



North East Local Area Plan



Submissions Report

April 2016

Contents

Summary of Submissions

Greenacre Small Village Centre (Action L1)	2
Punchbowl Small Village Centre (Action L2)	9
Hume Highway Enterprise Corridor (Action L5)	13
Canterbury Road Enterprise Corridor (Action L5)	16
Open Space (Action G1)	17
Government agencies and neighbouring councils	23

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

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 149 [Resident] Chaseling Street in Greenacre	This submission requests the rezoning of the properties in Chaseling Street (south side) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (4 storeys) as no one will be affected by the building height. This change will match the building height proposed in Chaseling Street (north side).	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to rezone the properties in Chaseling Street (south side) from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R3 Medium Density Residential (3 storeys).</p> <p>In considering this submission, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the small village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place.</p> <p>The review process recommends continuing with low-rise buildings at this location. This location is located at the edge of the Residential Frame precinct and the intended outcome is to provide an appropriate built form transition to the Greenacre Public School to the south. Based on the key considerations around building heights, allow up to 3 storeys to achieve better design outcomes.</p>	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 135 [Property owner]</p> <p>Nos. 76–80 & 84–86 Waterloo Road in Greenacre</p>	<p>This submission requests the rezoning of the properties at Nos. 76–80 & 84–86 Waterloo Road from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone R4 High Density Residential (6 storeys).</p> <p>The subject site lends itself to a larger and taller redevelopment due to access to transport, retail, community facilities and open space. The redevelopment would also produce positive urban design outcomes.</p> <p>The proposed 4 storeys (1:1 FSR) proposed on other parts of the small village centre is not likely to result in viable redevelopment scenarios.</p>	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action L1 did not propose to rezone Nos. 76–80 & 84–86 Waterloo Road as these properties fall outside the walking catchment of the small village centre.</p> <p>In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the village centre is a compact place. The structure plan identifies the small village centre boundary as a 5–10 minute walking distance measured from the main street (Waterloo Road). This distance provides an adequate level of containment for a centre of this size, and is an appropriate fit within the centres hierarchy.</p> <p>The review process does not propose to include these properties within the small village centre as these properties continue to fall outside the walking catchment. The current 2 storey limit would continue to apply.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 26 [Resident]</p> <p>Nos. 209–211 Waterloo Road in Greenacre</p>	<p>This submission does not support the proposed rezoning of the properties at Nos. 209–211 Waterloo Road from Zone R2 (2 storeys) to Zone B2 (6 storeys).</p> <p>The proposed rezoning would prohibit dual occupancies and make the properties unsellable except to developers. The proposed 6 storey height would also compromise the streetscape as it would adjoin the recently constructed Department of Housing property (2 storeys) which is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to rezone these properties from Zone R2 Low Density Residential (2 storeys) to Zone B2 Local Centre (6 storeys).</p> <p>In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the small village centre is a compact place, whilst responding to and reflecting the village feel and unique characteristics of the place. The review process identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The small village centre boundary as a 5–10 minute walking distance measured from the main street (Waterloo Road). 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 properties at Nos. 209–211 Waterloo Road form part of this compact place. There is the potential for these properties to function as part of the retail main street. However, it is noted these properties form the northern boundary of the retail main street and should therefore provide an appropriate height transition between the existing residential flat building at No. 201 Waterloo Road (2 storeys) and the adjoining low-rise housing (4 storeys) at Nos. 213–245 Waterloo Road. <p>Based on the review, it is proposed to amend the building height at Nos. 209–211 Waterloo Road from 6 storeys to 4 storeys to provide an appropriate transition to the adjoining low-rise housing in the Residential Frame precinct.</p>	<p>Amend Action L1: Amend the proposed building envelope controls for Nos. 209–211 Waterloo Road to 4 storeys / 2:1 FSR.</p>

