# AGENDA



# COUNCIL MEETING TUESDAY 13 FEBRUARY 2018

6.30pm



# Live Streaming of Council Meeting

In the spirit of open, accessible and transparent government, this meeting of the Inner West Council is being streamed live on Council's website. By speaking at a Council meeting, members of the public agree to being recorded and must ensure their speech to the Council is respectful and use appropriate language. A person who uses defamatory, discriminatory or offensive language may be exposed to liability for which Council takes no responsibility. Any part of this meeting that is held in closed session will not be recorded

# Pre-Registration to Speak at Council Meetings

Members of the public must register by 2pm of the day of the Meeting to speak at Council Meetings. If you wish to register to speak please fill in a <u>Register to Speak Form</u>, available from the Inner West Council website, including:

- your name;
- contact details;
- item on the Agenda you wish to speak to; and
- whether you are for or against the recommendation in the agenda.

# Are there any rules for speaking at a Council Meeting?

The following rules apply when addressing a Council meeting:

- keep your address to the point, the time allowed for each speaker is limited to three minutes. This time limit applies, no matter how many items are addressed by the speaker;
- when addressing the Meeting you must speak to the Chairperson;
- only 3 speakers for and against an Agenda Item are allowed.

# What happens after I submit the form?

Your request will then be added to a list that is shown to the Chairperson on the night of the meeting.

#### Are there any rules for speaking at a Council Meeting?

The following rules apply when addressing a Council meeting:

- keep your address to the point, the time allowed for each speaker is limited to three minutes with one extension of not more than three minutes with the approval of the Council. This time limit applies, no matter how many items are addressed by the speaker;
- when addressing the Meeting you must speak to the Chairperson;
- the Chairperson may curtail public participation where the information being presented is considered repetitive or irrelevant.

Where Items are deferred, Council reserves the right to defer speakers until that Item is heard on the next occasion.

#### Accessibility

Inner West Council is committed to ensuring people with a disability have equal opportunity to take part in Council and Committee Meetings. At the Ashfield Council Chambers there is a hearing loop service available to assist persons with a hearing impairment. If you have any other access or disability related participation needs and wish to know more, call 9392 5657.

Persons in the public gallery are advised that under the Local Government Act 1993, a person may NOT tape record a Council meeting without the permission of Council.

Any persons found recording without authority will be expelled from the meeting.

"Record" includes the use of any form of audio, video and still camera equipment or mobile phone capable of recording speech.

An audio recording of this meeting will be taken for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of the minutes.



PAGE

# PRECIS

- 1 Acknowledgement of Country
- 2 Apologies
- 3 Notice of Webcasting
- 4 Disclosures of Interest (Section 451 of the Local Government Act and Council's Code of Conduct)

# 5 Moment of Quiet Contemplation

6	Confirmation of Minutes	PAGE
	Minutes of 21 November 2017 Council Meeting	5
	Minutes of 12 December 2017 Council Meeting	27

# 7 Mayoral Minutes

Nil at the time of printing.

# 8 Staff Reports

# ITEM

C0218 Item 1	Affordable Housing Submission to Explanation of Intended Effect for State Environmental Planning Policy No. 70	45
C0218 Item 2	Planning Proposal for 114-140 Parramatta Road/Ormond Street/Gower Street/Tideswell Street/Liverpool Road, Ashfield	63
C0218 Item 3	Shade Sails in Playgrounds	272
C0218 Item 4	Investment Report as at 30 November 2017	275
C0218 Item 5	Investment Report as at 31 December 2017	306
C0218 Item 6	Tabling of Pecuniary Interest Returns of Councillors	336
C0218 Item 7	Business excluded from the Council Agenda of 12 December 2017	337
C0218 Item 8	Councillor Support Staff	338

# 9 Rescission Motions

ITEM		PAGE
C0218 Item 9	Notice of Motion to Rescind: Item 4 Post Exhibition Report - Sydenham Station Creative Hub Planning Proposal	346
10 Notices	of Motion	
ITEM		PAGE
C0218 Item 10	Notice of Motion: Upgrade and Beautification of Haberfield Main Street / Shopping Village	347
C0218 Item 11	Notice of Motion: Trees Policy	349
C0218 Item 12	Notice of Motion: Ferris Lane Annandale Green Space	350
C0218 Item 13	Notice of Motion: Ted Floyd Way	355



C0218 Item 14 Notice of Motion: Recognising January 26 as a day of Invasion, Mourning and Survival

357



#### Minutes of Ordinary Council Meeting held on 21 November 2017

# Meeting commenced at 6.36 pm

Present:	
Darcy Byrne	Mayor
Julie Passas	Deputy Mayor
Marghanita Da Cruz	Councillor
Mark Drury	Councillor
Lucille McKenna OAM	Councillor
Colin Hesse	Councillor
Sam Iskandar	Councillor
Pauline Lockie	Councillor
Victor Macri	Councillor
Rochelle Porteous	Councillor (6.38pm)
Vittoria Raciti	Councillor
John Stamolis	Councillor
Louise Steer	Councillor
Anna York	Councillor
Rik Hart	Interim General Manager
Peter Gainsford	Deputy General Manager Assets and Environment
Michael Tzimoulas	Deputy General Manager Chief Financial and Administration Officer
John Warburton	Deputy General Manager Community and Engagement
Tanya Whitmarsh	Group Manager Governance
Gill Dawson	A/Group Manager Strategic
Simon Lowe	Strategic Transport Planner
Ian Naylor	Manager Civic and Executive Support
Katherine Paixao	Business Paper Coordinator (Minute Taker)

#### APOLOGIES:

#### Motion (Da Cruz/Kiat)

That Council accept apologies for lateness from Councillor Porteous.

#### Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

# DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS:

#### Motion: (Byrne/McKenna)

That the following Disclosures of Interest be received and noted.

 Councillors Macri and Iskandar declared a significant, non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 and Item 31 - 466-480 New Canterbury Road, 26-38 Hercules Street, Dulwich Hill -Planning Proposal and Matters Being Reported to the Sydney Central Planning Panel for Determination, as they are members of the Sydney Central Planning Panel and may be required to determine this matter; and



2. Councillor Hesse declared a non-significant, non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 - 466-480 New Canterbury Road, 26-38 Hercules Street, Dulwich Hill - Planning Proposal, as his mother owns a property opposite the site.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Porteous

Councillor Porteous entered the meeting at 6.38 pm.

#### **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

#### Motion: McKenna OAM/Drury

- 1. That the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 24 October 2017 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the following changes:
  - a. The deletion of the words 'Leave of absence granted' from the apologies;
  - b. Recording Councillor Drury voting against amendment in Item 25 Making the Inner West a Leader in Renewable energy
    - 2. That the Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting held on 31 October 2017 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the following changes:
  - a. The deletion of the words 'Leave of absence granted' from the apologies;
  - b. Recording Councillor Raciti voting against the Motion for point 3e in Item 2 Local Government NSW Annual Conference.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

C1117 Item 32 Mayoral Minute: Letter of Condolence to the Family of Malcolm Young

#### MOTION: (Byrne)

THAT Council write a letter of condolence to the family of Malcolm Young, expressing our sadness at his passing and commending the contribution he made to the inner west community and music worldwide.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil



# C1117 Item 30 Mayoral Minute: Bulk Transfer of Nominated General Staff

# MOTION: (Byrne)

# **THAT Council:**

- 1. Complete the bulk transfer of the permanent positions within Footpaths, Roads, Traffic and Storm water; Trees, Parks, and Sports fields; Mechanical Services; Resource Recovery; Children and Family Services; Community Operations; and Recreational and Aquatics which have not yet been finalised through the organisational restructure. Notice of the awarding of these positions should be forwarded to all affected staff urgently to allow them to have certainty about the security of their employment prior to the end of 2017;
- 2. Adopt a policy of allowing all employees of the Inner West Council to have the five year employment protection, from the date of the amalgamation, as was provided for the officers of the former Leichhardt Council. Furthermore, that efficiency savings identified through the restructure are to be achieved through natural attrition;
- 3. Ask the General Manager to complete further harmonisation of employee conditions and service standards through consensus and collaboration between General Manager and Human Resources Group Manager, the officers of the Council and their industrial representatives; and
- 4. Produce a report summarising the previous best practices of Ashfield, Marrickville and Leichhardt Councils and the local government sector, in relation to equal opportunity employment practices. This should include consideration of gender equity and women leadership programs, apprenticeships and proactive approaches to attracting, retaining and developing Indigenous people and people with disability.
- 5. Receive a report at the February ordinary meeting on the implementation of the resolutions.

#### **Motion Carried**

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

Procedural Motion - Item 8 Victoria Road Precinct Planning Proposal Motion: (Macri/Passas)

THAT Council defer Item 8 in order for Councillors to be briefed on the matter.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Raciti
	and York
Against Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Porteous, Stamolis and Steer



#### **Suspension of Standing Orders:**

#### Motion: (Byrne/McKenna OAM)

THAT Items 2, 5, 7, 10, 20, 24, 26 and 27 be brought forward.

Motion Carried	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York Nil
For Motion:	
Against Motion:	

# C1117 Item 2 Draft Code of Meeting Practice

# Motion (Drury/Macri)

# THAT Council:

- 1. Adopt the Draft Code of Meeting Practice shown as Attachment 1 subject to the following amendments:
  - a. Delete reference to Public Forum from Clause 1.5 (1) a Order of Business;
  - b. Rename Clause 2.8 Public Forum Addressing Council;
  - c. Delete Clause 2.8 (2) and replace with:

"Those people referred to in Clause 2.8.1 may address council before debate on an item that they have given notice they wish to speak on in accordance with Clause 2.8.5. Council shall permit a maximum of three speakers for and three speakers against per item of business."

- d. Delete the note at the end of Clause 6.1.5;
- e. Introduce a moment of quiet contemplation in the order of business prior to the consideration of reports;
- f. That Clause 2.12 (3) be amended to state that Councillors are allowed to speak for 3 minutes.
- 2. Publish the Code of Meeting Practice on its website;
- 3. Communicate the changes to the Code of Meeting Practice through its website, social media, newsletters, advertisements in the Inner West Courier and with a public notice in Council's Libraries and Facilities; and
- 4. Write to the persons who made submissions during the exhibition period and notify them of Council's Decision.

Motion Carried For Motion:

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas,
	Raciti, Stamolis and York
Against Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Porteous and Steer

#### Foreshadowed Motion (Porteous)

- 1. Council defers the decision to change the Code of Meeting practice until the new model Code of Meeting practice is released by the OLG ;
- 2. Until that time Council continue to use the Leichhardt Code of Meeting practice; and



# 3. From February 2018 Council meets twice a month.

This Foreshadow Motion lapsed.

# Amendment (Stamolis/Lockie)

# THAT Council:

- 1. Adopt the Draft Code of Meeting Practice shown as Attachment 1 subject to the following amendments:
  - a. Remove Clause 2.3.(1) the words "Shall stand when speaking";

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Porteous, Stamolis and Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Raciti
-	and York

b. That Clause 2.12 (3) be amended to state that Councillors are allowed to speak for 3 minutes.

#### **Motion Carried**

For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Iskandar, Porteous, Stamolis and
Against Motion:	Steer Crs Byrne, Drury, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Raciti and York

As this amendment was carried, it was included in the Primary Motion.

c. Remove Clause 5.1(2c) "Councillors should not have to specify the source of funding for their motions".

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Porteous, Stamolis and Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Raciti and York

# C1117 Item 5 Amendments to Inner West DCP 2016

Motion: (McKenna OAM/Drury)

- 1. Council note the contents of the report;
- 2. The General Manager be authorised to make minor clerical amendments to the DCP amendments which do not change the content and intent of the document;
- 3. In accordance with Part 3, Clause 21 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act Regulation 2000, Council endorse and give public notice of the adoption of the amendments to Inner West Comprehensive DCP for Ashbury, Ashfield, Croydon, Croydon Park, Haberfield, Hurlstone Park and Summer Hill as shown at Attachment 1;



- a. Council provide the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment a copy of the DCP amendments pursuant to Part 3, Clause 25 AB of EPA Act Regulation 2000; and
- b. That a briefing be prepared on the heritage controls of the former Council areas.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

Councillors Iskandar and Marci left the Meeting at 8:52 pm and took no part in the discussion or voting on Item 7 as they had declared an a significant, non-pecuniary interest.

#### C1117 Item 7 466-480 New Canterbury Road, 26-38 Hercules Street, Dulwich Hill -Planning Proposal

# Motion: (Drury/Stamolis)

# THAT Council:

- 1. Receive and note this report;
- 2. Accepts the role of Relevant Planning Authority for the Planning Proposal at 466-480 New Canterbury Road & 26-38 Hercules Street, Dulwich Hill;
- 3. Request the Department of Planning and Environment delegate to Council the Plan Making functions to make the LEP amendment;
- 4. Submits the Proponent's Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning and Environment for a Gateway Determination; and

5. Council reiterates our view that the maximum building height be no greater

than 5-6 storeys alongside Dulwich Grove light rail station, and that any planning proposal on the subject land should seek to protect Dulwich Hill public school from overshadowing and privacy impacts.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, McKenna OAM,
	Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Crs Iskandar and Macri

#### Amendment (Porteous)

- 1. The Councillors appoint an appropriately qualified consultant to prepare a Councillors' submission to the planning proposal which puts particular focus on issues of concern to the community and the Councillors regarding this planning proposal.
- 2. Councillors be consulted on which issues they want included in this submission.



Councillors Macri and Iskandar returned to the Meeting at 8:58 pm.

# C1117 Item 10 Sydney Metro (Sydenham to Bankstown) EIS Submission

# Motion: (Drury/Hesse)

# THAT:

- 1. Council does not accept that the case for the Sydney Metro has been adequately made. Our community is not prepared to accept the disruption that would be caused by this project, that we are not convinced will benefit our community or Sydney as a whole;
- 2. Futhermore we request the council staff amend the report prior to submitting it, in order to;
- a. Make clear that one of the cumulative impacts which has not been addressed in the EIS is the impact of additional pressure being placed on the Bankstown line, while it is at reduced capacity from 2019 to 2024, due to additional housing being forced on communities by the Sydenham to Bankstown urban renewal strategy;
- b. Make clear that the cumulative impact of current development under the 2011 LEP and existing new housing needs be taken into consideration;
- Stress community concern regarding traffic impacts both during general construction and shutdown periods, including the potential for rat-running in local streets;
- d. Call for the individual Temporary Transport Plans to be exhibited before any rail line shutdown period; and
- e. Request a specific amount of money to control parking impacts.
- 3. Should the state government persist with this project then the Inner West Council advises that if the government does not want to create more chaos then it should place an embargo on planning "upzonings" in the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor (SBURC) until after the proposed completion of the of the Metro Line.

Failing this the government should arrange for a detailed assessment of the cumulative impacts of private construction due to the SBURC and public infrastructure construction for the Metro rail line be undertaken and exhibited, before any approval is given for the Metro line, given that this assessment is not included in the EIS; and

4. Council receives and notes the report and formally submits the attached submission to the Department of Planning and Environment.

# **Motion Carried**

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

Amendment (Da Cruz/Porteous)

THAT Council:



- 1. Amend the plans to incorporate shade in the form of structures, trees and vegetation around pedestrian pathways; and
- 2. Incorporate water management systems to replenish soil moisture levels.

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Porteous, Stamolis and Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Raciti and York

Councillor Drury left the Meeting at 9:26 pm. Councillor Drury returned to the Meeting at 9:35 pm.

C1117 Item 20 Notice of Motion to Rescind: Cottages at 9 and 11 Marion Street Leichhardt

Motion: (Porteous/Steer)

THAT Council's resolution of C0417 Item 14 Cottages at 9 and 11 Marion Street Leichhardt at the April 2017 Ordinary Meeting be rescinded.

Motion Carried

For Motion: Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis and Steer

Against Motion: Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM and York Motion: (Porteous/Steer)

THAT a report be brought to the February 2018 Ordinary meeting on the opportunity, costs and timeline for conversion of cottages 9 and 11 Marion St to a community purpose. The consideration on what that community purpose that should be to include: a Community Centre for Leichhardt Youth; artist studios and art gallery/cultural space; a general community space, housing for low income housing or other appropriate community uses.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1117 Item 24 Notice of Motion: Boosting the micro-brewing sector in the Inner West

Motion: (Byrne/York)

- 1. Investigate and report to the February ordinary meeting on:
  - a. Possible amendments to planning controls which would increase the allowable floor space for tasting on site within micro-breweries to the level of 40% of the gross floor area or 400 square metres, whichever is the lesser, as adopted by the former Ashfield Council; and
  - b. Options for updating and refining the definition of ancillary use for tasting rooms, within microbreweries, to provide greater certainty for proponents about the meaning and limits of ancillary use. This should be produced in consultation with local microbrewery operators.
- 2. Consult with the Inner West Brewers Association and consider in the context of the 2018/19 Budget the following initiatives:



- a. Establishing or supporting an annual Inner West Craft Beer Festival, in conjunction with local breweries, pubs and small bars, with the aim of making it one of the premier craft beer festivals in Australia; and
- b. Working with local microbreweries, tourism operators and government agencies to promote brewery trails and tours as a tourist attraction in the Inner West local government area.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Cr Passas

Councillor Passas left the Meeting at 10:27 pm.

#### C1117 Item 26 Notice of Motion: WestConnex Noise Issues

Motion: (Lockie/Hesse)

#### THAT Council:

- 1. Write urgently to the Premier, Minister for WestConnex and Minister for Planning to:
  - a. Express major concern about the unacceptable noise impacts of construction works in St Peters, Haberfield and Ashfield, where residents have faced weeks of night works on top of daily construction noise;
  - b. Demand that night works should not take place on an ongoing basis, as has been happening in recent weeks;
  - c. Insist that if night work is unavoidable, affected residents must be offered alternative accommodation or other meaningful noise mitigation measures, even if night works do not take place on consecutive nights, and regardless of whether they have been classified as "sensitive receivers" by WestConnex contractors;
  - d. Demand that WestConnex contractors act immediately to deliver their atproperty noise treatment obligations as outlined in the *WestConnex The New M5 Construction Noise and Vibration Plan* (October 2016).

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Passas

Councillor Passas returned to the Meeting at 10:40 pm. C1117 Item 27 Notice of Motion: Investigation into New Council Committees

#### Motion: (Stamolis/Lockie)

#### THAT Council:

- 1. Consider options for broader community attendance at its committees;
- 2. Consider local sub-committees of Council Committees which would enable greater <u>local</u> engagement as well as greater accessibility to meetings; and



3. Consider establishing sub-committees as part of the new Committee framework to address specific community priorities (such as Climate Change, Bicycle Use, Heritage and Sports Participation).

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York Nil

# **MOTION: (Byrne/Stamolis)**

THAT the following Items be moved en bloc and the recommendations contained in the reports be adopted: Items 3, 9, 13, 14, 17, 25 and 28.

Motion CarriedFor Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1117 Item 3 Audited Financial Reports as at 30 June 2017

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis)

THAT:

- 1. Receives and notes the report; and
- 2. Receives the final audited reports for the Inner West Council for the reporting period ending 30 June 2017 (<u>ATTACHMENT 1</u>).

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1117 Item 9 Greenway shared path through Arlington Grove development

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis)

- 1. Pursuant to section 55(3)(i) of the Act, the Council resolves that a satisfactory result would not be achieved by inviting tenders for the provision of a shared path through the Arlington Grove Development, to a suitable standard for use as the Greenway shared path, due to the following extenuating circumstances:
  - a. The land in question is owned by the developer of the Arlington Grove development.
  - b. Council has no entitlement other than with the permission of the developer to enter the land and construct the shared path.
  - c. Accordingly, the developer is the only party with whom the contract can be struck. An open tender process is of no utility in such circumstances.

Motion CarriedFor Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York



Against Motion: Nil

# C1117 Item 13 Dockless Bike Share Schemes

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis)

THAT Council receives and notes the report.Motion CarriedFor Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

# C1117 Item 14 Fee Waiver Applications in relation to community use of Council facilities in 2018

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis) THAT Council:

- 1. Approve the fee waiver applications submitted by regular annual hirers for use of Council venues and facilities in 2018 as listed in Attachment 1;
- 2. Note this a continuation of practice at the former Leichhardt Council; and
- 3. Note that Council Officers will be undertaking a review of Fees & Charges and policies for fee waiver and concessions with a view to consistency, equity and transparency across the Inner West LGA.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York<br/>NilAgainst Motion:Nil

C1117 Item 17 Investment Report as at 31 October 2017

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis)

THAT the report be received and noted.

Motion Carried

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

C1117 Item 25 Notice of Motion: Urgent Action needed to improving Air Quality

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis)

THAT Council submit a motion to the Local Government Association Conference calling on the NSW Government to:

- 1. Develop legislation to allow local councils to follow the NSW Chief Medical Officer's advice and phase out Wood Heaters;
- 2. Introduce effective education and incentive program commensurate with the \$8 billion health cost of residential wood heating pollution in NSW that will create widespread understanding of the benefits of switching to non-pollution heating; and



3. Provide effective powers for councils to take action against unhealthy levels of wood smoke pollution, including local exceedances of National PM2.5 Air Quality Standards.

