



South East Local Area Plan



Submissions Report

April 2016

Contents

Summary of Submissions

Revesby Village Centre (Action L1)	2
Padstow Village Centre (Action L2)	31
Suburban Neighbourhood (Action L3)	61
Community Facilities (Action L7)	62
Open Space (Action G1)	63
Government agencies and neighbouring councils	64

Summary of Submissions–Revesby Village Centre (Action L1)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 4 & 98, [Residents] Marco Avenue and The River Road in Revesby	These submissions do not support the proposed 12 storey unit blocks in Marco Avenue and The River Road. The preference is to allow 3–6 storeys, particularly the Revesby pub site.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed: - To maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre for the property at No. 178 The River Road and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR. - To maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre for the properties at Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue (former GoLo site) and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 12 storeys / 3.5:1 FSR provided the developer enters into a planning agreement with Council to deliver certain public benefits. Otherwise 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR will apply. In considering these submissions, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process identifies the commercial core as a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. Based on the urban design analysis, a traditional village centre is comprised of buildings that created a dense urban form, 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. However, there is the opportunity for a small number of taller elements (8 storeys) at appropriate core locations (namely adjacent to the railway station) to create a diverse and visually interesting skyline. The review process therefore proposes:	Amend Action L1: Adjust the building envelope control for Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue. Council may allow intensified development (12 storeys / 3.5:1 FSR) subject to the consolidation of the properties at Nos. 7A–17 Marco Avenue. Otherwise 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR will apply. This amendment continues to allow the property owner and Council to engage in

		• To continue with the proposed 8 storeys at No. 178 The River Road as this property meets the specific circumstances outlined above to providing taller elements (8 storeys) at appropriate core locations (namely adjacent to the railway station) to create a diverse and visually interesting skyline. • To adjust the building envelope control for Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue. Council may allow intensified development (12 storeys / 3.5:1 FSR) subject to the consolidation of the properties at Nos. 7A–17 Marco Avenue. Otherwise 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR will apply. The intended outcome is to ensure the site area is of sufficient size to accommodate a 12 storey building, which provides public benefits (central plaza and public parking spaces). This amendment continues to allow the property owner and Council to engage in discussions regarding an appropriate mechanism to realise certain improvement works in a timely manner.	discussions regarding an appropriate mechanism to realise certain improvement works in a timely manner.
--	--	---	---

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions																								
Submission No. 151 [Property owner] Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue in Revesby	This submission supports the proposed 12 storey limit for the properties at Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue. However, it requests increasing the proposed FSR from 3.5:1 to 4.5:1 to achieve a commercially viable development. It also seeks clarification on the proposed bonus provisions if it is to be incorporated into the allowable FSR. This includes the status of public car parking and access, the proposed central plaza and public domain improvements, and the relationship with Council land.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 12 storeys / 3.5:1 FSR provided the developer enters into a planning agreement with Council to deliver certain public benefits. Otherwise 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR will apply. In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends medium and medium high-rise development in the commercial core, and low and medium-rise development in the residential frame to achieve an appropriate fit within the Metropolitan Plan and Council’s strategic centres hierarchy. <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Centres Hierarchy</th><th colspan="2">Zone B2 Local Centre</th><th colspan="2">Zone R4 High Density Residential</th></tr><tr><th>Height</th><th>FSR</th><th>Height</th><th>FSR</th></tr><tr><td>Village Centres</td><td>6–8 storeys</td><td>2.5:1–3:1</td><td>4–6 storeys</td><td>1:1–1.5:1</td></tr><tr><td>Small Village Centres</td><td>4–6 storeys</td><td>2:1–2.5:1</td><td>3–4 storeys</td><td>0.75:1–1:1</td></tr><tr><td>Neighbourhood Centres</td><td>3–4 storeys</td><td>1.5:1–2:1</td><td>3–4 storeys</td><td>0.75:1–1:1</td></tr></table> The exception is the former GoLo site at Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue. The review process recognises the unique location of this site adjacent to the new central plaza which will function as the heart of the village centre. To facilitate the delivery of the central plaza, the review process recommends adjusting the proposed building envelope control. Council	Centres Hierarchy	Zone B2 Local Centre		Zone R4 High Density Residential		Height	FSR	Height	FSR	Village Centres	6–8 storeys	2.5:1–3:1	4–6 storeys	1:1–1.5:1	Small Village Centres	4–6 storeys	2:1–2.5:1	3–4 storeys	0.75:1–1:1	Neighbourhood Centres	3–4 storeys	1.5:1–2:1	3–4 storeys	0.75:1–1:1	Amend Action L1: Adjust the building envelope control for Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue. Council may allow intensified development (12 storeys / 3.5:1 FSR) subject to the consolidation of the properties at Nos. 7A–17 Marco Avenue. Otherwise 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR will apply. This amendment continues to allow the property owner and Council to engage in discussions regarding an
Centres Hierarchy	Zone B2 Local Centre			Zone R4 High Density Residential																							
	Height	FSR	Height	FSR																							
Village Centres	6–8 storeys	2.5:1–3:1	4–6 storeys	1:1–1.5:1																							
Small Village Centres	4–6 storeys	2:1–2.5:1	3–4 storeys	0.75:1–1:1																							
Neighbourhood Centres	3–4 storeys	1.5:1–2:1	3–4 storeys	0.75:1–1:1																							

		may allow intensified development (12 storeys / 3.5:1 FSR) subject to the consolidation of the properties at Nos. 7A–17 Marco Avenue. Otherwise 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR will apply. The intended outcome is to ensure the site area is of sufficient size to accommodate a 12 storey building, which provides public benefits (central plaza and public parking spaces). The economic analysis indicates the proposed building envelopes at 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR and 12 storeys / 3.5:1 FSR are feasible. This amendment continues to allow the property owner and Council to engage in discussions regarding an appropriate mechanism to realise certain improvement works in a timely manner.	appropriate mechanism to realise certain improvement works in a timely manner.
--	--	--	---