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 6 [Resident]</p> <p>Greenacre Small Village Centre</p>	<p>This submission raises concern with the range of proposed building heights in the shopping village area and would prefer a single height of 4 storeys across the centre.</p> <p>Other centres which have introduced greater building heights have lost their appeal. Buildings greater than 4 storeys also require lifts, which would increase strata levies and make these dwellings unattractive to first home owners.</p> <p>This submission highlights the importance of preserving green space / recreation areas and leisure activities within the area.</p> <p>This submission requests a reduction in the minimum lot width to allow development on existing lots without having to acquire more land. Development should also allow a single lot to have 3 rowhouses or 4 units with a 0.75:1–1:1 FSR.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The review process identifies the main street (Waterloo Road) 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 small village centre is comprised of buildings that create 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.</p> <p>There is the opportunity for an 8 storey element within Community Place, which will function as the heart of the small village centre. To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a masterplan as part of the Community Place Activation Project to better inform the community on the future of Community Place. The masterplan will explore the development options to create an enlivened mixed use destination, and will provide public space as part of this mixed use destination.</p> <p>The review process does not propose to change the minimum lot width requirements if development is to achieve better design outcomes. The current requirements ensure properties in the Residential Frame and Terrace Housing precincts can accommodate buildings, open spaces and setbacks, as well as driveways and services within a 0.75:1–1:1 FSR.</p>	<p>Amend Action L1: Amend Figure 9.6 to indicate that Council will prepare a masterplan as part of the Community Place Activation Project.</p> <p>No change is proposed.</p>

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission Nos. 23, 46, 90, 161, 170 & 190 [Residents and community group]</p> <p>Greenacre Small Village Centre</p>	<p>These submissions do not support the proposed redevelopment of Community Place for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed densities are not in proportion with the amount of open / green space in the area. • The site is partly covered by an electricity easement and a designated flood zone. • The proposal will remove the Greenacre Leisure Centre, the car park behind the Greenacre Hotel, and the parkland and trees (which is frequented by native birds). • The proposal to allow multi-storey flats is not compatible with the current character of the suburb, and will result in overcrowding and stormwater runoff. <p>Submission No. 46 specifically suggests retaining the green space, the historic designed library and the swimming pool, and to construct a new 3 storey glass cube to accommodate the multi-purpose community facility (similar to the Bankstown Library and Knowledge Centre).</p> <p>Submission No. 190 specifically suggests water features and outdoor cinema.</p>	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to transform Community Place into an enlivened mixed use destination, which includes a modern community facility and successful civic space that strengthens the local identity, and can accommodate a range of activities and events that meet the needs of the growing community.</p> <p>The new facility will replace the ageing buildings in the small village centre including the library, senior citizens centre and early childhood health centre. There is no proposal to heritage list these buildings based on the criteria set by the NSW Heritage Office.</p> <p>In considering this submission and following a review, Action L1 articulates Council's intent, including the provision of higher density development in Community Place to increase the ability for people to live close to services and facilities.</p> <p>To facilitate this action, Council will prepare a masterplan as part of the Community Place Activation Project. The masterplan will explore the development options to create an enlivened mixed use destination, and will provide public space as part of this mixed use destination.</p> <p>The intention is to undertake more detailed consultation with the community to discuss future community needs for the area.</p>	<p>Amend Action L1: Amend Figure 9.6 to indicate that Council will prepare a masterplan as part of the Community Place Activation Project.</p>

<p>Submission Nos. 23, 90, 161, 170 and 190 specifically raise concern with the proposed densities as more people and cars will result in congestion and parking problems, particularly as Greenacre does not have a railway station. Truck movements will increase due to the Enfield goods yard.</p>	<p>Submission No. 46 specifically raises concern with the proposed walking and cycling routes as people must cross roads with heavy traffic.</p> <p>This submission also raises concern about parking, and suggests the construction of 3 storey car parks in Community Place and Wilbur Street.</p>	<p>In response to community feedback, Council reviewed the structure plan to ensure the small village centre is a place of connection. The movement of people is fundamental to the success of the centre.</p> <p>With more pedestrians on the streets, getting around the small village centre easily and safely will become an even greater priority to ensure we have a balanced transport system. Action L1 therefore incorporates the findings of the Centres Transport Action Plan. The findings propose to have cars travel slowly in the small village centre, making streets easier to cross and a pleasant place to walk, sit and talk; and allows for gradual increases in parking capacity at convenient locations around the small village centre.</p> <p>Action L1 also proposes to improve the function and appearance of the car park at Nos. 183–185 Wilbur Street and No. 265 Wangee Road (based on developer contributions) to service the shops where the bulk of the parking demand will be generated.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>
<p>Submission No. 23 specifically raises concern with the proposed densities as it will increase crime in the area.</p>		<p>The proposal to increase the number of residents living in the small village centre provides the opportunity for more casual surveillance and street activity, which may assist in providing safer areas.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