Motion CarriedFor Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1117 Item 28 Notice of Motion: Cabcharge for Councillors

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis)

THAT in the interests of public accountability, transparency and safety, the Councillor Expenses and Facilities Policy be amended to include cabcharge cards to those Councillors who request this.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

Motion: (Byrne/Stamolis)

THAT Items 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 31 be brought forward for consideration and dealt with at this time.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1117 Item 1 Councillor Support Staff

Motion: (Stamolis/Hesse)

THAT a Councillor briefing be held in early 2018 to consider all options for Councillor support.

Motion CarriedFor Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

The Mayor, Councillor Byrne left the Meeting at 11:07 pm. The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Passas Assumed the Chair.

# PROCEDURAL MOTION: (Raciti/McKenna OAM)

THAT an extension of time be granted to deal with the confidential item - Item 29

**Motion Carried** 



For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Byrne

# **REPORTS WITH CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

#### C1117 Item 29 General Manager's Contract of Employment

#### Motion: Passas/Stamolis

THAT Council moves into closed session to deal with this matter as the information contained in <u>CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENTS 1</u> of this report are classified as confidential under the provisions of Section 10A (2) (a) of the Local Government Act 1993 for the following reasons:

a. personnel matters concerning particular individuals (other than councillors);

And in accordance with Sections 10A (4) of the Local Government Act 1993, that the Chairperson allow members of the public to make representations as to whether this part of the meeting should be closed.

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Passas moved into closed session at 11.07pm to allow Council to consider items of business containing confidential information. Members of the public were asked to leave the Chamber.

The Mayor, Councillor Byrne returned to the Meeting at 11:12 pm as assumed the Chair.

#### Motion: (Drury/Stamolis)

THAT Council return to open session to read out the recommendations from the Closed Session.

Motion CarriedFor Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

The Mayor read out to the Meeting the recommendation from the Closed Session of Council.

Motion: (Drury/Hesse)

THAT Item 29 – General Manager's Contract of Employment be deferred for consideration at the next Ordinary Council Meeting.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Stamolis, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:NilMeeting was adjourned at 11.55pm.

The Following Items will be considered at the next Ordinary Council Meeting on 12 December 2017, Items 4, 6, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 23. Item 31 will not be



considered at the next Council Meeting as it related to a decision of the Sydney Central Panel to be held on 28 November 2017.

The meeting was resumed on 12 December 2017 at 6.34 pm

Present:	
Darcy Byrne	Mayor
Julie Passas	Deputy Mayor (10.02pm)
Marghanita Da Cruz	Councillor
Mark Drury	Councillor
Lucille McKenna OAM	Councillor
Colin Hesse	Councillor
Sam Iskandar	Councillor
Pauline Lockie	Councillor
Victor Macri	Councillor
Rochelle Porteous	Councillor
Vittoria Raciti	Councillor (7.17pm)
Louise Steer	Councillor
Anna York	Councillor
Rik Hart	Interim General Manager
Peter Gainsford	Deputy General Manager Assets and Environment
John Warburton	Deputy General Manager Community and Engagement
Nellette Kettle	Group Manager Civic and Executive Support, Integration,
	Customer Service and Business Excellence
Joe Strati	Group Manager Legal
David Birds	Group Manager Strategic Planning
Gill Dawson	Manager Strategy and Policy
Kendall Banfield	Manager WestConnex Unit
Harjeet Atwal	Manager Planning Operations
Wal Petschler	Group Manager Footpaths, Roads, Traffic and Stormwater
lan Naylor	Manager Civic and Executive Support
Katherine Paixao	Business Paper Coordinator (Minute Taker)

# APOLOGIES:

\_

#### Motion (Macri/Lockie)

That apologies from Councillor Stamolis and lateness from Councillors Raciti and Passas be accepted.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York Nil

# DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS: Nil

#### Suspension of Standing Orders (Byrne/Macri)

THAT Items 4 and 21 be brought forward and dealt with at this time.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil



# C1117 Item 4 Post Exhibition Report - Sydenham Station Creative Hub Planning Proposal

Motion (York/Byrne)

**THAT Council:** 

1. Note:

a. The existing Sydenham Creative Hub proposal has been endorsed repeatedly by the former Marrickville Council and the NSW Department of Planning;

b. The large body of work that has been dedicated to the development of the policy for the Sydenham Station Creative Hub involving input from a wide range of stakeholders over a substantial period of time, and the careful consideration of the development of that policy by the former Marrickville Council;

c. The independent support for the policy from academic and planning experts including the City Futures Research Centre, Professor Peter Phibbs and SGS Economics in their 2014 Study of Marrickville Employment lands;

d. The very large proportion of submissions received during the consultation process in support of the existing proposal; and

- e. The original intent of the Sydenham Creative Hub proposal, which was to protect current industrial uses in the precinct, by adapting our planning Instruments to ensure emerging additional artistic and creative uses are permitted, as a means of securing the vibrancy and visitation to the area.
- 2. Defer consideration of the matter pending further investigation into options to achieve the original intent of the proposal, by further specifying and limiting new uses, including potentially;
  - a. Removing office space from the list of permissible uses;
  - b. A narrower focus on live performance and artistic uses to operate after existing businesses hours;
  - c. Further limiting the scope for small bars and restaurants;
  - d. Mandating a review period for the proposed controls following adoption; and
  - e. Further measures to mitigate the perceived risks identified in the most recent SGS report.

# Motion Lost

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, McKenna OAM and York
Against Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, Porteous, Raciti and Steer

Foreshadowed Motion (Porteous/ Da Cruz)



- 1. Council amend the planning proposal as follows:
  - i. Confine the land to which the planning proposal relates to the properties fronting Marrickville Road, Marrickville between Railway Parade and Sydney Street and the 2 properties fronting Railway Parade between Marrickville Road and Buckley Lane (being the properties 21-71 Marrickville Road and 101-103 Railway Parade, Marrickville respectively); and
  - ii. Limit the additional permitted uses on such land to "cafes, restaurants and small bars".
- 2. The Department of Planning and Environment be advised accordingly and Council request a 6 month extension of time to finalise the LEP; and
- 3. The amended planning proposal be publically exhibited and a further report be prepared for Council's consideration following the conclusion of the community consultation.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, Porteous, Raciti and
	Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, McKenna OAM and York

C1117 Item 21 Notice of Motion: Affordable housing for the Inner West

Motion: (Kiat/Steer)

- 1. The General Manager in consultation with the Housing Affordability Strategic Reference Group provide Council a strategic report for the consideration of the community and Councillors (Report);
- 2. The Report present options on how Council in collaboration with local communities, state and federal governments, and/or non-government organisations, will identify appropriate sites and properties in the LGA for development as affordable housing projects;
- 3. The Report assess the viability of Council identifying and developing affordable housing projects in partnership with relevant stakeholders and community partners;
- 4. The Report present options on how Council can create an Empty Dwellings Levy, by which Council would raise funds for affordable housing projects and increase rental supply by imposing a levy on residential properties left empty for an extended period (e.g. by tripling rates on properties left empty for at least 12 months);
- 5. The Report identify where funds generated by Council's affordable housing projects are directed, and present options as to how such funds can be set aside for spending within Council's affordable housing portfolio;
- 6. The Report present options on how Council will work toward the following affordable housing targets at 5 and 10 year periods:

INNER WEST COUNCIL

- a. 30% of all new housing stock in new developments to be affordable housing;
- b. 50% of all Crown or Council land that is zoned residential to be affordable housing; and
- c. 10% of total housing stock to be affordable housing.
- 7. The Report should reflect the wide diversity of needs when it comes to housing, including with reference to the life cycle of residents; and
- 8. The Report should include assessment of the current strategic and staff resources available to deliver identified potential affordable housing initiatives.

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Porteous and Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM, Raciti and York

# Foreshadowed Motion (Byrne/Drury)

THAT Council hold a briefing session for Councillors on Councils adopted policies on affordable housing and the body of research which has been undertaken to support it.

#### Motion Carried

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

#### Motion (Byrne/McKenna OAM)

That standing orders be resumed.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

# C1117 Item 6 469-483 Balmain Road, Lilyfield - Planning Proposal

# Motion (Byrne/McKenna OAM)

# THAT Council:

- 1. Adopt a position of opposition to the rezoning proposed, based on the objections submitted previously by Council officers;
- 2. Note that the NSW Government Greater Sydney Commission and the Planning Panel have failed to undertake community consultation prior to progressing the proposal to this stage; and
- 3. Write to the above mentioned agencies seeking that any further consideration of the proposal be deferred until proper community notification and consultation has taken place.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM, Raciti and York
Against Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Porteous and Steer



Foreshadowed Motion (Porteous/Da Cruz)

THAT Council:

- 1. Receive and note this report;
- Accepts the role of Relevant Planning Authority for the Planning Proposal at 469
  483 Balmain Road, Lilyfield;
- 3. Request the Department of Planning and Environment delegate to Council the Plan Making functions to make the LEP amendment;
- 4. Submits the Proponent's Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning and Environment for a Gateway Determination; and
- 5. The failure of Council to respond appropriately within the required timeframe to the Dept of Planning and Environment and therefore to lose the option to take
- on the role of consent authority and the failure to provide accurate and timely information to Councillors regarding this matter be referred to the Audit and
- **Risk** Committee for investigation and a report.

This Foreshadowed Motion lapsed.

# C1117 Item 11 Council Submission to Review of Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000

# Motion (McKenna OAM/Lockie)

# THAT Council:

- 1. Receives and notes this report including the draft submission (Attachment 1); and
- 2. Endorses the submission.

Motion Carried

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

# C1117 Item 12 Draft Future Transport Strategy 2056 - Council Submission

Motion (York/McKenna OAM)

- 1. This report be received and noted;
- 2. Council endorse the draft submission included in this report and that it be lodged as such with Transport for NSW/RMS;
- 3. The study proposed for Parramatta Road should be extended to include Strathfield;
- 4. The strategy should include clearly defined mode share targets;

- 5. To ensure equitable access throughout the Sydney Region it is essential that public transport is owned and operated by the State Government;
- 6. The strategy should include fully integrated, frequent, high speed public transport links to regional/rural centres;
- 7. To encourage reduced travel demand there should be an integrated and ongoing alignment between the geographic distribution of job placement and residential developments, with transport infrastructure provision;
- 8. There should be detailed examination of the likely impacts of the conversion of inner Sydney service industries and warehousing to residential and commercial uses. This should particularly address theincreased travel demand created as higher rental rates force such industries to more remote locations;

9. The current three cities policy ignores the previous five centres approach and also proposes the creation of a city around the Western Sydney Airport (the "Aerotropolis") at the expense of other parts of western and south-western Sydney (eg Penrith, Liverpool and Campbelltown). World-wide experience shows that airports are not suitable anchors for cities as they are clearly incompatible with residential development and tend to only attract air freight and air travel related industries;

10. Consideration should be given to the provision of demand management tools including comprehensive road pricing, parking pricing strategies, congestion pricing and removal of station user levies on the T8 airport rail line;

11. Provision should be made for the funding of separated cycleways and pedestrian paths within the budget of all major road projects;

- 12. Transparency of all infrastructure funding (including toll collection) should be ensured; and
- 13. A Councillor briefing be held on GETS and the impact of bus privatisation, including removal of bus stops in the Inner West.

Motion Carried

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil
Agamot motion	

C1117 Item 15 Naming of new lane between Grove and Alfred Streets, and perpendicular to Albion and Rolfe lanes, St Peters

Motion (Macri/Lockie)

- 1. The unnamed lane running between Grove and Alfred Streets, and perpendicular to Albion and Rolfe lanes, St Peters be named *Lata Lane*;
- 2. A suitable notice be published in the NSW Government Gazette and local newspaper;
- 3. The relevant statutory bodies and emergency services be notified; and
- 4. Persons who made submissions and landowners and residents whose property adjoins the lane be notified of Council's determination.



Motion Carried For Motion:

Against Motion:

Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

C1117 Item 16 Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 2 November 2017 and Extra-Ordinary Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 3 November 2017

Motion (McKenna OAM/Byrne)

THAT the Minutes of the Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 2 November 2017 and the Minutes of the Extra-Ordinary Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 3 November 2017 be received and the recommendations be adopted subject to amending the recommendation of Item 13 of the 2 November 2017 Meeting to:

# THAT Council:

- 1. Install a resident parking scheme "2p 8am-10pm Mon-Fri, Permit holders excepted, area A1" on the west side of Edith Street, Leichhardt (South of Marion Street); and
- 2. Limit the number of permits per eligible households to a maximum of 2 residential permits only.

#### Motion Carried

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Crs Passas and Raciti
Absent:	Crs Drury and Porteous

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

9.54pm - The Mayor, Clr Byrne adjourned the meeting for a short recess. 10.02pm – The Mayor, Clr Byrne resumed the meeting.

Councillor Passas entered the meeting at 10.02pm Councillors Drury and Porteous left the Meeting at 10.02 pm.

C1117 Item 16 Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 2 November 2017 and Extra-Ordinary Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 3 November 2017

#### Motion (McKenna OAM/Byrne)

THAT the Minutes of the Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 2 November 2017 and the Minutes of the Extra-Ordinary Local Traffic Committee Meeting held on 3 November 2017 be received and the recommendations be adopted subject to amending the recommendation of Item 13 of the 2 November 2017 Meeting to:

# THAT Council:

1. Install a resident parking scheme "2p 8am-10pm Mon-Fri, Permit holders



excepted, area A1" on the west side of Edith Street, Leichhardt (South of Marion Street): and

2. Limit the number of permits per eligible households to a maximum of 2 residential permits only.

**Motion Carried** 

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna
	OAM, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Crs Passas and Raciti
Absent:	Crs Drury and Porteous

Councillors Drury and Porteous returned to meeting at 10.07pm. Councillors Passas and Raciti left the meeting at 10.08pm.

# C1117 Item 18 Targeting a Non Fossil Fuel Investment Portfolio for Inner West Council

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT the report be received and noted.

#### Motion Carried

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Crs Passas and Raciti

Councillors Passas and Raciti returned to the meeting at 10.15pm.

# C1117 Item 19 Pensioner Rebates

# Motion (Passas/Drury)

# THAT:

- Council receive and note the report; and 1.
- 2. Council officers prepare the 2018/19 Domestic Waste Management Charge (as a part of the 2018/19 budget process) based on the former Leichhardt voluntary pensioner rebate model.

Motion Carried

For Motion: Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

**Against Motion:** 

#### C1117 Item 22 Notice of Motion: Ensuring an Affordable, Quality Early Education and **Childcare Place for Every Child**

Motion: (Kiat/Steer)

# THAT:

1. The General Manager provide Council an early education and childcare (EEC) strategic report (Report) for the consideration of the community and Councillors;

- 2. The Report include an analysis of current and projected EEC supply and demand for Council residents;
- 3. The analysis of current and projected EEC supply to include assessment of cost, location, service type, and number of places. This analysis should include a breakdown by operator type (ie Council, community and private); and
- 4. The analysis of current and projected EEC demand to include assessment of number and type of places required, accessibility and affordability issues, preferred location of services, and community preference by operator type (ie Council, community or private).

Councillor Kiat withdrew his Motion.

# Foreshadowed Motion (Byrne/Passas)

THAT Council note that the Council already well advanced in commissioning a detailed childcare needs analysis to be reported in mid-2018.

This Foreshadowed Motion lapsed.

- C1117 Item 23 Notice of Motion: Rainbow Tunnel
- Motion: (York/McKenna OAM)

# THAT Council:

- 1. Notes that:
  - a. The pedestrian underpass tunnel at Phillip St Enmore is maintained by Sydney Trains with regular painting, and is the site of frequent graffiti and tagging; and
  - b. Sydney Trains maintains the tunnel regularly as a graffiti 'hot-spot' and have advised Council that if the rainbow mural is reinstated, Council would also need to take on responsibility for regular maintenance of the tunnel, at a cost to Council.
- 2. Write to Sydney Trains to request Council's preference, on behalf of the community, that the rainbow be reinstated and maintained, in recognition of the marriage equality campaign and YES vote which was supported by residents in the area, and celebrated by the rainbow mural;
- 3. Note that, should Sydney Trains decline this request, Council staff investigate alternative options for a mural in support of marriage equality, preferably in the nearby area; and
- 4. Write to Sydney Trains about the graffiti along the Railway Crescent wall at Lewisham and request that it be repainted.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

Meeting closed at 12.06 am.



# Minutes of Ordinary Council Meeting held on 12 December 2017

# Meeting commenced at 6.34 pm

Present:	
Darcy Byrne	Mayor
Julie Passas	Deputy Mayor (10.02pm)
Marghanita Da Cruz	Councillor
Mark Drury	Councillor
Lucille McKenna OAM	Councillor
Colin Hesse	Councillor
Sam Iskandar	Councillor
Pauline Lockie	Councillor
Victor Macri	Councillor
Rochelle Porteous	Councillor
Vittoria Raciti	Councillor (7.17pm)
Louise Steer	Councillor
Anna York	Councillor
Rik Hart	Interim General Manager
Peter Gainsford	Deputy General Manager Assets and Environment
John Warburton	Deputy General Manager Community and Engagement
Nellette Kettle	Group Manager Civic and Executive Support, Integration,
	Customer Service and Business Excellence
Joe Strati	Group Manager Legal
David Birds	Group Manager Strategic Planning
Gill Dawson	Manager Strategy and Policy
Kendall Banfield	Manager WestConnex Unit
Harjeet Atwal	Manager Planning Operations
Wal Petschler	Group Manager Footpaths, Roads, Traffic and Stormwater
lan Naylor	Manager Civic and Executive Support
Katherine Paixao	Business Paper Coordinator (Minute Taker)

#### APOLOGIES:

# Motion (Macri/Lockie)

That apologies from Clr Stamolis and lateness from Clrs Raciti and Passas be accepted.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

#### DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS:

Clr Raciti declared a significant, non-pecuniary interest in Item 24 Lambert Oval Lease, as her husband is the president of the football club.

#### Motion (Passas/Byrne)

That the Declaration of Interest be received and noted.



C1217 Item 31 Mayoral Minute: Confirmation of 100 Days Waiver of Fee Hire For Same Sex Marriage

Motion: (Byrne)

THAT Council:

- 1. Congratulate LGBTIQ Australians on attaining a historic achievement through the legislating of marriage equality;
- 2. Note that the federal electorate of Grayndler, encompassing most of the Inner West Council local government area, achieved the highest turn out of any electorate in NSW in the postal survey on same sex marriage;
- 3. Note the significant advance the passing of this legislation represents for human rights and inclusivity in Australia and recommit ourselves to upholding the principles of freedom from discrimination and respectful treatment of all Australians regardless of their sexual preference, gender, ethnicity or social background;
- 4. Write to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, Government Leader in the Senate George Brandis and Leader of the Opposition in the Senate Penny Wong and other relevant party leaders, congratulating them on the successful enactment of the Same Sex Marriage Bill; and
- 5. As per previous resolutions, make Council facilities available, free of hire fees for 100 days to all same sex weddings and extend this offer to couples previously married overseas who wish to hold a recommitment ceremony. The period of the fee waiver is to begin from 9 January 2018, the earliest date on which same sex marriages can take place.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York Nil

C1217 Item 27 Mayoral Minute: Letter of Condolence to the Family of Lester Bostock

Motion: (Byrne)

THAT Council writes a letter of condolence to the family of Lester Bostock, expressing our sadness at his passing and commending the contribution he made to the inner west community and the Australian Aboriginal community.

Motion Carried For Motion: Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York Nil
C1217 Item 28 Clifford	Mayoral Minute: Letter of Condolence to the Family of Gail
Motion: (Byrne)	



THAT Council write a letter of condolence to the family of Gail Clifford, expressing our sadness at her passing and commending the contribution she made to the Friends of Maliana support activities in Timor Leste and to Leichhardt Council

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Against Motion:	· · · · ·

Councillor Drury requested that an Urgency Motion be considered to express condolences on the passing of Kerry McNally.

**Urgency Motion (Drury/Byrne)** 

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

The Mayor declared that this motion was urgent.