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 146 [Resident] Pambula Avenue in Revesby	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls in Pambula Avenue to allow 6 storeys. This considers its proximity to local services and transport. This submission does not support the proposed rezoning of Weston Street (from Tarro Avenue to The River Road). The street is busy with traffic and not wide enough to cope with more residents parking. If the rezoning is confined to Pambula Avenue, Parana Avenue, Tarro Avenue and Brent Street, the extra development is at least hidden to the wider community. The streets should provide on-street parking for residents only, and not commuters.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed: - To rezone the properties at Nos. 2–46 Weston Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR). - To maintain the current controls in Pambula Avenue as it is located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct. In response to this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 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. The implication is the properties at Nos. 2–46 Weston Street continue to fall within the 10 minute walking catchment and is an appropriate location for apartment living. In terms of parking, Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires apartments to provide off-street parking for residents. Pambula Avenue continues to fall outside the 10 minute walking catchment, and therefore does not form part of the proposed changes within the village centre. Pambula Avenue (cul-de-sac) is also found to be an impractical location for apartment living. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply. In terms of the potential to have on-street parking for residents only, this may be in the form of a permit parking scheme in consultation with the Roads & Maritime Services. As part of the local area planning process, Council consulted the Roads & Maritime Services. The Roads & Maritime Services did not recommend permit parking schemes in any of the centres.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 28 [Property owner] Nos. 25–29 Selems Parade in Revesby	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 25–29 Selems Parade to allow 16 storeys (5:1 FSR). The properties are well positioned and would not cause overshadowing on neighbouring properties. The higher densities would provide commercial and residential spaces, would stimulate economic activity.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre for these properties and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR. In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends continuing with medium high-rise buildings (8 storeys / 3:1 FSR) at this location as it strikes a balance between a dense urban form and retaining a sense of enclosure, human scale, comfort and enjoyment for people walking in the commercial core. The economic analysis indicates this proposed building envelope is feasible. A height greater than 8 storeys is discouraged at this location as it will conflict with the desired medium and medium high-rise character of the village centre. The overshadowing and visual impacts on the street and surrounding buildings will also be substantially greater. With the exception of the catalyst site at Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue, high-rise buildings (9+ storeys) are reserved for the Bankstown CBD.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 156 [Property owner] Selems Parade and Swan Street in Revesby	This submission requests a change to the building envelope controls in Selems Parade to allow a 3:1 FSR. This change will enable a larger floor area to dedicate to the ground floor commercial component of any future mixed use development. This submission requests a reduction in the proposed building height in Swan Street (south side) from 6 storeys to 4 storeys. This change can negate any overshadowing and privacy issues on Selems Parade (north side). Conroy Lane is too narrow to prevent considerable overshadowing on Selems Parade (north side) if the 6 storeys remain unchanged. In addition, appropriate setbacks to the upper portions of any proposed development would also reduce overshadowing.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed: - To maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre for the properties on Selems Parade (south side) and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR. - To rezone the properties on Selems Parade (north side) from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone B2 Local Centre (6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR). - To rezone the properties on Swan Street (south side) from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends continuing with medium high-rise and medium-rise buildings at this location as it strikes a balance between a dense urban form and retaining a sense of enclosure, human scale, comfort and enjoyment for people walking in the commercial core. The economic analysis indicates the proposed building envelopes are feasible. In terms of building design, Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to address amenity and privacy issues. The proposed DCP Amendments (Action L6) will review the setback requirements.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 7, 15 & 41 [Residents] Simmons Street in Revesby	These submissions request a change to the proposed zoning of Lillian Crescent and Simmons Street to allow 3 storey unit blocks.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed: - To rezone the properties at Nos. 39–43 Simmons Street and Nos. 150–164 The River Road from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR). - To maintain the current controls in Lillian Crescent and the remainder of Simmons Street as these streets are located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct.	Amend Action L1: Exclude Nos. 150–158 from the proposed changes in the village centre. Maintain the current controls (Zone R2 / 2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR). Rezone Nos. 35–37 Simmons Street to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR).
	This proposed change is compatible with the existing unit blocks in Swan Street, and could provide accommodation for seniors and people with disabilities.	Whilst the village centre boundary is measured as a 10 minute walking distance from the railway station, the boundary is adjusted to avoid constraints such as high stormwater flood risk and culs-de-sac. Most of Simmons Street is excluded as it is found to be an impractical location for apartment living. The exception is the properties at Nos. 39–43 Simmons Street, which will act as a built form transition to the multi-storey car park.	
	Submission No. 15 specifically requests that if the rezoning does not proceed, the whole street should remain untouched. This applies to the properties at Nos. 39–43 Simmons Street. Submission No. 41 specifically requests a change to the proposed zoning to the properties at Nos. 29–37 Simmons Street to allow Zone R4. This would allow continued development from The River Road through to Simmons Street with the suggestion that access would be via The River Road. This would in turn alleviate any traffic concerns in Simmons Street whilst still allowing extra	In considering these submissions, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends: - To continue with the proposed building envelope controls at Nos. 39–43 Simmons Street. - To adjust the village centre boundary to take into account the proposal to protect the existing house at No. 158 The River Road, which is found to have historic significance. The implication is Nos. 150–158 will be excluded from the proposed changes within the village centre. - To adjust the village centre boundary to include Nos. 35–37 Simmons Street. These properties would form the northern edge of the village centre and it is proposed to extend the proposed Zone R4 High Density	

Bankstown City Council

	housing to be built to meet Council requirements.	Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR) to these properties. The review process does not recommend changes in Lillian Crescent or the remainder of Simmons Street given the impractical nature of these locations for intensified development.	
--	---	---	--

