



South West Local Area Plan



Submissions Report

April 2016

Contents

Summary of Submissions

Panania Small Village Centre (Action L1)	2
East Hills Neighbourhood Centre (Action L2)	20
Open Space (Action G1)	23
Government agencies and neighbouring councils	25

Summary of Submissions–Panania Small Village Centre (Action L1)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 48 [Resident] Sherlock Avenue in Panania	This submission requests the height and FSR for their property in Sherlock Avenue be increased to 8 storeys / 3:1. This would enhance the development potential of their property (520m ² in area), and allow residents in the street to be able to move residence without the loss of finances involved in the moving.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to increase the building envelope in Sherlock Avenue from 2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR to 6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR. In considering this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure buildings and public spaces respond to and reflect the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings in the Residential Frame precinct (which includes Sherlock Avenue). The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form that responds to and reflects the village feel. Based on the key considerations around building heights, 4–6 storeys is considered appropriate to achieve a design outcome that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 11 & 159 [Residents] Tower Street (south side) in Panania	These submissions raise concern there is no appropriate transition between the proposed 4 storey mixed use development along Tower Street (south side) and existing single and 2 storey houses.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed the following changes to the properties along the southern side of Tower Street: - To change the height limit for the properties currently within Zone B2 Local Centre from 3 storeys (plus attic) to 4 storeys (no attic). - To rezone the properties between Lambeth Street and Hinemoa Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone B2 Local Centre (4 storeys).	Amend Action L1: Introduce rear setback controls for the properties along Tower Street (south side).
	Submission No. 11 specifically suggests extending the transition area in a north–south direction to allow for a more calm transition and to better encourage development.	In considering these submissions, Council reviewed the urban design, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the small village centre.	
	Submission No. 159 specifically suggests two options: - Option 1: Replace the 4 storey mixed use development along Tower Street (south side) with 3 storey terrace housing. - Option 2: Allow 3 storey terrace housing on properties immediately to the south of Tower Street (between Eddie Avenue and Picnic Point Road).	The review process identifies the need for development at the edges of the small village centre to make an appropriate built form transition to the low–rise detached housing in the surrounding suburban neighbourhood. It is therefore proposed to introduce rear setback controls for the properties along the southern side of Tower Street to provide an appropriate transition to the low–rise detached housing to the south.	

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 106 [Property owner] No. 147 Tower Street in Panania	This submission requests a 2:1–2.5:1 FSR (14 metre building height) for the property at No. 147 Tower Street. The property is located in close proximity to the Panania centre and provides the opportunity for residential and mixed use development.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to maintain the current building envelope controls for the property (3 storeys + attic / 0.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan. The review identifies the property at No. 147 Tower Street as forming part of the Commercial Fringe precinct. It is therefore proposed to increase the building envelope to 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to be consistent with the neighbouring business zoned land at this location. This is subject to applying rear setback controls to provide an appropriate transition to the low-rise detached housing to the south.	Amend Action L1: Increase the building envelope at No. 147 Tower Street to 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR. Introduce rear setback controls.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 103 [Property owner] No. 183 Tower Street in Panania (Panania Christian Church)	This submission does not support the proposal to heritage list the Panania Christian Church at No. 183 Tower Street. The reasons are: • The building is in a state of disrepair. The cost to repair the building is excessive. • The building has had significant works carried out in the 1970s. • A heritage listing will limit the church's ability to continue to meet the communities' needs if the church's facilities are not allowed to be altered in keeping with the communities' needs.	In considering this submission, Council reviewed the heritage assessment and property owner's submission. The review process indicates the principal item of significance is the form / shape of the church building. Recognising this significance can be achieved in many different ways without requiring a heritage listing. The Bankstown Heritage Committee considered this matter on 13 April 2016. Based on the review process, the Committee does not recommend that the church building be considered for listing in the Local Environmental Plan.	Amend Action L1: The property at No. 183 Tower Street in Panania will not be considered as a potential heritage item.

