5.2	CI 5.2	CI 5.2	LEPs are consistent. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Development near zone boundaries</i>	CI 5.3	CI 5.3	CI 5.3	CI 5.3	CI 5.3	<p>There are differences across LEPs in the distance from a zone boundary to which this clause applies. It varies between 1 metre (Parramatta LEP), 10 metres (Holroyd LEP) and 20 metres (Auburn LEP, The Hills LEP and Hornsby LEP). Holroyd LEP excludes the B4 Mixed Use zone and Hornsby LEP excludes the W2 Recreational Waterways zone from the clause, which other LEPs do not.</p> <p>It is proposed to prescribe a distance of 1 metre from a zone boundary for the purposes of this clause. Given that sites in some parts of the LGA can be small, applying a greater distance is not considered appropriate as this could result in undesirable land uses being carried out where they are not intended.</p> <p>It is proposed to apply this provision to include B4 and W2 zones, as per the Parramatta LEP version of the clause (these zones only occur in the LGA under this LEP). This approach is also consistent with the version of the clause in the Standard Instrument LEP.</p>
<i>Controls relating to miscellaneous permissible uses</i>	CI 5.4	CI 5.4	CI 5.4	CI 5.4	CI 5.4	<p>There are differences across LEPs in the prescribed maximum sizes of home business, home industry, industrial retail outlets, kiosks, neighbourhood shops, roadside stalls, secondary dwellings and artisan food and drink industries.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt the following maximum sizes for each use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bed and breakfast accommodation: 3 bedrooms (consistent across all LEPs). • Home businesses: 50sqm of floor area (consistent with majority of LEPs). • Home industries: 50sqm of floor area (proposed to be consistent with home businesses). • Industrial retail outlets: 5% of GFA of the associated industry or 400sqm, whichever is the lesser (consistent with Parramatta LEP. Proposed to limit the amount of retail floorspace in these uses). • Farm stay accommodation: 3 bedrooms (consistent across all LEPs). • Kiosks: 10sqm (consistent with Parramatta LEP and Auburn LEP. Kiosks are intended to be small businesses that sell convenience goods such as papers and refreshments. Permitting a larger floor area is not considered appropriate). • Neighbourhood shops: 80sqm (consistent with Parramatta LEP and Auburn LEP. Neighbourhood shops are proposed to be permitted in residential and industrial zones to provide convenience retailing. As such a smaller size is considered appropriate to minimise potential amenity impacts). • Neighbourhood supermarkets: 1,000sqm (consistent across all LEPs). • Roadside stalls: 8sqm (consistent across majority of LEPs). • Secondary dwellings: 60sqm or 5% of GFA of the principal dwelling, whichever is the greater (this is consistent with the maximum size permitted in the ARHSEPP). • Artisan food and drink industry exclusion: 5% of GFA of the associated industry or 400sqm, whichever is the lesser (consistent with industrial retail outlets).

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Development within the coastal zone</i>	CI 5.5	CI 5.5	CI 5.5	CI 5.5	CI 5.5	This clause was repealed from Standard Instrument LEPs as part of the gazettal of the <i>Coastal Management SEPP</i> in March 2018. LEP provisions have been replaced by the Coastal Management SEPP, which will apply to development within coastal management areas located in the LGA.
<i>Architectural roof features</i>	CI 5.6	CI 5.6	CI 5.6	CI 5.6	CI 5.6	While the stated objectives of this clause vary across LEPs, the detailed provisions are consistent. It is proposed to retain this clause in the consolidated LEP, as per the Standard Instrument LEP. While different LEPs include different stated objectives for this clause, they generally relate to the need to ensure architectural roof features contribute positively to the design of a building and that the development still satisfies the objectives of the Height of Building clause. It is proposed to adopt a clause objective consistent with that within the Parramatta LEP.
