

- Amend **Public Transport Accessibility Level Map – Sheet TAL_017** to show 'Category F' for the precinct.

(NB – changes requested to these 6 maps reflect the proposed mapping categories included in *draft Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2011* and have not been revisited as part of the preparation of this Planning Proposal.)

Further detail is shown in the maps provided in **Part 4** and in the LEP drafting notes at **Attachment A** of this Planning Proposal.

Part 3 – Justification

Section A – Need for the planning proposal

Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

A detailed urban design study was undertaken for the precinct in 2009/2010 in order to develop appropriate planning controls for inclusion in the City-wide *Standard Instrument* compliant LEP and DCP. The study included determining an appropriate development density and built form outcome. It also established the optimal location and hierarchy of streets and public spaces to allow for orderly redevelopment and independent redevelopment of sites.

The proposed controls resulting from this study were initially exhibited as an amendment to the Green Square DCP in June/July 2010. At the same time, the draft controls were included in the then draft Sydney LEP and DCP, which were exhibited from February to April 2011. When Sydney LEP 2012 and DCP 2012 came into effect in December 2012, the precinct was excluded to allow more time to address the public submissions on the exhibition. Refined controls were later placed on public exhibition as an amendment to the Green Square DCP in December 2012 to February 2013.

The public exhibitions in 2010 and 2011 raised concerns regarding development capacity and incentives, and the built form and public domain requirements for individual sites. As a result, FSRs of 2.4:1 were explored to address economic feasibility concerns. However, further extensive urban design testing established that a maximum FSR of 2.2:1 is the maximum achievable across the precinct, whilst maintaining a high quality urban form and appropriate amenity for the development and public domain. Corresponding building heights and public domain controls were also established.

Since their adoption in April 2013, there has been considerable uptake of the controls by developers. The integration of the controls into the City-wide LEP and DCP aims to ensure consistency with the City-wide controls and greater certainty by applying the appropriate LEP/DCP weight to the controls.

Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

A planning proposal to progress an amendment of Sydney LEP 2012, is the most effective way of providing certainty for the local community and landowners about the future development of the precinct and allowing orderly and economic development of the land.

Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework

Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or sub-regional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?

In March 2013 the NSW Government published the draft *Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031*. Once adopted, it will replace the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036*. The draft *Sydney City Subregional Strategy* is also applicable.

The Planning Proposal has strategic merit and is consistent with the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036* and draft *Sydney City Subregional Strategy*.

Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

The Metropolitan Plan is a State Government strategic document that outlines a vision for Sydney to 2036. The Metropolitan Plan identifies key challenges facing Sydney including a population increasing to 6 million by 2036 – an increase of 1.7 million since 2006 – requiring 770,000 new homes and 760,000 new jobs.

In responding to these and other challenges the Metropolitan Plan sets out five aims to enhance liveability, strengthen economic competitiveness, ensure fairness, protect the environment and improve governance.

It proposes nine strategic directions to achieve those aims including: Strengthening a City of Cities, Growing and Renewing Centres, Transport for a Connected City, Housing Sydney's Population, Growing Sydney's Economy, Balancing Land Uses on the City Fringe, Tackling Climate Change, Protecting Sydney's Environment, Achieving Equity, Liveability and Social Inclusion and Delivering the Plan. These are discussed below.

Strategic Direction A: Strengthening a City of Cities

The Metropolitan Plan continues to envisage Sydney as a 'City of Cities' and the continued success of Central Sydney as a global and iconic centre. It identifies Green Square as a 'Planned Major Centre' that will support central Sydney within a transport and economic network, offering a focus for housing, commercial activity and local services at a different scale to that of central Sydney. The Planning Proposal will facilitate the development of a significant area of Green Square, and enable the provision of a significant transport corridor, in the form of Gadigal Avenue, between the Green Square Town Centre and the City.

Strategic Direction B and E: Growing Sydney's Economy and Growing and Renewing Centres

The Green Square Urban Renewal Area is identified as being located within the Global Economic Corridor with the Green Square Town Centre a 'Planned Major Centre'. The Metropolitan Plan identifies the need to achieve well-connected, strong and viable centres which provide employment, retail and residential functions for the wider metropolitan area (Action B1.3). The provision of the Gadigal Avenue transport corridor through the precinct, and the provision of substantial residential development will support the role of the Town Centre as a major centre.

