

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
<p>1. <i>Resolution of matters the subject of an unresolved objection from the RMS</i></p>	<p>5. Consultation is required with the following public authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads and Maritime Services; 	N/A	<p>Letter from RMS (Dated 1/6/2017) confirms several unresolved issues:</p> <p>The cumulative traffic and transport impacts on the surrounding local and regional road network has not been adequately addressed.</p> <p>The proponent has identified that the likely future upgrade of the Victoria Road/ Sydenham Road intersection will require the acquisition of land in private ownership which is outside the boundaries of this PP. Given Council does not support the acquisition of these sites, it is concluded that the Victoria Road/ Sydenham Road intersection upgrade cannot be implemented.</p> <p>The proposal has not adequately addressed funding responsibilities and associated funding mechanisms and an Infrastructure Staging Plan which identifies the timing, cost and trigger points for the delivery of transport infrastructure upgrades. This should be undertaken prior to the gazettal of the plan and will not support the deferral of this matter to the DA stage.</p>	<p>Cumulative Impacts A further cumulative traffic analysis is not considered necessary at this stage because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The planning proposal is a long-term precinct wide proposal that will be implemented over a 10-15 year timeframe; b) Therefore demands on the road network by the proposal will be gradual and will coincide with growth across the wider area that will impact traffic movement patterns within the local road network; c) Two out of three of the intersections identified by the RMS for further cumulative impact studies are outside the Precinct, and operating at an LOS of B (good with spare capacity), and given the proposal looks at long term delivery, further studies on these intersections should not be required. <p>Future upgrade of the Victoria Road/ Sydenham Road Modelling on the Victoria Road/Sydenham Road intersection, as requested by RMS, demonstrated that the intersection would be able to accommodate growth. Further modelling, if required can occur at future stages of the development of the Precinct (e.g. DA Stage).</p> <p>The high level strategic concept design for the Vic Road/Sydenham Road intersection was designed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To specifically respond to the RMS’s ‘desired design solution’; - on the assumption that the Precinct would be developed to 100 per cent potential (which includes ALL of the B5 zoning); and - to Austroads standards and requirements, representing an ‘ideal unconstrained design

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
				<p>solution’ in response to the worst-case max. development scenario.</p> <p>Funding Mechanisms and Infrastructure Staging Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding intersection upgrades are likely to be delivered through VPAs (for land within the boundary of the PP but also for land outside of PP boundary. - Council have advised Proponent that a funding and delivery mechanism for any infrastructure upgrades could be undertaken after gazettal of the LEP.
<p>2. <i>There is to be no change to the existing IN1 – General Industrial zoning on the south-eastern side of Victoria Road. This land forms part of the core Sydenham/ Marrickville Industrial Area and should be preserved in line with the recommendations of the Marrickville Employment Lands Study and subsequent Review. Council will further consider its position subject to review of the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban</i></p>	<p>1(b) review the proposed R4 High Density Residential zoning around Wicks Park to provide a more appropriate interface and transition with the IN1 General Industrial zone at Faversham Street, either by retaining the IN1 General Industrial zone or by the application of a business zone, to provide for a suitable transition to the industrial land to the south.</p>	<p>The planning proposal has removed the R4 High Density Residential zoning around Wicks Park and applied part B4 Mixed Use and part B5 Business Development zoning to the land.</p> <p>The proposal seeks B5 Business Development to the north of Faversham Street which transitions well to the IN1 General Industrial land south of Faversham Street. Permissible uses are complimentary between both zones.</p>	<p>The planning proposal would result in the significant loss of industrial land. The draft Central District Plan encourages Council to take a ‘precautionary approach’ to the conversion of employment and urban services land and this recommendation is of particular importance to the Inner West area. There is no strategic planning or policy basis for the Victoria Road precinct to revert to a high density housing area or encourage a wholesale move away from industrial zonings.</p>	<p>Loss of Industrial Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Planning Proposal when originally submitted, proposed B4 on the Victoria Road frontage and R4 around the edges of Wicks Park. Gateway condition 1(b)asked the proponent to review that aspect by application of a business zone for a suitable transition to the industrial land to the south. The amended Planning Proposal deleted all R4 in the area and proposed that Faversham Street (west side) be changed to a B5 zone and the remainder of the area be zoned B4. The Department was satisfied the condition in the Gateway had been met, and was an appropriate land use solution. - the State Government’s Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy supports this area being zoned mixed use. - The Planning Proposal is consistent with the Strategy as outlined in the detailed Strategic Plan for the Sydenham Precinct. - The Strategy supports the rezoning of the Victoria Road Precinct and the proposed zonings in the SE corner of the Precinct.