<i>Development below mean high water mark</i>	CI 5.7	N/A	CI 5.7	CI 5.7	CI 5.7	This clause is consistent across the LEPs which have adopted it. The clause is not applicable within the former Holroyd LGA as it did not include any tidal waterways. This clause is relevant to the City of Parramatta LGA and therefore compulsory to be included in the consolidated LEP, as per the Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Conversion of fire alarms</i>	CI 5.8	CI 5.8	CI 5.8	CI 5.8	CI 5.8	This clause is consistent across LEPs. This clause is relevant to the City of Parramatta LGA and is therefore compulsory to be included in the consolidated LEP, as per the Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Preservation of trees or vegetation</i>	CI 5.9	CI 5.9	CI 5.9	CI 5.9	CI 5.9	Clause 5.9 has been repealed by the <i>Vegetation SEPP</i> , which now applies. No changes proposed.
<i>Trees or vegetation not prescribed by DCP</i>	CI 5.9AA	CI 5.9AA	CI 5.9AA	CI 5.9AA	CI 5.9AA	Clause 5.9AA has been repealed by the <i>Vegetation SEPP</i> , which now applies. No changes proposed.
<i>Heritage conservation</i>	CI 5.10, Heritage Map & Schedule 5	CI 5.10, Heritage Map & Schedule 5	CI 5.10, Heritage Map & Schedule 5	CI 5.10, Heritage Map & Schedule 5	CI 5.10, Heritage Map & Schedule 5	This clause is consistent across LEPs, with the exception of references to LGA names. No changes are proposed, apart from updating references to the City of Parramatta LGA. Existing heritage items, heritage conservation areas and archaeological sites identified in the various LEPs and located within the LGA will be retained in the consolidated LEP. These items will be identified under Schedule 5 and on the LEP Heritage Map. To facilitate consolidation of the schedule it is proposed to reorder and update item numbers and conservation area references. Some minor amendments are proposed, including removal of the Cheltenham Conservation Area (currently listed in Hornsby LEP) which only applies to fragments of land in the LGA. Proposed changes are outlined in Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal.
<i>Bush fire hazard reduction</i>	CI 5.11	CI 5.11	CI 5.11	CI 5.11	CI 5.11	This clause is consistent across the LEPs. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Infrastructure dev. and use of existing Crown buildings</i>	CI 5.12	CI 5.12	CI 5.12	CI 5.12	CI 5.12	This clause is consistent across the LEPs. Retain as per Standard Instrument LEP.
<i>Eco-tourist facilities</i>	N/A	N/A	CI 5.13	N/A	CI 5.13	Only The Hills LEP and Hornsby LEP adopt this clause however, it is not applicable to any land in the LGA as eco-tourist facilities are not permitted, or proposed to be permitted, anywhere in the LGA. Consequently, it is not proposed to include this clause in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Siding Spring Observatory</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	It is not proposed to adopt this clause in the consolidated LEP as it is not adopted by any LEPs currently applying in the City of Parramatta LGA.

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Defence communications facility</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	It is not proposed to adopt this clause in the consolidated LEP as it is not adopted by any LEPs currently applying in the City of Parramatta LGA.
<i>Subdivision of, or dwellings on, land in certain rural, residential or environmental protection zones</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	This clause is not relevant to land in the City of Parramatta LGA and is therefore not proposed to be adopted in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Artificial waterbodies in environmentally sensitive areas of operation of irrigation corporations</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	This clause is not relevant to the land in the City of Parramatta LGA and is therefore not proposed to be adopted in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Intensive livestock agriculture</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	This clause is not relevant to land in the City of Parramatta LGA and is therefore not proposed to be adopted in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Pond-based, tank-based and oyster aquaculture</i>	CI 5.19 & Schedule 6	CI 5.19 & Schedule 6	CI 5.19 & Schedule 6	CI 5.19 & Schedule 6	CI 5.19 & Schedule 6	Clause 5.19 and Schedule 6 were introduced through amendments to the Standard Instrument LEP in February 2019. Provisions are consistent across LEPs. Provisions will be retained, as per Standard Instrument LEP.