Strategic Direction C: Transport for a Connected City

The Planning Proposal will support the provision of the Gadigal Avenue transport corridor through the precinct. This forms part of the Eastern Transit Corridor, identified in the Green Square Transport Management Action Plan (TMAP), providing a key transport route between the Green Square Town Centre and the City. The realisation of this link will result in more sustainable travel behaviour with a key public transport route through the neighbourhood and wider Green Square area. The street network within the precinct will also make provision for increased cycling and pedestrian routes which link with wider networks.

Strategic Direction D: Housing Sydney's Population

The Metropolitan Plan provides dwelling targets. The redevelopment of the precinct, facilitated by the Planning Proposal, will assist in achieving these targets (Objective D1, Action D1.2), delivering approximately 4,000 dwellings when fully redeveloped.

Strategic Direction F: Balancing Land Uses on the City Fringe

The Metropolitan Plan aims to build 70 per cent of new homes in existing urban areas. The Planning Proposal is consistent with this aim, facilitating the transition of former industrial land to residential mixed uses, aiding the containment of Sydney's urban footprint (Objective F1).

Strategic Direction G: Tackling Climate Change and Protecting Sydney's Natural Environment

The Planning Proposal seeks to further consolidate the projected employment and population growth of Sydney within the existing urban footprint through the redevelopment of underutilised industrial sites for a significant residential development (Objective G4, Action G4.1, G5.2).

Strategic Direction H: Achieving Equity, Liveability and Social Inclusion

The Planning Proposal will provide for residential development and will promote a mix of housing types, including affordable housing, supported by and in close proximity to services, transport and employment. The Lachlan Precinct will provide for significant increases in public open space which will serve the needs of the future residents and workers, and the wider community (Objective H3, Action H3.1).

Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031

Balanced growth

The development of the precinct will provide new housing opportunities within an existing urban environment.

A Liveable City

The Planning Proposal will support the development of new housing within the city to assist in meeting the housing targets. The supporting DCP controls will also provide for public open space consistent with these objectives.

Accessibility and Connectivity

The Planning Proposal will facilitate development to achieve the Gadigal Avenue link between Victoria Park and Crown Square, which is vital for the realisation of the Eastern Transit Corridor connecting Green Square and Central.

Sydney City Draft Subregional Strategy

The State Government's draft *Sydney City Subregional Strategy* sets directions and actions for the implementation of the Metropolitan Strategy at a more detailed local level. Subregional planning provides a framework for coordinating planning, development, infrastructure, transport, open space networks and environmental actions across local and state government agencies. The draft Subregional Strategy sets targets for 55,000 new dwellings and 58,000 new jobs to be provided in the Sydney City Subregion by 2031.

Economy and Employment

The Planning Proposal zones the precinct for mixed use which will allow for development that can contribute to the subregional jobs target (Action A1.4). The Planning Proposal will not result in a loss of employment lands identified as Category 1 and 2 land in the 'Schedule of Future Employment Lands' in the draft Subregional Strategy (Figure 4, p29). The proposed B4 Mixed Uses zoning is also consistent with the general land use structure for Green Square, based around residential uses to the east, north and north-west of the renewal area and business uses in the area west of the Town Centre.

Housing

The Planning Proposal will deliver the provision of around 4,000 new dwellings which will support the State Plan priority for 'jobs closer to homes' by increasing the number of people living within 30 minutes of a major centre by public transport (Action C2.1.1). A supporting DCP will encourage various housing scale and dwelling mix as well as adaptable and accessible housing to provide for a broad demographic mix of residents (Action C2.3). The Planning Proposal will also promote design excellence in housing delivery, requiring the consideration of design excellence in the development approval process (Action C5.1).

Transport

The Planning Proposal seeks to take advantage of surrounding public transport. The precinct is located on the Miranda to City Strategic Bus Corridor which will target a 25km/hr average bus speed and new integrated bus network. The Planning Proposal will facilitate the provision of a transport corridor that will link Green Square Town Centre with the City and Central. The achievement of this corridor is key to ensure appropriate transport services to the Green Square area.

Environment, Heritage and Resources

The Planning Proposal assists in containing the urban footprint of the metropolitan region by providing dwellings within an existing urban area (Action E3.1).

Is the proposal consistent with a council's local strategy or other local strategic plan?