Urgency Motion (Drury/Byrne) – Condolences to the family of Kerry McNally

THAT Council send a letter of condolence to the family of Kerry McNally.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

# C1217 Item 29 Mayoral Minute: Recreation and Wellbeing Opportunities for Welcome Centre Clients

Motion: (Byrne)

THAT Council:

- 1. Dedicate free places within the learn to swim programs at Leichhardt Park Aquatic Centre to 0-5 year olds attending Callan Park Refugee Welcome Centre, with numbers to be determined after confirming interest from Welcome Centre clients;
- 2. Provide water safety support and advice to parents attending the lessons with their children; and
- 3. Investigate provision of additional health and recreation programs to attendees through Council's recreation partners and networks.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

# C1217 Item 30 Mayoral Minute: Endorsement of Bike Share Guidelines

Motion: (Byrne)

THAT Council:

- 1. Approve the draft bike share guidelines, noting minor revisions may occur subject to liaison with operators and neighboring councils;
- 2. Approve an initial short term review period of three months to evaluate how well the operators have adhered to the guidelines;
- 3. Write to all bike share businesses currently operating in the inner west local government areas to confirm the guidelines and the review period;
- 4. Note that there is potential for the guidelines to develop into a more formal arrangement should the initial review period indicate such an approach is required;
- 5. In partnership with the Inner City councils investigate the potential for a fee or levy system whereby operators contribute to bike infrastructure;
- 6. Request that the Group Manager Legal to report back to Council following discussion with City of Sydney, Randwick, Waverly, Woollahra and Canada Bay Councils to clarify the legal framework under which bike share companies operate, and the legal powers available to councils with regards to regulating bike share companies and their operations; and
- 7. Write to the State Government to request that it agrees to implement the guidelines on state land and to give further consideration to a state-wide approach.

#### Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

# Motion (Byrne/Iskandar)

That Council move into Committee of the Whole in the Council Committee Room.

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM and York
Against Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Porteous, Raciti and Steer

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

7.01pm - The Mayor, Clr Byrne adjourned the meeting for a short recess. 7.17pm – The Mayor, Clr Byrne resumed the meeting.

Clr Raciti entered the meeting at 7.17pm

#### Motion (Byrne/Macri)

THAT the following Items be moved en bloc and the recommendations contained in the reports be adopted: Items 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 21.

#### **Motion Carried**



For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer, Raciti and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1217 Item 5 Post exhibition outcomes - Annandale North Neighbourhood Movement Plan

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT Council adopt the Annandale North Neighbourhood Movement Plan shown attached as Attachment 1 to this report.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1217 Item 6 Open Inner West 2017-18 Program for Endorsement

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

#### THAT:

- 1. The report be received and noted;
- 2. Council note the festival dates for 2017-18; and
- 3. Council endorse funding the 15 applications as outlined in Attachment 1. Successful Grant Recipients 2017-18, totalling \$61,180 for the OIW 2017-18 grants Program.

Motion Carried<br/>For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1217 Item 12 Comparative Service Levels Pre and Post Merger

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT Council receive and note this report of comparative service levels pre and postmerger.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil



#### C1217 Item 13 Reporting of Code of Conduct Statistics

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

#### THAT Council receives and notes this report.

Motion CarriedFor Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1217 Item 14 Notice of Motion: Tempe Station Access

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT Council writes to the NSW Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Mr Andrew Constance, calling on the NSW Government and Sydney Trains to:

Immediately construct an at level footpath from number four platform at Tempe Railway Station to Griffiths Street Tempe so as to improve access to Tempe Railway Station.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1217 Item 15 Notice of Motion: New Timetable

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT Council writes to the NSW Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Mr Andrew Constance, calling on the NSW Government and Sydney Trains to:

Immediately review the new T3 Bankstown Rail timetable to restore the long-standing rail link between Marrickville and St Peters during peak periods.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York Nil

C1217 Item 18 Notice of Motion: Investigating Feasibility of an Inner West Council Solar Farm

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT the General Manager, investigate the requirements for a feasibility study into:

- a) The business case for Inner West Council to invest in a solar farm to offset Council's electricity consumption across facilities and operations; and
- b) Options to share investment and return / savings with the community, including direct community investment and / or savings passed on through rates discounts.



Motion Carried For Motion:

Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York Nil

Against Motion:

C1217 Item 20 Notice of Motion: Support for Balmain Para Rowing Group

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT Council writes to the Office of Environment and Heritage seeking permission for the Balmain Para Rowing Group to use Palm Court Ward A as the site for their new rowing facility.

# Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1217 Item 21 Notice of Motion: Arts and Music Inquiry

Motion: (Byrne/Macri)

THAT Council make a submission to the Inquiry into the Music and Arts Economy in New South Wales.

**Motion Carried** 

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

# Suspension of Standing Orders (Byrne/ Macri)

THAT the following items be brought forward and dealt with at this time: Items 3, 8, 11, 16 and 25.

**Motion Carried** 

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

C1217 Item 3 Support for Make Renting Fair Campaign and Sydney Alliance's Affordable Rental Housing Campaign

Motion (Drury/Byrne)

- 1. THAT Council:
- 2.
- 1. Actively join the:
  - 3.
  - (a) NSW Make Renting Fair campaign; and
- 4. (b) Sydney Alliance's affordable renting housing campaign.
- 5.
- 6. 2. Publicise our participation in these campaigns.



Motion Carried For Motion:

Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

Against Motion:

C1217 Item 8 Local Participatory Democracy at Inner West

Motion: (McKenna OAM/Byrne)

# THAT:

- 1. This item be deferred to a Councillor Briefing in February 2018;
- 2. The briefing include further information on how Council will engage with:
  - a. Multicultural communities:
  - b. Access committees and business committees and other committees that may be determined by Council;
  - c. Faith based communities;
  - d. strategic reference groups on research including a process for policy matters to be referred to the SRGs by resolution of Council and recommendations to be reported back;
  - e. Seniors; and
  - f. Members of former facilities committees.
- 3. The Strategic Reference Groups continue in the interim;
- 4. The briefing be widened to include an overview and assessment of all Committees that were up and functioning as part of the democratic structure of the 3 councils -Leichhardt, Ashfield and Marrickville up until they were forcibly amalgamated in May 2016. These Committees include but are not limited to the Access Committees, Youth and Senior Councils, Environment and Recreation, Heritage and Bicycle Committees.

# Motion Carried

For Motion: Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

# Against Motion:

Councillor Raciti left the Meeting at 9.28 pm.

C1217 Item 11 WestConnex Update Report

Motion: (Lockie/Hesse)

**THAT Council:** 

- 1. Receives and notes this report;
- 2. Writes to Sydney Motorway Corporation (SMC) in relation to M4 East residual lands and the Urban Design & Landscape Plan (UDLP) Updated Appendix F: Noise barrier location sub-plan seeking:
  - confirmation that residents of Walker Avenue, Haberfield and immediate (a) surrounds prefer Roads & Maritime (RMS)-owned dwellings at 18 & 20 Walker Avenue be put to residential rather than community use;
  - (b) a cash contribution for upgrading of Council community facilities in the

Haberfield town centre in lieu of ownership or use of dwellings for community purposes, if it is confirmed that local residents prefer residential use of these dwellings;

- (c) a commitment to early provision of operational traffic noise barriers or other noise amelioration to properties on the eastern side of Wattle Street / Dobroyd Parade between Ramsay and Waratah Streets and to properties at 14 to 24 Wattle Street, Haberfield to protect residents against construction noise.
- 3. Writes to RMS to:
  - (a) express opposition to any impact by WestConnex Stage 3 (M4-M5 Link) on any park or other publicly-accessible open space area;

(b) refuse concurrence to proposed compulsory acquisition for WestConnex of parcels of land at: Buruwan Park, North Annandale; intersection of Johnston Street and The Crescent, North Annandale; and King George Park at intersection of Victoria Road and Byrnes Street, Rozelle; and

(c) seek alternative design solutions that result in there being no impact on abovementioned parks and open space areas.

- 4. Writes to RMS and SMC (New M5) stating it does not support occupation of a further two netball courts at Tempe Reserve (taking the number of courts occupied from three to five), acknowledging that RMS can use its powers under the Roads Act to take this action;
- 5. Writes to the Minister for Roads expressing its opposition to the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link project as part of its overall position of opposing inner-Sydney motorways and preference for public transport options.
- 6. Provide \$800 in funding for a community anti-WestConnex protest that was held along Victoria Road, Rozelle on the morning of 12 December 2017.
  - 7. Officers recommendation 2 C) that Council: Seek a commitment to early provision of noise barriers or noise amelioration to properties on the eastern side of Wattle Street/Dobroyd Parade between Ramsey and Waratah Street; AND
  - 8. That Council seek same early provision of operation noise barriers, or other noise amelioration to include:
    - a. All properties along the western side of Wattle Street, Haberfield

between Parramatta Road and Ramsey Street (not just 12-24WattleStreet, ending at AshSide of (WattleStreet/ Dobroyd Parade).

Motion Carried	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
For Motion:	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Raciti

Councillor Raciti returned to the Meeting at 9.30 pm.



#### C1217 Item 16 Notice of Motion: Bikes Inner West Council

Motion: (Drury/Hesse)

THAT in order to progress the expansion of the Inner West Bike Route Network Council:

- 1. Establish a Bicycle Working Group with Councillors, local bicycle groups and interested community members;
- 2. Nominate a staff member to be a project manager for bike projects;
- 3. Work out a better way of balancing the competing needs of our road network;
- 4. Establish a budget for bike projects for the next three years; and
- 5. Appoint an Inner West Bicycle Coalition representative on the IWC Traffic Committee.

#### Motion Carried

For Motion: Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

Against Motion:

#### Motion (Byrne/McKenna OAM)

That standing orders be resumed.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

Councillor Passas entered the meeting at 10.02pm

Draft Greater Sydney Region Plan and Revised Draft Eastern City C1217 Item 1 **District Plan - Greater Sydney Commission** 

#### Motion (McKenna OAM/Byrne)

**THAT Council:** 

- 1. Receive and note the Report;
- 2. Adopts the proposed responses in this Report;
- 3. Prepare a submission to the Greater Sydney Commission based on the contents of this Report;
- Write to Google seeking a meeting to discuss Google's previous proposal to 4. establish their headquarters at the White Bay Power Station site with the aim of overcoming the accessibility and public transport deficiencies which resulted
- the deferral of those plans; and in
- Make reference to questions on how this plan is going to be funded to achieve 5. the desired outcomes of the plan.

Motion Carried


For Motion:

Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Porteous, Passas, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

Against Motion:

Amendment (Da Cruz/Kiat)

THAT Council:

- 1. Remove references to Parramatta Road Urban Transformation Strategy and extending the Camperdown-Ultimo Biomedical hub from the submission;
- 2. Amend Response 12 into two separate responses one in relation to the Refugee Welcome Centre in Callan Park and the other in relation to the Aboriginal Communities. The later should be drafted in conjunction with the appropriate staff in council;
- 3. The submission needs to include the following items which have been overlooked in the Plans:
  - a. The transition to distributed energy generation and supply in particular in relation to private local photovoltaic solar energy generation and the necessary infrastructure to for example support urban community solar farms;
  - b. Improving the amenity for passengers at bus stops by providing better pedestrian access, reducing air and noise pollution, providing shade from sun, shelter from rain and information such as bus routes and timetables both digitally and at the bus stop;
  - c. Reducing noise pollution from aircraft and motor vehicles on homes, schools, restaurants, cafes and public open spaces including footpaths;
  - d. The expansion and provision of frequent rail services and inter-region high speed rail services;
  - e. On Pg 13 with regard to schools and childcare these need to be accessible by good pedestrian, cycling and public transport infrastructure;
  - f. Either define an additional glossary or use the Greater Sydney Commission's glossary to define Public/Open/Green spaces and Public/Mass/Active Transport;
  - g. Transition to electric buses including the necessary infrastructure for recharging;
  - h. Public Transport and night time pedestrian amenity play a vital role in the night time economy to enable workers and patrons to get to and from venues; and



i. With regard to the cruise terminals, particularly the one at White Bay, shore power is required.

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Porteous and Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas,
	Raciti and York

C1217 Item 2 Review of State Environmental Planning Policy No. 1 - Development Standards and State Environmental Planning Policy (Miscellaneous Consent Provisions) 2007

# Motion (Byrne/Drury)

# THAT:

- 1. The report be received and noted; and
- 2. Council endorse the draft submission in ATTACHMENT 1 to this report to be forwarded to the Department of Planning and Environment.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Passas, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

# C1217 Item 4 Permitting dogs in Pubs in the Inner West

# Motion (Byrne/Drury)

# THAT Council:

- 1. Publicly exhibit a proposed amendment to the 2017/2018 Fees and Charges to provide for full fee waivers for Development Applications (and associated modifications), footpath use applications and any lease fees associated with establishment of new low-impact '*Dog-Welcome Zones*' (only) in outdoor areas such as footpath dining, courtyards or beer gardens, where a premises does not currently have such an area;
- 2. Provide a further report to Council outlining the outcomes of the application fee waiver public exhibition process at its completion; and
- 3. Publishes a plain English Comprehensive guide to Commercial Footpath Occupation on its website to encourage and assist businesses to apply for licenses to occupy and enliven these public spaces without negatively impacting pedestrian amenity. The guide is to include Council's policy(s), scale of occupation, application fees, lease charges, relevant legislation and other requirements that the businesses need to comply with including Food Safety, Licensing, Work Place Health and Safety, Public Liability and Pedestrian Amenity.

Motion Carried For Motion:

Against Motion:



Foreshadowed Motion (Da Cruz/Porteous)

# THAT:

- 1. There be no fee waivers; and
- 2. Council publishes a plain English Comprehensive guide to Commercial Footpath Occupation on its website to encourage and assist businesses to apply for licenses to occupy and enliven these public spaces without negatively impacting pedestrian amenity. The guide is to include Council's policy(s), scale of occupation, application fees, lease charges, relevant legislation and other requirements that the businesses need to comply with including Food Safety, Licensing, Work Place Health and Safety, Public Liability and Pedestrian Amenity.

This Foreshadowed Motion lapsed.

# C1217 Item 7 Schedule of Ordinary Council Meetings for 2018

Motion (Drury/Macri)

- 7.
- 8. THAT:
- 9.
- 1. Council hold Ordinary Council Meetings for 2018 at the Ashfield Service Centre commencing at 6.30pm on the dates shown in the Meeting Schedule in the report, and publish these dates on Council's Website; and 10.
- 2. The General Manager in consultation with the Mayor consider holding Council Meetings other venues in the Council area if there is a significant reason.

Motion Carried

For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Iskandar, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas,<br/>Raciti, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Crs Hesse, Kiat, Lockie and Porteous

Amendment (Hesse/Steer)

THAT Council build a new Council Chambers at the Petersham Service Centre and move Council meetings to Petersham once this is complete.

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Porteous and Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas,
	Raciti and York

Foreshadowed Motion (Porteous/Da Cruz)

THAT the Meeting Schedule of dates and times as outlined in the report be adopted, however in order to enable community members to be able to attend at least some Council Meetings which are accessible to them over the calendar year the location of Council Meetings be shared across the 3 council areas of Leichhardt, Ashfield and Marrickville either in the relevant Council Chambers or town halls.

This Foreshadow Motion lapsed.



# Motion: (McKenna OAM/ Macri)

# THAT the meeting be extended for a further 30 Minutes.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

Councillor Macri left the Meeting at 11:03 pm.

# C1217 Item 9 Quarterly Budget Review Statement at 30 September 2017

# Motion: (Drury/McKenna)

# THAT:

1. The report be received and noted; and

# 2. Council approves the budget adjustments required.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, McKenna
	OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Macri

Councillor Macri returned to the Meeting at 11:06 pm.

## C1217 Item 10 Inner West Council Brand Development

## Motion: (McKenna OAM/Byrne)

THAT Council:

1. Establish a panel of nine people (membership to include nominated Councillors and the Mayor, Council officers and relevant community members identified collaboratively by those Councillors and Council officers) to determine the specifications for a public logo design competition;

Nominated Councillors:

- 2. Include in the specifications for the logo design competition elements reflective of the past, present and future of the local community's character;
- 3. Will, through the committee, identify appropriate levels of funding for the competition, including prize money; and
- 4. Requests a further report to be brought back to Council, following the conclusion of the design competition, outlining the specifications for the branding process.

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, McKenna OAM and York
Against Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, Passas, Porteous, Raciti
	and Steer

Foreshadowed Motion (Macri/Porteous)



THAT Council defer this item for 6 months.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM,
Against Motion:	Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Crs Byrne and Drury

C1217 Item 17 Notice of Motion: Use of Infrastructure SEPP

Motion: (Porteous/Da Cruz)

THAT where council needs development approval for development on substantial development on publically owned land or property it must not use the Infrastructure SEPP to achieve this. The Infrastructure SEPP does not allow for adequate public scrutiny and community consultation. Instead all of Council's development proposals on publically owned land must be assessed through a full development application process.

Motion Lost	
For Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Porteous and Steer
Against Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas, Raciti and York

C1217 Item 19 Notice of Motion: Shade Sails

Motion: (Byrne/Drury)

## THAT Council:

1. Officers report on the suitability and rank the priority of the following playgrounds for installation of shade sails, to be considered in the preparation of the 2018/19 Budget:

Chester Street Annandale
Hearn Street Leichhardt
Marr Reserve Leichhardt
O'Connor Reserve Rozelle
Cary Street Leichhardt
Ann Cashman Reserve Balmain
Lambert Park Leichhardt
War Memorial Park Leichhardt
Elkington Park Balmain
Bridgewater Rozelle
Orange Grove Lilyfield
Gray Street Annandale
North Street Leichhardt
Mort Bay Birchgrove
Gladstone Park Balmain
36 Battalion Park Leichhardt

2. Have a review of all playgrounds in the LGA for the prioritisation of the installation of shade sails in preparation for the 2018/19 budget.



For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

# Motion: (Drury/McKenna OAM)

## THAT the meeting be extended for a further 30 Minutes.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil

## Motion (Passas/Raciti)

That Council move into Confidential session to consider Items of business containing Confidential Information.

Motion Carried For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
Against Motion:	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and York Nil

Members of the public were asked to leave the Chamber.

## Motion: (Drury/McKenna OAM)

THAT Council return to open session to read out the recommendations from the<br/>Closed Session.<br/>Motion Carried<br/>For Motion:For Motion:Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,<br/>McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Raciti, Steer and YorkAgainst Motion:Nil

The Mayor read out to the Meeting the recommendation from the Closed Session of Council.

## **REPORTS WITH CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

C1217 Item 23 General Manager's Contract of Employment

Motion (McKenna OAM/Iskandar)

THAT Council extends the General Manager's current contract of employment for a period of twelve (12) months on the same remuneration package. All other terms and conditions will be in accordance with the Office of Local Government Standard Contract of Employment for General Managers of Local Councils in New South Wales. In relation to Schedule A – Council Policies, the following will apply:- all Inner West Council policies that apply to all staff, including IWC Leaseback Motor Vehicle policy.



Against Motion: Crs Da Cruz, Kiat, Lockie and Porteous

Clr Raciti left the meeting as she had declared a pecuniary interest in Item 24 and did not vote or participate in discussion of the matter.

# C1217 Item 24 Lambert Oval Lease

# Motion (McKenna OAM/Iskandar)

# THAT:

- "A. Council agrees to vary the existing lease with APIA Leichhardt Tigers Football Club Inc ("APIA") so as to achieve the following outcomes:
  - 1. The term of the initial lease is extended by 6 months (ie. to 31 March 2020);
  - 2. The date for payment of sinking fund payments is varied to 31 March each year (including 31 March 2020 and any March within a hold over or renewal lease period); and
  - 3. APIA is to pay Council \$22,500 upon the date the lease comes to an end (whether that end date occurs during an initial period, a hold over period or a renewal period) to reflect the additional 6 months use permitted under paragraph 1 above and the payment deferral permitted by paragraph 2.
- B. The General Manager is authorised to negotiate the variation to the lease to implement the above."

Item A3 is intended to ensure that Council is no worse off as a result of the payment deferral.

Motion Carried	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
For Motion:	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Raciti

C1217 Item 25 Request for Information on the Process for Initiating a Public Inquiry and Holding a Plebiscite

Motion (McKenna OAM/Iskandar)

11. THAT Council provide a public statement about the legal advice on the process for initiating a public inquiry and holding a plebiscite on de-amalgamation.

Motion Carried

For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Drury, Iskandar, Lockie, Macri, McKenna OAM, Passas and York	
Against Motion:	Crs Da Cruz, Hesse, Kiat, Porteous and Steer	
Absent:	Cr Raciti	

C1217 Item 26 Legal Advice on Challenges to Westconnex

Motion: (McKenna OAM/Iskandar)



# THAT Council receive and note this report.

Motion Carried	
For Motion:	Crs Byrne, Da Cruz, Drury, Hesse, Iskandar, Kiat, Lockie, Macri,
	McKenna OAM, Passas, Porteous, Steer and York
Against Motion:	Nil
Absent:	Cr Raciti

Meeting closed 12.06am



ltem 1

Item No: C0218 Item 1

Subject: AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUBMISSION TO EXPLANATION OF INTENDED EFFECT FOR STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 70

Prepared By: Katie Miles - Strategic Planner

Authorised By: David Birds - Group Manager Strategic Planning

# SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek endorsement of the attached submission to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) supporting a proposed amendment to *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)* (SEPP 70) to include the Inner West local government area (LGA) in SEPP 70. It also advises on the next steps to be taken to utilise the amendment to help secure more affordable housing.