PART 6 - ADDITIONAL LOCAL PROVISIONS						
<i>Dual occupancy development</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.11 & Dual Occupancy Prohibition Map	CI 4.1A	<p>Parramatta LEP and The Hills LEP include specific provisions relating to dual occupancy development in residential zones.</p> <p>Parramatta LEP includes a Dual Occupancy Prohibition Map, which identifies land on which dual occupancy development is not permitted, despite any other provision of the LEP. The LEP only permits attached forms of dual occupancy development, unless the site contains a heritage item or at least two street frontages. Under the LEP, a minimum lot size of 600sqm is required to build a dual occupancy in R2, R3 or R4 zones.</p> <p>Under The Hills LEP, a minimum lot size of 600sqm is required to build an attached dual occupancy in R2 and R3 zones, and 700sqm for a detached dual occupancy. 1,800sqm is required to build a dual occupancy in R1 and R4 zones.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt the approach taken in Parramatta LEP, which will permit dual occupancy development in residential zones, except for land identified on the Dual Occupancy Prohibition Map, where dual occupancies are not considered suitable. Proposed prohibition areas include those already identified in Parramatta LEP, plus certain low density residential land in the former Hornsby and The Hills council areas. Heritage conservation areas and certain R2 zoned land in Carlingford, Dundas, Dundas Valley, Eastwood, Epping and Oatlands are also proposed to be included on the Dual Occupancy Prohibition map.</p> <p>On sites where dual occupancy development is permitted, it is proposed to only allow attached forms to be built, unless the site contains a heritage item, or is a corner site/has at least two street frontages. The intent of this provision is to achieve better design and amenity outcomes from dual occupancy development. Land within the South Parramatta Conservation area will also be allowed to be developed for detached dual</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						<p>occupancies, consistent with the current objectives and controls specific to this area in Section 4.4.4.2 of <i>Parramatta Development Control Plan 2011</i>.</p> <p>Given the proposed restrictions on detached forms, it is proposed to require a minimum lot size of 600sqm to build a dual occupancy development in residential zones. This is consistent with minimum lot size provisions in the Parramatta LEP and (for attached forms) The Hills LEP. Urban design testing has indicated that this is the minimum lot size necessary to achieve a good level of amenity, landscaping, private open space and appropriate setbacks.</p> <p>It is also proposed to include an LEP provision requiring a minimum site frontage of 15 metres for dual occupancy development. This will elevate existing DCP site frontage requirements into the LEP to provide more certainty over the required size and shape of sites considered suitable for dual occupancy development. Refer to Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for more information on the proposed LEP dual occupancy provisions.</p>
<i>Acid sulfate soils</i>	CI 6.1 & Acid Sulfate Soils Map	CI 6.1 & Acid Sulfate Soils Map	CI 6.1 & Acid Sulfate Soils Map	CI 6.1 & Acid Sulfate Soils Map	CI 7.1 & Acid Sulfate Soils Map	<p>All LEPs have adopted a clause for acid sulfate soil management and a supporting map. This clause is generally consistent across LEPs, with the exception of Auburn LEP, which includes additional wording in subclause 6(a) providing examples of works that could involve the disturbance of less than 1 tonne of soil.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt a clause consistent with the majority of LEPs. The additional wording in subclause 6(a) of Auburn LEP is considered inconsequential and not necessary to include in the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>The Acid Sulfate Soils Map from each LEP will be combined into a new map for the consolidated LEP. No changes are proposed to the map.</p>
<i>Earthworks</i>	CI 6.2	CI 6.2	CI 6.2	CI 6.2	CI 7.2	<p>This clause is generally consistent across LEPs. Auburn LEP includes an additional exemption, not requiring development consent for earthworks that alter the existing ground level by 600mm or less. Holroyd LEP, Hornsby LEP, and The Hills LEP also require consideration of appropriate measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate the impacts of the earthworks in addition to the other matters listed in the clause under all LEPs.</p> <p>As the LEPs are broadly consistent it is proposed to adopt provisions modelled on the Parramatta LEP version of the clause, with the inclusion of the additional matter for consideration from Holroyd, Hornsby and The Hills LEPs (refer to section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal).</p> <p>Earthworks that do not alter ground level by more than 600mm is exempt development under the Codes SEPP and is therefore not considered necessary to be included in the clause.</p>