Bankstown City Council

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 16 [Resident] Panania Small Village Centre	This submission comments that residents have not been directly informed or approached by Council.	Prior to this exhibition, Council used a variety of ways to obtain public feedback during the preparation and exhibition of the Draft Local Area Plan. This included focus groups, drop-in sessions, community workshops and online engagement. Council also held resident panel meetings, specifically in relation to village feel. As part of this exhibition process, Council posted notification letters and placed advertisements in the local newspaper. Council also held Public Listening Sessions, which provided residents and interested people the opportunity to present their views to an independent consultant. The outcome of this work has informed the Local Area Plan.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 21, 27, 32, 71, 136, 144, 153, 154, 166 & 167 [Residents] Panania Small Village Centre	These submissions raise concern: - The proposed densities will impact on the capacity of road infrastructure. - Increased traffic will affect the safety of cyclists and children playing in the street. - There is a lack of commuter parking spaces and train services. - Parking will be a major issue for shoppers and users unless adequate parking spaces are made mandatory for new development. Elderly residents require consideration as they cannot always catch public transport or walk too far to do shopping and cars need to be used to carry them and their loads. - There is a need to provide parking for staff working in the businesses. Most people will not live in the immediate walking vicinity and most will not be travelling by bike or train.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the small village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre. With more pedestrians on the streets, getting around the small village centre easily and safely will become an even greater priority to ensure we have a balanced transport system. Action L1 therefore incorporates the findings of the Centres Transport Action Plan. The findings propose to have cars travel slowly in the small village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk. The CTAP identifies a range of infrastructure improvements within the centre to support the growth including: - Reduced speed limits in the centre on key streets. - Footpaths and pedestrian crossing upgrades. - Allow for gradual increases in parking capacity at convenient locations around the small village centre. - Formalise the regional on-road cycle route which traverses through the local streets with painted markings. - Advocate to Transport for NSW for improved public transport services and access to these services. In terms of off-street parking: - Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to provide off-street parking for residents. - Council applies the Development Control Plan, which requires non-residential development to provide off-street parking for workers and visitors.	No change is proposed.

	Submission Nos. 21 and 166 specifically raise concern about safety. A suggestion is to install monitoring / CCTV on main streets.	The proposal to increase the number of residents living in the small village centre provides the opportunity for more casual surveillance and street activity, which may assist in providing safer areas.	No change is proposed.
	Submission Nos. 21 and 167 specifically question whether the council amalgamations will impact the local area plan process.	Council's strategic planning program is being undertaken to align with current State planning and urban renewal initiatives. Council will continue to work with the Department of Planning & Environment and other relevant state agencies to streamline plan making and renewal opportunities and promote the principles of urban consolidation to ensure better use of existing infrastructure across the city. Council is committed to ensuring its strategic planning program is designed to provide certainty to industry and community on the scale, timing and location of growth and how this growth will be supported by necessary infrastructure, services and facilities. Council would be able to continue with the above whilst the State Government considers the proposed amalgamation of the Bankstown and Canterbury local government areas. It is noted that Council's position on the proposed amalgamation is to stand-alone.	No change is proposed.
	Submission Nos. 27, 71, 136, 144, 153 and 167 specifically raise concern there is no planning or funding to increase the infrastructure in the area (such as electricity, gas, water sewage, drainage, roads, footpaths, cycling paths and train services).	As part of the local area planning process, Council consulted government agencies. The government agencies such as Transport for NSW, Roads & Maritime Services, Ausgrid, NSW Health–South Western Sydney Local Health District and Sydney Water did not identify any significant impact on services as a result of the proposed changes in the Local Area Plan. Action L1 also identifies the need for Council to advocate to Transport for NSW for more frequent, direct and prioritised rail and bus services to allow for the long term growth in commuter movements.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 27 specifically questions whether there are enough schools in the area to support the number of people.	As part of the local area planning process, Council consulted government agencies. The Department of Education raises no objection to the proposals set out in the Draft Local Area Plan.	No change is proposed.