The inclusion of Inner West Council in SEPP 70 is supported as it will provide a legal mechanism to enable Council to require affordable housing contributions in association with development enabled by Planning Proposals that amend Local Environmental Plans (LEPs).

Council had previously written to DPE seeking inclusion in SEPP 70 and submitted supporting evidence on the need for affordable housing in Council's area.

## RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council:

- 1. Support the inclusion of the Inner West LGA in SEPP 70;
- 2. Endorse Council's Strategic Planning Group to work with the DPE to develop proposals for affordable housing contribution schemes under SEPP 70 to implement Council's Affordable Housing Policy;
- 3. Endorse Council's Strategic Planning Group to require affordable housing contribution schemes to support Planning Proposals to amend relevant LEPs in accordance with the aims of Council's Affordable Housing Policy;
- 4. Request that the DPE provides guidance to councils on the process and information requirements to be addressed in preparing an affordable housing contribution scheme; and
- 5. Request Council's Strategic Planning Group to report back to Council on discussions with DPE on the implementation of Council's Affordable Housing Policy and the potential need for changes to the Policy to optimise the outcomes that can be achieved utilising SEPP 70.

## BACKGROUND

On 15 December 2017, the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) announced proposed changes to the *State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)* (SEPP 70) governing affordable rental housing. The proposal involves expanding the provisions of the SEPP 70 to include Inner West Council and City of Canada Bay, City of Ryde, Northern Beaches and Randwick City Councils.

The amendment to SEPP 70 to include Council was on exhibition until 31 January 2018. Council's officers requested an extension to this deadline to allow for the proposal to be



discussed at Council's meeting on 13 February 2018. DPE requested that a draft submission be submitted by 31 January 2018 and that the outcome of the consideration of the submission by Council be confirmed after the 13 February 2018 meeting. Accordingly a draft submission that is consistent with the recommendations in this report has been submitted to DPE and forms ATTACHMENT 1.

This report describes the proposed changes to SEPP 70 and the next steps required to utilise the proposed changes to help implement Council's Affordable Housing Policy.

The following earlier Council resolutions relate to matters considered in the report.

Council Meeting Date	Council Resolution No	Affordable housing resolution
28/03/2017	C0317	In relation to the adoption of the Inner West Affordable Housing Policy, the Administrator:
		<ul> <li>Adopts the Affordable Housing Policy and the Position Paper: Best Practice in Value Capture.</li> </ul>
24/10/2017	C1017	In relation to the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy Submission, that Council:
		<ul> <li>Requests the NSW Minister for Planning agrees to provide SEPP 70 for affordable housing in line with the Inner West Affordable Housing Policy.</li> </ul>
21/11/2017	C1117	In relation to a notice of motion by Councillors Kiat and Steer, Council resolved:
		<ul> <li>That Council hold a briefing session for Councillors on Councils adopted policies on affordable housing and the body of research which has been undertaken to support it.</li> </ul>

# Proposed Amendment to SEPP 70 and the Explanation of Intended Effect

The proposal to expand the provisions of SEPP 70 to apply to the Inner West Council LGA is welcomed and responds directly to a request from Council to be included. Inclusion in SEPP 70 will provide a legal mechanism to enable Council to require affordable housing contributions in association with the many Planning Proposals coming forward. Currently Council is only able to require affordable housing contributions in association with Planning Proposals and development applications by way of voluntary planning agreements (VPAs).

Section 94F(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act) only allows conditions requiring affordable housing contributions to be applied to a development application under that section if a State environmental planning policy identifies that there is a need for affordable housing within the area. The proposed amendment to SEPP 70 will satisfy that requirement for Council. SEPP 70 will then enable Council to introduce affordable housing contributions schemes, implemented through Planning Proposals that amend the existing Council LEPs, that require the imposition of a condition of consent to collect affordable housing contributions or dedication of affordable housing at the development assessment stage (under Part 4 of the EP&A Act).

The submission made by Council to justify inclusion in SEPP 70 relied on information on local need for affordable housing derived from Council's Affordable Housing Policy and Background Paper. The exhibited DPE Explanation of Intended Effect on the proposed amendment notes this information, supports Council's analysis and as a result proposes inclusion in SEPP 70.

It is important to note that the inclusion of Council in SEPP 70 will not give statutory force to Council's Affordable Housing Policy but it will provide an important new tool that Council can use to seek to secure affordable housing in association with new Planning Proposals. It will also enable Council to prepare its own Planning Proposals to apply requirements for affordable housing to development proposals. This will make affordable housing requirements



associated with new development proposals clear to landowners, residents, construction and the real estate industry early in the planning and development process.

The amendment of SEPP 70 will allow the listed councils to prepare affordable housing contribution schemes for defined precincts, areas or developments associated with increased density and higher development yield because of the initial zoning of a site, or the rezoning of a site within their local government area.

# Lack of Guidance on the Implementation of SEPP 70 Provisions

The Explanation of Intended Effect (EIE) and other exhibition material do not provide any details of the requirements for the content of an affordable housing contribution scheme or potential associated draft model LEP clause(s).

The associated exhibition material indicates that proposed affordable housing contribution rates should not impact on the supply of general housing but no details are given on how this should be assessed, for example with requirements for feasibility assessment modelling. Guidance on a common approach to the assessment of this issue, including the accepted methodology for financial analysis and the consideration of its results, would assist in this regard and would help limit the extent of costly feasibility analyses that Councils may otherwise need to commission to support proposed schemes.

It is also unclear how Councils can apply affordable housing contribution schemes to wider areas in advance of the approval of Planning Proposals that later set the detailed parameters for new development.

It is considered that the Department should be requested to provide guidance on the matters raised above to assist Councils seeking to introduce affordable housing contributions schemes. As Council is currently facing a large number of Planning Proposals from which it is important to seek affordable housing contributions, it is proposed that Council offers to work with DPE on finalising supporting guidance, including considering a potential standard tool for financial feasibility assessment of individual development proposals.

# Implementing the Inner West Council Affordable Housing Policy Utilising SEPP 70

Council adopted its Affordable Housing Policy in March 2017. The Policy requires 15% of all total gross floor area (residential or commercial, if it is a mixed use development) to be transferred to Council as affordable rental housing units for any residential development approved through the process of rezoning that has 20 or more dwellings or with a gross floor area larger than 1,700m<sup>2</sup>. The Policy applies to all land subject to re-zoning for residential or mixed use purposes across the LGA and is not limited to any specific area.

Council's Policy also supports an affordable housing target of 30% of affordable units on State Government owned land.

It is proposed that Council utilises the opportunity presented by inclusion in SEPP 70 to secure affordable housing in accordance with the Policy. To apply its Affordable Housing Policy under SEPP 70, the Council will need to prepare a Planning Proposal to:

- a) establish specific affordable housing contribution schemes; and
- b) insert appropriate provisions in the three current LEPs for contributions to be required in accordance with an approved dedications (or contributions) scheme.

Council will also need to prepare an affordable housing contribution scheme to support each new Planning Proposal where contributions for affordable housing will be required. The schemes will be assessed by the DPE and approved by the Minister for Planning as part of the consideration of an associated Planning Proposal that will introduce the schemes.



Council officers have met with representatives of the DPE to discuss issues arising from the proposed inclusion in SEPP 70. The discussions highlighted the DPE concern that affordable housing contribution schemes will need to demonstrate that the proposed affordable housing contributions rate will not impact on supply of general housing. This will need to take into account consideration of other potential development costs such as State Infrastructure Contributions (SICs), Local Infrastructure Contributions (Section 94 Contribution Plans) and other public benefit requirements. DPE identified particular concerns about how Council's Affordable Housing Policy addresses this issue. It is proposed to discuss these concerns with DPE and report back to Council on any potential need for changes to the Policy to optimise the outcomes that can be achieved under SEPP 70.

Affordable housing contribution schemes under SEPP 70 can only be implemented through a Planning Proposal to amend the relevant LEP. The Strategic Planning Group is best placed to prepare and implement affordable housing contribution schemes as development feasibility is often assessed as part of reviews to the Local Environment Plan, Development Control Plan and Section 94 Developer Contribution Plans.

Council should note that there are likely to be considerable costs incurred in preparing affordable housing contribution schemes and associated Planning Proposal documents and no funds have been allocated for the implementation of Council's Affordable Housing Policy through LEP amendments. However for proponent-led Planning Proposals (rezoning applications) the cost can be borne largely by the proponent. The Council led component can be considered as part of the allocation of funds for the LEPs review in the budget for 2018/19.

# FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil at this stage, however there is currently no budget for the implementation of the Affordable Housing Policy.

It is expected that there will be a cost to prepare affordable housing contribution schemes and associated LEP amendments to help implement the Affordable Housing Policy. This will be considered as part of the allocation of funds for the LEPs review in the budget for 2018/19. It will also be the subject of discussions with DPE when that will seek to identify the requirements for affordable housing contribution schemes in detail.

## PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Not applicable.

# CONCLUSION

It is recommended that Council endorse the attached submission that requests the DPE expedites changes to SEPP 70 to include Council in SEPP 70.

# ATTACHMENTS

- 1.<u>1</u> Inner West Draft Council Submission SEPP 70
- **2.** DPE SEPP 70 Explanation of Intended Effects
- **3.** DPE SEPP 70 Frequently Asked Questions



Contact: Gill Dawson Phone: 9335 9044

31 January 2018

Director, Housing & Infrastructure Policy Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Director, Housing & Infrastructure Policy

# RE: INCLUSION OF INNER WEST COUNCIL IN STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 70 AFFORDABLE HOUSING (REVISED SCHEMES) (SEPP 70)

Thank you for providing Council with the opportunity to comment on the Explanation of Intended Effect (EIE) on the proposed amendments to SEPP 70. Council strongly supports the proposed inclusion of the Inner West Council in SEPP 70 which responds positively to Council's request for inclusion. Council looks forward to drawing on the opportunity provided by inclusion in SEPP 70 to work collaboratively with the Department to introduce local affordable housing contribution schemes in association with Planning Proposals that will deliver affordable housing to help meet local needs.

It is requested that the proposed change to SEPP 70 is made as soon as possible. There is a large number of current Planning Proposals across the Inner West local government area that appear to have the capacity to help deliver local affordable housing in support of Council's policy aims and those of the Greater Sydney Commission as identified in the recent draft Greater Sydney Plan and draft Eastern City District Plan. In the interim, Council will continue to seek to obtain affordable housing contributions as part of voluntary planning agreements in association with Planning Proposals.

It is noted that the inclusion of Council in SEPP 70 only provides a mechanism to introduce local affordable housing contribution schemes in association with amendments to Local Environmental Plans (LEPs) for consideration for approval by the Minister. The preparation of schemes can be a costly process. It is understood that the Department is considering providing guidance on the preparation of affordable housing contribution schemes. This would be greatly beneficial to all stakeholders and would help in establishing a common approach to such matters, and help reduce the costs and timeframes for the finalisation of Planning Proposals for all involved. It would be helpful if the Department could make such guidance available to all stakeholders as soon as possible. The Council is prepared to work with the Department to help finalise such guidance if this would be helpful.

The Council notes the Department's concern to ensure that proposed affordable housing contributions schemes should not impact on the supply of general housing, and understands

### **Customer Service Centres**

 Petersham
 P (02) 9335 2222
 E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au
 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

 Leichhardt
 P (02) 9367 9222
 E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au
 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

 Ashfield
 P (02) 9716 1800
 E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au
 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131





that the Department may require development feasibility/financial modelling to demonstrate the viability of such schemes. The Council is prepared to work with the Department to establish a suitable feasibility model to be used for this purpose, including testing modelling on sites in the Council area.

In order to provide clarity for future operation under the SEPP 70, Council requests that the Ashfield, Leichhardt and Marrickville LEPs be specifically referenced in SEPP 70 to provide clarity that the policy aims apply to each of these environmental planning instruments. Once Council has completed a comprehensive review of the future Inner West Local Environmental Plan, SEPP 70 will need to be updated to reflect this.

Should you have any questions regarding Council's concerns and recommendations please contact Council's Manager of Strategy & Policy, Gill Dawson on 9335 9044.

Yours sincerely,

David Birds GROUP MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING

**Customer Service Centres** 

 Petersham
 P (02) 9335 2222
 E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au
 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

 Leichhardt
 P (02) 9367 9222
 E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au
 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

 Ashfield
 P (02) 9716 1800
 E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au
 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



Item 1



Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)

> Explanation of Intended Effect December 2017



2

December 2017 © Crown Copyright, State of NSW through its Department of Planning and Environment 2017

#### Disclaimer

While every reasonable effort has been made to ensure this document is correct at time of printing, the State of NSW, its agents and employees, disclaim any and all liability to any person in respect of anything or the consequences of anything done or omitted to be done in reliance or upon the whole or any part of this document.

### Copyright notice

In keeping with the NSW Government's commitment to encourage the availability of information, you are welcome to reproduce the material that appears in Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) Explanation of Intended Effect. This material is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). You are required to comply with the terms of CC BY 4.0 and the requirements of the Department of Planning and Environment. More information can be found at: http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Copyright-and-Disclaimer.

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) December 2017



# **Contents**

Explanation of Intended Effect	4
State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)	4
Executive summary	5
Planning context and objectives	6
Planning context	6
State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)	6
Key policy changes	7
Proposed change	10

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) | December 2017

3



# **Explanation of Intended Effect**

# State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)

This Explanation of Intended Effect (EIE) has been prepared for the purposes of Section 38 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 (the Act) to explain the intended effect of an amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) (SEPP70).

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) | December 2017



# **Executive summary**

As Sydney's population continues to grow the delivery of housing becomes an imperative for Government at all levels. Providing accessible, well designed and affordable housing ensures the continued success of local economies and communities at large.

Some areas within the Greater Sydney metropolitan region, especially those with ready access to employment, transport and desirable amenities have felt increased pressure on housing prices, and the associated impact of a reduction in the availability of housing for workers on very low, low and moderate incomes. Randwick, Inner West, Northern Beaches, Ryde and Canada Bay local government areas have been susceptible to these pressures.

These Councils have identified concern that the private rental market in their local government areas cannot respond to the housing needs of very low, low, and moderate income families at affordable levels. Issues such as gentrification and the consequential displacement of lower income households have significant social and economic implications for the growth, future investment opportunities and the effective functioning of the City.

The Councils are seeking inclusion within SEPP70 to enable them to require contributions for affordable housing in association with development proposals in areas where this housing is needed. The Councils have prepared the following reports to support their inclusion in SEPP70:

- The Randwick City Affordable Rental Housing Needs Analysis 2016,
- The Inner West Council Affordable Housing Policy Paper 2016 and Affordable Housing Background Paper 2016,
- The Northern Beaches Affordable Housing Needs Analysis December 2016,
- The City of Ryde Affordable Housing Policy 2016 2031, and
- The City of Canada Bay Affordable Rental Housing Evidence Report September 2017.

The reports demonstrate a need for affordable housing in the respective local government areas. The reports have been reviewed by the Department of Planning and Environment and it is considered that they meet the requirement under section 94F(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to demonstrate a need for affordable housing within the local government areas.

As a result, this Explanation of Intended Effect proposes an amendment to SEPP70 to identify the Randwick, Inner West, Northern Beaches, Ryde and Canada Bay as local government areas with a need for affordable housing.

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) December 2017



6

# Planning context and objectives

## **Planning context**

The amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) will expand the application of the existing provisions within the SEPP to identify Randwick, Inner West, Northern Beaches, Ryde and Canada Bay as local government areas with a need for affordable housing. Affordable housing is defined in the Environmental Panning and Assessment Act 1979 as housing for very low income households, low income households or moderate income households with the income brackets prescribed within SEPP70.

The amendment to SEPP70 will meet the requirement of section 94F(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 that a state environmental planning policy must identify that there is a need for affordable housing within an area in order for a requirement for affordable housing contributions to be applied when granting consent for a development application.

In order to impose a condition of consent councils are required to have appropriate provisions within their local environmental plans and ensure the condition is in accordance with a scheme for dedications or contributions. Amendments to local environmental plans will follow the existing gateway process while proposed contribution schemes will be reviewed by the Department of Planning and Environment, with a determination made by the Minister for Planning. This process will ensure new contribution schemes maintain the viability of development in NSW and do not unduly impact on broader housing delivery.

# State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)

### Background

State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) (SEPP70) commenced on 1 June 2002. The policy identifies that there is a need for affordable housing in a local government area, describes the kinds of households that affordable housing may be provided for and provides the mechanism for the imposition of affordable housing provisions.

Broadly, the policy provides the link between section 94F of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) and collection of affordable housing contributions or dedication of affordable dwellings.

SEPP70 currently applies to the City of Sydney and Willoughby City Council areas.

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) December 2017

# **Key policy changes**

#### Identifying a need for affordable housing in the Inner West Council Local Government Area

The proposed amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) will include the Inner West Council in the list of councils identified as having a need for affordable housing within their local government area.

The Inner West Council Affordable Housing Policy Paper 2016 and Affordable Housing Background Paper 2016 provide a comprehensive analysis of housing conditions within the local government area and identify a need for greater affordable housing. The reports outline the changing social and economic profile of the area over the past decades, and the rapid gentrification of suburbs including Leichhardt, Petersham and Marrickville. This is highlighted by the increase in median weekly household incomes in Marrickville and Leichhardt, of 25% and 35% respectively, compared with an increase of 10% for Greater Sydney.

The gentrification of the inner west has been coupled with a reduction in houses available to very low and low income households. This has led to an increase in housing stress<sup>1</sup> among these households, paying a disproportionate amount of their weekly income on rent and thus at risk of having insufficient income to pay for other necessities such as healthy food, education, transport and health care.

In 2011, 81% of very low income, 69% of low income and 26% of moderate income households were in housing stress in the Inner West LGA, with rates trending upwards for low and moderate income households.

The findings of the analysis undertaken by the Inner West Council are supported, and it is proposed that the Council is included in SEPP70.

#### Identifying a need for affordable housing in Randwick Local Government Area

The proposed amendments to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) will include Randwick City Council in the list of councils identified as having a need for affordable housing within their local government area.

The Randwick City Affordable Rental Housing Needs Analysis 2016, prepared by Randwick City Council, states that 'in 2011, 20.5% of Randwick City's renting households were experiencing rental stress. The report further notes that Randwick has lost affordable housing stock since 2011, with the proportion of affordable rental stock in Randwick declining significantly for very low to low income households from December 2011 to December 2014, by more than 77% and 58% respectively. This loss coupled with a projected increase in population of an additional 36,500 people by 2031 will lead to a significant deficit in affordable housing in the area.

The report also notes the importance of the two largest employment centres within the local government area, being the Education Precinct surrounding the University of New South Wales and the Health precinct surrounding Prince of Wales Hospital, Royal Hospital for Women and the Children's Hospital, Neuroscience Research Australia and the Lowy Cancer Centre.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Households paying 30% or more of their income on housing costs (mainly rent) are defined as being in housing stress. Under those circumstances the cost of housing is affecting a household's ability to pay for other primary needs including food, power and water, health services, travel and transport, education and household good.'

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) December 2017



The report further notes that employment forecasts for these precincts project an additional 3,920 jobs will be created by 2031 or an increase of 26%. Both the Children's Hospital and the Royal Hospital for Women have noted the difficulty in filling job vacancies for specialist nurses (such as pediatric and neonatology nurses) who are highly desirable in terms of international competition for their skills and being priced out of living in the area. Growth within these precincts will generate demand for services typically staffed by lower income earners.

The report is comprehensive in its analysis of the existing housing stock within the Randwick local government area, as well as it's analysis of population, income, employment, rental and purchasing trends and housing stress. It concludes that without the provision of more affordable housing through policy intervention, the market is expected to continue to produce more expensive housing in the area, so that housing will only be affordable to households on relatively high incomes.

The findings of the analysis undertaken by Randwick City Council are supported, and it is proposed that the Council is included in SEPP70.

#### Identifying a need for affordable housing in Northern Beaches Local Government Area

The proposed amendments to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) will include Northern Beaches Council in the list of councils identified as having a need for affordable housing within their local government area.

The Northern Beaches Affordable Housing Needs Analysis, December 2016 demonstrates that the supply of affordable housing to rent or buy within the Northern Beaches is at historically low levels, and is significantly below the Sydney average. Analysis of stocks of rental properties across the Northern Beaches which would be considered affordable (i.e. less than 30% household disposable income) at June 2015 found that: for very low income households only 1% would be affordable, compared to 3% for Sydney average; for low income households only 3% of rental properties in Manly, 5% in Warringah and 7% in Pittwater are considered affordable, compared to 18% for Sydney average; and for moderate income households only 26% of rental properties in Manly, 5% in Pittwater and 40% in Warringah, compared to 60% of all rental properties for Sydney region. This is despite strong new supply of dwellings in recent years, with 1,648 new dwellings built between 2012 and 2015 across the Northern Beaches (82% of which were multi-unit dwellings).