<i>Essential services</i>	CI 6.5	CI 6.3	N/A	CI 8.2	N/A	<p>Auburn LEP and Holroyd LEP include a provision that requires the consent authority to be satisfied that water, electricity, sewage, stormwater drainage and road access is available to support relevant development. The clause is identical in both LEPs. Parramatta LEP includes a similar provision that relates only to land within the Telopea Precinct.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt a provision consistent with the Auburn and Holroyd LEPs and apply it to all land in the LGA. Consequently, it would not be necessary to include the Telopea-specific clause.</p>
<i>Flood planning</i>	CI 6.3 & Flood	CI 6.4	CI 6.3 & Flood	CI 6.3	CI 7.3	<p>This clause is generally consistent across LEPs, with some minor wording differences. The main difference is that Hornsby LEP and Auburn LEP include a Flood Planning Map, identifying land to which the flood</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub Planning Map	Hol	Hor Planning Map	Par	Hil	
						<p>planning provisions apply, in addition to land at or below the flood planning level. The definition of flood planning level is consistent across LEPs (being the 1:100 flood event level plus a 500mm freeboard).</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt a clause consistent with the Parramatta LEP, which currently applies to the majority of flood prone land in the LGA, and does not include a Flood Planning Map. The Flood Planning Level will be the 100 year (1% AEP) flood level plus 500mm freeboard, consistent with all LEPs.</p> <p>It is not proposed to include a Flood Planning Map in the LEP at this stage as one is not required to operate the clause and consistent mapping for the whole LGA does not currently exist. Council has commenced detailed work to review and update flood mapping for the LGA however, this is not expected to be finalised within the timeframes of this Planning Proposal.</p>
<i>Biodiversity protection</i>	N/A	CI 6.5 & Biodiversity Map	CI 6.4 & Terrestrial Biodiversity Map	CI 6.4 & Natural Resources - Biodiversity Map	CI 7.4 & Terrestrial Biodiversity Map	<p>All LEPs except Auburn LEP include a biodiversity clause and supporting LEP map. The objectives and operation of each clause are generally consistent across LEPs, including the detailed matters for consideration in subclauses 3 and 4, even though their wording differs.</p> <p>One key difference is that Holroyd LEP has a stricter requirement that requires development to which the clause applies does not have any adverse impact on the condition, ecological value and significance of the fauna and flora on the land. Under the other LEPs, measures to minimise or, at the very least, mitigate impacts may be considered if impacts cannot be reasonably avoided.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt a version of this clause based substantially on the Hornsby LEP version of the clause, with some elements from other LEPs used where these provide better clarity. Refer to section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for more information.</p> <p>The stricter requirement of Holroyd LEP is not considered appropriate in our LGA given its urban context and the need for infill development and urban renewal. As this clause applies to sites that have not been zoned for environmental conservation, a more balanced approach to managing impacts on biodiversity is considered appropriate. It is also noted that none of the land to which Holroyd LEP's clause applies falls within the City of Parramatta LGA, and this land could be of a different nature to that found in our LGA.</p> <p>The basis for sites being identified on different LEP Biodiversity Maps is unclear. Consequently the map of biodiversity sites has been reviewed to ensure a consistent basis is taken across the LGA. It is proposed to map significant vegetation on land in private ownership as 'Biodiversity' land in the LEP. This mapping will be consistent with NSW Government's <i>Native Vegetation of the Sydney Metropolitan Area</i> mapping. Significant public bushland reserves will be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. Further details of proposed changes to the map are outlined in Part 4 of the Planning Proposal.</p>
<i>Protection of riparian land and waterways</i>	N/A	CI 6.6 & Riparian Lands and Watercourses Map	N/A	CI 6.5 & Natural Resources - Riparian Land and Waterways Map	N/A	<p>This clause is only adopted by Parramatta LEP and Holroyd LEP. There are differences in the wording of each clause, but the intent of both LEPs is generally consistent and applies only to land mapped on the relevant LEP map. The Holroyd LEP clause is more detailed and includes additional matters for consideration under subclause 3.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt heads of consideration consistent with clause 6.6(3) of Holroyd LEP, with the following updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use term "waterway" instead of "watercourse".