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 30 [Property owner] Nos. 1–15 Swan Street and Nos. 15–21 Polo Street in Revesby	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 1–15 Swan Street and Nos. 15–21 Polo Street to allow 7 storeys (2.25:1 FSR). The site represents a rare and substantial landholding and should be considered a catalyst site in the planned renewal. The site is well positioned to achieve the objectives of the draft plan, and the generous building envelope will provide high amenity for future residents whilst protecting the amenity of surrounding low density development. The proposed change is supported by a concept design report.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends continuing with medium–rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the low–rise housing on the northern side of Swan Street. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 6 storeys (1.5:1 FSR). The economic analysis indicates this proposed building envelope is feasible. A height greater than 6 storeys is discouraged at this location as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the street and surrounding buildings will be substantially greater.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 83 [Property owner] Nos. 16–20 Swan Street in Revesby	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 16–20 Swan Street to allow 6 storeys (2.5:1–3:1 FSR). Justification includes providing additional housing stock within the walking radius of the centre, and the proposed building envelope conforms to the desired future character and introduces limited adversity on neighbouring properties. The proposed change is supported by a concept design report.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise detached housing in the surrounding suburban neighbourhood. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 4 storeys (1:1 FSR). The economic analysis indicates this proposed building envelope is feasible. A height greater than 4 storeys is discouraged as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the street and neighbouring houses will be substantially greater.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 86 [Property owner] Nos. 175–179 The River Road and No. 90 Uranus Road in Revesby	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 175–179 The River Road and No. 90 Uranus Road to allow a 6 storey mixed use (commercial / residential) development. This proposed change will have little impact on neighbouring properties, and will extinguish existing use rights on the site for heavy industrial usage (smash repair).	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise detached housing in the surrounding suburban neighbourhood. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 4 storeys (1:1 FSR). The economic analysis indicates this proposed building envelope is feasible. A height greater than 4 storeys is discouraged as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the street and neighbouring houses will be substantially greater.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 184 [Resident] Uranus Road in Revesby	This submission does not support 4 storeys in Uranus Road as apartments generally have limited parking and will cause traffic hazards in the street. Apartments will also impact on the amenity of adjoining properties in terms of overshadowing and removal of privacy. The preference is to retain the low density residential zone in Uranus Road or to include neighbouring properties within the high density residential zone.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to rezone the properties at Nos. 82–88 Uranus Road from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process recommends continuing with the proposed building envelope (4 storeys) in Uranus Road subject to appropriate setbacks. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the suburban neighbourhood, which adjoins mid-block. The proposed DCP Amendments (Action L6) will therefore review the setback requirement in cases where a high density residential zone adjoins a low density residential zone mid-block.	Amend Action L6: Review the setback requirements in cases where a high density residential zone adjoins a low density residential zone mid-block.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 175 [Resident] Weston Street in Revesby	This submission requests a change to the zoning to the area between Weston Street and Tower Street to allow 3 storey development.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to maintain the current controls for this area as it is located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct. In response to this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 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. The implication is this area continues to fall outside the 10 minute walking catchment, and therefore does not form part of the proposed changes within the village centre. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 20 [Resident] Revesby Village Centre	This submission is not opposed to development in the area. However, traffic flow is slow at major periods during the day. Consideration needs to be given to changing the traffic lights at the intersection of The River Road, Sphinx Avenue and Marco Avenue.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre. With more pedestrians on the street, getting around the 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 village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk. Action L1 also proposes certain improvements to alleviate movements along The River Road. In addition to these improvements, it is proposed to investigate the alignment of Sphinx Avenue at the intersection with The River Road and Marco Avenue.	Amend Action L1: Investigate the alignment of Sphinx Avenue at the intersection with The River Road and Marco Avenue.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 20 [Resident] Revesby Village Centre	This submission raises concern regarding the aesthetic appeal of medium density housing. Prefer innovative and sustainable housing similar to the Sydney CBD.	Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to address building design issues.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 22 [Resident] Revesby Village Centre	This submission does not support the proposed high density development as it fails to provide a well-planned harmonious setting for the community. The proposed development is not conducive to the elderly who have difficulty using stairs, and will have an impact on the gardens that are adorned with trees. Street parking is also a problem.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to address access and open space issues. The Local Area Plan also outlines infrastructure improvements to support the village centre. More specifically, the analysis shows the existing supply in the village centre can accommodate parking demand from growth however there may be significant circulation around the centre as users attempt to find a car park at peak times. The preferred approach is to allow gradual increases in capacity at convenient locations around the centre. This allows different management strategies to be applied for each car park, and the construction of additional levels to the multi-storey car park (based on developer contributions) at No. 168 The River Road and No. 45 Simmons Street.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 22 [Resident] Revesby Village Centre	This submission raises concern the draft plan does not allocate additional resources (pools in particular).	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. In addition, Action L1 outlines infrastructure improvements to support the village centre. This includes transforming Amour Park and the Revesby Leisure Centre into a recreation and leisure destination that meets the needs of the growing community.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 56 [Resident] Revesby Village Centre	This submission does not support the draft plan as it does not address the intersection next to the Revesby police station. The current performance of the intersection is unsafe, and is an impediment to further commercial development in Revesby. Council must negotiate with the State Government to relocate or rebuild the police station and child care centre in order to properly align the intersection at The River Road, Sphinx Avenue and Marco Avenue. This must occur prior to construction of high-rise buildings on each corner.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre. With more pedestrians on the street, getting around the 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 village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk. Action L1 also proposes certain improvements to alleviate movements along The River Road. In addition to these improvements, it is proposed to investigate the alignment of Sphinx Avenue at the intersection with The River Road and Marco Avenue. Council will continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre.	Amend Action L1: Investigate the alignment of Sphinx Avenue at the intersection with The River Road and Marco Avenue.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 56 [Resident] Revesby Village Centre	This submission does not support the proposal to involve a developer in funding a public plaza next to the railway station as it is likely to fail. The preference is to fund the plaza through a contributions plan.	The Local Area Plan identifies a number of community infrastructure works and public improvements to improve the village centre. Council must explore a range of mechanisms to fund the works program. In terms of the central plaza, one option is for the property owner and Council to discuss an appropriate mechanism to realise this improvement work in a timely manner subject to the consolidation of the properties at Nos. 7A–17 Marco Avenue. Otherwise an alternative mechanism will fund this initiative.	No change is proposed.
Submission Nos. 74 & 80 [Residents] Revesby Village Centre	These submissions comment that the reference 'village centre' is similar to the commercial development of the Revesby Workers Club, and whether the intention of the club is to purchase the north side of the commercial area.	The reference 'village centre' is consistent with the Department of Planning & Environment's Metropolitan Plan, which identifies the centres hierarchy across Sydney. The redevelopment of the Revesby Workers Club site is a matter for the club to consider.	No change is proposed.
	These submissions request restricting outdoor dining on footpaths to allow sufficient space for pedestrians to use footpaths as thoroughfares.	Council applies the Bankstown Commercial Use of Footways Policy to enable the commercial use of public footways whilst addressing the requirements of public access and circulation.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 74 & 80 [Residents] Revesby Village Centre	These submissions comment that the commercial area developed during the 1950s, and the street network was designed to cope with the traffic of the day. To improve traffic flow and prevent congestion, these submissions suggest: • Providing parallel parking on each side of Marco Avenue. • Removing the ability to make U-turns on Marco Avenue. • Converting the River Road / Bransgrove Road intersection into a traffic controlled intersection in the short term.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre. With more pedestrians on the street, getting around the 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 village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk. Action L1 also proposes certain improvements to alleviate movements along The River Road, which includes converting the River Road / Bransgrove Road intersection into a traffic controlled intersection in the long term. Council will continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre.	No change is proposed.
	These submissions raise concern as to whether the central plaza will address the issues of parking, flood mitigation, the removal of the former nursery, and the needs of stallholders when stocking their stalls at the monthly markets.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to create a new central plaza at No. 7A Marco Avenue. This central plaza will be an urban extension to Abel Reserve, the railway station and the pedestrian connection across the railway line. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan. The concept plan would address detailed issues such as stormwater management and access.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 74 & 80 [Residents] Revesby Village Centre	These submissions do not support the loss of Ray McCormack Reserve as it will remove the parkland and pathway.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to transform Ray McCormack Reserve into a successful civic space with a modern multi-purpose community facility. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create an enlivened 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 Ray McCormack Reserve.
	These submissions raise concern the proposed rezoning of properties from Zone R2 to Zone R4 will force residents to sell. One would hope that people can continue to live in their homes until they wish to sell.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. The structure plan will guide growth to 2031. There is no action that forces residents to sell their properties.	No change is proposed.
	These submissions raise concern as to whether Council has the ability to enforce conditions which proposed structures should meet via conditions of consent. Experience shows developers can alter their plans without consulting Council.	The Environmental Planning & Assessment Act provides Council with legal options to enforce conditions of consent.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 99, 115, 165 & 174 [Residents and community group] Revesby Village Centre	These submissions do not support the proposed 12 storey building height at Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue, and the proposed 6–8 storeys in other areas as it has the potential to replace an existing community with a probable ghetto. The preference is to have 4 storeys in the shopping centre. Submission No. 115 specifically notes that fences are being used as boundaries between different heights of development. Streets are logical boundary markers.	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 commercial core as a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. Based on the urban design analysis, a traditional village centre is comprised of buildings that created a dense urban form, 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. There is the opportunity for a small number of taller elements (8 storeys) at appropriate core locations (namely adjacent to the railway station) to create a diverse and visually interesting skyline. The exception is the former GoLo site at Nos. 11–17 Marco Avenue. The review process recognises the unique location of this site adjacent to the new central plaza which will function as the heart of the village centre. To facilitate the delivery of the central plaza, the review process recommends adjusting the proposed building envelope control. Council may allow intensified development (12 storeys) subject to the consolidation of the properties at Nos. 7A–17 Marco Avenue. Otherwise an 8 storey limit will apply. In terms of transitions between different building heights, where possible the structure plan uses streets as the boundary markers. The proposed DCP Amendments (Action L6) will therefore review the setback requirement in cases where a high density residential zone adjoins a low density residential zone mid-block.	Amend Action L6: Review the setback requirements in cases where a high density residential zone adjoins a low density residential zone mid-block.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 62, 99, 115, 153 & 164 [Residents and community group] Revesby Village Centre	These submissions raise concern that parking continues to be an issue. Existing car parks are fully used by commuters during weekdays, and Revesby will continue to attract visitors (motorists) from outside the area given the services that Revesby provides. Underground parking on many blocks is not an option due to the area being affected by high stormwater flood risk. Traffic congestion around the shopping strip is at present a problem. With extra projected vehicles, the area will be grid locked. Submission No. 99 specifically suggests development to continue to provide parking, and to investigate using the Whitehall site as a multi-storey car park. The Whitehall site could provide parking for commuters and visitors to Amour Park.	The Local Area Plan outlines infrastructure improvements to support the village centre. More specifically, the analysis shows the existing supply in the village centre can accommodate parking demand from growth however there may be significant circulation around the centre as users attempt to find a car park at peak times. In terms of public parking, the preferred approach is to allow gradual increases in capacity at convenient locations around the centre. This allows different management strategies to be applied for each car park, and the construction of additional levels to the multi-storey car park (based on developer contributions) at No. 168 The River Road and No. 45 Simmons Street. The analysis does not identify the properties at Nos. 75A–75C Marco Avenue (former Whitehall site) as a convenient location for parking to service the village centre. In terms of parking requirements for development: • 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.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 44, 45, 47, 51, 52, 56, 59, 60, 62, 66, 67, 72, 76, 99, 112, 114, 115, 121, 122, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 132, 134, 138, 141, 143, 148, 153, 164, 171 & 174 [Residents and community group] Nos. 75A–75C Marco Avenue and Ray McCormack Reserve in Revesby	These submissions do not support the divestment of community land, particularly the former Whitehall site and Ray McCormack Reserve. Community land should be retained for the community. In particular, Ray McCormack Reserve is the only park on the southern side of the railway line that residents and children can enjoy, and residents use the pathway in the park to walk to the shops and railway station. The reserve also contains canopy remnants of Cooks River / Castlereagh Ironbark Forest, and other endemic species (woollybutt, white feather honey myrtle, and grey box). Alternative options to avoid the removal of parkland include: - Rebuild the facilities on a nearby commercial property or on the former Centrelink site. - Utilise the empty commercial	As part of the exhibition, Action G1 proposed to investigate divestment of the properties at Nos. 75A–75C Marco Avenue (former Whitehall site). Action G1 does not propose to divest Ray McCormack Reserve. In response to community feedback, Council reviewed Action G1 and the status of the properties identified for possible divestment. 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 properties at Nos. 75A–75C Marco Avenue continue to meet the specific circumstances outlined above. It is therefore proposed to continue with the option of divesting these properties. In terms of Ray McCormack Reserve, Action L1 proposes to transform this property into a successful civic space with a modern multi-purpose community facility. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create an enlivened 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 Ray McCormack Reserve.