Sustainable Sydney 2030 Strategic Plan

The City's *Sustainable Sydney 2030* Strategic Plan is the vision for the sustainable development of the City to 2030 and beyond. It includes 10 strategic directions to guide the future of the City, as well as targets against which to measure progress. **Table 3** shows the consistency of this Planning Proposal with key directions of *Sustainable Sydney 2030*.

Table 3 - Consistency with *Sustainable Sydney 2030*

Consistency with Sustainable Sydney 2030	
Direction	Comment
Direction 1 – A globally competitive and innovative city	The Planning Proposal does not contain any elements which are inconsistent with this direction.
Direction 2 – A leading environmental performer	The redevelopment of the precinct will lead to new building stock with significantly improved environmental performance than the current industrial and warehouse buildings. The design excellence provisions which are proposed to be carried forward for the precinct under Sydney LEP 2012 require Environmentally Sustainable Design elements to be considered by new development.
Direction 3 – Integrated transport for a connected city	The centre of the precinct is approximately 1,500m from Green Square Train Station which offers regular services to the airport and central Sydney. It will also be served by a new public transport corridor, Gadigal Avenue, which will provide a connection to the Green Square Town Centre and Central. This will be complemented by the encouragement of active transport, including walking and cycling, through the provision of greater route choice and connectivity within the precinct. Maximum car parking rates as stipulated in the Sydney LEP 2012 will be enforced in the precinct which will assist with managing car travel demand.

Consistency with Sustainable Sydney 2030	
Direction	Comment
Direction 4 – A city for walking and cycling	The Planning Proposal will facilitate the introduction of a finer grain street pattern, new pedestrian links and open space. These will provide greater route choice for pedestrians and cyclists, reflecting desire lines and encouraging short trips to be taken by bicycle and by foot. New separated cycleways are also proposed along key streets, linking into wider cycle networks. The creation of open space and the transition to residential development will lead to greater activation of the public domain and a greater sense of security. Appropriate built form controls also seek to achieve a pedestrian scale along the new streets. Proposed non-residential uses fronting the key streets and open space will further activate the public domain and provide an environment more conducive to active transport.
Direction 5 – A lively and engaging city centre	The Planning Proposal does not contain any elements which are inconsistent with this direction.
Direction 6 – Vibrant local communities and economies	The Planning Proposal will facilitate the redevelopment of a large area of land for mixed use purposes. Open space, shops/cafes and an increased population will lead to a renewed vibrancy. Proposed open spaces will also meet a variety of recreational and community needs. Integration of existing and new compatible non-residential uses will achieve a mix of activity and provide opportunities for work within the precinct.
Direction 7 – A cultural and creative city	The Planning Proposal does not contain any elements which are inconsistent with this direction.
Direction 8 – Housing for a diverse population	The Planning Proposal will facilitate the provision of residential accommodation by the private market in accordance with objective 8.1. Development in the precinct will also continue to be subject to the Green Square affordable housing contributions levy requirements under Sydney LEP 2012. Redevelopment of the precinct will facilitate 4,000 new dwellings in the inner city.
Direction 9 – Sustainable development, renewal and design	The Planning Proposal seeks to establish a finer grain block pattern that integrates with the surrounding street pattern. New streets and open space provided in the precinct will also enhance the pedestrian experience, in accordance with objective 9.2 of direction 9. The built form that can be achieved under the controls has been carefully developed to secure a variety of heights throughout the precinct, enhancing pedestrian amenity and legibility, visual interest, and good solar access within the public domain. Provisions relating to design excellence are also proposed to be continued.
Direction 10 – Implementation through effective partnerships	The Planning Proposal does not contain any elements which are inconsistent with this direction. The additional floor space potentially achievable for the provision of "community infrastructure" seeks to ensure that private developers partner with the City in the provision of infrastructure.

Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?

The consistency of the Planning Proposal with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) is outlined in **Table 4**. Those SEPPs which have been repealed or were not finalised are not included in this table.

Table 5 shows the consistency of the Planning Proposal with former Regional Environmental Plans (REPs) for the Sydney and Greater Metropolitan Regions, which are deemed to have the weight of SEPPs.