	Submission Nos. 27, 136 and 167 specifically raise concern the proposed 4–6 storey building height is excessive and will change the small village character and amenity.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the small village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the small village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: • The small village centre boundary as a 5–10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. This distance provides an adequate level of containment for a centre of this size, and is an appropriate fit within the centres hierarchy. • There is the potential for the Residential Frame precinct to be a place of well–proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The intended outcome is to provide a mix of low and medium–rise living choices within a short walking distance of the railway station, commercial core and local services.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 153 specifically raises concern that the proposed 6 storey buildings will overlook the primary school and playground. This raises welfare, safety and security issues for young children.	In considering this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure buildings and public spaces respond to and reflect the village feel and unique characteristics of the place (Action L1). The review process recommends continuing with medium–rise buildings (6 storeys) in Tower Street (north side). The roadway separates Tower Street (north side) from St Christopher’s Catholic Primary School. Council also applies the State Government’s Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to address any potential privacy issues. As part of the local area planning process, Council consulted government agencies. The Department of Education raises no objection to the proposals set out in the Draft Local Area Plan.	No change is proposed.

	Submission Nos. 27, 71, 153, 154, 166 and 167 specifically raise concern the redevelopment of the Civic Precinct (No. 77 Anderson Avenue, No. 31 Pepper Street and Nos. 176–178 Tower Street) may: • Remove the existing public green space next to the library, which is a valuable public asset. • Relocate the car park to the other side of the railway line. At present, it is difficult to get from one side to the other. • Remove the Nurse Schwarzel Monument (heritage item).	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to create a retail and civic heart at this location. This will include a new multi-purpose community facility and mixed use development set within a high quality public domain. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create this mixed use destination. In considering these submissions, it is proposed to amend Action L1 to note that the concept plan will provide public space as part of this mixed use destination.	Amend Action L1: The concept plan will provide public space as part of any mixed use destination at the Civic Precinct.
	Submission No. 153 specifically raises concern the Vale of Ah and Deepwater Park are not readily accessible and are poorly maintained by Council. These areas are overgrown and used as dumping areas. Linking these green areas with the small village centre is inappropriate.	As part of the exhibition, Action G3 proposed to strengthen the recreational and ecological functions of Deepwater Park to ensure this regional park is capable of sustaining population growth expected in the South West Local Area and the wider city. This action will require a review of the plan of management. In addition, Council is working together with the Regional Illegal Dumping Squad with the aim of tackling the challenging problems of illegal dumping. Council has led the way, taking a tough approach to illegal dumping, and successfully prosecuting some of the worst serial dumpers in NSW.	No change is proposed.

	Submission No. 166 specifically does not support the proposed 3 storey terrace housing, particularly where it overlooks neighbouring houses and backyards. It will lead to the destruction of existing green streets that have front yards with shrubs and grassed areas.	In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the small village centre. The review process identifies the need for development at the edges of the small village centre to make an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise detached housing in the surrounding suburban neighbourhood. The proposed 3 storey terrace housing at the edges of the small village centre is considered to be an appropriate built form transition at this location.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 166 specifically raises concern there are few road crossings in a north-south direction. It is recommended that section 94 contributions be put towards widening the Carson Street bridge over the railway line.	In terms of the Carson Street bridge over the railway line, it is proposed to investigate the performance of the intersections to determine if there is a need for any widening.	Amend Action L1: Investigate the performance of the Carson Street overbridge to determine if there is a need for any widening.
	Submission No. 166 specifically raises concern the rate of dual occupancies is increasing. This places additional pressure on Bankstown. An alternative way of meeting higher densities is to focus on existing high density areas in and around the Bankstown CBD. The major goal of Australians is to own their own freestanding home.	The Local Area Plan is implementing the Residential Development Study, adopted by Council following community consultation. The City of Bankstown is expected to grow by 22,000 dwellings and 6,000 new jobs in the period 2006 to 2031 and Council is committed to manage this change to create a liveable, green place rather than allowing this change to occur in an ad hoc unplanned manner. The Residential Development Study proposes to distribute the new dwellings with 80% in the centres and 20% in the suburban neighbourhood areas. This ensures most of the growth is concentrated in locations that have good access to public transport. Houses and dual occupancies in the suburban neighbourhood areas will continue to play a role in meeting the dwelling target.	No change is proposed.