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
<p><i>Renewal Corridor Strategy.</i></p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The council recommendation that heavy industry is located on one side of Victoria Road (the SE corner) and mixed use (with residents) on the other side will lead to a poor design outcome characterised by clashing land uses and built form on the east and west side of Victoria Road, and a lower amenity for the Precinct and may stifle investment and renewal. - 12% of the precinct will be included within a residential zone, with 88% of private land within Precinct 47 will continue to be zoned exclusively for industrial and/or business uses, and 48% of the Precinct will be retained as its existing zoning including IN1 Industrial zoned land and analysis has been undertaken on these areas and it has been demonstrated that the Planning Proposal has strategic merit and will deliver employment growth in the area. - Retention of this land for IN1 would also result in a poor outcome for Victoria Road and will not lead to the creation of new employment. - The Marrickville Employment Lands Study (MELS) upon which this recommendation is based, was not endorsed by the former elected Marrickville Council which disagreed with its recommendations.
<p>3. <i>With the exception of the properties on the north - western side of Farr Street to be zoned R3 – Medium Density Residential, no properties in the precinct are to be</i></p>	<p>1(d) provide further justification for inconsistencies identified with A Plan for Growing Sydney, particularly regarding the protection of industrial land around the Sydney Airport Transport Gateway, to ensure the area is able to</p>	<p>1(d) The Proponents justification was noted and accepted. There is still wider concern about the loss of employment / industrial lands in this area.</p>	<p>The planning proposal would result in the significant loss of industrial land. The draft Central District Plan encourages Council to take a ‘precautionary approach’ to the conversion of employment and urban services land and this recommendation is of particular importance to the Inner West area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - these land use issues were scrutinised and considered extensively at Gateway and determined at the time to be a land use solution with strategic merit. - The Planning Proposal that was deemed to have strategic merit by the Gateway Determination. - Land in the south-west corner of the precinct has been demonstrated to be suitable for residential

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
<p><i>zoned residential; the Danias Timbers Site / Timber yards Sub-precinct to be zoned B4 – Mixed Use (along Victoria Road and Sydenham Road) and B7 – Business Park (for the remainder of the sub-precinct) with an appropriate mix of employment and residential uses to be provided via site specific provision. The remainder of the precinct north west of Victoria Road and north of Chalder Street to be zoned B5 – Business Development.</i></p>	<p>provide employment opportunities</p> <p>1(e) provide further justification for inconsistencies with Section 117 Direction 1.1 Business and Industrial Zones, in particular:</p> <p>i. the loss of industrial land in the Precinct (Clause 4(b));</p> <p>ii. the loss of total potential floor space area for industrial uses in industrial zones (Clause 4(d));</p> <p>address the suitability and appropriateness of R4 High Density Residential adjacent to the IN1 General Industrial at Faversham Street</p>	<p>1(e) The Department outlined that the analysis undertaken was robust and clearly articulates potential benefit of land rezoning.</p> <p>The analysis could have been better justified to account for the loss of industrial land to R3 Medium Density Residential and R4 High Density Residential and quantify that information. However, the additional information does give sufficient background to the employment outcomes of the proposal.</p> <p>The proponent in addressing the gateway condition has amended and reduced the proposed area to be rezoned to R4 High Density Residential to address an appropriate and suitable setback from Faversham Road and to protect the amenity of Wicks</p>	<p>There is no strategic planning or policy basis for the Victoria Road precinct to revert to a high density housing area or encourage a wholesale move away from industrial zonings.</p>	<p>uses, and the proposed residential zoning in this location was determined to have strategic merit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning land in the south-west corner to a B7 zone would undermine the intent of trying to achieve a greater diversity of employment in the northern part of the precinct. - the Planning Proposal that received Gateway Determination was publicly exhibited as proposed and received community support, with 68% of the circa 550 submissions received supportive of the Planning Proposal, including the proposed residential zoning. - The land use solution suggested in the Council recommendation was previously analysed at Gateway Stage, and the Department determined at the time that a change to the zoning map to show B7 in the south-west corner of the precinct was not warranted. - delivering residential zoned land in the south-west corner of the precinct is vital to achieving the State Government’s strategic objectives of accelerating housing supply and urban renewal. This would not be possible under the B7 Business Park Zone suggested by Council. - the recommendation does not take into consideration the Precinct as a whole as a longstanding design principle has been to activate the core Victoria Road corridor.