Table 4 - Consistency with State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs)

State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)	Comment
SEPP No 1—Development Standards	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP No 4—Development Without Consent and Miscellaneous Exempt and Complying Development	Not applicable.
SEPP No 6—Number of Storeys in a Building	Consistent - The Planning Proposal seeks to translate the current DCP height in storeys control to a maximum height expressed in RLs within an LEP. This will ensure a consistent interpretation of height controls for the precinct, both within the precinct and compared with the wider City of Sydney.
SEPP No 10—Retention of Low Cost Rental Accommodation	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP No 14—Coastal Wetlands	Not applicable.
SEPP No 15—Rural Landsharing Communities	Not applicable.
SEPP No 19—Bushland in Urban Areas	Not applicable.
SEPP No 21—Caravan Parks	Not applicable.
SEPP No 22—Shops and Commercial Premises	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP No 26—Littoral Rainforests	Not applicable.
SEPP No 29—Western Sydney Recreation Area	Not applicable.
SEPP No 30—Intensive Agriculture	Not applicable.
SEPP No 32—Urban Consolidation (Redevelopment of Urban Land)	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP. It presents an opportunity for urban renewal and enables a range of uses appropriate to the precinct.
SEPP No 33—Hazardous and Offensive Development	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP No 36—Manufactured Home Estates	Not applicable.
SEPP No 39—Spit Island Bird Habitat	Not applicable.
SEPP No 41—Casino Entertainment Complex	Not applicable.
SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection	Not applicable.
SEPP No 47—Moore Park Showground	Not applicable.
SEPP No 50—Canal Estate Development	Not applicable.
SEPP No 52—Farm Dams and Other Works in Land and Water Management Plan Areas	Not applicable.
SEPP No 53—Metropolitan Residential Development	Not applicable.
SEPP No 55—Remediation of Land	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP. The proposed zoning change from Mixed Uses Zones 10(b) and 10(e) to B4 Mixed Uses will permit similar land uses as currently permissible. Assessment of contamination is required at development application stage to ensure that sites can be remediated appropriately for their proposed use.
SEPP No 59—Central Western Sydney Regional Open Space and Residential	Not applicable.
SEPP No 60—Exempt and Complying Development	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP No 62—Sustainable Aquaculture	Not applicable.

State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)	Comment
SEPP No 64—Advertising and Signage	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP No 65—Design Quality of Residential Flat Development	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP. The built form analysis which underpins the proposed density, height and building envelope controls reflects the requirements of the Residential Flat Design Code.
SEPP No 70—Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP. The Green Square Affordable Housing Scheme will continue to apply to the precinct under Sydney LEP 2012.
SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection	Not applicable.
SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP (Major Development) 2005	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006	Not applicable.
SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP (Kosciuszko National Park—Alpine Resorts) 2007	Not applicable.
SEPP (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007	Not applicable.
SEPP (Temporary Structures) 2007	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008	Not applicable.
SEPP (Western Sydney Parklands) 2009	Not applicable.
SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this SEPP.
SEPP (Western Sydney Employment Area) 2009	Not applicable.
SEPP (Development on Kurnell Peninsula) 2005	Not applicable.

Table 5 - Consistency with former Sydney and Greater Metropolitan Regional Environmental Plans (REPs)

Regional Environmental Plan (REPs)	Comment
Sydney REP No 5—(Chatswood Town Centre)	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 8 (Central Coast Plateau Areas)	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 9—Extractive Industry (No 2—1995)	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 11—Penrith Lakes Scheme	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 13—Mulgoa Valley	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 16—Walsh Bay	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 17—Kurnell Peninsula (1989)	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 18—Public Transport Corridors	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 19—Rouse Hill Development Area	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 20—Hawkesbury- Nepean River (No 2—1997)	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 24—Homebush Bay Area	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 25—Orchard Hills	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 26—City West	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 28—Parramatta	Not applicable.

Regional Environmental Plan (REPs)	Comment
Sydney REP No 29—Rhodes Peninsula	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 30—St Marys	Not applicable.
Sydney REP No 33—Cooks Cove	Not applicable.
Sydney REP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005	Consistent - The Planning Proposal will not contradict or hinder application of this REP.
Drinking Water Catchments REP No 1	Not applicable.
Greater Metropolitan REP No 2— Georges River Catchment	Not applicable.

Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?

The Planning Proposal has been assessed against each Section 117 Direction. The consistency of the Planning Proposal with these directions is shown in **Table 6** below.