Bankstown City Council

	<p>Submission Nos. 90, 161 and 190 specifically question whether the draft plan is applicable if Bankstown is amalgamated with another council.</p>	<p>Council's strategic planning program is being undertaken to align with current State planning and urban renewal initiatives. Council will continue to work with the Department of Planning & Environment and other relevant state agencies to streamline plan making and renewal opportunities and promote the principles of urban consolidation to ensure better use of existing infrastructure across the city.</p> <p>Council is committed to ensuring its strategic planning program is designed to provide certainty to industry and community on the scale, timing and location of growth and how this growth will be supported by necessary infrastructure, services and facilities. Council would be able to continue with the above whilst the State Government considers the proposed amalgamation of the Bankstown and Canterbury local government areas. It is noted that Council's position on the proposed amalgamation is to stand-alone.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>
	<p>Submission No. 190 specifically questions the timing and infrastructure of the community hub at Roberts Park.</p> <p>The park is a football oval and it is not known whether other sporting activities could take place, especially in winter when the park is used exclusively for football. There is no mention of additional parking to support the community hub.</p>	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action L1 proposed to transform Roberts Park into a recreation and leisure destination that meets the needs of the growing community.</p> <p>In considering this submission and following a review, Action L1 articulates Council's intent to consolidate the youth activities currently dispersed in the local area. This action will require a review of the plan of management in the short-medium term, and this review will consider the issue of parking.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

Summary of Submissions–Punchbowl Small Village Centre (Action L2)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 84 [Property owner] Nos. 30–32 Acacia Avenue in Punchbowl	This submission supports the proposed changes to the properties at Nos. 30–32 Acacia Avenue from Zone R2 (2 storeys / 0.5:1 FSR) to Zone R4 (6 storeys / 1.5:1 FSR).	This comment is noted.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 182 [Property owner] Breust Place in Punchbowl</p>	<p>These submissions do not support the proposed listing of the facades along Breust Place as there has been modifications and alterations to the original buildings over the years. The preference is to preserve the heritage significance using photo documentation or other high tech device. The listing may also deter or hinder development in the area.</p>	<p>In considering these submissions, Council reviewed Action L2 and notes the requirement for the Local Area Plan to identify and protect places of heritage significance.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p> <p>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.</p>

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
Submission No. 113 [Property owner] Highclere Avenue in Punchbowl	This submission requests 20 storeys for the property at No. 18 Highclere Avenue (similar to Burwood). This will provide young families with affordable housing near the railway station.	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to increase the building height for this property from 3 storeys (plus attic) to 8 storeys. This is consistent with the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy, released by the Department of Planning & Environment. Following a review process, it is proposed to continue with the proposed 8 storeys as the recommendations of the Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy remain unchanged.	No change is proposed.
Submission No. 10 [Property owner] South Terrace in Punchbowl	This submission supports the proposed changes to the small village centre and requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 storeys for properties in South Terrace. • A reduction in the minimum lot size for residential flat buildings from 1,500m² to 1,300m². 	As part of the exhibition, Action L2 proposed to increase the building heights for certain properties in South Terrace from 2 storeys (plus attic) to 6 storeys. This is consistent with the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy, released by the Department of Planning & Environment. Following a review process, it is proposed to continue with the proposed 6 storeys as the recommendations of the Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy remain unchanged. In addition, the review process does not propose to change the minimum lot size requirement if development is to achieve better design outcomes. The current lot size requirement ensures properties in the Residential Frame precinct can accommodate buildings, open spaces and setbacks, as well as driveways and services.	No change is proposed.

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 169 [Resident]</p> <p>Punchbowl Small Village Centre</p>	<p>This submission raises concern there is a significant lack of infrastructure planning detail. The most crucial task is to deal with the through traffic on Punchbowl Road, particularly at the rail overbridge.</p> <p>This submission suggests relocating the railway station towards the Broadway development or south (opposite Kelly Street). This would permit two extra traffic lanes to proceed south on Punchbowl Road to the rail overbridge and permitting both lanes to turn left into The Boulevard. This may require some property acquisition. The benefit would be two lanes of through traffic toward Canterbury Road (with clearway restrictions).</p> <p>There is also no right turn from Stacey Street into Griffiths Avenue, requiring a 1.2km detour to access local streets in the residential sector.</p> <p>This submission raises concern that action is required to address traffic congestion, parking, clearway restrictions and peak traffic in Punchbowl Road, South Terrace and Myall Street. Any development in the small village centre should encourage the consolidation of narrow roads and laneways to provide adequate breathing space and open areas.</p>	<p>Action L2 incorporates the Department of Planning & Environment’s Draft Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy, which outlines future housing development and infrastructure delivery in the small village centre. The vision is to have more people living close to the railway station and the Sydney Metro Line.</p> <p>To facilitate this action, the Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy contains recommended infrastructure improvements to support this growth. The improvements include increasing train and bus frequencies, streetscape works, footpath and cycle links, and new open space. The improvements also encourage the retention of rear laneways.</p> <p>Council will advocate the State Government to assist with funding, as well as provide an accessible railway station with better pedestrian and road links across the railway corridor.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