	buildings next to the reserve. • Rezone existing buildings in Macarthur Avenue (opposite Dixon Lane) to accommodate the proposed development. • There is a need for a respite centre for people with disabilities and their carers. Submission No. 76 specifically raises concern with having a new community centre in Ray McCormack Reserve as it is often used for noisy parties and community events. It may not be compatible with an increased presence of more high density apartments. The preference is to relocate the community centre to the YMCA facility or Amour Park.		
Submission No. 63 [Resident] Ray McCormack Reserve in Revesby	This submission supports the redevelopment of Ray McCormack Reserve with something spectacular (e.g. lots of glass, balconies and open space included). It is possible to remember the name of Ray McCormack by naming the whole area the Ray McCormack Revesby Village.		

	Submission No. 76 specifically raises concern the extent of the proposed high density development is limited thus continuing the lack of housing availability. The preference is to rezone areas within a 1km radius of the railway station for high density development. This makes it more equitable to existing property owners, and will provide an adequate amount of housing.	In response to this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance (600 metres) 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.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 99 specifically comments that the existing urban regeneration combined with some increased opportunities within the commercial zone could exceed the population target. This means the remaining environment that the locals currently enjoy and prefer could be maintained.	The Local Area Plan implements 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.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 99 specifically raises concern the draft plan makes little reference to practical traffic management. The roundabout at Polo Street and Marco Avenue is regularly blocked, and the pedestrian crossings on Marco Avenue	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre. With more pedestrians on the street, getting around the 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	Amend Action L1: Amend Figure 9.6 to illustrate the existing closure of Simmons Street near

	inhibit traffic movement. The street layout will make it difficult to improve traffic management. Suggested changes include: • The draft plan needs to show the existing closure of Simmons Street near Winders Lane. • The proposal to increase traffic using Brangrove Road requires traffic calming methods to improve safety. • Avoid more traffic lights on The River Road. • Improve public transport services to areas other than the Sydney CBD and Bankstown.	travel slowly in the village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk. Action L1 also proposes certain improvements to alleviate movements along The River Road, which includes converting the River Road / Brangrove Road intersection into a traffic controlled intersection in the long term. Council will continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre, and to advocate Transport for NSW for improved bus services. In terms of the draft plan needing to show the existing closure of Simmons Street near Winders Lane, it is proposed to amend Figure 9.6 to illustrate the road closure.	Winders Lane.
	Submission No. 99 specifically raises concern that: • Parking will be an issue if 4 storey development is proposed at Nos. 39–43 Simmons Street. • The ability to heritage list No. 158 The River Road when it is proposed to allow 4 storey development on the property.	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 recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise detached housing in the surrounding suburban neighbourhood. Based on the key considerations around building heights: • Continue with the proposed building envelope control (4 storeys) at Nos. 39–43 Simmons Street. • Adjust the village centre boundary to take into account the proposal to protect the existing house at No. 158 The River Road, which is found to have historic significance. The implication is Nos. 150–158 will be	Amend Action L1: Exclude Nos. 150–158 from the proposed changes in the village centre. Maintain the current controls (Zone R2 / 2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR). Rezone Nos.

		excluded from the proposed changes within the village centre. • Adjust the village centre boundary to include Nos. 35–37 Simmons Street. These properties would form the northern edge of the village centre and it is proposed to extend the proposed Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys) to these properties. 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.	35–37 Simmons Street to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR).
	Submission No. 99 specifically raises concern of the potential loss of the Revesby police station if it is proposed to allow 4 storey development on the property. Submission No. 63 supports the demolition of the police station as it is an eyesore. The draft plan should replace the police station with a new building consisting of a small police station, community hall and apartments.	The redevelopment of the Revesby police station is a matter for NSW Police to consider, however Council will continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre.	No change is proposed.

	Submission Nos. 112 and 115 specifically do not support 6 storeys in the Panania Small Village Centre as it would overwhelm the main street. A height of 4 storeys is more than adequate.	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.	No change is proposed.
	Submission Nos. 112 and 115 specifically request the retention of the car park, open space, Sarah Schwarzel Memorial fountain, and other historical buildings in and around the Civic Precinct (No. 77 Anderson Avenue, No. 31 Pepper Street and Nos. 176–178 Tower Street). Replacing the green spaces with multi-storey mixed commercial complexes would not maintain community expectations. There are plenty of opportunities for development in the areas surrounding them.	As part of the exhibition, the South West Local Area Plan (Action L1) proposed to transform this location into a successful civic space with a modern multi-purpose community facility. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create an enlivened 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 South West Local Area Plan (Action L1): The concept plan will provide public space as part of any mixed use destination at the Civic Precinct.

	Submission No. 112 specifically raises concern with the designation of Wonga Smith's bushland at the Western Sydney University for educational facilities. This area deserves classification for environmental protection. There is also no discussion on the suitability of environmental protection zones. There is scope for designations in a range of deserving bushland remnants including Deepwater Park, Lambeth Park, Monash Reserve, Smith Park, East Hills Park and Kelso Wetlands.	As part of the exhibition, the South West Local Area Plan (Action G2) proposed to protect and manage local and regional significant conservation lands via a biodiversity protection protect in the LEP. This is considered appropriate for the purposes of environmental protection.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 112 specifically suggests Council could instigate a 1% levy on ratepayers to pay for much needed environmental and bushland rehabilitation projects. A similar levy has been implemented by Liverpool and other councils. More can also be made of recreational opportunities at Deepwater Park by reinstating the Maxwell Avenue car park.	At the Ordinary Meeting of 22 March 2016, Council resolved to continue the stormwater levy to provide funding for environmental and bushland rehabilitation projects such as: • floodplain risk management planning; • projects to improve drainage across the city; • waterway restoration and water quality improvement works; • works to enhance stormwater harvesting efforts to reduce potable water use; and • the maintenance of stormwater assets.	No change is proposed.

Bankstown City Council

	Submission No. 112 specifically endorses the proposal to reclassify the property at No. 2D Lehn Road, East Hills from operational to community land.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 142 [Resident] Revesby Village Centre	This submission supports the draft plan.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.