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
		Park. This was a critical issue in relation to this condition to ensure an appropriate transition between existing industrial and proposed residential land uses.		
4. <i>Any intersection upgrade works necessitated by the planning proposal cannot require the acquisition of parts of Wicks Park or properties outside the area covered by the planning proposal.</i>	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The planning proposal seeks to up zone land and this requires infrastructure planning and delivery outside the scope of Marrickville Section 94/94A Contributions Plan. - the planning proposal should incorporate an appropriate mechanism to fund the provision of required infrastructure. - Council’s General Counsel refutes the claims of the proponent (that any planning agreements should be postponed to DA stage, advising that given the significant infrastructure works, the planning agreement must form part of the planning proposal. - This preferred process was also outlined in the original assessment report considered by Council at its meeting on 3 November 2015. - the need to acquire properties outside the area of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The high level strategic concept design for the Victoria Road – Sydenham Road intersection was prepared to respond to the RMS’s specific ‘desired design solution’ and was designed under the assumption that the Victoria Road Precinct is redeveloped to realise 100% of its development potential, including all of the proposed B5 zoning. This represents a worst-case scenario. - the scale of the upgrade is not required to support the forecast increase in traffic movements generated by the Planning Proposal. - at 100% development take up the scale of the intersection upgrade is considered excessive and over-engineered for its purpose. - a less impactful design solution could be achieved for the intersection upgrade that is fit for purpose whilst not requiring any significant land acquisitions. - it is highly unlikely that the Victoria Road Precinct will ever be redeveloped to accommodate 100% of its full development potential. - the need for property acquisitions for a fully upgraded intersection is highly unlikely. - the future final design of any intersection upgrade works, if necessary, can be determined at a later stage. It is noted that Council will be party to any future discussions on upgrade works should they be required in the future.

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
			<p>the planning proposal as well as sections of Wicks Park for road widenings are considered insurmountable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need to acquire private properties cannot be funded by Council (or the RMS) for the purpose of facilitating this private proposal. - The issue of infrastructure planning and provision of an appropriate mechanism to provide public certainty that funding will be realised from across the precinct and multiple owners remains unresolved. 	
<p>5. <i>The planning proposal must adequately deal with infrastructure planning, funding and delivery (including any required property acquisitions) in consultation with Council.</i></p>	N/A	N/A	See Above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Post the Gateway Determination the Council officers advised the proponent in writing on 23/2/16 (see Attachment A) that it was not appropriate to deal with changes to the Section 94 Plan as part of the Planning Proposal, and that Council would deal with this matter after the Proposal had been determined. - Council advised in the letter: <i>“With the demands that a proposal of this scale would put upon local infrastructure and other public and community needs, there will need to be further consideration of how the proposal can best meet these demands. It is anticipated that discussions in this respect would commence once the final planning proposal has been determined and agreed to by DP&E.”</i> - It is inappropriate for the Council officers to now reverse their advice on this at such a late stage in the planning proposal process.