Table 6 - Consistency with applicable Ministerial Directions under Section 117

No.	Title	Comment
1. Employment and Resources		
1.1	Business and Industrial Zones	Consistent. Whilst the Planning Proposal seeks to rezone part of the precinct from a predominantly employment based zone, the proposed B4 Mixed Use zone will allow the continued operation and introduction of new employment uses compatible with the area. The proposed FSR controls also seek to encourage non-residential uses by permitting a higher FSR for such developments. Supporting DCP controls seek to achieve non-residential uses at ground level across much of the precinct and to establish activity strips of non-residential uses along the key north-south and east-west street in the precinct.
1.2	Rural Zones	Not applicable.
1.3	Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries	Not applicable.
1.4	Oyster Aquaculture	Not applicable.
1.5	Rural Lands	Not applicable.
2. Environment and Heritage		
2.1	Environment Protection Zones	Not applicable.
2.2	Coastal Protection	Not applicable.
2.3	Heritage Conservation	Consistent. The Planning Proposal seeks to list the existing heritage item at 866-882 Bourke Street, Waterloo in <i>Schedule 5 Environmental Heritage, Part 1 Heritage items</i> under Sydney LEP 2012.
2.4	Recreation Vehicle Areas	Not applicable.
3. Housing Infrastructure and Urban Development		
3.1	Residential Zones	Consistent. The Planning Proposal will facilitate delivery of 4,000 dwellings in the precinct, increasing the amount and variety of housing in the City of Sydney LGA area.
3.2	Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home Estates	Not applicable.
3.3	Home Occupations	Consistent. The Planning Proposal does not contradict or hinder

		application of the home occupation provisions of Sydney LEP 2012.
3.4	Integrating Land Use and Transport	Consistent. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the aims, objectives and principles of <i>Improving Transport Choice – Guidelines for planning and development</i> (DUAP 2001) and <i>The Right Place for Business and Services – Planning Policy</i> (DUAP 2001). Integrating the Lachlan Precinct within Sydney LEP 2012 will apply the Land Use and Transport Integration and Public Transport Accessibility Level parking restrictions to the precinct. This should help to discourage private vehicle use. The planning controls will also facilitate delivery of a key public transport corridor and new cycling and pedestrian links.
3.5	Development Near Licensed Aerodromes	Not applicable.
3.6	Shooting Ranges	Not applicable.
4. Hazard and Risk		
4.1	Acid Sulfate Soils	Consistent. The Planning Proposal does not contradict or hinder application of acid sulphate soils provisions in Sydney LEP 2012.
4.2	Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	Not applicable.
4.3	Flood Prone Land	Consistent. The Planning Proposal does not contradict or hinder application of flood prone land provisions in Sydney LEP 2012.
4.4	Planning for Bushfire Protection	Not applicable.
5. Regional Planning		
5.1	Implementation of Regional Strategies	Not applicable.
5.2	Sydney Drinking Water Catchments	Not applicable.
5.3	Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast	Not applicable.
5.4	Commercial and Retail Development along the Pacific Highway, North Coast	Not applicable.
5.8	Second Sydney Airport, Badgerys Creek	Not applicable.
6. Local Plan Making		
6.1	Approval and Referral Requirements	Consistent. The Planning Proposal does not include any concurrence, consultation or referral provisions nor does it identify any development as designated development.
6.2	Reserving Land for Public Purposes	Consistent. The Planning Proposal will not affect any land reserved for public purposes. The reservation along the southern side of Lachlan Street, required by the NSW Roads and Maritime Services for road widening, will be shown in the relevant LEP map as 'Classified Road SP2'.
6.3	Site Specific Provisions	Consistent. The Planning Proposal does not contradict or hinder the application of this s.117 Direction.
7. Metropolitan Planning		
7.1	Implementation of the Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036	Consistent.

		The Planning Proposal does not contradict or hinder achievement of the vision, land use strategy, policies, outcomes or actions of the <i>Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036</i> .
--	--	---

Section C – Environmental, social and economic impact

Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

The land subject to this Planning Proposal has been previously developed and has not been identified as containing critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats.

The Planning Proposal provides the opportunity for the enhancement of local biodiversity through the establishment of new parks and landscaped setbacks.

In considering a development proposal in the precinct, the consent authority must have regard to the suitability of the land for development and any environmental impact which may be generated by the development.

Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the Planning Proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

The proposed amendments to Sydney LEP 2012 are a translation of current controls for the precinct into a *Standard Instrument* format. They are unlikely to result in environmental effects beyond those currently impacting the precinct or that cannot be managed through other existing policies and regulations. The key environmental considerations arising from the Planning Proposal relate to transport and traffic, flooding, contamination, and amenity, and are discussed in detail below.