	Submission No. 166 specifically raises concern the draft plan does not protect the heritage character of the South West Local Area. In particular, the 1950s and 1960s architectural style of the shopping centre or the working class origins of Bankstown such as the 'fibro frontier'. Measures should be considered and implemented on how the current housing stock is best managed. Consideration must be given to the adaptive reuse of the existing shopping centre stock and incorporating in a sensitive manner additional dwellings on top of or to the rear of the current building stock. In addition, it is unlikely the property at No. 171A Tower Street would be retained as a potential heritage item when it is also slated for high density residential.	Council has conducted a review of known and potential heritage items within the Panania Small Village Centre. While many properties and places may have historic value, Council must balance this attribute with ensuring there is sufficient development potential for the centre to grow and change over time. In terms of No. 171A Tower Street, Council will work with the property owner to consider the implications and opportunities afforded by a heritage listing and what other opportunities exist to preserve the heritage significance of this site.	No change is proposed.
--	--	--	-------------------------------

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 33 [Resident] Panania Small Village Centre	This submission supports the proposed changes to the Panania Small Village Centre and suggests the following: • Ensure ground floor retail / commercial uses along the new business zone in Tower Street. • Coordinate the preparation of the Panania Railway Station masterplan with the Transport for NSW's works program. • Include a small park with seating as part of the Panania Railway Station masterplan. • Use a high profile architect to design the community centre and library area.	This comment is noted with the following feedback: • The Commercial Fringe precinct provides a transitional connection between the commercial core areas. Retail and commercial uses are encouraged in this precinct, however are not mandatory. Council considers there is sufficient retail and commercial floor space in the commercial core areas to meet the needs of the current and forecast population to 2031. • Council is committed to achieving high quality design and sustainability for its community facilities, including public domain improvements. Council will work with Transport for NSW to develop a masterplan for the Panania Railway Station upgrade which takes advantage of renewal opportunities at this location.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 73 [Resident] Panania Small Village Centre	This submission supports the rezoning in Sherlock Avenue provided there is additional parking for the centre and train station.	The Panania Centre Transport Action Plan was prepared to support the growth proposed in the Draft Local Area Plan. The CTAP identifies a range of infrastructure improvements within the centre to support the growth including gradual increases in parking capacity at convenient locations around the small village centre.	No change is proposed.
	This submission does not support the proposed rezoning of Hinemoa Street and Batchelor Avenue as it is too widespread. The rezoning should not occur until the demand for housing in the central area actually happens.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the small village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the small village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: • The small village centre boundary as a 5–10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. This distance provides an adequate level of containment for a centre of this size, and is an appropriate fit within the centres hierarchy. • There is the potential for the Residential Frame precinct to be a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The intended outcome is to provide a mix of low and medium-rise living choices within a short walking distance of the railway station, commercial core and local services.	No change is proposed.
	This submission does not support the loss of open space and community facilities in the Civic Precinct as this oasis is fundamental to the village community atmosphere.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to create a retail and civic heart at this location. This will include a new multi-purpose community facility and mixed use development set within a high quality public domain. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create this mixed use destination. In considering these submissions, it is proposed to amend Action L1 to note that the concept plan will provide public space as part of this mixed use destination.	Amend Action L1: The concept plan will provide public space as part of any mixed use destination at the Civic Precinct.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 178 [Property owner] Nos. 35–47 Anderson Avenue in Panania	This submission requests an increase in the building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 35–47 Anderson Avenue to 6 storeys / 2:1 FSR.	In considering this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure buildings and public spaces respond to and reflect the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. This review identifies a need to further investigate possible options to better utilise and revitalise the space and adjoining land comprising Nos. 34–48 Anderson Avenue, Nos. 35–63 Anderson Avenue, Nos. 99–103A Marco Avenue, Edwards Park and the Anderson Avenue car park. This will be the subject of a masterplan, and will be of a similar scale to the area south of the railway line (4–6 storeys) with improved open space and parking to support mixed use development.	Amend Action L1: Prepare a masterplan to provide the opportunity to better utilise this space and adjoining land (within the context of up to 6 storeys on the eastern side of Anderson Avenue).
Submission Nos. 73 & 104 [Residents] Panania Small Village Centre	These submissions do not support the proposed 6 storey development above the railway station and hotel site as the new development will overshadow the war memorial on the northern side of railway line.		
	These submissions specifically suggest there is a need for multi-storey car parks for commuters, shoppers and visitors.	The Panania Centre Transport Action Plan was prepared to support the growth proposed in the Draft Local Area Plan. The CTAP identifies a range of infrastructure improvements within the centre to support the growth including gradual increases in parking capacity at convenient locations around the small village centre.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 104 specifically does not support the loss of open space as part of the redevelopment of the library and community centre in the Civic Precinct.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to create a retail and civic heart at this location. This will include a new multi-purpose community facility and mixed use development set within a high quality public domain. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create this mixed use destination. In considering these submissions, it is proposed to amend Action L1 to note that the concept plan will provide public space as part of this mixed use destination.	Amend Action L1: The concept plan will provide public space as part of any mixed use destination at the Civic Precinct.