Summary of Submissions–Padstow Village Centre (Action L2)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 12 [Resident] Alice Street in Padstow	This submission supports the draft plan and requests the rezoning of Alice Street to allow high density residential development.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone Alice Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4–6 storeys). Zone R4 allows high density residential development.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 65 [Resident] Astley Avenue in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the zoning of Astley Avenue to allow 4 storey units. The area is opposite a park and within easy walking distance to shopping, services and transport. The area would have minimal reliance on cars / parking as it is close to public transport modes.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to maintain the current controls in Astley Avenue as it is located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct. In response to this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 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. The implication is Astley Avenue continues to fall outside the 10 minute walking catchment, and therefore does not form part of the proposed changes within the village centre. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 96 & 137 [Residents] Nos. 1–7 Banks Street in Padstow	These submissions request a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 1–7 Banks Street to allow 6 storeys (1.5:1 FSR). This will achieve the outcome of locating the highest densities next to the railway station, and will not impact on the selling price to potential developers.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process indicates it may be possible to have medium-rise buildings at this location as any additional overshadowing will be over the railway line rather than surrounding buildings. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR.	Amend Action L2: Amend the building envelope controls for Nos. 1–7 Banks Street to 6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR.
Submission No. 188 [Property owner] Nos. 9–11 Banks Street in Padstow	This submission requests a change of the building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 9–11 Banks Street to allow 6 storeys. Justification includes feasibility, a more appropriate means of resolving boundary adjustments, ensuring the orderly development of sites, and potential to better deal with noise impacts from the railway corridor. The proposed change is supported by a concept design report.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise housing in Nigel Place, whilst achieving better design outcomes. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 4 storeys. A height greater than 4 storeys is discouraged at this location as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the street and neighbouring properties in Nigel Place will be substantially greater.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 172 [Resident] Banks Street in Padstow	This submission does not support the proposed high density residential zone in the area north of the railway line. It is difficult to see how the construction of 4–6 storey buildings will preserve the existing character when the village centre is comprised of houses and not unit blocks. The high density development will result in overcrowding, increased traffic congestion and lack of on street parking, overshadowing, destruction of village atmosphere and senior residents needing to move out of the area. Adopting a medium density zone with a focus on terrace and town houses would allow for more dwellings in a manner more in keeping with the existing streetscape.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: • The village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. • Banks Street forms part of this compact place. There is the potential for Banks Street to be a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The review process therefore recommends continuing with low-rise buildings (4 storeys) at this location. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise housing in Nigel Place. A height greater than 4 storeys is discouraged at this location as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the street and neighbouring properties in Nigel Place will be substantially greater. The exception is Nos. 1–7 Banks Street, where the review process indicates it may be possible to have medium-rise buildings at this location as any additional overshadowing will be over the railway line rather than surrounding buildings. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR.	Amend Action L2: Amend the building envelope controls for Nos. 1–7 Banks Street to 6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 82 [Property owner] No. 20 Banks Street and Nos. 7–12 Jeanette Street in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the properties at No. 20 Banks Street and Nos. 7–12 Jeanette Street to allow 9 storeys (2.4:1 FSR). The proposed change is consistent with housing choice, proximity to public transport and services, urban design, and has minimal environmental impact. The proposed change is supported by a concept design report.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the low-rise detached housing in the suburban neighbourhood, whilst achieving better design outcomes. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 4 storeys.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 126 [Property owner] Nos. 33–41 Cahors Road and Nos. 117A–117B Iberia Street in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the properties at Nos. 33–41 Cahors Road and Nos. 117A–117B Iberia Street to allow 8 storeys (3:1 FSR). The rationale is it will provide a physical balance to the streetscape, increase housing stock, and strengthen the town centre as a destination. The site forms a rectangular block which is considered to be logical in shape and dimension to cater for additional density.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed: - To maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre for the property at No. 33 Cahors Road and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR. - To rezone the properties at Nos. 37–41 Cahors Road and Nos. 117A–117B Iberia Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone B2 Local Centre (6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR). - To rezone the property at No. 35 Cahors Road from Zone SP2 Infrastructure (Place of Public Worship) to Zone B2 Local Centre (6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process identifies the commercial core as a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. Based on the urban design analysis, a traditional village centre is comprised of buildings that created a dense urban form, 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. However, there is the opportunity for a small number of taller elements (8 storeys) at appropriate core locations within the commercial core precincts to create a diverse and visually interesting skyline. More specifically within the Northern Commercial Core precinct, the review process proposes to increase the building envelope for the properties on the northern side of Cahors Road to 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR. The intended outcome is to provide a	Amend Action L2: Increase the building envelope to 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR for the properties on Cahors Road (north side) within the Northern Commercial Core precinct.

		more appropriate built form transition to the central heart within the Northern Commercial Core precinct, which is also 8 storeys. The review process does not propose to change the 6 storeys on the southern side of Cahors Road (Nos. 78–130 Cahors Road). A height greater than 6 storeys is discouraged at this location as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the surrounding buildings in Alice Street will be substantially greater.	
Submission No. 105 [Property owner] Nos. 12–16 Faraday Road in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed zoning of the properties at Nos. 12–16 Faraday Road to allow a high density mixed use zone (2.5:1 FSR). The site has exceptional access to the railway station and the centre. The proposed change will provide a kick start to urban renewal and responds to local housing needs. In the absence of appropriate planning controls, this site will be stifled. The structure plan should also extend the Southern Commercial Core precinct to the area bound by Segers Avenue and Faraday Road. This supports the clustering of businesses and activities within the centre.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process identifies Howard Road, Padstow Parade and Cahors Road as the main streets of the village centre, and is proposing to rezone certain properties within the main streets to Zone B2 Local Centre. This proposed change provides sufficient capacity to meet retail and commercial floor space demand to 2031. The review process does not identify the properties at Nos. 12–16 Faraday Road as forming part of the main streets. There is no demand to extend the business zone to this location. The review process therefore recommends continuing with medium–rise apartments at this location (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). The economic analysis indicates this proposed building envelope is feasible.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 42, 168 & 181 [Residents] Gibson Avenue in Padstow	These submissions do not support the proposed rezoning of Gibson Avenue and Cahors Road around Playford Park. The proposed 3 storey terrace housing is a bad fit as it will bring visual and human congestion, traffic, overshadowing and a loss of sense of community. It will also overshadow Playford Park.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone the properties at Nos. 36–74 Cahors Road and Nos. 172–200 Gibson Avenue from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R3 Medium Density Residential (3 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies:	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 145 [Resident] Gibson Avenue in Padstow	This submission requests a change of the zoning of Gibson Avenue (Watson Avenue to Moro Avenue) to allow apartments. Future residents living here will enjoy views over the park, and are a short distance to the station and shops.	- The village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. - Cahors Road and parts of Gibson Avenue form part of this compact place. There is the potential for Cahors Road and Gibson Avenue to be a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The review process therefore recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is offer terrace housing (most with rear lane access) as a living choice that respond to local needs. The review process does not propose to include Nos. 162–170A Gibson Avenue (between Newey Lane and Moro Street) as part of the village centre, as these properties fall outside the 10 minute walking distance to the railway station. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.	

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 145 [Resident] Gibson Avenue in Padstow	This submission comments that traffic is a big issue and must be taken into account in the rezoning plan. The bus services are running well.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre. With more pedestrians on the street, getting around the village centre easily and safely will become an even greater priority to ensure we have a balanced transport system. Action L2 therefore incorporates the findings of the Centres Transport Action Plan. The findings propose to have cars travel slowly in the village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk. Council will also continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 9 [Resident] No. 22 Howard Road in Padstow	This submission requests the listing of the property at No. 22 Howard Road (former Padstow Star Theatre) as a local heritage item. Built in 1952, the site has considerable local historical and social significance.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre for this property and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR. 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.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 85 [Property owner] No. 22 Howard Road in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls for the property at No. 22 Howard Road to allow 8 storeys (3:1 FSR). The property is unrestrained by any heritage, environmental features or easements. The draft plan does not allow the efficient use of the site. The proposed change provides for a sustainable, orderly and economic use of viable land that is underutilised. It will provide relief to the housing demand and development pressure in Sydney. It can address urban design policies.	The review process identifies the commercial core as a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. Based on the urban design analysis, a traditional village centre is comprised of buildings that created a dense urban form, 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. The review process therefore recommends continuing with medium-rise buildings (6 storeys) at this location as it strikes a balance between a dense urban form and retaining a sense of enclosure, human scale, comfort and enjoyment for people walking in the commercial core. The economic analysis indicates the proposed building envelope is feasible. The review process also recommends an archival record of the existing building due to its use as a former picture theatre and interior features. This can be undertaken as part of the development application process.	