Transport and traffic

Since early 2000 in the long term planning for the Green Square Urban Renewal Area (including the precinct), the City has carried out or has partnered in a number of transport studies and management plans to address road capacity, traffic management and transport infrastructure to support the redevelopment of Green Square. In general, studies have shown that while there is some capacity in the road network, this is limited, and transport measures must be implemented as development occurs. Some key actions to address this are outlined below:

- Continuing advocacy by the City for improved public transport in the Green Square area;
- Securing as development occurs the key transport corridor, the Eastern Transit Corridor, which connects Green Square Town Centre with Central, along Gadigal Avenue through the eastern residential precincts of Green Square. Gadigal Avenue is the primary north-south link through the precinct. The City has acquired land within the precinct along this corridor. Some land still needs to be secured before the full corridor can be realised. The City continues to work with the NSW Government to secure the corridor;
- Planning and design work for increased and improved pedestrian and cycle connections throughout the precinct, the wider area and to public transport networks to encourage sustainable travel behaviour and achieve better integration between transport modes;
- Continuing to advocate with Transport for NSW for completing an update to the 2008 *Green Square Transport Management and Accessibility Plan* (TMAP). The update is to review assumptions contained in the 2008 TMAP and establish clear directions and agency responsibility for managing transport demand and improving public transport accessibility and services as the area redevelops.
- Continuing work by the City with Transport for NSW to develop measures to improve transport in this area. This includes for example measures to improve the capacity of the existing public transport corridors, and improve reliability and travel times for buses.

Flooding

The location of streets and open space has been determined to ensure that the impacts of flooding in the precinct are mitigated, providing overland flowpaths to drain ponding and release trapped low points in and around the precinct. An associated drainage network, under the proposed public domain, has also been designed to alleviate above ground flooding. The precinct will also be subject to the flooding provisions contained in clause 7.15 Flooding of the Sydney LEP 2012.

The local park to be provided within the Wulaba Park site can be designed to provide stormwater detention and water treatment benefits. New streets will also incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) features such as bio-swales and rain gardens, which will act to slow stormwater flows and improve the quality of run off.

Contamination

As with all brownfield urban renewal, contaminated land is a potential environmental issue. The precinct is currently occupied by a variety of industrial uses which are likely to have an associated risk of contamination. However, given that residential development is already permitted within the precinct, the proposal to establish a B4 Mixed Uses zoning does not give rise to additional implications in this regard. Detailed information relating to contamination will be required at the development application stage and remediation will be required where necessary.

Amenity

The detailed built form provisions, particularly development density and building height and distribution, have been rigorously tested to ensure that amenity to existing and future residents is maximised. Supporting controls will be provided within the amendment to the Sydney DCP 2012 to ensure that appropriate levels of amenity are achieved. Further, SEPP 65 would ensure any overshadowing or overlooking is minimised at development application stage to protect the amenity of surrounding properties.

Has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

The Planning Proposal does not seek to significantly amend the current controls relating to the precinct in terms of permissible land uses and built form. It seeks to incorporate controls into Sydney LEP 2012 and Sydney DCP 2012 to provide consistency and certainty in the development process, and in accordance with the *Standard Instrument (Local Environmental Plans) Order 2006*.

The Planning Proposal does not seek to impact upon the operation of existing viable businesses operating in the precinct, instead providing controls to enable the development of sites which are vacant or available for redevelopment.

Redevelopment of the precinct will realise a number of social and economic benefits, including the delivery of 4,000 dwellings, in turn providing greater housing choice, and new public infrastructure, including streets, open spaces, pedestrian links and cycle routes. An 'activity strip' in the central third of the precinct, lined with new café, retail and service uses, will link the precinct's open spaces and provide a community hub for both workers and residents.

Section D – State and Commonwealth interests

Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

The precinct is located approximately 1,500 metres from the Green Square rail station and is fairly well serviced by bus routes between the City, Bondi Junction, Eastgardens and Botany. The redevelopment of the precinct will also support the realisation of the light rail corridor between the Green Square Town Centre and Central.

New social infrastructure is also to be provided within walking and cycling distance, including 15,000sqm of public open space within the precinct, an aquatic centre and playing fields in Epsom

Park to the south, and a library and other civic and community facilities in the Town Centre. Some of this infrastructure is being delivered through the private development of sites, whilst some is being delivered by the City.