Summary of Submissions–Hume Highway Enterprise Corridor (Action L5)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 124 [Property owner]</p> <p>Nos. 167–183 Hume Highway in Greenacre</p>	<p>This submission requests the following changes to the properties at Nos. 167–183 Hume Highway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the building envelope controls to 6 storeys / 2:1 FSR. • Remove the amalgamation requirement with the properties at Nos. 165 and 185 Hume Highway and No. 74 Tennyson Road. • Reduce the rear setback from 10 to 9 metres and the side setback from 10 to 6 metres. <p>These proposed changes are supported by a concept design report.</p>	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action L5 proposed to increase the FSR for the properties at Nos. 167–183 Hume Highway from 1:1 to 1.5:1. Action L5 also proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow for architectural corner features at the north–east corner of the site to add visual interest. Specific to the property at No. 167 Hume Highway, this may be in the form of an extra storey or other measure that provides a balanced response to the horizontal and vertical proportions of the buildings. • To reduce the highway setback for dwellings from 20 to 10 metres provided there is appropriate amenity (noise and air quality) protection for future residents. Otherwise a 20 metre setback will apply. • To remove the 2 storey buffer to the side and rear boundaries. • To maintain the landscaping requirement to enhance the Remembrance Driveway landscape corridor. • To maintain the lot consolidation requirement in the DCP. <p>In response to the issues raised in this submission and previous submissions, a review of the properties was undertaken to determine if there was merit to a further increase in FSR. This was carried out by an independent specialist with significant expertise in development and planning. The review found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 4 storey building height is suitable for this site. • The proposed 1.5:1 FSR is consistent with the building height. The review does not recommend a FSR greater than 1.5:1 at this site. • The minimum highway setback for dwellings would need to reduce to 10 metres to accommodate the floor space ratio. 	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is the opportunity to standardise the side setbacks to accommodate the floor space ratio. <p>The review also tested the feasibility of the proposed 1.5:1 FSR and found the value of the current business use (liquor and gaming licenses) is significant. A mixed use development combining the current business use with dwellings would improve the feasibility of development at this site.</p> <p>In terms of setbacks, the review process recommends continuing with the proposed setback changes outlined in Action L5.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 125 [Property owner]</p> <p>Nos. 119–151 Hume Highway, Nos. 50–54 Shellcote Road, No. 306 Noble Avenue & No. 1Z Cahill Lane in Greenacre</p>	<p>This submission requests the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone the properties at Nos. 119–135 Hume Highway, No. 54 Shellcote Road and No. 1Z Cahill Lane from Zone B5 Business Development to Zone B6 Enterprise Corridor. • Rezone the properties at No. 50 Shellcote Road and No. 306 Noble Avenue from Zone R2 Low Density Residential to Zone B6 Enterprise Corridor. <p>This rezoning will facilitate orderly and efficient land use planning and assemble the entire site for redevelopment. The rezoning could accommodate ground floor development of a car dealership with a podium above to accommodate other employment uses. These uses are compatible and not mutually exclusive.</p>	<p>The properties at Nos. 119–151 Hume Highway and No. 54 Shellcote Road are currently located within Zone B5 Business Development. As part of the exhibition, Action L5 proposed to maintain the current zoning of these properties consistent with the Hume Highway Corridor Strategy, and to rezone the property at No. 1Z Cahill Lane from Zone R2 Low Density Residential to Zone B5 Business Development.</p> <p>In considering this submission and following a review, it is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To continue with the current zoning of Nos. 119–135 Hume Highway and No. 54 Shellcote Road, and the proposal to rezone No. 1Z Cahill Lane to Zone B5 Business Development. <p>The property owner is proposing to expand an existing vehicle sales or hire premises on these properties, and Zone B5 allows vehicle sales or hire premises and other employment uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To amend Action L5 to rezone No. 50 Shellcote Road and No. 306 Noble Avenue from Zone R2 Low Density Residential to Zone B5 Business Development. This zone reflects the current use of the properties as a vehicle sales or hire premises. <p>The review process does not recommend changing to Zone B6 Enterprise Corridor as the intended outcome of this zone is to provide for residential uses, but only as part of a mixed use development. There is no identified need for additional housing at Nos. 119–135 Hume Highway, Nos. 50–54 Shellcote Road, No. 306 Noble Avenue and No. 1Z Cahill Lane.</p>	<p>Amend Action L5: Rezone No. 50 Shellcote Road and No. 306 Noble Avenue from Zone R2 Low Density Residential to Zone B5 Business Development.</p>