The Northern Beaches Affordable Housing Needs Analysis further identifies that 6,847 very low, low or moderate income households renting across the Northern Beaches, were experiencing housing stress according to 2011 Census data.

The report provides a comprehensive analysis of the need for affordable housing with the Northern Beaches local government area, demonstrates the inability for the private rental market to facilitate housing for very low, low and moderate income households and makes a sound argument for the need for policy intervention. The findings of the analysis undertaken by Northern Beaches Council are supported, and it is proposed that the Council is included in SEPP70.

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) December 2017



### Identifying a need for affordable housing in the City of Ryde Council Local Government Area

The proposed amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) will include the City of Ryde Council in the list of councils identified as having a need for affordable housing within its local government area.

The City of Ryde: Affordable Housing Policy 2016 - 2031 provides a comprehensive analysis of housing conditions within the local government area and identifies a need for greater affordable housing. The report outlines the changing social and economic profile of the area over the past decades identifying that in 2011, 68% of very low-income households were in rental stress, as were 56% of low income households and 16% of moderate income households. In terms of household type, rates of rental stress were higher for families and other households (44%) compared to smaller households (lone persons and couples without children) (35%).

The City of Ryde: Affordable Housing Policy 2016 – 2031 found that low income households renting through the private market have virtually no option but to live in housing stress, apart from those at the top of the income band wishing to rent a one-bedroom apartment. While smaller households in the top half of the moderate income band can generally afford to rent a one-bedroom apartment in Ryde LGA, their choices are constrained if they need a two bedroom apartment.

The report further noted that with a limited supply of affordable housing for very low, low and moderate-income key worker householders in the market, the requirements for key worker households will increase. In 2011, 7,450 key worker households in Ryde LGA were in need of affordable priced housing; it is estimated that by 2031, Ryde LGA will need 10,700 affordable housing dwellings for key workers. This equates a required supply of 40 affordable housing dwellings on average each year, yet in the five years from 2011 to 2015, only six affordable housing dwellings (1.2 per year on average) were approved (but not built) in the LGA.

The findings of the analysis undertaken by the City of Ryde Council are supported, and it is proposed that the Council is included in SEPP70.

### Identifying a need for affordable housing in the City of Canada Bay Local Government Area

The proposed amendments to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) will include City of Canada Bay Council in the list of councils identified as having a need for affordable housing within their local government area.

The City of Canada Bay Evidence Report Affordable Rental Housing September 2017, prepared by HillPDA Consulting, found that 4,249 households or 42% of households renting were experiencing housing stress. That is, they were paying 30% or more of their household income on their rental repayments.

The report identifies that 56 affordable units have been approved in the LGA since 2009. These units are only held as affordable units for 10 years after which they can be sold or rented at market rent. This number is well below what is required to accommodate a population that is expected to grow by a further 42,850 people between 2011-2036.

The report is comprehensive in its analysis of the existing housing stock in the Canada Bay local government area, as well as its analysis of population, income, employment, rental and purchasing trends and housing stress.

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 - Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) December 2017



10

It concludes that without policy intervention, facilitated by inclusion in SEPP70, the deficit between existing affordable housing and the demand for affordable housing will increase.

The findings of the analysis undertaken by City of Canada Bay Council are supported, and it is proposed that the Council is included in SEPP70.

### **Preparation of Affordable Housing Contribution Schemes**

The inclusion of Randwick, Inner West, Northern Beaches, Ryde and Canada Bay Councils in State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) satisfies only one of the requirements of s94F of the EP&A Act. The Councils will each be required to prepare a planning proposal to insert appropriate provisions in their Local Environmental Plans for contributions to be required in accordance with an approved scheme.

The Councils will need to prepare an affordable housing contribution scheme to support each new planning proposal where contributions for affordable housing will be required. The scheme will be assessed by the Department of Planning and Environment and approved by the Minister for Planning.

## **Proposed change**

### Clause 9 Identification of need for affordable housing

Randwick, Inner West, Northern Beaches, Ryde and Canada Bay Councils will be listed under section 9 of State Environmental Planning Policy No 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) as local government areas with an identified need for affordable housing.

ltem `

Amendment to State Environmental Planning Polic	y No 70 – Affordable Housing	(Revised Schemes)	December 2017



# **SEPP 70 Affordable Housing** (Revised Schemes)

Frequently asked questions

December 2017

# The NSW Government is working with councils to make it easier to deliver affordable rental homes in their communities.

### What has been announced?

Proposed changes to the state policy governing affordable rental housing is a step towards boosting the number of affordable rental homes in Sydney.

The proposal involves expanding the provisions of the Affordable Housing State Policy – SEPP 70 – so it applies to five new councils, being Randwick City, Inner West, Northern Beaches, City of Ryde and City of Canada Bay.

These proposed changes will facilitate affordable housing in future rezonings in the respective local government areas.

### What does SEPP 70 allow councils to do?

The State policy identifies councils with a need for affordable housing and enables them to prepare affordable housing contribution schemes requiring contributions to provide affordable housing. The provisions currently operate in City of Sydney local government area.

### What are the proposed changes?

Expanding the existing provisions to identify Randwick City, Inner West, Northern Beaches, City of Ryde and City of Canada Bay in the SEPP, and to allow the Councils to prepare affordable housing contribution schemes for upcoming rezonings.

The Councils are required to prepare draft affordable housing contribution schemes for consideration by the Minister for Planning for approval as part of the normal planning proposal process.

### What do councils have to do to implement an Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme?

To implement an affordable housing contribution scheme a council will need to prepare a draft scheme in support of a rezoning proposal. The scheme will need to demonstrate that the proposed affordable housing contributions rate will not impact on supply of general housing.

### How do councils currently provide affordable rental housing?

Many councils currently use Voluntary Planning Agreements to boost the number of affordable rental homes in their area on an ad-hoc basis.

Inclusion in SEPP70 will simplify the process for development in these LGAs, meaning there is a consistent approach to providing affordable rental homes. It will make the requirements clear to landowners and proponents early in the planning and development process.



Department of Planning and Environment Page 1



# SEPP 70 Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes)

# Frequently asked questions

December 2017

The current system provides little consistency or certainty for developers, the community and councils.

### Why do we need more affordable housing?

Affordable rental housing underpins economic productivity and can support Sydney as a prosperous global city.

The provision of affordable housing in the right places connects workers to jobs and people to services.

Affordable housing is necessary for the workers on low incomes who keep Sydney and NSW operating and it is also a pathway out of social housing.

### What consultation has been undertaken?

The Department has undertaken targeted stakeholder consultation regarding SEPP 70 as well as two other housing State Policies being reviewed (the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP and the Housing for Seniors or People with Disability SEPP). It has consulted with agencies, industry stakeholders and councils.

### What will happen next?

Following exhibition all submissions received will be taken into account when the Minister considers whether to make the amendments to SEPP70.

As noted above, if the Minister decides to make the amendment to SEPP70, affordable housing contributions will not be implemented in the local government areas until an affordable housing contribution plan is made and incorporated into the Council's LEP.

# Will SEPP 70 and the SIC both have affordable housing contributions in Rhodes East?

No. In Rhodes East it is proposed to support affordable housing through a council led SEPP 70 scheme. The proposed SIC will not include a contribution for affordable housing.

Attachment 3



Department of Planning and Environment



Item No: C0218 Item 2

Subject: PLANNING PROPOSAL FOR 114-140 PARRAMATTA ROAD/ORMOND STREET/GOWER STREET/TIDESWELL STREET/LIVERPOOL ROAD, ASHFIELD

**Prepared By:** Con Colot - Senior Strategic Planner & Projects

Authorised By: David Birds - Group Manager Strategic Planning

# SUMMARY

Council has received a Planning Proposal seeking to make major amendments to the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2013 for Land Use zoning, Maximum Height of Buildings and Maximum Floor Space Ratio (FSR) development standards as described in the report.

The proposal was put on preliminary community consultation in accordance with the policy of the former Ashfield Council, so that Council may take submissions into consideration upfront as part of the process of determining whether to support the Planning Proposal.

345 submissions have been received including 310 objections. A Strategic Merit assessment has been carried out against the "Planning Proposal Guidelines" prepared by the Department of Planning and Environment and it is considered the Proposal fails that test. It is also significantly inconsistent with the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010 and recommendations of the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy. The Proposal should not be supported.

# RECOMMENDATION

# THAT:

- 1. Council not support the Planning Proposal for the reasons given in the report, including that:
  - a) It fails the Strategic Merit test of the Planning Proposal Guidelines pursuant to Section 55(3) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act;
  - b) It is inconsistent with the local council strategy being the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010;
  - c) It is inconsistent with the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy and the recommended Land Use Zoning and Maximum Height of Buildings and Maximum Floor Space Ratio standards, and outside the staging period for development for 2016-2023;
  - A significant part of the affected land is outside the Frame Area of the Implementation Plan of the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy for redevelopment of land, and is not part of any local strategy;
  - e) It is inconsistent with Section 117 Direction Clause 7.3 (4), in that it does not comply with the recommendations of the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy, and has not produced a "better outcome" pursuant to Section 117 Direction 7.3 (5);
  - f) It will lead to a substantial loss of employment and urban services generating land;



- g) It will lead to a substantial adverse impact on the character of the local area due to its significantly excessive height and density, and will have an adverse social impact as demonstrated by the significant amount of objections to the proposal; and
- h) Support of the application would cause an adverse precedent and be contrary to the orderly development of land and the objectives of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.
- 2. Should the proponent request a Rezoning Review by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment, delegation is given to the Group Manager of Strategic Planning to lodge a submission to the review process in accordance with this report and Council's resolution.

# 1.0 OVERVIEW OF REPORT

Council has a received a Planning Proposal application (**Attachment 1**) for the block bounded by Parramatta Road, Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street for the area shown in grey shading in **Figure 1** below seeking to make amendments to the Ashfield LEP 2013 for Land Use zoning, Maximum Height of Buildings and Maximum FSR development standards.



Figure 1 - Land affected by Planning Proposal is shown in grey shading



**Figure 1.1** - Depictions of potential site layout and resulting building forms from Design Concept

The Proposal comprises many properties with varying proposed Maximum Height of Building development standards and Maximum FSR development standards, which are described in more precise detail below in Part 2.1. The Proposal essentially seeks to amend the planning controls applying to the entire site as summarised in the table below:

# Table 1 – Proposed amendments to Ashfield LEP 2013

ltem 2



Existing	Proposed
Land Use Zoning	Land Use Zoning
B6 - Enterprise Zone for properties along Parramatta Road.	Retain B6 Enterprise Zone for properties along Parramatta Road, and add a "shop top housing" land use.
R3 - Medium Density Residential for properties off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.	Replace R3 zone, with R1 General Residential zone for properties off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street, and add new R1 Land Use table in the Ashfield LEP 2013.
Maximum Building Height	Maximum Building Height
15m (4 commercial storeys) for properties along Parramatta Road zoned B6.	Heights varying between 34m (10 storeys), 44m (13 storeys), 55m (16 storeys) along Parramatta Road.
12.5m (3 storeys) for properties zoned R3 off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.	Heights varying between 12.5m (3 storeys), 14m (4 storeys) and 31m (9 storeys) – for land zoned R1 for properties off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street
	Some properties will retain a 12.5m height.
	Refer to maps in Part 2 of this report.
Maximum Floor Space Ratio	Maximum Floor Space Ratio
2.0:1 for properties along Parramatta Road zoned B6.	FSR varying between 2.8:1 to 4.2:1 along Parramatta Road.
0.7:1 for properties zoned R3 for properties off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.	FSR varying between 0.7:1 to 2.3:1 for properties off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street
	Some properties will remain at 0.7:1.
	Refer to maps in Part 2 below.

The application was lodged on 16 October 2017. It has been put on preliminary community consultation in accordance with the policy of the former Ashfield Council, so that Council may take submissions into consideration upfront as part of the process of determining whether to support the Planning Proposal.

There have been 345 submissions, including 310 submissions objecting to the proposal, 14 submissions in support of the proposal subject to changes, and 11 submissions of support which are summarised in **Part 3** of the report.



The submissions raise many concerns and these include that the development standards are extremely excessive in building scale, generating a large amount of proposed dwellings and resulting population density; the proposed building heights will adversely change the character of the area; the proposal is inconsistent with the Ashfield Council Urban Planning Strategy 2010 and community vision for the area, and is inconsistent with the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS).

Arguments put forward by the applicant in support of the Planning Proposal include that it complies with various State Plans on the basis that it will provide additional housing near public transport and services (such as shopping areas) and that it benefits from WestConnex infrastructure, it produces a "better outcome" to the PRCUTS (pursuant to Clause 7.3, 4, of the Section 117 Direction). It argues that the PRCUTS recommendations for Land Use Zoning, Maximum Height of Buildings and Maximum FSR are not feasible for encouraging new development.

A Strategic Merit assessment against the "Planning Proposal Guidelines" criterion is provided in **Part 5.0 - Table 1** of this report, and the applicant's arguments for justifying the Proposal are not agreed with and are considered to fail the relevant criterion. This includes that the Planning Proposal is inconsistent with various State Plans for retaining "employment and local services" noting there has already been a considerable loss of land due to the WestConnex project; it is inconsistent with a local strategy (Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010) and community vision for the area; does not comply with the PRCUTS recommendations: is "out of sequence" with the PRCUTS and fails to produce a better outcome pursuant to Section 117 Direction 7.3.

It is concluded that Council should not support the application. It is considered that it is premature to be reconsidering the land uses and development standards for the affected land, noting that the PRCUTS proposes that any such review should be carried out post 2023 and up to 2050.

# 2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PLANNING PROPOSAL

The application was lodged on 16 October 2017 and affects the land shown in Part 1.0 **Figure 1** of this report which contains many properties with different ownerships, and seeks amendments to the Ashfield LEP 2013 as explained in more detail below in **Part 2.1**.

"Ozzy States" is the applicant, and according to Council records owns 126 -128 Parramatta Road, and 8 Tideswell Street, Ashfield. Procedurally, the Environmental Planning and Assessment (EP&A) Act allows the lodgement of a Planning Proposal without the requirement to obtain owners consent. Council is then required to assess and determine whether it wishes to support the application (refer to **Part 7** of this report for more detail on the processes).

# 2.1 Description of amendments

The Planning Proposals seeks to make the following amendments to the Ashfield LEP 2013.



# Proposed Land Use Zoning

Existing	Proposed
B6 - Enterprise Zone for properties along Parramatta Road.	Retain B6 Enterprise Zone for properties along Parramatta Road, and add a "shop top housing" land use.
R3 - Medium Density Residential for properties off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.	Replace R3 zone with R1 General Residential zone, add new R1 Land Use table in the Ashfield LEP 2013 as follows: "Attached dwellings; Boarding Houses, Centre based child care facilities; Community facilities; Dwelling houses; Group homes; Hostels; Multi dwelling housing; Neighbourhood shops; Places of public worship; Residential flat buildings; Respite day care centres; Semi-detached dwellings : Seniors housing ; Shop Top housing". Refer to maps in <b>Figure 2b</b> below.

"Shop top housing" is defined as *"means one or more dwellings located above ground floor retail premises or business premises*". A "business premises" can include such uses as commercial premises (offices), banks, post offices, hairdressers, dry cleaners, travel agencies or the like. "Retail premises" are prohibited in the B6 Enterprise Zone of the Ashfield LEP 2013, this in order to prohibit further "permit food and drink" premises such as takeaway food outlets as part of the policy of the former Ashfield Council.

"Shop top housing" permits apartments and has the potential to enable a predominantly residential use of buildings above a ground level storey "business use".

Proposed Maximum Height of Building

Existing	Proposed
15m (4 commercial storeys) for properties along Parramatta Road zoned B6.	Heights varying between 34m (10 storeys), 45m (13 storeys) and 55m (16 storeys) along Parramatta Road zoned B6.
12.5m (3 storeys) for properties zoned R3 off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.	Heights varying between 12.5m (3 storeys), 14m (4 storeys) and 31m (9 storeys) – for properties zoned R1 off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.
	Refer to Maps in <b>Figure 3b</b> below.



Proposed Maximum Floor Space Ratio

Existing	Proposed
2.0:1 for properties along Parramatta Road zoned B6.	FSR varying between 2.8:1 to 4.2:1 for properties along Parramatta Road zoned B6.
0.7:1 for properties zoned R3 for properties off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.	FSR varying between 0.7:1 to 2.3:1 for properties zoned R1 off Ormond Street, Gower Street, Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street.
	Refer to Maps in <b>Figure 4b</b> below.

The applicant's "justification" for the above is provided in Part 6.3 of the Planning Proposal **(Attachment 1)**.

The Council officer assessment pursuant to the "Planning Proposal Guidelines" (which are a matter for consideration under Part 55(3) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act) is provided in **Part 4** of this report. This includes an assessment relative to various current State Government Plans and Council's "Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010". It also includes an assessment relative to Section 117 Direction 7.3 and the recommendations of the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS).





R3 - Medium Density Residential Zone, B6- Enterprise Zone

Figure 2 a - Existing Ashfield LEP 2013 Land Use Zoning Map



R1 –General Residential Zone, B6- Enterprise Zone

Figure 2b - Proposed Ashfield LEP 2013 Land Use Zoning Map





M = 12.5m, O1 = 15m

Figure 3a – Existing Ashfield LEP Maximum Height of Buildings Map



M = 12.5m, N1 = 14m, U = 31m, V = 35m, W= 44m, X = 55m

Figure 3b - Proposed Maximum Height of Buildings Map





H = 0.7:1, T1 = 2.0:1

Figure 4 a - Existing Ashfield LEP Maximum Floor Space Ratio Map



 $\mathsf{H}=0.7{:}1,\,\mathsf{T}1=2.0{:}1,\,\mathsf{U}1=2.8{:}1,\,\mathsf{W}=4.2{:}1,$ 

Figure 4b - Proposed Maximum Floor Space Ratio Map

# 3.0 LOCAL CONTEXT AND EXISTING PLANNING STRATEGIES





Figure 5 - Aerial view. Affected land is within red boundary.

# 3.1 Existing Land Uses Within Affected Land

Existing land uses include:

- Buildings along Parramatta Road including a two storey furniture shop, appliance repairs, Hungarian Catholic Community Organisation, residential flat buildings and dwelling houses.
- Buildings in Tideswell Street consist of dwelling houses and two storey residential flat buildings, and take away food premises.
- Buildings along the north eastern side of Gower Street consist of dwelling houses and two storey residential flat buildings.
- Buildings along Ormond Street include the two storey furniture shop fronting Parramatta Road and dwelling houses including Heritage Items at 51, 53, 55, 57, 59 Ormond Street.
- Buildings along Liverpool Road consist of a mixture of residential flat buildings and dwelling houses.

# 3.2 Local Context

Directly to the north along Parramatta Road there are two storey residential flat buildings, commercial properties and dwellings houses. Behind this is the Haberfield Heritage Conservation Area.

To the south and east is a mixture of single storey dwelling houses and three to four storey residential flat buildings, and Explorers Park.

To the east is the Ashfield Park.

The corner of Liverpool and Parramatta Road is a major traffic intersection, carrying approx. 27,000 vehicles per day along Liverpool Road, and 35,000 vehicles per day along Parramatta


tem 2

Road. Nearby (200 metres) to the west on Parramatta Road are the WestConnex portals (under construction) and when completed there will likely be a substantial amount of traffic wishing to use the Liverpool Road intersection to access those portals. More detail on this is given in **Part 6.1** of this report under Council's Traffic Engineer's comments.

#### 3.3 Description of key parts - Ashfield LEP 2013 and Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010, PRCUTS and State Plans

There are various "plans" which contain <u>town planning rationale</u> that are relevant to consideration of the Planning Proposal, which are assessed in **Part 5.0** in **Table 3** of this report as part of the "Strategic Merit" test. Given that there are numerous Plans, it is necessary to give an overview of the salient (key) issues contained in those Plans below.

#### Ashfield LEP 2013 and Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010

For the land along Parramatta Road as (illustrated in **Figure 2a** above) - the Ashfield LEP 2013 applies the following:

- Land Use Zone B6 Enterprise Zone,
- Maximum Height of Buildings 15m
- Maximum Floor Space Ratio 2.0:1

The rationale for the zoning resulted from the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010 (A Thriving Place to do Business- Part 6.2), and that the corridor along Parramatta Road should be a B6 Enterprise Zone to provide for employment and urban services as it has historically has done so given its location. This is also a long term strategy. There has been significant takeup and demand sought for such land uses as explained below.