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insert additional head of consideration from Parramatta LEP relating to development impacts on the flows, capacity and quality of groundwater systems. <p>It is proposed to include provisions consistent with clause 6.5(4) of Parramatta LEP. The stated objective of the clause will combine those from both Holroyd and Parramatta LEPs. Refer to section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for details.</p> <p>The LEP Riparian Lands and Waterways map will identify all natural creek corridors on privately owned land in the LGA, consistent with the widths recommended in the NSW Department of Industry <i>Guidelines for controlled activities on waterfront land – Riparian corridors</i>. Further details of proposed changes to the map are outlined in Part 4 of the Planning Proposal.</p>
<i>Stormwater management</i>	N/A	CI 6.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>This clause is only included in Holroyd LEP.</p> <p>It is proposed to include this clause in the consolidated LEP as it supports Council's goals to minimise the impact of flooding on the community and to make the Parramatta River swimmable again by 2025, as identified within the City of Parramatta <i>Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</i>. An update is proposed to the clause to add consideration of impacts of stormwater runoff on water-based recreation areas to the matters for consideration in subclause 2(c).</p>
<i>Development on landslide risk land</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.6 & Natural Resources - Landslide Risk Map	CI 7.6 & Landslide Risk Map	<p>Parramatta LEP and The Hills LEP adopt provisions and a supporting map that require proposed development to be responsive to the constraints of landslide risk, where this exists. Both versions of the clause are consistent. The Hills LEP Landslide Risk Map does not identify any land within the City of Parramatta LGA.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt a clause consistent with Parramatta LEP. The existing Landslide Risk Map will be retained. It is not proposed to map any new landslide risk sites at this time, but an amendment may be considered at a later date through a future Planning Proposal.</p>
<i>Development in foreshore areas</i>	CI 6.4 & Foreshore Building Line Map	N/A	CI 6.5 & Foreshore Building Line Map	CI 6.7 & Foreshore Building Line Map	CI 7.5 & Foreshore Building Line Map	<p>All of the LEPs, with the exception of Holroyd LEP, include a clause relating to development in foreshore areas. Foreshore areas are typically identified along tidal waterways, such as the Parramatta River. The clause applies to land in the foreshore area as identified on the associated Foreshore Building Line Map. The LEPs are generally consistent, with only minor variations. The Hills and Auburn LEPs include an additional provision requiring consideration of sea level rise or change in flooding patterns as a result of climate change.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt provisions consistent with clauses 6.7(2) and (3) of Parramatta LEP, with the addition of the provision from Auburn LEP clause 6.4(4)(h) requiring consideration of potential future sea level rise or change in flooding patterns. This will ensure that development does not inadvertently impact foreshore areas in the future, such as by blocking public access to them.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt additional clause objectives to better clarify the intent of the clause. Refer to Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for details.</p> <p>The Foreshore Building Line map from each applicable LEP will be combined into a new map for the consolidated LEP. It is proposed to identify additional land along the foreshore at Wentworth Point, covering land in the precinct currently subject to Auburn LEP, but which has not had any foreshore area mapped. The additional foreshore area will be mapped in accordance with the widths recommended in the Department of</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						Industry <i>Guidelines for controlled activities on waterfront land – Riparian corridors</i> . Further details of proposed changes to the map are outlined in Part 4 of the Planning Proposal.