Summary of Submissions–Canterbury Road Enterprise Corridor (Action L5)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 179 [Property owner]</p> <p>No. 23 Canterbury Road in Punchbowl</p>	<p>This submission requests 5 storeys for the property at No. 23 Canterbury Road. This height will provide greater design flexibility including the provision of more ground floor unenclosed space (such as cafe seating and waste room to the rear).</p> <p>Should Council consider the property does not have an entitlement to full utilisation of the available density, it is requested that the western area of the site be taken into account. The unbuilt areas will contribute to the development of the site.</p> <p>If the neighbouring Club Punchbowl site is permitted to extend to 5 storeys, the scale of development on the site will appear incongruous.</p>	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action L5 proposed to continue with the current building envelope controls for the property at No. 23 Canterbury Road. This reflects the electricity and drainage easements, which significantly constrain the potential for mixed use or residential development on this property.</p> <p>In considering this submission and following a review, it is proposed to continue with this approach as the location of this property does not offer good amenity for increased densities.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

Summary of Submissions–Open Space (Action G1)

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 79 [Resident including a petition with 65 signatures]</p> <p>No. 102 Columbine Avenue in Punchbowl (Warwick Reserve)</p>	<p>This submission requests that should Council divest Warwick Reserve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rezoning of the property is specific to Zone R2 Low Density Residential. • Council create a drainage easement along the northern boundary to allow for drainage from Nos. 90–100 Columbine Avenue. • Council use the funds from the sale to upgrade Author Park (which requires landscaping and lighting). <p>This submission does not support the proposed rezoning of the property to Zone B1 Neighbourhood Centre as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is inconsistent with the surrounding area. • It will lead to parking congestion and place pressure on Pratten Lane. • It will result in loss of amenity through added noise. 	<p>In considering this submission and following a review, it is proposed to continue with the proposal to rezone the property at No. 102 Columbine Avenue from Zone RE1 Public Recreation to Zone B1 Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>Zone B1 is compatible with the adjoining local shops (Nos. 90–100 Columbine Avenue) and allows a range of land uses that may adapt to the triangular shape of the property. It is also proposed to apply the same building envelope controls as the adjoining local shops, which is 2 storeys (plus attic).</p> <p>However, this rezoning is subject to Council deciding whether to divest this property. Following this decision, Council may consider issues such as easements.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 79 [Resident including a petition with 65 signatures]</p> <p>No. 102 Columbine Avenue in Punchbowl (Warwick Reserve)</p>	<p>This submission does not support the proposal to increase the building height of certain properties within Zone B1 from 2 storeys (plus attic) to 3 storeys (no attic). The concern is this height increase will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set a precedent for all properties within Zone B1. • Increase the bulk and scale. • Promote bad design, and promote development that is out of character with the surrounding R2 zone. Keeping the 2 storey pitch roof maintains that character. • Ignore the minimum 26 metre frontage required for multi residential construction (as stated in the DCP). 	<p>According to Action L4, there is some potential for the Suburban Neighbourhood precinct to accommodate growth.</p> <p>The research reviewed the neighbourhood shops within this precinct based on certain criteria (together with the surrounding context) to decide if there is potential for additional density.</p> <p>The research identified certain neighbourhood shops where there is the potential for additional density in the form of 3 storey development. These locations are Nos. 53–71 Hume Highway, Nos. 118–120 Rawson Road, and Nos. 331–341 and 342–344 Waterloo Road.</p> <p>The research does not identify the neighbourhood shops at Nos. 90–100 Columbine Avenue or the adjoining property at No. 102 Columbine Avenue as an appropriate location to allow 3 storey development.</p> <p>In considering this submission, it is not considered that allowing 3 storey development at certain neighbourhood shops will set a precedent for all properties within Zone B1. The DCP will contain provisions to maintain the 2 storey limit (plus attic) at the neighbourhood shops at Nos. 90–102 Columbine Avenue.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission Nos. 37 and 170 [Residents]</p> <p>No. 8A Fairland Avenue in Greenacre (Fairland Reserve)</p>	<p>These submissions do not support the proposed divestment of Fairland Reserve as the redevelopment of the property will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase traffic flow in the street. • Result in the loss of native gum trees which are home to an array of wild birdlife, bats and possums. • Result in the loss of a safe and accessible green open space which is enjoyed by residents and children. 	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action G1 proposed to investigate divestment of the property at No. 8A Fairland Avenue (known as Fairland Reserve), and to utilise the funds for the purchase and embellishment of new and existing open space. It is also proposed to rezone the property to Zone R2 Low Density Residential and to reclassify to operational land.</p> <p>In response to community feedback, Council reviewed Action G1 and the status of this property.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Following the review, the property at No. 8A Fairland Avenue continues to meet the specific circumstances outlined above.</p> <p>Action G1 analysed the current supply and distribution of open space in Greenacre, and found that dwellings around Fairland Avenue are within easy walking distance of Bromley Reserve and Gosling Park. The open space at No. 8A Fairland Avenue is in proximity to these two good quality parks, and is surplus to future population and recreation needs (based on the criteria set out in the Open Space Strategic Plan).</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