The Strategy acknowledged that there are already high levels of residential flat developments (transit oriented development) between Parramatta Road and the Inner West railway line, which would benefit from having an employment zone in close vicinity (approximately 60% of the former Ashfield LGA comprises residential flat buildings). Former Ashfield Council had ensured that it had met already its "1997 -2017" housing targets and the new Ashfield LEP demonstrated it was capable of meeting the new required targets for 2031 (which the Department of Planning and Environment agreed with).

Long established R2 Low Density Zone residential areas, and Heritage Conservation Areas, either side of the Enterprise Corridor were to be retained and protected for the benefit of the community, including maintaining their character and protected from the visual impacts of any new development along the road by restricting maximum building height.

The above Strategy and LEP development included a lengthy and comprehensive community consultation process between the period of 2010 to 2012. Maximum building heights and FSR were carefully constructed to be sympathetic to characteristics of adjacent residential land uses, with the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) later funding a Development Control Plan (DCP) for the Parramatta Road Zone strip which is now contained in the Inner West DCP 2016.

Land to the south of the B6 Strip off Gower, Ormond and Tideswell Street is as follows:

- Land Use Zone R3 Medium Density
- Maximum Height of Buildings 12.5m
- Maximum FSR 0.7:1



The rationale for this resulted from a translation of the zoning and standards of the Ashfield LEP 1985, which at the time had a Residential 2(b) zoning which reflected townhouse type development, and as explained above, that the character of those residential areas was to be retained.

Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS)



Figure 6 – Frame area of PRCUTS

Land affected by the PRCUTS is within the red boundary. The land outside the frame area is not the subject of any current State Government or Local Council Strategy requiring amendments to the current Ashfield LEP 2013.

The front portion of the land along Parramatta Road, currently zoned B6 Enterprise Zone, is affected by the PRCUTS. This document was finalised after Urban Growth NSW (State Government department) sought the participation of local Councils (this included a Memorandum of Understanding with the former Ashfield Council), and conducted extensive consultation between 2013 and 2016. The PRCUTS documents were also the subject of two public consultations.

Urban Growth NSW agreed with the longstanding position of the former Ashfield Council (as contained in the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010 and in the various former Ashfield Council submissions on the PRCUTS) to retain an Enterprise Zone along Parramatta Road for job retention and creation, and to generally maintain the maximum heights found in the Ashfield LEP 2013 (south side) given the sensitive (as described in the PRCUTS) adjacent low rise residential areas.

The PRCUTS (in the Planning and Design Guidelines) recommends the following for the affected land within the frame area as reflected in its maps:

- Land Use Zoning B6 Enterprise Zone
- Max Height of Buildings Up to 16m (equivalent of three to four commercial building storeys)
- Maximum Floor Space Ratio Up to 2.2:1.



PRCUTS Development staging: The land included in the Planning Proposal along Parramatta Road (within the Frame Area - refer to **Figure 6**) is not part of any "sequencing" (development) required for the period 2016 - 2023. It instead is required to occur at a future period between 2036 - 2050, a long term development objective. Nevertheless the land use zoning and development standards of the Ashfield LEP 2013 already closely align with the PRCUTS recommendations.





Figure 7 – Extract of PRCUTS Planning and Design Guidelines

Note - there are typographical errors on pg 214 Planning and Design Guide of PRCUTS that refer to the land between Iron Cove Creek (Dobroyd Parade) to Hawthorne Canal as B5 Business Development – which is an error, since it is clearly shown as B6 Enterprise zone on the map. The strip is clearly intended for business uses noting that in the separate PRCUTS Strategy document map it is shown as an Enterprise and Business zone (pg 106). The preceding exhibited June 2016 draft PRCUTS version shows this strip as solely a B6 Enterprise zone.

The PRCUTS Planning and Design guidelines in addition to compliance with Maximum Building Height, has various ancillary controls requiring lower transitionary heights when a site is adjacent or nearby "sensitive areas" such as low rise housing.



#### <u>WestConnex</u>

The areas along Parramatta Road, mainly between Frederick Street and Liverpool Road have been impacted by the WestConnex proposal, with approx. 13% of the B6 Enterprise Zone land lost for employment and urban services. The former Ashfield Council made a lengthy submission in 2015 opposing the proposal, and was successful in having the roadway portals moved to the west so as to not have the northern part of the Ashfield Park removed for roadway widening.

The final PRCUTS November 2016 did not address the "intervention impacts" of WestConnex, and so this "impact matter" is yet to be adequately analysed and resolved for affected and nearby land along Parramatta Road, including additional traffic impacts and understanding externalities and appropriate land uses. It is evident this would require a future holistic and lengthy detailed town planning study covering the entire length of the road between Battle Bridge/Hawthorne Parade and Croydon Road.

#### Various State Plans

The following Plans are matter for consideration when assessing Planning Proposals under s55 of the EPA Act:

- "A Plan for Growing Sydney" 2014 and its update draft "Towards our Greater Sydney 2056" Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) November 2017
- Draft "Metropolis of Three Cities" October 2017
- Draft "Eastern City District Plan Regional Plan" October 2017

The need to maintain land supply for employment and urban services is given strong emphasis in the 2017 documents. These objectives do not conflict with the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010, or PRCUTS.

Examples of takeup of commercial ("enterprise") building types along the Ashfield part of the corridor include 84-90 Parramatta Road and 12-28 Parramatta Road (see below) which have substantial three storey commercial buildings constructed relatively recently, providing high levels of employment. Other examples include long established commercial premises between corner of Liverpool Road and Battle Bridge.

Examples of commercial building demand include approvals for a substantial supermarket on the corner of Bland Street and Parramatta Road, and approval sought for a private hospital on the corner of Walker Avenue, with progress on these have been deferred pending the completion of the WestConnex. This commercial demand phenomenon is taking advantage of larger sites that can take larger building footprints, which is a different situation to that found to the east of Battle Bridge.



Figure 8 - 12-28 Parramatta Road





#### Figure 9 - 84-90 Parramatta Road

#### 4.0 PRELIMINARY NOTIFICATION AND PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Preliminary upfront community consultation was carried out in accordance with the policy of the former Ashfield Council. This action also aligns with "A guide to preparing local environmental plans" prepared by DPE, Part 5.5.2 – Community Consultation - which states that "depending on the nature of the proposal, a Relevant Planning Authority may consider that it is appropriate to seek the general views of the community to assist in further defining the intent of the planning proposal prior to submitting it to gateway."

The Planning Proposal was notified between November 2017 and 30 January 2018. A notice was placed in the local newspaper, letters sent to property owners within a half kilometre radius, and exhibited material placed on Council's Have Your Say webpage and hard copies provided at the Ashfield Service Centre, Ashfield Library, and Haberfield Library.

1,700 people viewed the documents on Council's webpage.

There were 345 submissions received as follows:

- 11 submissions in support of the proposal.
- 14 submissions supporting the proposal subject to changes, refer to **Table 2** below for a summary of comments.
- 310 submissions objecting to the proposal, refer to **Table 2** below for a summary of comments made. Those objecting included people living on properties within the land affected by the Planning Proposal, living opposite the land or in close vicinity including in adjacent streets in Ashfield, in Haberfield and Summer Hill.

#### Table 2 - Submissions

Issues raised	Officer Response
Support subject to changes	
Support providing buildings are lowered in height, with requests ranging reduced in height to 4 storeys, to no higher than 9 storeys.	Refer to Part 5.0 of the report below for more detail, including the proposed heights and the strategic merit of the proposal.
Support if development potential is reduced to 200 dwellings.	
Support if there are no driveways off Parramatta Road.	



## Objections

Proposal is an overdevelopment, being excessive in building height and FSR, not in keeping with the existing building scale and will have an adverse visual impact on surrounding areas.	It is agreed that the proposed heights are excessive. Refer to Part 4.0 of this report below for more detail.
Excessive amount of dwellings and residents who will use local streets as rat runs, and create a loss of on-street parking. The area cannot cope with additional population and use of public transport is at a capacity and roads are congested. There is inadequate infrastructure for new residents, including available student places in local schools.	The proposal has the potential to generate approximately 515 dwellings, approximately 1,000 occupants, and approximately 750 cars. There will likely be more use of local streets, more people using existing open space and local schools. Refer to Part 4.0 for assessment of the strategic merit of the proposal relative to Council's existing strategy (Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010). Traffic impacts on local roads is a consideration. Any resultant future buildings will need to provide onsite carparking, but there will also likely be an affect for on street parking availability. Refer to Part 5.1 of this report under Council's Traffic Engineers comments for more detail.
Proposal will adversely change the character of the area, such as has occurred at the McGill Street/Lewisham precinct. WestConnex has already made the area worse. Proposal does not follow the recommendations of the PRCUTS, which was arrived at after length community	It is agreed the proposal's heights will change the scale and character of the area, and the impacts of WestConnex need to be taken into consideration. This is examined in more detail in Part 4.0 of this report. It is agreed the proposal does not follow the recommendations of the PRCUTS. Refer to Part 4.0 for more detail.
consultation and Ashfield Council involvement. Proposal disregards the Ashfield LEP 2013 and Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010 which were developed with the input of the community, and the Enterprise Zone B6 zone should be retained.	The proposal does not accord with the Ashfield LEP and Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy. Refer to Part 4.0 of this report for more detail.
Support of the proposal will create a precedent for other land owners along Parramatta Road.	If the Proposal, which does not follow any of the parameters of existing "plans" and strategies, was to be implemented, this would likely create a new precedent.
Apartment buildings should be much lower.	It is agreed the proposed heights are excessive, refer to Part 4.0 of this report for more detail.
Apartments should be a maximum of 6 storeys high There are property owners who	Procedurally, the EP& A Act allows the lodgement of a
	78



have not signed the authority to lodge planning proposal forms.	Planning Proposal without the requirement to obtain owners consent. Council is then required to assess and determine whether it wishes to support the application.
All property owners should give consent.	The application purports that it has obtained the approval of land owners to lodge the application, however several property owners have submitted to Council that they have not given such an approval, and so for precautionary purposes this should not be relied on as demonstrating substantial land owner support for the submission
	Some property owners affected by the proposal, have objected to the proposal.
Allegation that the property owner authorisations submitted by the applicant contains signatures not produced by property owners.	This matter has been referred to the Ashfield Police as required by local government protocol.

There is inadequate open space in the local area.	Presently in this area there is approximately 50 % of the required open space. This has been confirmed by various studies, including by earlier drafts of the PRCUTS and the Government Architect open space studies, as well former
Proposal would have an adverse impact on the use of Ashfield Park, and buildings will overlook and dominate the park. Ashfield Park is a "family oriented" one and should not be a congested place.	Ashfield Council planning data. The proposal has the potential to generate approximately 515 dwellings and so approximately 1,000 occupants and so there will likely be more use of the park. Refer to Part 5.2 – Parks Manager comments - for more detail.

Buildings depicted in the Design	The Planning Proposal relates to an amendment to the
Concept have an unattractive	Ashfield LEP 2013, it is not a development application
appearance which is austere and	putting forward building design for approval. An illustrative
"cookie cutter", and give a	architectural proposal is provided in the "Design Concept",
"faceless feeling", which is	(Attachment 2) and comments on its qualities are
unsympathetic and alien to the	provided in Part 4.0 of this report.
area.	

Adverse impact on Heritage item houses in Ormond Street.	It is not proposed to remove the heritage listings. Refer to Council Heritage Adviser comments in Part 6.3.

Heritage item houses in Ormond Street will be unreasonably shadowed.	It is agreed that houses will be overshadowed in winter up until midday.
Buildings should be reduced in height to enable adequate levels of sun to Explorers Park.	Explorers Park will be affected in winter by afternoon overshadowing.



Submission from local residents and the Haberfield Association. There will be an adverse affect on Haberfield. <i>"Haberfield is a heritage suburb, gaining its character from its leafy green aspect and having a modern tower overlooking our heritage properties in such close proximity will affect the environment, visual aspect and general heritage nature of the area".</i>	The proposed building heights, up to 16 storeys, placed contextually within a low rise environment will have a large and alien visual impact and be highly perceptible from Haberfield, and other residential areas, and this is a significant matter for consideration. Refer to Part 5.0 of this report for more detail, and Heritage adviser comments in Part 6.3.
Residents within apartments along main roads will have poor amenity due to exposure to traffic noise, and this would be a "planning, urban design and amenity disaster".	It is agreed that residents in such exposed apartments will have poor amenity. Refer to Part 4.0 of this report for more detail. Any such apartments should have "special" designs" such as dual aspect apartment (two orientation including to a "quite side"), adequate building setbacks, and deep soil planting for tall trees to ameliorate the impacts. This will affect building massing and so the extent of floor space ratio that can be accommodated.
Residents living in houses within the affected site will be adversely affected by the new buildings, including during construction stages.	It is likely that in a future development scenario that development would occur in a piecemeal way with construction occurring on consolidated sites large enough to take buildings, but much smaller than that depicted in the Design Concept document, and so people residing in existing houses would be affected. This matter is discussed in more detail in Part 4.0 of this report which examines the practicalities of the Design Concept.
A supermarket should be provided to accommodate the needs of future residents.	As the proposal has the capacity to generate 515 dwellings and approximately 1,000 occupants, such a facility may be beneficial.
Shops or businesses along Parramatta Road will not be successful.	Businesses along Parramatta Road are considered viable as currently demonstrated by existing premises.
There should be a green setback along Parramatta Road to provide a wide green verge between Explorers Park and Ashfield Park, and bike path provided.	This would be a design matter and part of a future Development Control Plan guideline. The Design Concept diagrams show a green setback and this could accommodate a bike path.
The architectural proposal does not incorporate adequate	This application seeks an amendment to the Ashfield LEP 2013 and is not a development application. Detailed



ltem 2

tree canopy.	
Future buildings will increase the heat island effect and adverse cause wind tunnels.	The Design Concept's proposals for communal open space is assessed in Part 4.0 of this report including the adequacy of the area of communal open space relative to potential population.
	Provision of building setbacks to enable wide verges for substantial wide canopy street planting would be addressed in a Development Control Plan.
There has been inadequate	The Proposal was notified in in accordance with the

There has been inadequate	The Proposal was notified in in accordance with the
notification of the Planning	policy of the former Ashfield Council. A notice of the
Proposal.	exhibition of the Proposal was placed in the Inner
	West Courier, in excess of 3,000 letters were sent to
	property owners within a half kilometre radius, and
	the exhibition was for an extended period between
	November 2017 until 30 January 2018. There have
	been a large number of submissions.

A petition from the "Hungarian Catholic Community of NSW", at 120 Parramatta Road, with 60 signatures objecting to the proposal.	This is noted.
The organisation has a 50 year history, the site is an iconic one for its members and has cultural significance, and there is no intention of moving.	

#### Т

# 5.0 Assessment of Planning Proposal – Strategic Merit Test – "Planning Proposal Guidelines"

Council is required to determine whether to support the Application (see Part 7 below regarding the Planning Proposal assessment process). In assessing the Planning Proposal it is Council's responsibility to ensure there is adequate content and "justification" as required in "Planning Proposal – A Guide to preparing Planning Proposal Guidelines" August 2016 prepared by DPE, and whether this warrants Council's support of the application. There are numerous "gatepost" matters to consider and the following provides an assessment of this.

#### Table 3 – Planning Proposal Guidelines Assessment

#### Part 1 Objectives and intended outcomes and explanation of provisions

	Guideline Requirements	Officer Comments
2.1	Requires a concise statement setting out the objective or intended outcomes.	The descriptive statement given in the Planning Proposal in Part 6.1 of <b>Attachment 1</b> is satisfactory. Refer to report above in Part 2.1 for a description of the requested amendments.

#### Part 2 Explanation of provisions

Guideline Requirements Officer Comments
---



2.2	Requires an explanation of the land use zones and	The Proposal adequately describes and provides adequate mapping for the following land use
	development standards sought to be amended.	zones and development standards amendment:
		<ul> <li>(i) Permit "shop top housing" over the lots fronting Parramatta Road currently zoned</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>B6 – Enterprise Corridor.</li> <li>(ii) Rezone the land currently zoned R3 - Medium Density Residential to R1 - General</li> </ul>
		Residential.
		<ul> <li>(iii) To increase the maximum building heights for specific properties – ranging from 14m, 31m, 35m, 44m and 55m, and maintain some properties at 12.5m.</li> </ul>
		<ul><li>(iv) To increase the maximum floor space ratios for specific properties - ranging from 2.3:1, 2.8:1 and 4.2:1, and maintain some properties at 0.7:1.</li></ul>

#### Part 3 Justification

The numbering in the left column follows that found in the Guidelines.

	Guideline Requirements	Officer Comments
2.3	Part 3 requires adequate justification	The applications justification is
	documentation to be provided for the specific land	contained in Part 6.3 of
	use and development standards proposed to the	Attachment 1 which has a table
	LEP.	setting out the response to each
		of the Strategic merit test
	It states :	questions, which is assessed
		below.
	The overriding principles that guide the preparation	
	is the impact the planning proposal will have.	A Design Concept document
		(Attachment 2) has been
	It is not necessary to address a question if it is not	provided to demonstrate building
	considered relevant to the planning proposal. In	massing and site layout. This is
	such cases the reason why it is not relevant should	commented on in response to
	be briefly explained.	Questions 3 and 6 below within
		this section of the report.
	The level of justification should sufficient to allow a	
	Gateway determination to be made with the	
	confidence that the LEP can be finalised within the	
	time frame period.	
	Diagrams are provided that suggest that building	
	envelopes/massing diagrams should be provided	
	that reflect the proposed maximum heights and	
	maximum FSR. In addition Question 3b (second	
	column) below requires an explanation on how	
	proposals relate to existing and future land uses.	
L		1



	Guideline Requirements	Officer Comments
Section	on A – Need for Pla	anning Proposal
Q1	Is the planning	The Proposal states:
	proposal a result of any strategic study or report?	"The Planning Proposal is not the result of a strategic study or report prepared by Council but is consistent with State Government Strategies as detailed in section 3 of the (Planning Proposal) report".
		Officer Comments:
		The Proposal is not part of any strategic study or report, and therefore fails this criterion.
		Part 3 of the submitted Planning Proposal <b>(Attachment 1)</b> instead makes reference to the particular parts of various State Government Plans and Council Officer's comment is given on this below within this section of the report.
Q2	Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better	<u>The Proposal states:</u> "Yes. A Planning proposal amending the land zoning inclusion of additional permitted use, amending permitted height of buildings and floor space ratio are the only means of achieving the objectives and intended outcomes."
	way?	Officer Comments:
		This question is somewhat of a tautology since it is circular and asks the proponent to confirm that what is being sought is reflected in the form the amendments will be made in an LEP. The response to other relevant Questions below examines whether the actual "intended outcomes", being the land use zonings and development standards, are supportable.
Section	on B – Relationshi	p to Strategic Planning Framework
Q3	Is the planning	Officer Comments:
	proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional, sub	A proponent is required to address the assessment criteria under Questions 3(a) and 3(b) (left column), refer below.
	regional or district plan or strategy (including any exhibited draft	
	plans or strategies)?	
Q3 a	Does the	



ls it:	
Consistent with a the relevant District Plan within the Greater Sydney region, or corridor/precinct plans applying to the site, including any draft regional, district or corridor/precinct plans released for public comment	<ul> <li>The Proposal states:</li> <li>The applicants detailed response to this question is not contained in its part dealing with compliance with the Planning Proposal guidelines in Part 6.3 (Attachment 1), it is instead included in a separate preceding part called "Context".</li> <li>The proposal in its Part 3 Context (Attachment 1) provides commentary on selective parts of the numerous Plans produced by the State Government on the following:</li> <li>A Plan for Growing Sydney (December 2014)</li> <li>Toward our Greater Sydney 2056 (GSC - November 2017)</li> <li>Draft Eastern City District Plan (GSC - November 2017)</li> <li>Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Implementation Plan 2016, Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Implementation Plan 2016, Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Plan 2016, Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Implementation Plan 2016, Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Plan 2017)</li> <li>It does not comment on "A metropolis for three cities" - GSC - Draft Regional Plan (November 2016).</li> <li>The above voluminous State plans have numerous objectives and principles. The proposal focuses on making reference to the principles concerning provision of more housing near places with public transport and local shopping precincts, and the proposal implicitly argues this is the overriding pre-eminent consideration for supporting a Planning Proposal. For example it states</li></ul>
	Officer Comments:

	The Planning Proposal's commentary in its Part 3 (Attachment 1) which is not a direct response to the Planning Proposal Guidelines Strategic Merit Questions is narrowly selective and does not list all the relevant Objectives and Principles contained in the above State Plans and Draft Plans and explain whether they are relevant. In particular it ignores particular objectives and principles pertaining to retention of employment and urban services land. It disregards the objectives of the PRCUTS Planning and Design Guidelines and also various axiomatic urban design criterion which include having a sympathetic building scale and transitionary heights where there are adjacent "sensitive areas" such as low rise housing.
	As a result of WestConnex there has been a 13% loss of employment generating land (approx. 1,200 jobs less based on lost floorspace) on B6 Enterprise zone land. The proposal has the potential to reduce this further. Currently the B6 zoning on the affected land pursuant to potential floorspace has potential for approx. 350 jobs (14,600sqm generated as part of an FSR of 2:1 over 3 storeys). The addition of a shop top housing use in the Enterprise Zone will likely lead to a predominantly residential use - as development will likely seek the most profitable outcome, and only a small amount of ground level located commercial use is required to enable "shop top housing".
	The PRCUTS Strategic Actions also recommends provision of 5-10 % affordable housing on any "uplift". Despite this, no voluntary planning agreement, or inclusionary LEP clauses requiring this provision have been put forward by the applicant.
	Consideration of the adequacy of the strategic merits of the Planning Proposal requires assessment of key criterion not adequately presented in the Planning Proposal. In particular :
	The State Plans, whether existing or in draft form, require the retention of employment and urban services land. This includes :
	<ul> <li>"A Plan for Growing Sydney" 2014, "Delivering this plan a bold direction", establishes a nexus with the Subregional planning including achieving employment objectives.</li> </ul>
	• Draft "A metropolis of three cities" (Regional Plan- GSC November 2017), Directions for Productivity", Objective 23 – Industrial and urban services land is planned, protected and a managed. It is advised that Sydney has 2-3 years of serviced land supply. Objective 24 - "Economic sectors are targeted for success", lists various job/professions as growth industries many of which are permissible in the B6 Enterprise zone.
	<ul> <li>Draft "Eastern City District Plan" (GSC November 2017) - Productivity, Planning Priority E12- Protecting industrial and urban services land.</li> </ul>
	The State Plans also leave planning for medium density housing for a local Council to determine (e.g. Draft Eastern City District Plan- Planning Priority E5 –pg 40). There is no wholesale direction for a Relevant Planning Authority to leave the future town planning of its areas to upzoning for high rise residential development based on very



Consistent with a relevant local council strategy that has been endorsed by the Department (3a- continued)	simplistic criterion of vicinity to public transport and shopping areas. There is no direction in the State Plans for a Relevant Planning Authority to dispense with considerations of a local Council strategy and community input, and to disregard whether future development will be sympathetic to local context and character. This which would not be justifiable town planning practice and contrary to DPE circular- "Respecting and enhancing local character". In this regard land uses between and around Tideswell Street and Gower Street are already zoned R3 Medium Density Residential and there is no current local Strategy to reconsider this. Consideration of the PRCUTS is brought into play by Section 117 Direction 7.3 (as explained in more detail in <b>Question 6</b> below), the PRCUTS provides clear parameters for land use zoning and development standards (FSR and Height) which the proposal does not comply with. The Section 117 Direction also provides clear procedures for assessing the merits of proposals where they do not comply with the recommendations PRCUTS which the proposal has not followed – see <b>Question 6</b> below. Also the PRUTS does not include the land to the rear of Parramatta Road properties between Tideswell Street and Gower Street (as identified in <b>Figure 6</b> above). It is considered the Proposal fails the criterion for this question. <u>The Proposal states:</u> That it is consistent with the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010. <u>Officer Comments :</u> The proposal is not consistent with the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010. The Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010 was approved by the DPE, it was a requirement for approval of the
	exhibition on the draft Ashfield LEP 2012, and developed in close consultation with the community overs several years. The Strategy explicitly (part 6.2) shows a B6 Enterprise Zone along Parramatta Road with no residential component (see explanation in <b>Part 3</b> of this report) for job retention or creation, and retention of R3 zones and heritage items in Ormond Street.
	The addition of a shop top housing use in the B6 Enterprise Zone will likely lead to a predominantly residential use - as it follows that development will likely seek the most profitable outcome, and only a small amount of ground level commercial use is required to enable "shop top housing". Excluding residential use in the B6 Enterprise Zone ensures that all available commercial floorspace is utilised and the building design and construction is carried out in a functional way which facilitates such a use, such as providing high floor to ceiling heights, servicing areas, vehicular entry and exists points and various other functional aspects of commercial building design.
Responding to a change in	The Proposal states:
circumstances, such as the	No comment is given.
investment in	Officer Comments:
new infrastructure or	There is no response.



	changing demographic trends that have not been recognised by existing planning controls. 3(a)	
	continued. There will be a	The Proposal states:
	presumption	
	against a rezoning review	No comment is given.
	request that seeks to amend	Officer Comments:
	LEP controls that are less than 5 years old, unless the	The Proposal fails this criterion which has been in place since July 2016. The Ashfield LEP was gazetted in December 2013, and is less than 5 years old.
	proposal can clearly justify that it meets the Strategic Merit Test. 3(a)	In addition, the DPE is aware that Council will be seeking to produce a new LEP, and a result of the Council amalgamations in 2016, is not in a position to have completed a new LEP by December 2018, and it is not reasonable to entertain "jumping the gun" on this.
	continued.	It is considered the Proposal fails the criterion for this question.
Q3b	Does the proposal have strategic merit with regard to the following :	
	The natural	The Proposal states:
	environment	No comment is given.
		Officer Comments :
		There are no anticipated affects on the natural environment, the proposal being in a "brownfield site" location.
	The existing uses, approved	The Proposal states:
	uses, and likely future uses of land in vicinity of the proposal.	No comments are given. A response is instead given to <b>Question 6</b> below, which deals with the PRCUTS where the applicant states that the architectural outcomes will produce a superior result to that found in the PRCUTS for surrounding land.
		Officer Comments:
		It is considered the proposal does not have site specific merit with regard to impacts on approved adjacent land use and in close vicinity to the proposal, and the likely future use of land in the vicinity, for the reasons given in more detail in the response to <b>Question 6</b> below. This includes that it is evident that the building scale of 55m (16 storeys) along Parramatta Road, is up to 4 times the height recommended in the PRCUTS, is significantly incompatible and alien to the existing one to three storey building scale, character and building typology of surrounding and nearby areas and the nearby single storey scale of the Haberfield Conservation Area. It is evident the proposed building



		heights will have a large visual impact, including up to 1.0 km away as demonstrated by the Visual Catchment diagram.
	The services and	The Proposal states:
	infrastructure that are or will	No comment is given.
	be available to meet the	Officer Comments:
	demand arising from the proposal and any proposed financial arrangement for infrastructure provision	There are high residential densities between Parramatta Road and the Inner West Railway line. Noting this, there is a 50% shortfall in open space, as verified by the earlier draft 2015 PRCUTS documents and the 2015 Government Architects office open space study. Up to potentially 515 dwellings will naturally increase demand on Ashfield Park and Explorers Park (refer to comments from Council's Park's officer under <b>Part 6.2</b> of this report) with no other significantly large parks being within 800m.
Q4	Is the proposal	The Proposal states:
	consistent with a council's local strategy or other local strategic	States that it is consistent with the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010.
	plan?	Officer Comments:
		This is a repeat of Question 3 (a) and has been responded to above. The Proposal is not consistent Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010.
		In addition, the Proposal does not address Council's Affordable Rental Housing Policy. There is no draft Voluntary Planning Agreement put forward. This is despite the PRCUTS Strategic Action requiring provision of 5-10 percent affordable housing on any uplift.
		The Proposal fails this criterion.
Q5	Is the planning	The Proposal states:
	proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP).	States the following applies: SEPP 32 –Urban Consolidation, SEPP 65, SEPP 65 - Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development, SEPP Affordable Rental Housing 2009, SEPP Basix 2004, SEPP Infrastructure 2007.
		Officer Comments:
	SEPPs relevant to the Planning	<u>SEPP 32</u>
	Proposal must be identified and the relationship of the Planning	This has been repealed.
	proposal with those SEPPs	<u>SEPP 55</u>
	discussed.	This will require investigations to occur at Development Application stage.
		<u>SEPP 65</u>
		In the future, should a residential use be permissible in the B6 zone and proposed R1 Zone SEPP 65 would apply when assessing



		development applications.
		At this point in time it does not follow that there needs to be compliance demonstrated with all of the design principles SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guide (160 pages), for a proposal that has excessive development standards of FSR and Height which cannot be supported for the reasons given in this report. However the provision of ground level communal open space is relevant for the "Landscape" and "Amenity" Principles of SEPP 65, which the proposal fails to provide realistic minimum areas for (refer to comments on the Design Proposal and its efficacy under <b>Question 6</b> below).
		SEPP Affordable Rental Housing 2009
		This is of marginal affectation at DA stage, and does not automatically lead to provision of affordable housing.
		SEPP Basix 2004
		In the future, should a residential use be permissible, this SEPP would apply when assessing development applications.
		SEPP Infrastructure 2007
		This SEPP will apply when assessing development applications, but it has provisions that affect land use along Parramatta Road due to Clause 101 (2a) of SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 states:
		<i>"the consent authority must not grant consent to the development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless it is satisfied that</i>
		(a) Where practicable, vehicular access to the land is provided by a road other than the classified road".
		This functional traffic access matter has not been adequately addressed in the Planning Proposal and its Design Concept for the reasons explained below in <b>Question 6</b> below and in the Traffic Comments in <b>Part 5</b> below of this report. It is considered that there are several development options for the site, including development occurring on smaller parcels of land, and these would be different to what is depicted and have distinctive and different traffic and servicing impacts affecting Parramatta Road to that portrayed.
		Amenity for residents on a main road (Parramatta Road and Liverpool Road) will also need to be considered if the proposal was progressed in accordance with the SEPP.
Q6	ls the planning proposal	Proposal states the following are the applicable Directions.
	consistent with applicable	<u>1 Employment and Resources</u>
	Ministerial Directions (s.	The Proposal states:
	117 directions)?	It is compliant with this direction.



Each planning proposal must identify which, if any, section 117 **Directions are** relevant to the proposal and whether the proposal is consistent is consistent with that direction. Where the proposal in inconsistent.... those inconsistencies must be specifically explained and justified in the planning proposal.

Officer Comments:

It is considered the proposal is not compliant with protecting employment land. Application of a "shop top housing" land use in the B6 zone along Parramatta Road will likely lead to a majority of the FSR and floorspace being utilised for a residential use, with only a small amount of ground level "business use" floor space required for 'shop top housing'.

The affected B6 zoned land currently has capacity (Ashfield LEP 2013) for approximately 14,600 sqm of commercial floor space (FSR of 2:1), equating to approx. 350 jobs. A shop top housing development has potential to lose a significant portion of this in the event that there is a small provision of commercial use at ground level. In the event that only the ground level was used for employment and urbans services, it is also possible that the building layout will not be capable or flexible enough to accommodate functional considerations for an Enterprise Zone uses, such as for a commercial building or light industrial building or appliance repairs. Also to note is that there has also been a loss of approximately 13% of B6 zoned land due to the construction of WestConnex roadways.

#### 2 Environment and Heritage

The Proposal states:

It is compliant with this direction.

Officer Comments:

No changes are proposed to the Heritage Item listings at 51-59 Ormond Street in the Ashfield LEP 2013. Whilst only illustrative and not certain, it is noted that the Design Concept (see **Attachment 2**) illustrates a future development application proposal could propose that the back garden area of the properties are converted to a large central communal open space use for the future 515 dwelling residents. However this would compromise the cultural significance of those heritage items - refer to Council's Heritage adviser's comments in **Part 6.3** of this report.

## 3 Housing, Infrastructure and Urban Development

The Proposal states:

It is compliant with this direction.

Officer Comments:

The Proposal does not contravene this Direction.

## 4 Hazard and Risk

The Proposal states:

It is compliant with this direction.



ltem 2

	Officer Comments:
	The Proposal does not contravene this Direction.
	<u>5 Regional Planning</u>
	The Proposal states:
	It is compliant with this direction.
	Officer Comments:
	As explained in responses above, it considered that the proposal does not comply with the State Plans requirement retaining employment and urban services land.
	<u>6 Local Plan Making</u>
	The Proposal states:
	It is compliant with this direction.
	Officer Comments:
	The Proposal does not contravene this Direction.
	7 Metropolitan Plan Making
	7.1 – Regional Strategy
	The Proposal states:
	It is compliant with this direction and a "Plan for Growing Sydney" 2014 and providing more housing.
	Officer Comments:
	A "Plan for Growing Sydney" is a generalist document and it is evident that it delegates to "Draft Plans" for more detail, which require retention of employment and urban services land. This plan has also been updated by draft "Toward our Greater Sydney 2056" (GSC – November 2017), and this implicitly recognises the need for retention of employment and local services land given the other draft plans, and states that planning for the medium density housing areas are to be left to local Councils to determine.
	7.3 Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy.
	The Proposal States:
	<i>"It is considered to be consistent with the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy" (pg 64).</i> In Part 1 of the Planning Proposal ( <b>Attachment 1</b> ) it instead essentially states that the Strategy is faulty and that the type of development recommended will not result, and that the proposed land use and maximum Building Height and FSR



will provide a better result, due to proximity to public transport and vicinity to the Ashfield Town Centre, and based on the building outcomes of the Design Concept site layout and architectural portrayal. Officer Comments: Compliance with this direction must be assessed with regard to the following clauses of the Direction. It is evident that the proposal is inconsistent with the Direction 7.3, (4) which includes that : (b) be consistent with the Strategic Actions within the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (c) be consistent with the Parramatta Road Corridor Planning and Design Guidelines Planning and Design Guidelines (d) be consistent with the staging and other identified thresholds for land use change identified in the Implementation Plan 2016-2023. The northern side of the block within the proposal is clearly contrary to the PRCUTS recommended non - residential Enterprise Zone land use, development standards and maximum height - to a significant extent (refer to Part 3 of this report). It is outside the timing /staging for 2016 -2023, with development of the land required by 2050. The southern part of the block is outside the "frame area" boundary of the Strategy (as shown in Figure 2 above). Where proposals do not meet the requirements of the PRCUTS they may choose to address the following part of the Direction. Clause (5) states that "a Planning Proposal may be inconsistent with the terms of this direction only if the relevant planning authority can satisfy the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment that the planning proposal is : (a) Consistent with the out of sequence Checklist in the Parramatta Road Corridor Implementation Plan 2016-2023 (November 2016), or (b) Justified by a study prepared in support of the planning proposal that clearly demonstrates better outcomes are delivered than identified in Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (November 2016) and Parramatta Road Corridor Implementation Plan 2016-2023 (November 2016), or (c) Of minor significance" No submission has been made relative to the 5(a) clause. Nevertheless an assessment in Attachment 6 shows if such a submission had been made it would fail to comply with the requirements of the "Out of Sequence checklist" of the PRCUTS "Implementation Guidelines". This procedurally firstly requires the process of submitting what is called a "Preliminary Planning Proposal Application", having carried out community consultation, and a produced a detailed response to each of the Out of Sequence criterion. This includes that a Proposal must

adhere to the Land Use zoning and Maximum Heights and FSR in the PRCUTS, and produce a precinct wide traffic study.
It therefore follows that the proposal relies on clause 5(b) above, and claims in its Part 1 that it achieves better outcomes than the PRCUTS are based on the "Design Concept" Portrayal. This is not agreed with for the reasons given below in the assessment of the "Design Concept". These include that the portrayal of how the site would be arranged is not realistic for the purpose of assessment of the Proposal and should not be relied on, that development would likely occur in smaller parcels with different arrangements of buildings and open space, and that the Design Concept does not produce a better outcome since it creates numerous adverse impacts including a considerably excessive building scale up to four times the current recommended heights and large visual impacts, unlikely provision of adequate open space, disregards local built form context and would create a significant change of character for the area.
It is evident that the proposal is inconsistent with the Section 117 direction 7.3. It has failed to properly tailor the application and necessary justification commentary to the relevant parts of the Direction 7.3. Examination of the proposal's land use zonings and development standards clearly are substantially and extraordinarily beyond the recommendations and objectives, of the PRCUTS and so fail clause 7.4 Clause 4 (b). It is would be an extraordinary situation that a Relevant Planning Authority could dispense with the PRCUTS recommendations which was developed between 2013 and 2016 following numerous iterations with Council (former Ashfield Memorandum of understanding) and community input.
It is considered that the Proposal has not produced a better outcomes to that found in the PRCUTS and so fails clause 7.3, Clause 5 (b).

## Assessment of Design Concept

Question 6 – Section 117 Direction – Clause 7.3 (4) (b) - states

(d) Justified by a study prepared in support of the planning proposal that clearly demonstrates better outcomes are delivered than identified in Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (November 2016) and Parramatta Road Corridor Implementation Plan 2016-2023 (November 2016)

The Planning Proposal states that it considers the proposal will be a better outcome than the recommendations of the PRUTS, by relying on the building and development outcomes of the "Design Concept". In response to this, the following comments are provided on key aspects of the site layout and architectural portrayal.

"Design Concept" documentation (**Attachment 2**) has been submitted showing general arrangement of site layout, apartment layouts, and three dimensional depictions, with buildings ranging in height from 55m (16 storeys) to 31m (13 storeys) along Parramatta Road, and heights up to 31m (9 storeys) on the north side of Gower Streets. Refer to below extracts of Design Concept. This is reliant on two large site consolidations and two large carparks as illustrated below.





The Design Concept treats the site as an independent "stand alone" one, in that it does not follow a normal urban design paradigm for making a new proposal relate to and be sympathetic to adjacent and nearby existing building typologies and an area's characteristics. It instead models its own building proposals independent of impacts on surrounding areas. No building sections have been produced showing the proposed building height relationships to nearby affected areas, such as low rise residential areas, and so extent of spatial affectation. No detailed three dimensional depictions have been provided for existing buildings in adjacent and nearby areas. Implicitly, the Design Concept's reasoning is that because the land is on Parramatta Road and within vicinity of a train stations and bus routes, that this warrants the extent of tall building heights and high FSR sought.

#### Officer Comments:

It is not agreed that the above "locational concept" is a sound or superior town planning criterion which justifies high rise development, and such simplistic grounds would open up a precedent for all land in such circumstances – which is contrary to the EPA Act objectives and the orderly development of land, and to the Design and Heritage objectives of the newly amended EPA Act, and DPE circulars. This is also contrary to the urban design objectives of the PRCUTS – Planning and Design guidelines for retaining character.

#### Site Layout and building and open space arrangement

The site layout depiction is contingent on the land being developed in totality in two large stages being the block north of Tideswell Street and the block south of Tideswell Street. For example the drawings above shows the development being dependent on two large separate carparking areas, with the heritage item houses having their rear gardens transformed into a communal open space area for the entire development.

Approx 30% of the land is provided for communal open space, including setback along Ormond Street and Parramatta Road. Half of that is to be located in the areas found in the back gardens of houses in Ormond Street which are Heritage items.



## Officer Comments:

Depiction of a development scenario where the entire 19,959sqm (2 hectare) site is developed in two stages is extremely idealistic and not of adequate or relevant value in assessing the proposal. This is because there is no certainty that this staging can be guaranteed, since it would require one or two parties to have acquired all the land parcels, obtained approvals, and proceeded to construction. Such staging cannot be enforced in an LEP, or in a DCP (providing simply guidelines), and should not be relied as demonstrating likely outcomes as future development will naturally seek the most realistic and feasible outcomes. One instead needs to take into account realistic spatial town planning basics, and that a site layout can eventuate in a substantially different way if one takes into consideration the following:

It is likely that development /construction will happen in a piecemeal fashion, on various smaller lots capable of taking new buildings, and this scenario has not been illustrated. It is evident that there can be development of individual properties where they are technically large enough for construction and provision of basement carparking (achievable with a minimum width of 25 metres). Those sites would have their floor plans arranged in way where they can be individually serviced – noting that the Infrastructure SEPP does not permit access of Parramatta Road, and so access would be required off Tideswell Street. The properties would have to be arranged in a way which provides within their own site provision of 25% of communal open space. One cannot instead rely on provision of communal open space on a land allotment separate to a development site as portrayed in the Design Concept. In the Design Concept it is purported that houses which are actually Heritage Items will be acquired and their back gardens turned into communal open space for the entire block which is not considered realistic.

The Apartment Design Guide of SEPP 65 provides guidelines for the provision of communal open space, and requires 25-30 % of the site to provide this. The proposal provides approx. 30 percent, however this is dependent on the use of areas currently containing the back gardens of heritage item house which constitutes 13% of site communal open space. Use of the back of heritage item houses is not a supportable outcome. Addressing this to provide other places for communal open space would lead to smaller building footprints and substantially lower levels of floor space ratio as compared to that being sought.

#### Height of building and visual impacts - sites along Parramatta Road

#### Officer Comments:

It is evident that the part along Parramatta Road which has building between 13 and 16 storeys is up to four times the height recommended in the PRCUTS and Ashfield LEP 2013. This is clearly inconsistent with various considerations in PRCUTS – Planning and Design Guidelines, which limit height to 16m and include various written objectives for having a lower transitionary building scales adjacent "sensitive areas" - which is an urban design axiom which is disregarded by the Design Concept.