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 54 [Resident] Iberia Street in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the zoning at the northern end of Iberia Street to allow 4 storey units. This change would support the increase in population over the next 20 years.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to maintain the current controls at the northern end of Iberia Street (including the properties at Nos. 50–56 Iberia Street) as it is located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct. In response to these submissions, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 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.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 87 [Resident including a petition with 8 signatures] Nos. 50–56 Iberia Street in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed zoning of the properties at Nos. 50–56 Iberia Street to reinstate the medium density residential zone (3 storeys) as it originally applied between the centre and Davies Road. Justification includes an improved height transition from the centre, a more appropriate means of resolving boundary adjustments, ensuring the orderly development of sites, and Iberia Street is an important connection from the centre to Davies Road. The proposed change is supported by a concept design report.	The implication is the northern end of Iberia Street (including the properties at Nos. 50–56 Iberia Street) continues to fall outside the 10 minute walking catchment, and therefore does not form part of the proposed changes within the village centre. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.	

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 97 & 160 [Property owners] Nos. 2 and 8 Padstow Parade in Padstow	These submissions do not support the proposed heritage listing of the properties at Nos. 2 and 8 Padstow Parade. In terms of No. 2 Padstow Parade, the exterior facade has undergone significant alteration and there is no visible original fabric. The decorative brickwork is no longer apparent and the windows have been removed. The site is no longer capable of demonstrating vernacular shop architecture. In terms of No. 8 Padstow Parade, this building was built in the 1950s and is not from the early period of 1930s development. The building is not a major work that is aesthetically distinctive, and does not have a strong or special association with a particular community group or the Parker family. It also does not address the other criteria under the Burra Charter.	In considering these submissions, Council reviewed Actions L2 and L5 notes the requirement for the Local Area Plan to identify and protect places of heritage significance. According to Action L2, preserving heritage significance can be achieved in many different ways. These include listing properties on the heritage item list or preserving important commercial facades through to incorporation of the story of the building or place into the design of buildings and places. As part of the planning proposal process, Council will work with property owners to identify the best way to preserve the heritage significance of the facades. The planning proposal will be reported to Council to outline the discussions with property owners prior to any final decision on this matter.	No change is proposed. As part of the planning proposal process, Council will work with property owners to identify the best way to preserve the heritage significance of the facades. The planning proposal will be reported to Council to outline the discussions with property owners prior to any final decision on this matter.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 8 [Resident] Parmal Avenue in Padstow	This submission does not support the proposed changes to Parmal Avenue. The rezoning of Parmal Avenue to allow 4 storey apartments will increase traffic and parking congestion. Parmal Avenue is a cul-de-sac and commuters currently park in the street. As there is no time limit for parking, there are no spaces for residents to park on-street or place their bins for collection. The parking congestion also makes it difficult for ambulances and trucks to move in and out of the street.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone Parmal Avenue from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: • The village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. • Parmal Avenue form parts of this compact place. There is the potential for Parmal Avenue to be a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The review process therefore recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. 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, continue to allow up to 4 storeys.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 110 [Resident including a petition with 10 signatures] Parmal Avenue in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls in Parmal Avenue (north side) to allow 6 storeys and an increased floor space ratio. The rationale is it is a central accessible location and provides appropriate controls for the growing centre. It increases the housing stock and affordability, and improves the streetscape and infrastructure.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone Parmal Avenue from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: - The village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. - Parmal Avenue form parts of this compact place. There is the potential for Parmal Avenue to be a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 140 [Resident] Parmal Avenue in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed building height in Parmal Avenue to allow 8 storeys. This should also apply to Howard Road, Crusade Avenue and Padstow Parade near the rail corridor.	The review process therefore recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. 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, continue to allow up to 4 storeys. Introducing a height greater than 4 storeys is discouraged at this location as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the surrounding buildings will be substantially greater.	
	This submission does not support the removal of the park adjacent to the railway station.	Action L2 does not propose to remove the public space on Memorial Drive (adjacent to the railway station).	

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 57 [Resident] No. 37 Ryan Road in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the proposed building envelope controls at No. 37 Ryan Road to allow a 0.75:1 FSR.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to maintain the current controls for Nos. 35–37 Ryan Road as these properties are located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct. In response to this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 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. The implication is the properties at Nos. 35–37 Ryan Road continue to fall outside the 10 minute walking catchment, and therefore does not form part of the proposed changes within the village centre. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 116 [Property owner] Nos. 2–6 Segers Avenue and Nos. 89–99 Howard Road in Padstow	This submission requests a change of the proposed zoning of the properties at Nos. 89–99 Howard Road and Nos. 2–6 Segers Avenue to allow Zone B2 Local Centre (8 storeys / 3:1 FSR). The proposed change would enable an 8 storey mixed use development containing a supermarket (3,200m²) and up to 200 units. This submission indicates the location of the proposal is not quite inside the commercial core precincts, however there are few or no opportunities to accommodate the proposal inside the commercial core precincts. The submission also comments: The site is unique as it has multiple street frontages creating the opportunity for a high quality redevelopment with a major retail anchor tenant.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys / 1:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. Whilst the review process recognises the merits in having supermarkets as part of the village centre, the concern with this submission is the location of the proposal. Firstly, the structure plan identifies Howard Road, Padstow Parade and Cahors Road as the main streets of the village centre. The intended outcome is to concentrate the business zone adjacent to the centre heart and railway station to support the established business and pedestrian areas. The structure plan also recognises the opportunity for additional retail and commercial floor space including the potential to expand the existing supermarket or add a second supermarket. The review process therefore proposes to rezone certain properties within the main streets to Zone B2 Local Centre. This proposed change provides sufficient capacity to meet retail and commercial floor space demand to 2031. It does not propose to extend the business zone beyond the main streets as the emphasis is to have a compact village centre. Secondly, should this proposal proceed at the southern edge of the village centre, the size of this proposal (a supermarket up to 3,200m² in area and up to 200 units) has the capability of drawing customers away from the established business and pedestrian areas. This could have a detrimental	No change is proposed.

	- The vision is to have a vibrant mixed use hub with a retail podium and apartments above. The development would prioritise pedestrian connections to the railway station, school and RSL club. This may include a plaza with an ANZAC theme. - In creating a mixed use development, this will achieve a better urban design and planning outcome compared to a purely residential scenario. A preliminary traffic analysis advises the local street network can accommodate a supermarket without unreasonable traffic impacts. The proposed change is supported by a concept design report, preliminary traffic analysis and trade area analysis.	effect on the structure plan of the village centre and the movement of people. Thirdly, the structure plan identifies the opportunity for a small number of taller elements (8 storeys) at appropriate core locations (namely adjacent to the railway station) to create a diverse and visually interesting skyline. It does not identify the edges of the village centre as an appropriate location for 8 storey development. Introducing a height greater than 4 storeys is discouraged at this location as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the surrounding low-rise housing to the south will be substantially greater. The review process therefore recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. 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, continue to allow up to 4 storeys.	
--	---	--	--