However, improvements to existing public infrastructure are required to support the growth of the precinct and the wider Green Square Renewal Area. This includes improvements to public transport connections and to services and education facilities. This infrastructure is the responsibility of the NSW Government. The City continues to advocate for these improvements. Consultation with public agencies through the preparation of the Planning Proposal will provide opportunity for further discussions with the NSW Government.

NSW Government-provided Facilities and Services

Provision of a range of facilities and services accessible to Lachlan are the remit of NSW Government agencies. These include health and education services and a range of community services, such as aged care, early childhood health and homelessness support services.

The City advocates on behalf of the wider community to seek to ensure that adequate facilities and services provided by other levels of government are available to those living and working within the LGA.

As part of this agenda, the City participates in cross-government forums. In recent years, it participated in an inter-agency Steering Group coordinated by the NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet, which was established to consider the social infrastructure needs arising from the urban renewal of Green Square. This group included representatives from a range of agencies including NSW Health, NSW Police and DEC.

The City understands that the re-establishment of this working group is currently being considered by relevant agencies. The City will seek to continue to participate in these discussions, to ensure that relevant NSW agencies are aware of development in Lachlan and are able to plan for adequate services to be in place as development occurs.

Education

NSW Department of Education (NSW DEC) has responsibility for ensuring sufficient primary and secondary school places are available to meet local communities' needs. The agency manages school enrolment demand on an ongoing basis, in cooperation with school principals. The City supports this work through assisting with information on forecast population growth, including that associated with urban renewal areas such as Lachlan.

City staff are in regular contact with the NSW DEC regarding the forecasted growth in the local population (an increase of 35.8% (5,300 residents) between the 2006 and 2011 census, compared to 10.8% across the City of Sydney).

Healthcare

NSW Government health services are now delivered on a localised basis through Local Health Districts, which are supported by local boards. Lachlan is located within the Inner West Medicare Local Area. This network includes GPs, hospitals and allied health services. The clinical service, including psychological services, affordable paediatric speech therapy, and dental services for health care card holders, will complement existing public, private and NGO services.

In September 2013, services provided by NSW Family and Community Services (FACS) were restructured to a localised delivery model aligned with local health district boundaries. The District Director is responsible for housing, disability and community services service planning and development. Through this structure, FACS provides services to:

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders;
- children and young people;
- families;
- the homeless;
- people with a disability, their families and carers;

- women; and
- older people.

The City will continue to work with the relevant stakeholders in the Sydney South FACS District to help ensure that appropriate and effective services are available to the emerging Lachlan community.

Childcare

The City has recently completed a comprehensive Child Care Needs Analysis Study to investigate issues associated with child care supply and demand across the LGA, including the changing policy context impacting on supply, and changing population trends.

The study is published on the City's website, and its findings indicate a very strong and growing demand for child care facilities across all parts of the City. The current supply shortfall is estimated at more than 3,000 places.

The current estimated gap in demand has been assessed across every Village Group, and the Village Groups within the City South Area have been identified as a high priority with the current undersupply of places estimated as a 353 place shortfall for the Green Square and City South village area.

The study concludes that a range of strategies are urgently needed to increase the supply of childcare places to meet this shortfall, including increased delivery by the private and not-for-profit sectors, in part facilitated by the City, and increased action at all levels of government.

The City has committed to investing \$55M to fast track the direct delivery of new childcare centres and will continue to facilitate delivery of new centres by the private sector through its planning instruments.

Open Space Provision

The City has identified a total of 73,000 square metres of new open space across the Green Square urban renewal area and around 15,000 square metres in Lachlan (Rope Walk Park, Wulaba Park and Duralya Park). There are also large existing open spaces close to the Lachlan precinct, at Moore Park and Joynton Park.

Plans are underway to provide a new aquatic facility and gym in the Epsom Park Precinct, at Joynton Avenue in Zetland. It is anticipated that this will be delivered in late 2018, and is located approximately 800 metres from Lachlan. The newly completed Prince Alfred Park Pool is also approximately two kilometres from Lachlan.

Community Support

The City understand that communities in high density areas need to be supported and employs a Community Development Coordinator who is responsible for community engagement across a number of communities in the LGA that are affected by major redevelopment. This work to date includes helping a number of groups in Green Square in building community business partnerships, applying for grants and running pilot programmes like Infohub, a resident drop-in information centre in Zetland.

What are the views of state and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the Gateway determination?

State and Commonwealth public authorities will be consulted in accordance with the Gateway Determination.