<i>Salinity</i>	N/A	CI 6.8 & Salinity Map	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>Holroyd LEP includes provisions applying to land identified on a Salinity Map as having potential for salinity. Proposed development on such land is required to appropriately manage salinity risk having regard to the matters for consideration prescribed in the clause.</p> <p>The area transferred to the City of Parramatta from the former Holroyd LGA is mapped as having 'Moderate Salinity' (the lowest possible category) on the Salinity Map. This map is based on data from the <i>Map of Salinity Potential in Western Sydney</i> published in 2002 by the former Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources.</p> <p>It is proposed to extend the application of the Parramatta DCP salinity provisions to the former Holroyd area. Given this, it is not proposed to adopt this clause in the consolidated LEP. An LEP provision relating to salinity is not considered necessary, as this issue can be adequately managed through DCP controls and conditions of consent, as has been the practice across areas of the LGA under Parramatta DCP.</p> <p>The <i>Map of Salinity Potential in Western Sydney</i> will be used to identify land with potential salinity risk, as is the practice under Parramatta DCP. Geotechnical reports are usually required for certain developments, which identify any salinity problems and provide recommendations for its management and mitigation.</p>
<i>Restricted premises</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.8	N/A	<p>Parramatta LEP includes provisions that require adequate separation between restricted premises and sensitive land uses.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain this clause in the consolidated LEP, but amend subclauses 1 and 2(a) slightly to mandate that restricted premises are not permitted at ground floor level or within 100 metres of a residential zone or public recreation zone.</p> <p>Restricted premises should be sited away from sensitive land uses or places frequented by children to minimise land use conflicts and adverse amenity impacts. The proposed changes are necessary as the current wording of this clause is too ambiguous and can be easily varied. The proposed changes will not affect the overall intent of the clause, but will better establish what the clause is trying to achieve. Refer to in Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for more detail of the proposed changes to the clause.</p>
<i>Location of sex services premises</i>	CI 6.7	N/A	CI 6.7	CI 6.9	CI 7.9	<p>All LEPs, except Holroyd LEP, adopt provisions that seek to limit the provision of sex services premises near sensitive uses such as schools, childcare centres or places of public worship. The intent of the clause is generally consistent across LEPs however, there are differences in locational criteria and the matters for consideration. Parramatta LEP and Auburn LEP require a minimum distance of 200 metres between sex services premises and sensitive land uses, whereas The Hills LEP only restricts sex services premises on sites adjoining sensitive uses. Hornsby LEP does not include any distance criteria. Auburn LEP does not allow sex services premises to be located within 50 metres of a public utility undertaking (i.e. taxi rank or bus stop).</p> <p>The Auburn, The Hills and Hornsby LEP clauses also include a stated objective to assist with implementation of the provisions. The objective is consistent between these LEPs.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt provisions consistent with clause 6.9 of Parramatta LEP, with the addition of the following objective, consistent with the other LEPs:</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to minimise land use conflicts and adverse amenity impacts by providing a reasonable level of separation between sex services premises and sensitive land uses, including residential development or land in a residential zone, places of public worship, hospitals, places frequented by children (i.e. schools and child care centres), community facilities or recreation areas. <p>The Parramatta LEP provisions are considered to be the strongest. The minimum buffer requirement of 200 metres between sex service premises and sensitive uses will be retained to help ensure these premises are discretely located and that adequate separation is provided.</p> <p>The requirement in Auburn LEP for a 50 metres buffer zone from a public utility undertaking is not proposed to be adopted as it is considered to be excessive and will discourage patrons and staff from using public transport.</p>
<i>Design excellence</i>	N/A	CI 6.11 & Design Excellence Map	CI 6.8	CI 6.12 & Key Sites Map CI 6.13 & Design Excellence Map CI 7.10 & Key Sites Map	CI 7.7	<p>All LEPs, except Auburn LEP, include design excellence provisions, but the approach varies. The provisions of Parramatta LEP and Holroyd LEP apply to development in specified locations (the Holroyd LEP provisions do not apply to any land in the LGA). By contrast the design excellence provisions of The Hills LEP and Hornsby LEP apply to development anywhere in the LEP area over a prescribed height limit.</p> <p>The LEP clauses are consistent in so far as they require development to which they apply to demonstrate they achieve design excellence. This is considered against a set of principles, which are broadly similar across LEPs. One difference between LEPs is that the clauses in Parramatta LEP also require development proposals over a set threshold to go through a design competition. No other LEP has a similar requirement.</p> <p>The Hills LEP and Holroyd LEP require referral of applications to a design excellence panel, which is not required by other LEPs. However, the City of Parramatta Council does operate a Design Excellence Advisory Panel that reviews a range of development applications to ensure a good design outcome is achieved.