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 24 [Resident] Nos. 1–5 Segers Avenue in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the properties at Nos. 1–5 Segers Avenue by: - Reinstating the mixed use zoning at Nos. 1–5 Segers Avenue as per the first exhibition. Padstow Lane may form a natural breakpoint between medium high-rise mixed use and medium-rise apartments. - Allow 8 storeys at Nos. 1–5 Segers Avenue to ensure economic feasibility and allow the property owners the scope to relocate should they choose.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process identifies Howard Road, Padstow Parade and Cahors Road as the main streets of the village centre, and is proposing to rezone certain properties within the main streets to Zone B2 Local Centre. This proposed change provides sufficient capacity to meet retail and commercial floor space demand to 2031. The review process does not identify the properties at Nos. 1–5 Segers Avenue as forming part of the main streets. There is no demand to extend the business zone to this location. The review process therefore recommends continuing with medium-rise apartments at this location (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). The economic analysis indicates this proposed building envelope is feasible.	No change is proposed.
	This submission requests clarification on what constitutes a storey, particularly with reference to the schematic drawing shown in Figure 10.3.	For the purposes of the Local Area Plan, a storey is measured above ground and does not include basement levels.	No change is proposed.
	This submission requests confirmation the minimum 30 metre lot width will remain for residential flat buildings in Zone R4.	Action L2 does not propose to change the current lot width requirement for residential flat buildings within Zone R4 High Density Residential.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 50 [Property owner] Nos. 11–15 Segers Avenue in Padstow	This submission requests a change to the zoning of the properties at Nos. 11–15 Segers Avenue to allow a high density mixed use zone (6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR). The draft plan is an underutilisation of the site. The proposed change forms an orderly, economic and sustainable use of the site in proximity to the railway station and the Padstow Park Public School. The proposed change conforms to the desired future character of the area and can address urban design policies. The proposed change is supported by a concept design report.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process identifies Howard Road, Padstow Parade and Cahors Road as the main streets of the village centre, and is proposing to rezone certain properties within the main streets to Zone B2 Local Centre. This proposed change provides sufficient capacity to meet retail and commercial floor space demand to 2031. The review process does not identify the properties at Nos. 11–15 Segers Avenue as forming part of the main streets. There is no demand to extend the business zone to this location. The review process therefore recommends continuing with medium–rise apartments at this location (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR). The economic analysis indicates this proposed building envelope is feasible.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 1, 3, 108 & 129 [Residents] Segers Avenue in Padstow	These submissions raise concern the proposed 6 storey height and increased densities in Segers Avenue will create traffic and parking congestion, particularly for parents trying to access the Padstow Park Public School. In addition, having blocks of units opposite the school may pose a safety threat to children.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone Segers Avenue from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (3–6 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: • The village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. • Segers Avenue forms part of this compact place. There is the potential for Segers Avenue to be a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The review process therefore recommends continuing with medium-rise buildings (6 storeys) in Segers Avenue (north side), and low-rise buildings (3–4 storeys) in Segers Avenue (south side). In terms of privacy, the roadway separates Segers Avenue (north side) from the Padstow Park Public School. Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to address any potential privacy issues.	No change is proposed.

	Submission No. 129 specifically raises concern with the proposed 3–4 storey development in Watson Road and opposite the Padstow North Public School. This will create traffic and safety issues for parents, students and teachers.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone the properties at Nos. 59–91 Watson Road from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R3 Medium Density Residential (3 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: • The village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. • Nos. 59–91 Watson Road form part of this compact place. There is the potential for this part of Watson Road to be a place of well–proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The review process therefore recommends continuing with low–rise buildings at this location. The intended outcome is offer terrace housing (most with rear lane access) as a living choice that respond to local needs.	No change is proposed.
--	--	---	-------------------------------

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 35, 36, 64, 107 & 163 [Residents] Stephanie Street in Padstow	These submissions raise concern with the proposed rezoning of Stephanie Street (as well as Banks Street and Cahors Road) to allow 4–8 storey apartments. The proposed rezonings will overshadow current dwellings, increase safety risks, create loss of privacy, and increase noise and traffic negatively impacting on the tranquil characteristic of the Stephanie Street neighbourhood. Over the years, there has been a gradual change from houses to dual occupancies. This change maintains the village environment whilst increasing the number of residents in the area. This change is more suitable when compared to high rise residential. Parking also needs to be addressed as Stephanie Street is full from 7am to 6pm with commuter parking. There is also a lot more cars parking in the street on weekends, which makes it difficult for residents and visitors to park.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed: - To rezone the properties at Nos. 13–29 and 22–34 Stephanie Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys). - To rezone the properties at Nos. 31–39 and 36–46 Stephanie Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (6 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies: - The village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. It is important that this compact place contains sufficient capacity to accommodate a mix of living choices that respond to local needs, and will ensure new homes are within a short walking distance of a wide range of local services. - Nos. 13–39 and 22–46 Stephanie Street form part of this compact place. There is the potential for this part of Stephanie Street to be a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. The review process therefore recommends continuing with low-rise and medium-rise buildings at this location. 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, continue to allow up to 4–6 storeys.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 2 [Resident] Padstow Village Centre	This submission supports the draft plan as it will increase investment and retail opportunities, and introduce much needed housing supplies.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
Submission Nos. 5 & 29 [Residents] Padstow Village Centre	These submissions do not support the proposed changes to the Residential Frame precinct. The rezoning of the Residential Frame precinct to allow 4 storey apartments would be detrimental to the long established village charm of the area. A majority of residents will be affected as views will be lost, and backyards will be overshadowed. Traffic congestion will also increase.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone the properties within the Residential Frame precinct from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4–6 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, and where people feel there is variety and choice that respond to local needs. The review process recommends continuing with low–rise and medium–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, 4–6 storeys is considered appropriate to achieve a design outcome that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. Council also applies the State Government’s Apartment Design Guide, which requires apartments to address amenity issues.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 18 [Resident] Padstow Village Centre	This submission supports the draft plan, in particular the removal of the proposed high density areas around Playford Park. The tallest (8 storey) high rise should be restricted to the current commercial precinct.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 39 [Resident] Padstow Village Centre	This submission supports the proposed changes to the south side of the village centre.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
	This submission also supports having a new community area in Carl Little Reserve, and the deletion of the proposed redevelopment of the Padstow War Memorial.		
	This submission questions whether there is a need for high rise when the current trend of duplexes and villas may be sufficient to meet future population growth.	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.
	This submission raises concern there is little in the draft plan regarding infrastructure improvements. Congestion exists on Canterbury Road, Gibson Avenue, Chapel Road, Davies Road and Watson	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, Department of Education and Sydney Water did not identify any significant impact on services as a result of the proposed changes in the Local Area Plan. Council will continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre.	No change is proposed.

	Road, as well as Cahors Road due to the location of pedestrian safety islands. The phasing of traffic lights and the length of the green needs to be looked at.		
	This submission does not support the proposed 6–8 storeys on Cahors Road. The preference is to have 4 storeys.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed: - To maintain the current Zone B2 Local Centre for the property at No. 33 Cahors Road and to increase the building envelope from 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR to 6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR. - To rezone the properties at Nos. 37–41 Cahors Road and Nos. 117A–117B Iberia Street from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone B2 Local Centre (6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR). - To rezone the property at No. 35 Cahors Road from Zone SP2 Infrastructure (Place of Public Worship) to Zone B2 Local Centre (6 storeys / 2.5:1 FSR). In considering this submission, Council reviewed the urban design and economic analysis, and the community and industry feedback to establish the desired built form for the village centre. The review process identifies the commercial core as a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. Based on the urban design analysis, a traditional village centre is comprised of buildings that created a dense urban form, 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. However, there is the opportunity for a small number of taller elements (8 storeys) at appropriate core locations within the commercial core precincts to create a diverse and visually interesting skyline. More specifically within	Amend Action L2: Increase the building envelope to 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR for the properties on Cahors Road (north side) within the Northern Commercial Core precinct.

		the Northern Commercial Core precinct, the review process proposes to increase the building envelope for the properties on the northern side of Cahors Road to 8 storeys / 3:1 FSR. The intended outcome is to provide a more appropriate built form transition to the central heart within the Northern Commercial Core precinct, which is also 8 storeys. The review process does not propose to change the 6 storeys on the southern side of Cahors Road (Nos. 78–130 Cahors Road). A height greater than 6 storeys is discouraged at this location as the overshadowing and visual impacts on the surrounding buildings in Alice Street will be substantially greater.	
	This submission does not support 4 storey development in the Residential Frame precinct and culs-de-sac. The move away from 3 storeys is going the wrong way.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to rezone the properties within the Residential Frame precinct from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4–6 storeys). In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place, and where people feel there is variety and choice that respond to local needs. The review process recommends continuing with low-rise and medium-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, 4–6 storeys is considered appropriate to achieve a design outcome that is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood.	No change is proposed.
	This submission questions the removal of the proposed 3 storey terraces around the Astley Avenue reserve as the park would provide wonderful amenity for those living around it.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to maintain the current controls in Astley Avenue as it is located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct. In response to this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 10 minute walking distance measured from the railway station. This distance provides an adequate	No change is proposed.