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further based on analysis of the Indicative Masterplan the planning proposal will still generate in the order of \$36,000,000 of contributions that will be paid to Council under the current Section 94 framework. - If a precinct specific contributions framework is considered necessary by Council then this could be prepared post gazettal of the LEP amendment, with the incumbent Section 94 framework acting as an interim measure in the meantime, in combination with voluntary planning agreements, ensuring that any future development in the precinct makes substantive contributions to local infrastructure provision. - redevelopment of the precinct will occur over a 15-20 year timeframe, as such there will be ample time to produce a well-considered infrastructure contributions programme after the LEP is gazetted (if necessary).
<p>6. <i>The planning proposal must reflect the urban design and built form recommendations provided by Rod Simpson and Council’s Architectural Excellence Panel.</i></p>	<p>1(c) amend the maximum building height to: (iv) consider design advice provided in the independent Urban Design Study, prepared by Roderick Simpson</p>	<p>At a meeting between the proponent, Council and the Department, the project team addressed this condition. Advice from the independent UDS has been incorporated into the design principles contained in the masterplan. The masterplan has considered a finer grain for development, particularly in the areas where more intense development is proposed.</p> <p>The advice from the independent UDS has been</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant’s assertion that urban form should not be considered post Gateway is not supported. - the proponent has not addressed fundamental concerns and recommendations contained in the Urban Design Report prepared by Rod Simpson or the Architectural Excellence Panel (AEP) advice as it does not provide new laneways and road connections required to service the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr Rod Simpson’s findings were considered by both the Council and the Department during the Gateway Assessment. - the proponent was required to address as part of the Gateway Conditions, some of the findings of the Design Report. - A comprehensive response to Rod Simpson’s report was prepared at the Gateway Determination Stage. - This was reviewed by the Department and it was subsequently Determined that the response was sufficient and the Gateway Conditions had been met. - a response to the subsequent matters raised by Architectural Excellence Panel were addressed in

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal
Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
		<p>incorporated into the planning proposal, draft DCP and masterplan. Where the advice has not been accepted, clear justification has been provided.</p>	<p>rezoning and stated vision for the Victoria Road corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rod Simpson’s Urban Design Study and the AEP report recognise the provision of rear lanes for servicing access and waste collection as crucial to avoid regular vehicular crossings into basements and waste collection areas impacting on pedestrian safety and amenity, reducing the activation of frontages, on Victoria Road. - the issue of site serviceability of new developments cannot be addressed at development application stage and that access may be provided from side streets. - Rod Simpson’s Urban Design Study and the AEP report recognise the need to provide new areas of public open space to support the new resident and worker population. - At 14 storeys the maximum building heights proposed are excessive given the surrounding context and will result in unreasonable impacts on the amenity of Wicks Park. 	<p>detail within the Response to Submissions report issued to Council on 13 March 2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is considered that the design issues raised by Rod Simpson and the Architectural Excellence Panel have already been addressed. - in the Council letter of 14/2/17 that the Council’s Architectural Excellence Panel specifically rejected the Officer’s recommendation that residential (mixed use) should not be located around Wicks Park. - Council’s Architectural Excellence Panel supported the Planning Proposals suggested B4 zoning. - the Architectural Excellence Panel specifically rejected the Officer’s recommendation that residential (mixed use) should not be located around Wicks Park, suggesting a B4 zoning. The Panel found the proposed land uses were justified and would produce a favourable outcome especially for activation of Wicks Park. - Under the Planning Proposal both sides of Victoria Road are activated and the proposed zonings work in tandem.

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proponent’s rationale that the height of the proposed buildings around Wicks Park help to activate the park and maximise the use of the amenity provided by the open space is not supported, as a 14 storey building is not required to “activate the park”. - The proposed building heights will result in significant overshadowing of Wicks Park reducing the amenity of this important area of public open space. - the height, bulk, scale and form of a number of the building envelopes sought as part of the planning proposal are not supported particularly given the distance the precinct is located from the entrance to Sydenham Station (approximately 800 metres). - The Danias Timber site is proposed to have a Floor Space Ratio of 3:1 and a height of approximately 46 metres (14 storeys) which is significantly greater than any other site of this size covered by MLEP 2011. 	