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt the approach in Parramatta LEP, which is to apply design excellence provisions, including architectural design competitions, to specific locations only. It is intended that the provisions of clauses 6.12 and 6.13 of Parramatta LEP will be merged into a single clause.</p> <p>A standalone clause is proposed to be maintained for the Parramatta CBD. However, it is proposed that the matters for consideration in determining whether design excellence has been achieved will be consistent across all design excellence clauses included in the consolidated LEP. Refer to Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for more information.</p> <p>Council intends to continue operating the Design Excellence Advisory Panel to facilitate design excellence in developments across the LGA, where a design competition is not required, including in areas where formal LEP design excellence provisions do not apply.</p>
<i>Development on certain land at Westmead</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.10 & Key Sites Map	N/A	<p>These provisions only apply to a particular site in Westmead. It is proposed to retain the clause in the consolidated LEP and update the <i>LEP Key Sites Map</i> to reflect any changes to the cadastral boundaries for the subject site. The continued need for these provisions will be considered as part of the planning for the Westmead Precinct and any necessary amendments will be progressed through a separate Planning Proposal.</p>

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Development on 24-26 Railway Parade, Westmead</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.10A	N/A	These provisions only apply to a particular site in Westmead. It is proposed to retain the provisions in the consolidated LEP, but incorporate them into clause 4.4 Floor Space Ratio as the clause applies a special FSR provision to the site. The continued need for these provisions will be considered as part of the planning for the Westmead Precinct and any necessary amendments will be progressed through a separate Planning Proposal.
<i>Development of certain land at Granville</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.14	N/A	These provisions only apply to certain land at Granville. They restrict development for purposes other than residential accommodation to a maximum of 4000sqm. It is proposed to retain this provision in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Underground power lines at Carlingford</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 7.8 & Key Sites Map	These provisions only apply to land at Carlingford under The Hills LEP, which is now within the City of Parramatta LGA boundary. It is proposed to retain the clause in the consolidated LEP. Part of the land to which this clause applies remains to be developed and undergrounding of power lines will achieve a better urban design outcome.
<i>Contributions to State infrastructure in the Carter Street Precinct</i>	CI 6.8 & map	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	These provisions only apply to land within the Carter Street Planned Precinct. They seek to ensure that satisfactory arrangements are put in place for the delivery of State public infrastructure in the Precinct before development is approved. It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP but merge them with clause 8.1 of Parramatta LEP (which apply similar provisions to the Telopea Precinct). This clause will be included in the consolidated LEP until a mechanism is in place to collect contributions towards state and regional infrastructure.
<i>Development of certain land at Wentworth Point</i>	CI 6.10 & Key Sites Map	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	These provisions only apply to land within the Wentworth Point Maritime Precinct. They identify additional permitted uses for this land. It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP, but include them in Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses, rather than as a standalone clause.
<i>Height of buildings for certain land in Telopea Precinct</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.16 & Height of Buildings Map	N/A	These provisions only apply to land in the Telopea Precinct. They identify additional provisions relating to the height of buildings on certain sites. It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP, but incorporate them into the main Height of Buildings clause (clause 4.3) along with other site-specific provisions relating to height controls.
<i>Floor space ratio for certain land in Telopea Precinct</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.17 & Floor Space Ratio Map	N/A	These provisions only apply to land in the Telopea Precinct. They identify additional provisions relating to the floor space ratio of buildings on certain sites. It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP, but incorporate them into the main Floor Space Ratio clause (clause 4.4) along with other site-specific provisions relating to FSR controls.
<i>Development requiring the preparation of a development control plan</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.18 & Key Sites Map	N/A	These provisions only apply to land in the Telopea Precinct and certain land at Granville. It is proposed to retain the clause in the consolidated LEP.
<i>Floor space ratio for certain land at Granville</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.19 & Key Sites Map	N/A	These provisions only apply to certain land in Granville. It is proposed to retain the provisions in the consolidated LEP but incorporate them into the main Floor Space Ratio clause (clause 4.4) as they apply special FSR controls to the site. The site will be mapped on the Floor Space Ratio Map instead of the Key Sites Map, consistent with the approach to other sites with special FSR provisions.