Bankstown City Council

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 77 [Resident] Panania Small Village Centre	This submission supports the draft plan as it provides a good opportunity for young families and business people to be close to shops, schools, parklands and public transport. If the area begins to boom again, then banks will consider to reopen in the area and people will be connected to the railway line. Parking would not be a problem as buildings surrounding the shops and railway station would have underground parking.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 92 [Resident] Panania Small Village Centre	This submission does not support the proposed 6–8 storey building heights in Panania as it is excessive and will destroy the soft character of the area. • This submission requests that: • Amend the 8 storeys to read 6 storeys. • Amend the 6 storeys to read 4 storeys. • Amend the 4 storeys to read 2 storeys. • Amend the 3 storeys to read 2 storeys.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure buildings and public spaces respond to and reflect the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies the Panania Small Village Centre as a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. This is generally of a similar height and not more than 6 storeys. This continuous urban form helps to define the streets, and helps to achieve a street proportion (i.e. building height relative to street width) of no more than 1:1 to create a comfortable level of spatial enclosure. It is noted that Action L1 does not propose 8 storey development in the Panania Small Village Centre.	No change is proposed.
	This submission raises concern the draft plan does not allow for adequate parking in the shopping / business area.	Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to provide off-street parking for residents.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 95 [Resident] Panania Small Village Centre	This submission does not support the draft plan as it will not maintain Panania as a unique and attractive place to live. In particular, it is unclear how the draft plan will maintain a buffer between the proposed 3–4 storey development and neighbouring 2 storey houses. A preferred option is to maintain the 2 storey limit at these locations (including Hinemoa Street) and to change the current development rules to allow this development to utilise more of the current blocks. The reference to neighbourhood centres (150 metre walking catchment) and small village centres (400 metre walking catchment) as both being within a 5 minute walk is conflicting.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed the following changes to the properties along the southern side of Tower Street: - To change the height limit for the properties currently within Zone B2 Local Centre from 3 storeys (plus attic) to 4 storeys (no attic). - To rezone the properties between Lambeth Street and Hinemoa Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone B2 Local Centre (4 storeys). In considering these submissions, Council reviewed the urban design, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the small village centre. The review process identifies the need for development at the edges of the small village centre to make an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise detached housing in the surrounding suburban neighbourhood. It is therefore proposed to introduce rear setback controls for the properties along the southern side of Tower Street to provide an appropriate transition to the low-rise detached housing to the south. In terms of the small village centre boundary, it is measured as a 5–10 minute walking distance from the railway station.	Amend Action L1: Introduce rear setback controls for the properties along Tower Street (south side).