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the sites with the greatest FSR’s and heights are located close to centres and rail transport hubs and the subject area is not within a local centre or in direct proximity to main public transport services and can therefore not be considered a Transit Oriented Development. - The planning proposal does not provide any suitably sized new areas of public open space and the proposed building envelopes will result in overshadowing and visual bulk impacts for Wicks Park reducing the amenity of this important piece of public open space. - the planning proposal will also result in a loss of public open space as parts of Wicks Park have now been identified for acquisition to cater for the road widening required by the planning proposal. 	
7. <i>affordable housing being provided in accordance with the requirements of the Inner West Council</i>	N/A	N/A	In view of the scale of the proposed up-zoning, Council considers that the proposed 5% affordable housing rate is inadequate. Council also notes that the 5 % rate of affordable housing is well below the 15% sought under the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The affordable rental housing target for the Precinct of 5% of new floor space is consistent with the Draft District Plan. - The proposal was submitted and assessed for exhibition prior to the Council’s draft affordable housing policy. There was uncertainty as to

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
<p><i>Affordable Housing Policy</i></p>			<p>Inner West Council’s Affordable Housing Policy adopted by Council on 28 March 2017.</p>	<p>whether this target would be formally adopted by Council or permitted by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (via an amendment to SEPP 70).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delivery of affordable housing within the precinct can occur by either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) amending the Council’s draft affordable housing policy to include a precinct specific policy that relates to the Victoria Road Precinct and stipulates a 5% requirement; or 2) including a precinct specific control within the Victoria Road Precinct DCP which states that 5% of housing within new residential development must be provided as affordable dwellings. <p>An amendment to SEPP 70 to include the Inner West Council area is not supported as a post-exhibition change as it is considered beyond the original intent of the planning proposal and requiring re-exhibition.</p>
<p>8. <i>the planning proposal cannot result in the loss of any existing areas of public open space and adequate new additional areas of public open space must be provided to service the new resident and worker population (e.g. an expansion and</i></p>	<p>1(c) amend the maximum building height to: (iv) consider design advice provided in the independent Urban Design Study, prepared by Roderick Simpson</p>	<p>Advice provided in the independent Urban Design Study, prepared by Roderick Simpson raises concerns about the quality of open of open space (particularly Wicks Park), accessibility and useability.</p> <p>The proposal intends to enhance Wicks Park and it argues that accessibility is good (as the park addresses two major roads) and</p>	<p>Council is of the view that the Planning Proposal does not resolve the fundamental issue that there is a lack of public open space to service the new resident worker population. The total open space required to support the additional resident and worker population is 4.131 hectares.</p> <p>Council is concerned that the only reference to the proposed new 1200 sqm area of public open space envisaged in the Rich Street employment precinct appears in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improving the quality of existing public open spaces, as well as new spaces and public domain upgrades, will provide a significantly greater net benefit to the community by providing desirable, active spaces. - In the ‘Marrickville Recreation Policy and Strategy’, one action states that “Council will negotiate with the Department of Education and Training and local School Principals regarding the use of school facilities and open space outside of school hours.” - Council’s recommendation of a new park adjacent to the existing Marrickville Public School playground would simply replicate an existing community facility that could instead be opened

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
<i>embellishment of Wicks Park)</i>		<p>development around the park will contribute to local amenity and activate the space.</p> <p>The proposal will also provide new pocket parks, shared streets and improved public domain.</p>	<p>draft DCP. This does not provide adequate certainty that this open space will be provided under the planning proposal.</p>	<p>through negotiation in accordance with Council’s policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposed pocket parks, with a combined open space of 2,040sqm, could be expanded if necessary. The exact design and location will be determined at DA stage. - provision of open space and permeability through the site under the Planning Proposal will set a new benchmark for the area. - The planning proposal does not propose the loss of any existing areas of public open space, and seeks to provide new public open space in the form of pockets parks and a publicly accessible green space in the northern part of the precinct. In total, Wicks Park is approximately 7,500sqm and the proposed additional parks for the precinct are approximately 3,250sqm (not including publicly accessible laneways). In addition, the Planning Proposal will provide significant assistance with improving the quality of existing spaces and open space assets.
9. <i>the planning proposal must provide suitable mechanisms to deliver the new laneways and road connections required to service the rezoning and stated vision for the Victoria Road corridor</i>	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant’s position does not respond to the importance of improving access and servicing arrangements for a new precinct that is proposed to undergo substantial change - Realising the stated vision for the Victoria Road precinct is reliant on the creation of new road and laneways, providing for vehicular access, servicing and waste collection to avoid regular vehicular crossings into basements and unsightly 	<p>The Planning Proposal is accompanied by a Draft DCP, which identifies future laneways and road connections. Servicing arrangements for rezoned sites will also be assessed in detail at the DA stage to ensure a satisfactory solution is achieved.</p> <p>See also our response to A9.</p>