		<p>In considering this submission and following a review, it is proposed to rezone this property from Zone RE1 Public Recreation to Zone R2 Low Density Residential, which is compatible with the surrounding suburban neighbourhood.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Submissions	Issues	Council Response	Actions
<p>Submission No. 170 [Resident]</p> <p>Various open spaces</p>	<p>This submission does not support the proposed divestment of the property at No. 28 Peter Crescent in Greenacre (Peter Reserve) as it is a small grassy park with children’s play equipment.</p>	<p>As part of the exhibition, Action G1 proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To investigate divestment of the property at No. 28 Peter Crescent (known as Peter Reserve). It is also proposed to rezone the property to Zone B6 Enterprise Corridor and to reclassify to operational land. • To investigate divestment of the property at No. 10 Treuer Lane. It is also proposed to reclassify to operational land. • To investigate divestment of the properties at Nos. 16–17 Salamander Place. It is also proposed to reclassify to operational land. <p>Action G1 also proposes to utilise the funds for the purchase and embellishment of new and existing open space.</p> <p>In response to community feedback, Council reviewed Action G1 and the status of this property.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Following the review, the properties at No. 28 Peter Crescent, No. 10 Treuer Lane and Nos. 16–17 Salamander Place continue to meet the specific circumstances outlined above.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>
	<p>This submission does not support the proposed divestment of the property at No. 10 Treuer Lane in Greenacre.</p>		
	<p>This submission does not support the proposed divestment of Nos. 16–17 Salamander Place in Greenacre as this is a grassy area with mature trees.</p>		

		It is therefore proposed to continue with the option of divesting these properties. However in the case of No. 28 Peter Crescent, the proposed rezoning is subject to Council deciding whether to divest this property.	
	This submission does not support the proposed divestment of operational land. Council should keep the land if it requires an easement.	As part of the exhibition, Action G5 proposed to divest certain operational land, which are identified as surplus to Council's needs. This is based on an operational land analysis. In considering this submission and following a review, the properties identified in Action G5 continue to meet the divestment criteria outlined in the operational land analysis. It is therefore proposed to continue with the option of divesting these properties.	No change is proposed.
	This submission supports the action to protect local and regionally significant conservation lands such as Norfolk Reserve.	This comment is noted.	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]	<p>This submission supports the shift in planning decisions and policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
<p>Submission No. 69 [Department of Education]</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>This comment is noted.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Council will work with the Department of Education on the implications of this proposed initiative.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>
<p>Submission No. 78 [NSW Rural Fire Service]</p>	<p>This submission raises no objection to the revised Local Area Plan.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The development application process would consider this issue.</p>	<p>No change is proposed.</p>

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]	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>	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.