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 95 [Resident] Panania Small Village Centre	This submission questions whether Panania provides a good transport connection and train services.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 identified the need for Council to advocate to Transport for NSW for more frequent, direct and prioritised rail and bus services to allow for the long term growth in commuter movements.	No change is proposed.
	The draft plan needs to provide clear provisions for parking including a real commitment from the State Government to erect a railway car park as other suburbs have received. Parking also needs to be clearly defined as a requirement for both commercial and residential areas given that there are no road widenings.	In terms of off-street parking: • Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to provide off-street parking for residents. • Council applies the Development Control Plan, which requires non-residential development to provide off-street parking for workers and visitors.	
	This submission raises concern the draft plan does not discuss the social effects and social ramifications of having more people in Panania.	The proposal to increase the number of residents living in the small village centre provides a positive opportunity for greater services and improved community facilities within walking distance.	No change is proposed.

Summary of Submissions–East Hills Neighbourhood Centre (Action L2)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 58 [Resident] Area bound by Broe Avenue, Forest Road and Maclaurin Avenue in East Hills	This submission does not support the proposal to rezone the area bound by Broe Avenue, Forest Road and Maclaurin Avenue from Zone R2 to Zone R4 for the following reasons: • The extent of the high density residential zone on the southern side of the railway line is applied unfairly with little occurring on the northern side of the railway line. • The proposed rezoning will benefit new residents from outside the area, with existing residents having to move elsewhere. • There is an understanding that 4 storey development is not allowable within sight of Henry Lawson Drive. • The percentage of zoning change in East Hills is significantly higher compared to Panania and Revesby.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the neighbourhood centre is a compact place. The structure plan identifies the neighbourhood centre boundary as a 5 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. This distance provides an adequate level of containment for a centre of this size, and is an appropriate fit within the centres hierarchy. This distance is also less compared to Panania (small village centre) and Revesby (village centre). The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings in the Residential Frame precinct. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form that responds to and reflects the village feel. Based on the key considerations around building heights, 4 storeys is considered appropriate to achieve a design outcome that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. The Residential Frame precinct also avoids rezoning properties that have direct vehicle access to Henry Lawson Drive.	No change is proposed.
	This submission supports the proposed changes within the business zone.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 123 [Resident] Area bound by Park Road, Cook Crescent, Maclaurin Avenue and Henry Lawson Drive in East Hills	This submission does not support the proposed change to the boundary of the neighbourhood centre as it will have a visual impact on the remaining houses. The preferred option is to maintain the boundary of the neighbourhood centre as shown in the previous version of the draft plan. This included the block bound by Park Road, Cook Crescent and Maclaurin Avenue. This block is bound by the railway line and major roads, and will have little visual impact on suburban housing.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 excluded the area bound by Park Road, Cook Crescent, Maclaurin Avenue and Henry Lawson Drive as part of the neighbourhood centre. In considering this submission and following a review, it is proposed to continue to exclude the area bound by Park Road, Cook Crescent, Maclaurin Avenue and Henry Lawson Drive as part of the neighbourhood centre. The reason is this area is subject to certain constraints which do not support increased densities, in particular the Residential Frame precinct avoids rezoning properties that have direct vehicle access to Henry Lawson Drive.	No change is proposed.
	This submission questions the impacts (if any) on hospitals, public transport systems, education facilities and road networks to accommodate the proposed growth in the precinct.	As part of the local area planning process, Council consulted government agencies. The government agencies such as Transport for NSW, Roads & Maritime Services, Ausgrid, NSW Health–South Western Sydney Local Health District, Sydney Water and Department of Education did not identify any significant impact on services as a result of the proposed changes in the Local Area Plan.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 147 [Resident] East Hills Neighbourhood Centre	This submission raises concern the proposal for 4 storey development will impact on the privacy of adjoining properties. Their property on Henry Lawson Drive is currently located outside the boundary of the neighbourhood centre. This submission is requesting Council to consider their property as part of the proposal.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the neighbourhood centre is a compact place. The structure plan identifies the neighbourhood centre boundary as a 5 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. This distance provides an adequate level of containment for a centre of this size, and is an appropriate fit within the centres hierarchy. The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings in the Residential Frame precinct. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form that responds to and reflects the village feel. Based on the key considerations around building heights, 4 storeys is considered appropriate to achieve a design outcome that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. The review process also does not propose to change the boundary of the neighbourhood centre as the Residential Frame precinct avoids rezoning properties that have direct vehicle access to Henry Lawson Drive.	No change is proposed.