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
			<p>waste collection areas impacting on pedestrian safety and amenity and reducing activation along Victoria Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing large block structure which adequately serviced the historic industrial uses is not appropriate for the proposed rezoning and smaller street / block structures are required to service the shift to higher order and more intense employment activity in the precinct. - The Movement Network Map contained in the draft DCP not deliver any significant change to the road network in the area. - As part of this movement network map included in the draft DCP, the proposed extension of Hans Place and Chalder Avenue will not occur as it requires land outside the area encompassed by the planning proposal and no uplift is proposed on that land meaning there is no incentive for the redevelopment required to create these connections. Council is also unlikely to support any future 	

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
			<p>rezonings in this area that would result in a further loss of industrial lands.</p> <p>Councils Cycling Planner reviewed the proponent’s submission outlining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the draft DCP identifies Council’s planned bicycle routes through Precinct 47, however it remains unclear what measures will be taken on the relevant streets in the study area to be consistent with the planning proposal objectives of encouraging cycling, providing a comfortable and attractive environment for cyclists and enhancing cyclists connections to surrounding commercial precincts. - appropriate cycling infrastructure treatments and enhancements on the identified bicycle routes in the study area are expected to be identified in the planning proposal and draft DCP, which are consistent with Council’s Marrickville Bicycle Strategy and the NSW Bicycle Guidelines; and - Addison Road is outside the planning proposal area, however the planned route 	

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
			on Addison Road should be shown on the DCP Movement Network Map to show the wider bicycle network context, and connectivity of bicycle routes in the study area.	
<i>10. the planning proposal must adequately deal with identified potential heritage</i>	2. Prior to public exhibition, a heritage study is to be conducted for Precinct 47 to identify items that have potential heritage significance and should be preserved (this includes industrial heritage)	<p>A heritage study has been conducted for Precinct 47 in response to this condition and in accordance with the agreed scope.</p> <p>The draft DCP contains controls to preserve and, where possible, adaptively re-use heritage items as well as ensuring future development responds sensitively to these items.</p>	Council suggests identified items should be thoroughly assessed and if found to be significant should be listed as part of the planning proposal under Schedule 5 of Marrickville LEP 2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Heritage Report undertaken for the Planning Proposal was prepared by Artefact in response to the Gateway Conditions issued by the Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E). It was reviewed by the DP&E and deemed to satisfy the relevant Gateway Condition. - The Planning Proposal is accompanied by a Draft DCP that identifies ‘potential heritage items’ and requires a heritage assessment to be undertaken for potential heritage items within the precinct. - Any future DA for the redevelopment of sites of potential heritage significance will need to be accompanied by a Heritage Report, offering buildings, which are presently not listed heritage items, a level of protection ensuring further analysis is undertaken prior to any works occurring. - Council has just recently completed their own ‘comprehensive heritage assessment of the former Marrickville LGA. As part of this they recommended heritage listing 75 new buildings. Despite this no buildings within the Victoria Road Precinct were recommended for listing by Council officers.
<i>Other Issues not addressed in Resolution</i>	1(e) Prior to public exhibition the planning proposal is to be	Further justification in response to Section 117	Unresolved impacts remain regarding precinct wide drainage and flooding	N/A

Victoria Road Precinct – Planning Proposal

Assessment of Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017) against Gateway Determination Conditions and updated PP

Council’s Resolution (27 June 2017)	Relevant Gateway Condition	Department consideration of revised PP	Outstanding issues	Proponents Response
	<p>updated to provide further justification for inconsistencies with Section 117 Direction Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land, in particular:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. how future developments will be designed to mitigate the impact of flooding on buildings and neighbouring properties as well as emergency egress management.</p>	<p>Direction 4.3 was provided in Section 7.2.2 of the proposal as well as in the updated Flood Report and the Draft DCP. The Department was satisfied this condition had been met following this revision.</p>	<p>issues that will result in a need for Council to carry out significant capital works that are currently unfunded.</p>	