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Development of land at 38,40 and 42 East Street, Granville</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 6.20	N/A	These provisions apply only to particular sites in Granville. It is proposed to retain the provisions in the consolidated LEP however incorporate them into clause 4.4 Floor Space Ratio as the clause relates to the calculation of gross floor area of proposed development on the site for the purposes of applying a FSR. The site will be mapped on the Floor Space Ratio Map.
OTHER LEP PROVISIONS						
<i>Part 8 – Intensive urban development areas</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Part 8 and associated maps	N/A	These provisions currently only relate to land within the Telopea Precinct. It is proposed to carry over the provisions into the consolidated LEP but insert them into other sections of the LEP, as outlined below. Consequently, it is not proposed to retain this section in the consolidated LEP.
Arrangements for designated State public infrastructure	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 8.1 & Intensive Urban Development Area Map	N/A	These provisions only apply to land in the Telopea Precinct. They seek to ensure that satisfactory arrangements are put in place for the delivery of State public infrastructure in the Precinct before development is approved. These provisions are similar to those relating to the arrangements for State public infrastructure in the Carter Street precinct under clause 6.8 of Auburn LEP. It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP but merge them with those relating to the Carter Street precinct. This clause will be included in the consolidated LEP until a mechanism is in place to collect contributions towards state and regional infrastructure.
Arrangements for designated State public infrastructure for certain land at Granville	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 8.1A & Intensive Urban Development Area Map	N/A	This clause extends the provisions of clause 8.1 of Parramatta LEP to the development of certain land at Granville, and includes development for the purposes of commercial premises and mixed use development. It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP but merge them with those relating to the Carter Street and Telopea precincts.
Public utility infrastructure	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 8.2	N/A	These provisions only apply to land in the Telopea Precinct. They seek to ensure that adequate public utility infrastructure is available to service new development. These provisions are similar to those within clause 6.5 of Auburn LEP and clause 6.3 of Holroyd LEP (which apply to the whole LEP area). It is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated LEP but merge them so that there is one clause that applies to all land across the LGA, including the Telopea Precinct. Consequently, it would not be necessary to include this Telopea-specific clause in the consolidated LEP. Refer to Section 2.1 of the Planning Proposal for more information.
Relationship between Part and remain of Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A	CI 8.3	N/A	This clause only applies to land in the Telopea Precinct and states that provisions within Part 8 of Parramatta LEP prevail over any other provision of the LEP. It is not proposed to retain this clause in the consolidated LEP, as the similar wording can be included in other relevant clauses, as needed – for example, clause 8.1 of Parramatta LEP includes wording “Despite all other Provisions of this Plan....”
<i>Part 7 - Additional local provisions relating to Parramatta City Centre</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Part 7 & Additional Local Provisions Map	N/A	These provisions only relate to land in the Parramatta CBD and will not affect any land from the incoming areas. This section will be incorporated into the consolidated LEP. No changes are proposed as part of this Planning Proposal. New and revised provisions for the CBD are being considered separately through the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal process.

Clause/Issue	LEP comparison					Comments and proposed action to consolidated LEPs
	Aub	Hol	Hor	Par	Hil	
<i>Homebush Bay West Precinct (Wentworth Point)</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>Land at Wentworth Point is deferred from the Auburn LEP. Instead relevant planning controls are contained within <i>SREP 24</i> and <i>Homebush Bay West Development Control Plan</i>. This creates additional complexity in the LGA's land use planning framework.</p> <p>Council is working with the State Government to transfer the existing development controls (including zoning, height and FSR) for Wentworth Point into the LEP and repeal <i>SREP 24</i>. Controls transferred into the LEP will match the current approved development outcomes and adopted planning controls for the area. Any provisions that do not need to be transferred into the LEP will remain in the DCP.</p> <p>The process of transferring controls and repealing <i>SREP 24</i> is separate to developer-led proposals currently under consideration by Council to amend planning controls for certain sites in the precinct.</p>