Summary of Submissions–Open Space (Action G1)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 53, 75, 111 and 155 [Residents] No. 32 Eynham Road in Milperra (Eynham Reserve)	These submissions do not support the proposed divestment of the property at No. 32 Eynham Road (known as Eynham Reserve) for the following reasons: - The residents currently enjoy the open space reserve and do not want to see this property redeveloped. - The residents of one of the adjoining properties use the reserve as passive open space for their disabled daughter. - A 2 storey development on the property will impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties (such as loss of privacy and access to sunlight). - Development on the property will cause parking issues and overcrowding in street, and will have a negative impact on the value of adjacent properties.	As part of the exhibition, Action G1 proposed to investigate divestment of the property at No. 32 Eynham Road (known as Eynham Reserve), and to utilise the funds for the purchase and embellishment of new and existing open space. It is also proposed to rezone the property to Zone R2 Low Density Residential and to reclassify to operational land. In response to community feedback, Council reviewed Action G1 and the status of this property. Whilst there is some community concern in relation to the divestment of certain open spaces, the overall objective of the Open Space Strategic Plan is to ensure open space assets are accessible, meet the needs of the community and forms part of the city's public domain infrastructure. Council has therefore proposed the divestment of certain open spaces in very specific circumstances. These circumstances include where there is currently a high provision of local and neighbourhood open space; the open space has limited recreational, social or environmental value; or where residents have access to another quality open space asset within 400 metres. Following the review, the property at No. 32 Eynham Road continues to meet the specific circumstances outlined above. It is therefore proposed to continue with the option of divesting this property. However, the proposed rezoning is subject to Council deciding whether to divest this property.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 117, 139 & 158 [Residents] No. 13A Kathleen Parade in Picnic Point (Kathleen Reserve)	These submissions do not support the proposed rezoning and divestment of the northern portion of the property at No. 13A Kathleen Parade for the following reasons: - The residents bought into the area based on the proximity to this open space. - Kathleen Reserve, with its large gums, is a home and feeding ground to native fauna. The removal of the reserve will damage a valuable part of the wildlife corridor. - It will result in the loss of valuable green space for the well-being of residents. The reserve is an area where neighbours play sport and celebrate important dates and an area where children can play away from traffic. Submission No. 117 specifically requests if Council proceeds with this proposal, that adjoining property owners be given first option to purchase the land.	As part of the exhibition, Action G1 proposed to investigate divestment of the northern part of the property at Part No. 13A Kathleen Parade Road (known as Kathleen Reserve), and to utilise the funds for the purchase and embellishment of new and existing open space. It is also proposed to rezone this part of the property to Zone R2 Low Density Residential and to reclassify to operational land. In response to community feedback, Council reviewed Action G1 and the status of this property. The review process recognises the southern part of the property contains environmental significance and this property should continue to function as open space. The northern part of the property at No. 13A Kathleen Parade will therefore not be considered for divestment.	Amend Action G1: The northern part of the property at No. 13A Kathleen Parade will not be considered for divestment.