		level of containment for a centre of this size, and is an appropriate fit within the centres hierarchy. The implication is Astley Avenue continues to fall outside the 10 minute walking catchment, and therefore does not form part of the proposed changes within the village centre. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.	
	This submission questions whether there will be additional green space to replace the loss of park currently at Cahors Road.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to transform Carl Little Reserve into a successful civic space with a modern multi-purpose community facility. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create an enlivened mixed use destination. In considering this submission, it is proposed to amend Action L2 to note that the concept plan will provide public space as part of this mixed use destination.	Amend Action L2: The concept plan will provide public space as part of any mixed use destination at Carl Little Reserve.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission Nos. 43, 61, 93, 94, 100, 101, 102, 162 & 174 [Residents] Padstow Village Centre	These submissions do not support the draft plan as the proposed high density living is not a characteristic of Padstow. The proposed high density living may also increase noise, crime rates and aggression between occupants (similar to Riverwood and Hurstville). With more flats, there will be less garden space. The building height in the shopping centre should remain as 3 storeys. Infrastructure (schools, hospitals, emergency services and train services) do not support tripling the population. There is insufficient parking, which will have a negative impact on shops and will not encourage trade in Padstow. Ryan Road and the surrounding area are at saturation point. The area cannot take extra traffic.	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. <u>Built form</u> The review process identifies the commercial core as a place of well-proportioned, human scale buildings and streets to contribute to the sense of comfort and village feel. Based on the urban design analysis, a traditional village centre is comprised of buildings that created a dense urban form, 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. There is the opportunity for a small number of taller elements (8 storeys) at appropriate core locations (namely adjacent to the railway station) to create a diverse and visually interesting skyline. In terms of building design, Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires apartments to address amenity and open space issues. <u>Infrastructure</u> 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, Department of Education and Sydney Water did not identify any significant impact on services as a result of the proposed changes in the Local Area Plan. Council will continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre.	No change is proposed.

	Submission No. 43 specifically raises concern with developing areas within a medium or high risk for stormwater flooding. The flood rating would restrict the use of underground as parking for the proposed structures.	The development application process would consider this issue.	No change is proposed.
	Submission Nos. 61, 93 and 94 specifically raise concern with allowing high level units around the Padstow Park Public School. The streets are inadequate to cope with an increase in traffic and parking particularly around school pick-up and drop-off times.	In terms of privacy, the roadway separates Segers Avenue (north side) from the Padstow Park Public School. Council applies the State Government's Apartment Design Guide, which requires shop top housing and apartments to address any potential privacy issues. In terms of transport improvements, Action L2 incorporates the findings of the Centres Transport Action Plan. The findings propose to have cars travel slowly in the village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk.	No change is proposed.
	Submission Nos. 61, 101, 102, 162 and 174 specifically raise concern with the removal of the war memorial, and the community facilities and green space at Carl Little Reserve.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to transform Carl Little Reserve into a successful civic space with a modern multi-purpose community facility. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a concept plan to explore development options to create an enlivened mixed use destination. In considering this submission, it is proposed to amend Action L2 to note that the concept plan will provide public space as part of this mixed use destination. In terms of the war memorial, Council acknowledges that the Padstow War Memorial provides an important landmark which is highly valued by the community. However, there is limited space to hold large events and activities. It is for this reason that Action L2 identifies a need to investigate options with stakeholders to possibly relocate the Padstow War Memorial to a better location, which can hold large events associated with ANZAC Day and other memorial commemorations. Further consultation will occur with stakeholders prior to any final decision on possible locations.	Amend Action L2: The concept plan will provide public space as part of any mixed use destination at Carl Little Reserve.

	Submission Nos. 102 and 162 specifically raise concern with the proposed traffic lights at the Cahors Road roundabout as it will cause congestion with traffic building up in the approaching roads, especially coming from Davies Road. The closure of Cahors Road will also impact on local residents reaching their homes.	In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre. With more pedestrians on the street, getting around the village centre easily and safely will become an even greater priority to ensure we have a balanced transport system. Action L2 therefore incorporates the findings of the Centres Transport Action Plan. The findings propose to have cars travel slowly in the village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk. Action L2 also proposes certain improvements to alleviate movements along Cahors Road and Gibson Avenue. Council will continue to work with the State Government on future improvements to the village centre.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 102 specifically suggests accommodating the increased population on the other side of Davies Road. This area is close to the shops and public transport, and would not impact on people living around the shopping centre.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to maintain the current controls on the eastern side of Davies Road as it is located within the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct. In response to this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The review process identifies the village centre boundary as a 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. The implication is Davies Road continues to fall outside the 10 minute walking catchment, and therefore does not form part of the proposed changes within the village centre. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.	No change is proposed.

Bankstown City Council

	Submission No. 102 specifically questions how Council allowed the demolition of the proposed item at No. 42 Milperra Road in Revesby.	The Local Area Plan is a strategic planning document that is yet to convert to a planning proposal. State legislation therefore requires Council to assess development applications based on current controls. The current controls allow the demolition of the house.	No change is proposed.
	Submission No. 174 specifically suggests having shopfronts on the ground floor of the Revesby car park.	As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to rezone the car park at No. 168 The River Road and No. 45 Simmons Street from Zone SP2 Infrastructure (Road Infrastructure Facility) to Zone B2 Local Centre. The proposed business zone would allow shopfronts on the ground floor.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 133 [Resident] Padstow Village Centre	This submission supports the draft plan as it will improve the look of Padstow, benefit existing businesses, create employment and make better use of infrastructure.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 150 [Resident] Padstow Village Centre	This submission supports the draft plan and the proposed change to allow high density living.	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.

Summary of Submissions–Suburban Neighbourhood (Action L3)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 25 [Resident] Villiers Road in Padstow Heights	This submission comments the draft plan does not mention off-street parking provision in new dwellings in residential areas. There is currently a problem for cars to move in and out of Villiers Road due to insufficient off-street parking.	Council's current controls for dual occupancies require off-street parking for residents to reduce the need for parking on the streets.	No change is proposed.
	This submission comments the draft plan does not mention expanding / redeveloping Council's swimming pools.	Action L1 outlines infrastructure improvements to support the South East Local Area. This includes transforming Amour Park and the Revesby Leisure Centre into a recreation and leisure destination that meets the needs of the growing community.	No change is proposed.

Summary of Submissions–Community Facilities (Action L7)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 185 [Community group] No. 89 The River Road in Revesby (Endeavour Hall)	This submission does not support the proposal to divest Endeavour Hall for the following reasons: • There has been no consultation with the current users including the Australian Air League, Padstow Squadron and the Revesby Guides. The justification for the divestment is incorrect and unsubstantiated. • These groups have invested in the maintenance of the building over the years, and the hall is structurally sound. • The hall has been in continuous use by the community since 1971. • The hall is well serviced by public transport. • The use of a church hall or school hall is an unfeasible option for the groups currently using Endeavour Hall.	As part of the exhibition, the Draft Local Area Plan (Action L7) recommended a regional approach in providing community facilities. The intended outcome is to provide high quality facilities and services at focal points that will serve the long term needs of the community consistent with the Bankstown Community Plan. The South East Local Area will be served by new multi-purpose community facilities in the Revesby and Padstow Village Centres which will provide spaces for the range of activities being undertaken in the local area. The future development plans for the expansion will need to consider the appropriate types of spaces and safe movement of users. In considering this submission and following a review, Council continues to support the co-location of community services within the walking catchment of the growth centres. When properties are being considered to be divested, Council will consult the relevant users of the facilities. Facilities identified as appropriate for long-term divestment are also subject to phase-out strategies. The phase-out strategies will recommend appropriate alternative spaces for the activities currently using the surplus facilities.	No change is proposed.

Summary of Submissions–Open Space (Action G1)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 98 [Resident] No. 102A Carrington Street in Revesby (Greenway Reserve)	This submission does not support the rezoning of Greenway Reserve to residential use.	As part of the exhibition, Action G1 proposed to investigate divestment of the property at No. 102A Carrington Street (known as Greenway Reserve) and to utilise the funds for purchase and embellishment of new and existing open space. 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. 102A Carrington Street 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.

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.