Summary of Submissions—Government agencies and neighbouring councils

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 177 [Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure & Regional Development]	This submission notes the Local Area Plan does not refer to airspace protection or aviation safeguarding measures. Development which intrudes into the Bankstown Airport's prescribed airspace represent a controlled activity as defined by the Airports Act 1996 and Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996. These regulations provide for the protection of airspace at and around airports in the interests of the safety, efficiency and regularity of air transport operations.	The development application process would consider this issue.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 69 [Department of Education]	This submission supports the shift in planning decisions and policies: • To encourage infrastructure costs to be funded by developer contributions. • To optimise the size, amenity and function of existing schools to afford greater choice and provide contemporary teaching spaces for students. • To facilitate out of hours shared use of education facilities such as ovals and halls. • To remove planning policy barriers to schools development. • To deliver land dedications and appropriate zoning in areas where a new school is required. • To have streamlined planning approvals for new education infrastructure.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
	This submission comments the Department is exploring a number of options to build greater school capacity in the area. Public school student numbers in the Bankstown LGA have progressively grown over the last decade and are anticipated to continue to increase rapidly. A significant number of schools are currently zoned 'special use'. The Department recommends rezoning the schools to align with adjoining (future) uses.	The planning proposal process may consider changes to the special use zone subject to the Department of Education undertaking relevant contamination investigations as required by SEPP No. 55—Remediation of Land.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 69 [Department of Education]	This submission suggests funding some infrastructure costs through developer contributions or land dedications. Funding for school infrastructure at a time where land availability in the Bankstown LGA is limited and entry costs are high is a challenge. Should the opportunity arise, the Department would be responsive to enter into negotiations for the granting of voluntary planning agreements.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
	This submission indicates the Department is intent on exploring broad spectrum opportunities with Council, other government bodies and community partners for joint or shared use of community facilities such as before and after-school care, early learning centres and child care, gym, public open space, sports fields and recreation and community infrastructure.	Council will work with the Department of Education on the implications of this proposed initiative.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 78 [NSW Rural Fire Service]	This submission raises no objection to the revised Local Area Plan. The NSW Rural Fire Service supports the concentration of high density development within established village and neighbourhood centres connected by rail and road network, embellishment of open areas, and the establishment of connection to the bush (via green streets and reserves). It is recommended to continue to assess and evaluate the conservation areas to inform planning decisions. Any amendments to the built form need to consider the bush fire risk to future and existing development with due regard to protection measures recommended in the Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006.	The development application process would consider this issue.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 189 [Roads & Maritime Services]	This submission is supportive of Council's forward planning to accommodate residential and employment growth in the local government area.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
	This submission indicates the proposed future zoning amendments are likely to result in traffic and transport generating impacts on the local and regional road network. The rezoning application should be accompanied by transport studies to identify traffic and transport impacts, to identify mitigation measures and to establish funding mechanisms (e.g. voluntary planning agreements and developer contribution schemes).	The planning proposal process may consider this issue.	No change is proposed.
	This submission requests that prior to proceeding to gateway, Council should ascertain whether the subject sites are affected for road purposes. In this regard, any rezoning should preserve the integrity of the road reservations. No infrastructure relating to development (e.g. drainage and / or parking) should locate within the reservations.	The Local Area Plan does not propose to change the special use zone where it is designated for road widening purposes.	No change is proposed.
	This submission notes a number of sites nominated in the draft plan are on arterial roads. Council should give attention to State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 to ensure sites have frontage to a local street and to prevent rezoned sites from being landlocked to the arterial road network.	The development application process would consider this issue.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 49 [Sydney Water]	This submission supports the Local Area Plan, and comments that the trunk infrastructure will have adequate supply to accommodate the forecast growth to 2031. According to the Sydney Water Growth Servicing Strategies, over 90% of Council's projected growth can be accommodated. Sydney Water will incorporate the latest local area planning advice from Council as part of the planned investigations for the Inner South Urban Renewal Corridor (including the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor).	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.

Bankstown City Council

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 31 [Strathfield Council]	This submission comments the proposed centres hierarchy and associated planning controls are generally consistent with their adopted methodology in developing the Strathfield LEP 2012.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 176 [Western Sydney University]	This submission requests the update of certain text to reflect current functions and enrolment numbers.	In considering this submission, it is proposed to amend certain text in Action I1 to reflect current functions and enrolment numbers at the Western Sydney University.	Amend Action I1: Update text to reflect current functions and enrolment numbers.