It is evident the proposed heights will have a large visual impact, up to 1.0km away as demonstrated by the Visual Impact map in **Attachment 8**. The building scale of 55m (16 storeys) and 44m (13 storeys) along Parramatta Road, is evidently significantly incompatible and alien to the existing building scale, character and building typology of surrounding and nearby areas, and to the nearby Haberfield Conservation Area. This visual impact is implicitly disregarded and considered as irrelevant- which is not a sound urban design and community principle. This self-referential urban design reasoning does not provide justification for disregarding the area's existing character, typology and building scale. It is evident that the juxtaposition of this very high built form has no ameliorating factors such as a large separation distance to adjoining areas that would overcome its scale impacts, such as being "towers in wide expanses of parkland", or



"towers placed next to existing towers".

There has also been considerable effort on the depiction and rendering of buildings as justification for the proposal, and the proposal states in response to Question 8 of the Planning Proposal Guidelines: "Streetscape and character are to be managed/mitigated through high standards of architectural designs".

However it is evident that architectural style does not have a superior bearing or replace the cognitive impacts of building scale for affected people. Also, at a future Development Application stage there is no certainty the Design Concept portrayal will be pursued. It is noted that the building portrayal is an illustrative one, with the style idiom being of basic geometric shapes and abstract relationships, and this is not a traditional one using established architectural canons and requiring particularly compositional relationships between building parts. Depending on what one means by "design excellence", this style idiom does not equate to a situation that would necessarily set new superior architectural standards and overcome its visual impacts. Notwithstanding matters of building scale, this simple style idiom is in strong contrast to the traditional architectural character of nearby places such as those found in nearby heritage conservation areas and the other streetscapes of Ashfield, on which it will have a dominant visual and cognitive impact.

#### Sites behind Parramatta Road strip and between Gower Street

#### Officer Comments:

This area currently consists of a mixture of one storey houses and two storey residential flat buildings, includes houses that are heritage item houses in Ormond Street, and it has distinct dormitory low rise residential character.



Figure 10- Heritage Items in Ormond Street



Figure 11- Houses and residential flat buildings at Ormond Street

The proposal seeks to apply a R1 General Residential zoning, and to increase building height in parts of Gower Street from 12.5 m (three storeys) to 31m (U – nine storeys). Again, conceptually the implicit justification for this is that the site can be treated as standalone architectural composition, and that compositionally the 9 storeys is justifiable as a lower height counterbalance to the 13 and 16 storeys buildings on the Parramatta Road strip. This self-referential urban design reasoning does not provide justification for disregarding the area's existing character, typology and building scale. As stated in the various State Government plans, including the Draft Eastern District Plan-E5, appropriate land use zonings and development standards are a matter for Councils in consultation with the community to determine.



#### Amenity

Noting the plans are simply illustrative- a large percentage of the apartments that would be along Parramatta Road are shown with layouts that would be directly exposed to the high levels of noise from Parramatta Road- resulting in very poor amenity for residents. A different apartment layout to that shown would be required to address this such as cross - through apartments, and that would affect how the buildings would be arranged and the acceptable total FSR. Such guidelines are found in the Inner West (Ashfield part) DCP 2016 for the Ashfield East and Ashfield West areas.

As explained above, if one discounted the use of the rear gardens of heritage item houses, there is a large shortfall of communal open space provided with approximately half what is required being provided.

#### **Shadowing**

There will be large amounts of winter overshadowing for areas and properties to the rear of the tall buildings, including where their communal open space will be, for significant periods in winter, as demonstrated in the Design Concept shadow diagrams. Explorers Park will be overshadowed in winter after 11am. A different built form would be required to be "sculpted" to give adequate winter solar access to those places.

#### **Conclusion**

It is not considered that the Design Proposal has produced a better outcome that those in the PRCUTS Planning and Design Guidelines.

Q7	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?	<u>The Proposal states</u> : No. <u>Officer Comments</u> : This is agreed with, the land is already occupied by buildings.
Q8	Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?	The Proposal states:"The primary causes for potential impacts are visual /streetscape impacts arising from a proposal that will be transformative to the existing character. Other impacts relate to traffic and additional demand for public services and utilities. It is argued the impacts are not unacceptable and can be appropriately managed.Streetscape and character are to be managed/mitigated through high standards of architectural designs. A site specific DCP could also be prepared in consultation with Council and other stakeholders. The Introduction of mixed use development into the locality is necessarily to enable urban renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor.Preliminary Traffic Impact is considered acceptable and with the
		road improvement suggested would be beneficial to the subject site



		and also the broader community".
		Officer Comments:
		It is evident that in town planning terms that the visual and cognitive impacts for local resident impacts from an up to 16 storey building (55 metres) within a low rise scale areas can be overcome by the design of a building – and "its architectural dressing". The above statement instead disregards normal urban design criterion that building scale being sympathetic to context. Also, no Visual Impact study has been produced and the proposal will be visible up to 1 km away.
		The proposal fails this criterion.
Q9	How has the planning	The Proposal states:
	proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?	The social and economic impacts of this proposal are significantly positive as it will facilitate additional supply and choice of housing within a highly accessible location. The development as proposed will also act as a catalyst to the urban renewal to the urban renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor. The proposal will enable the development of a large site with a high standard of amenity and deliver a high quality mixed use product which promotes heathy and sustainable living.
		Officer Comments:
		There have been a large number of objections have been received. No affordable housing is being proposed.
		There has not been any economic analysis submitted as to why it can be justified that there should be a substantial reduction of part of 14,600sqm of employment floorspace as a result of potential abandonment of non-residential floorspace generated under the B6 zone (FSR of 2:1 - 14,600sqm - 365 jobs) over three levels. Availability of employment and urban services land is a long term necessity for local and regional users and this is acknowledged in the various State Plans.
		The Proposal fails this criterion.
Q10	Is there	The Proposal states:
	adequate public infrastructure for	There is adequate infrastructure.
	the planning proposal?	Officer Comment:
		Currently there is a 50% shortfall in open space for local residents. Any review of the land for up to 515 additional dwellings must therefore carefully balance the open space needs of new residents against this.
Q11	What are the	The Proposal states:
	views of State and Commonwealth	Consultation with other public authorities or the wider community has not commenced yet.



	authorities	
	consulted in	
	accordance with	
	the gateway	
	determination?	Officer Comments:
	The Planning	The Proposal has not nominated the particular authorities required
	Proposal should	to be notified. The following is noted:
	nominate the	
	state and	
	Commonwealth	Parramatta Road is a classified road, and so the Roads and
	agencies to be	Maritime Services will need to be notified, refer to Traffic engineers
	consulted and	comments below in <b>Part 6.</b> The RMS also has responsibility for
	outline the	overseeing the impacts of WestConnex.
	particular land	
	uses or site	The PRUTS intends to have Transport for NSW implement a fast
	conditions which	bus route along Parramatta Road and so the proposal will require a
	have triggered	referral.
	the need for the	
	referral. The	
	proposed	Department of Education referral is required and school capacity
	agency	needs to be confirmed.
	consultation will	
	be confirmed	
	with the	
	Gateway	
	determination.	
2.4 Ma		
	Maps reflecting	The Proposed submission:
	land use and	
	development	Maps have been submitted.
	standards are to	
	be submitted.	
		Officer Comments:
		Adaguata mana baya baca areyidad that describe what the provided
		Adequate maps have been provided that describe what the proposal
		is seeking, and are commented on in Part 2 of the report.
2500	mmunity Consultat	
2.5 00	An indication of	Officer Comments:
	the period of	
	community	If the Proposal was to receive Gateway determination it is
	consultation is	considered that the Proposal should be formally exhibited for a
	required.	minimum of 28 days in accordance with the Inner West DCP 2016
		(former Ashfield Council area).
2.6 Pr	oject Timeline	1
	An indication of	Officer Comments:
	the Project	
	timeline is	The Gateway Determination will determine the maximum timeline,
	required.	and so it is premature to state actual milestones. The Planning
		Proposal provides the necessary timeline table.



#### 6.0 REFERRALS

#### 6.1 Traffic impacts and Traffic Engineer's Comments

There are numerous matters to consider with regard to the upzoning of the entire block, provision of 515 dwellings, and 3,315 sqm of ground level commercial space with regard to traffic generation, and functional servicing requirements for various building uses. These include:

- The site is approx. 200 m from the WestConnex portals on Parramatta Road, and adjacent a major intersection at Liverpool Road that will provide the primary means of access to the portals. When the M4 East motorway is completed there will evidently be large amounts of westbound traffic using this part Parramatta Road and Liverpool Road to access the portals. Ground level commercial uses will require substantial areas for servicing requirements, such as deliveries and waste collection to enable their operation to be viable. This will have an impact on vehicular entry and exit and servicing for sites along Parramatta Road which will require access from the rear off Tideswell Street.
- Noting that Parramatta Road is a major arterial road, which carries a high volume of traffic, where traffic movement efficiency is of great importance, the Roads and Maritime Services has various document guidelines that require side street or rear lane access in order to reduce congestion delays and reduce crashes. This evident matter is reinforced in the PRCUTS, and in the following State Environmental Planning Policy : Clause 101 (2a) of SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 states:

*"the consent authority must not grant consent to the development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless it is satisfied that* 

- (b) Where practicable , vehicular access to the land is provided by a road other than the classified road"
- The PRUTS recommends fast bus routes along Parramatta Road utilising "superbustops" similar to those that exist at Broadway. This will affect front building setbacks and the amount of land that needs to be potentially resumed.
- There will be "on street" locations for stopped garbage trucks required for the collection waste (garbage and recycling) for the 515 dwellings, and these must be in places which do not impact resident and street amenity.
- The potential additional 515 dwellings will generate high occupancy rates and carparking with potential for high amounts of cars seeking "rat runs" through nearby local streets, such to avoid traffic congestion on the Liverpool Road intersection. This will include along streets bounding Ashfield Park.
- The Design Concept assumes that the land will be developed in only two large stages being the block north of Tideswell Street and the block south of Tideswell Street. There is no certainty for this, since it would require one party to have acquired all the land parcels, obtained approvals, and proceeded to construction. It is likely that development/construction will happen in a piecemeal fashion, on smaller lots capable of taking new buildings.
- The Parramatta Road Urban Transformation Strategy as part of the "Out of Sequence" checklist, requires detailed traffic impact studies to be provided upfront where proposal are not in accordance with the recommended development staging, as this proposal is.

Noting the above, Council's Traffic Engineer has advised that:



"The current traffic report does not adequately address all the matters arising from the potential traffic generation impacts and site servicing requirements. The report assumes that the land will be developed in to large stages as shown in the Design Concept which is not realistic. The report leaves addressing the above matters to a future stage and states (pg 15) that *more detailed design and traffic impact assessment will be required at the DA stage which* is not acceptable".

#### 6.2 Parks Planning and Engagement Comments

A consideration for accounting for the amount of new residents, being potentially up to 1,000 people (using a 2 person occupancy rate), is the use of existing open space. Due to the high amount of flat buildings in this part of Ashfield, open space provision is at 50 percent of the required standard.

Council's Parks Planning and Engagement Manager has advised:

"Ashfield Park is a district level park which is greatly valued by the community as one of the earliest parks to be created in Sydney. The Park has been a place for celebration, marking significant local and national events and a place for memorialising the contributions of local people. It is a destination park that provides multiple uses including passive and active recreation, informal sporting opportunities, socialising and play for children. The Park has also become the focal point of community activities over recent years for event such as jazz concerts and Carnival of Cultures. Because of its central location it is a highly valued site for community events (this may not sit well with apartment owners).

Due to its large size, multiple uses and diverse activities "presently" coexist without impacting on the enjoyment and amenity of other users. There is one sporting field in the park which is carefully managed. In terms of organised sporting use this facility is at capacity. In the weekends use of the park as a whole is very high given its central location and the lack of open space in this area of the LGA.

Explorers Park is a neighbourhood park facility which caters for local neighbourhood needs. The park is maintained to a high standard and caters for informal recreational use. The Park is poorly sited next to Parramatta Road and as such use is not extensive".

#### 6.3 Heritage Adviser Comments

Council's Heritage adviser's (Ashfield LGA specialist) comments are contained in **Attachment 7** and he has strong objections to the proposal as causing an adverse impact on the Heritage Items in Ormond Street and Haberfield Conservation Area, including the following:

"In my opinion, quite simply put, the core premise of this proposal that development of the scale and bulk proposed will not adversely affect its context is profoundly wrong. While the heritage items upon the site will be at risk of trivialised retention and placed in wholly inappropriate contexts and settings, the monumental and elephantine planning disaster that would be consequent would be the complete and utter visual domination of the Haberfield Conservation Area – a single storey, Model Garden Suburb of arguably international significance".

#### 6.4 Urban Ecology Comments

Council's Urban Ecology Coordinator recommends that any future development proposal should ensure there is a "biolink" (eg trees for wildlife) through the land between Ashfield Park to Explorers Park so as to connect to any future "biolink" which carries through to the east to the "GreenWay" along Hawthorne Canal. There should be open space areas for water urban sensitive design (ground level stormwater filtering) and deep soil planting for wide tree canopy planting or pedestrian shading and heat mitigation.

Item 2



#### 7.0 COUNCIL AFFORDABLE HOUSING POLICY

This has been in place since March 2017, and requires the provision of affordable housing for any uplift, by provision of a Voluntary Planning Agreement offer. No such offer has been made by the applicants. The provision of affordable housing is also a Strategic Action of the PRCUTS.

#### 8.0 NEXT PROCEURAL STEPS FOR PLANNING PROPOSAL

To date, Council received the Planning Proposal application on the 16 October 2017 and has carried out a preliminary community consultation.

Procedurally Council is now required to determine whether to support, or otherwise, the Planning Proposal application, and will note the officer's recommendation. The following should also be noted as it affects the former Ashfield Council LGA:

#### Ashfield LEP 2013 and Council delegation for being RPA

Council needs to be aware of the delegation granted to the former Ashfield Council, for the land affected by the Ashfield LEP 2013, who had delegation from the DPE to be able to act as the "Relevant Planning Authority" for the making of Planning Proposals, but only on the following terms:

- In November 2012 the Minister for NSW Planning & Infrastructure delegated certain powers to Council to make and determine an LEP amendment. This enables Council to exercise the Minister's Plan making functions after "Gateway Determination" stage (i.e. to draft and make the LEP in addition to the standard steps). The delegations operate when Council requests NSW Planning and Environment to issue a 'Written Authorisation to Exercise Delegation" (called the Authorisation). This Authorisation can be issued to Inner West Council as part of the "Gateway Determination". The delegation was subsequently granted to Ashfield Council. However this delegation <u>does not</u> cover large scale Planning Proposals.
- The previous Ashfield Council previously resolved to use the above delegation <u>on the</u> <u>proviso</u> that the General Manager is the person who exercises the delegation only with prior approval from Council for each specific Planning Proposal. This requires a report to be made to the Council and for Council to have resolved this for each specific Planning Proposal.

#### Next steps in the Process

Council is required to determine whether or not to support the Planning Proposal.

#### Scenario where Council supports application.

If Council resolves to support and proceed with the Planning Proposal the next steps are to:

- refer the application to the DPE.
- either request to make Council the Relevant Planning Authority, or instead request that the DPE be the Relevant Planning Authority.

After Gateway Determination (which may or not be positive) by the DPE the "Relevant Planning Authority" will be responsible for processing the application including putting it on formal public exhibition and ensuring that the requirements of the Gateway Determination are followed.



#### Scenario where Council does not support application.

If Council resolves not to support the Proposal, it would simply need to advise the applicant of this.

If Council resolves not to support the application, or at the expiration of 3 months from the lodgement of the application, the applicant may choose to seek that the Department of Planning and Environment review the Planning Proposal and determine whether to support it and request a Gateway Determination to proceed to exhibition stages. If a Gateway Determination is issued the Department would be the Relevant Planning Authority, unless Council agrees to being the Relevant Planning Authority.

#### 9.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

#### **10.0 OTHER STAFF COMMENTS**

#### **11.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Public exhibition was carried out between 14 November 2017 until 30 January 2018 with 345 submissions received. Refer to Part 3 of the Report.

#### CONCLUSION

The Planning Proposal was put on preliminary public exhibition so that Council may take community feedback into consideration when determining whether or not to proceed with the Planning Proposal. There is significant community opposition with a large amount of submissions having been received, with 310 submissions objecting to the proposal.

It is considered that the proposal fails the Strategic Merit test as indicated in this Planning Report, and fails most of its "question criterion" found in the Planning Proposal Guidelines. The Proposal is also contrary to State Plans that require meaningful retention of employment and services land, and that leave the planning of medium density areas for Councils and local communities to determine. It is contrary to the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010 agreed with the community. It is evident the proposal is inconsistent with the PRCUTS recommendations for Land Use Zoning and Maximum Height of Buildings and Maximum Floor Space Ratio, and is "out of sequence" with the staging of future development. It instead contends that pursuant to Section 117 Direction 7.3 (5) that it produces a better outcome and this is not agreed with for the reasons stated in the report.

The proposal would instead result in adverse impacts on the existing and nearby community and built environment, and the loss of a substantial amount of potential employment and urban services land along Parramatta Road. Support for such a proposal would also not be in the public interest, would cause a precedent, and non-compliance with the PRCUTS and Section 117 directions challenges the EPA Act planning system procedures and objectives, including the orderly development of land.

It is premature to be reconsidering the land uses and development standards for the affected land, noting that the PRCUTS proposes that any such review and staging should be carried out post 2023 and up to 2050. A review would, in the future, require a detailed and holistic town planning study as part of the development of a new Inner West LEP undertaken by Council, taking into consideration the impacts of the intervention of the WestConnex portals, a local council strategy which includes community participation and addresses all relevant considerations, the PRCUTS recommendations for public transport along Parramatta Road and provision of fast bus lanes, and how sites would be realistically be able to function in this unique context.



The Proposal should not be supported.

## ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Planning Proposal
- 2. U Planning Proposal Design Concept
- 3. Planning Proposal Landscape Plan
- 4. U Planning Proposal Traffic and Parking report.
- 5. Planning Proposal Heritage Report
- 6. Ut of Sequence Checklist
- 7. J. Council Heritage Adviser
- 8. Uisual Impact Diagram





## Land Owner Initiated Planning Proposal

#### Application to amend the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013

- 1,1A,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 Tideswell Street;
- 114,118,120,122,124,126,128,130-140 Parramatta Road;
- 45,47,51,53,55,57,59,61,63 Ormond Street;
- 43,45,47,49,51,53 Grower Street; and,
- 25,29,31,33,35,37,39 Liverpool Street

#### David Haskew (Partner)

A: Soper Chambers – Suite 10 / 118-120 Katoomba Street, Katoomba P. 0414 407 022 E: david@hdcplanning.com.au

#### Gilbert de Chalain (Partner)

A: Mezzanine Level - 50 Carrington Street, Sydney, NSW 2000 Australia P: 0417 253 416 E: gilbert@hdcplanning.com.au



Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

Item 2

#### Copyright

The concepts and information contained within this document is the property of HDC Planning. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of HDC Planning constitutes an infringement of copyright.



Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

# Table of Contents

<u>1</u>	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	1 PROPOSED LEP AMENDMENT	7
<u>2</u>	SITE DETAILS	
2.1	1 SITE DESCRIPTION	11
2.2	2 EXISTING DEVELOPMENT	13
2.3	3 VEGETATION	18
<u>3</u>	SITE CONTEXT	<u>19</u>
3.1	1 SITE CONTEXT – LOCATIONAL	19
3.2	2 SITE CONTEXT – PLANNING FOR CHANGE	21
3.2	2.1 A PLAN FOR GROWING SYDNEY	21
3.2	2.2 TOWARDS OUR GREATER SYDNEY 2056	23
3.2	2.3 DRAFT CENTRAL DISTRICT PLAN	24
3.2	2.4 PARRAMATTA ROAD CORRIDOR URBAN TRANSFORMATION STRATEGY	28
3.2	2.5 PARRAMATTA ROAD CORRIDOR URBAN TRANSFORMATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 2016-2023	35
3.2	2.6 PARRAMATTA ROAD CORRIDOR URBAN TRANSFORMATION PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDELINES	35
3.2	2.7 ASHFILED URBAN PLANNING STRATEGY 2010	38
<u>4</u>	EXISTING STATUTORY PLANNING FRAMEWORK	41
<u>4</u> <u>5</u>	EXISTING STATUTORY PLANNING FRAMEWORK	
_	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	45
<u>5</u>	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	<u>45</u> 45
- <u>5</u> 5.1	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	<u>45</u> 45 46
_ 5.1 5.2	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	45 45 46 46
_ 5.1 5.2 5.3	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY	<u>45</u> 45 46 46 49
	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN.         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY         5       PUBLIC DOMAIN IMPROVEMENTS	<u>45</u> 45 46 46 49 49
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN.         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY         5       PUBLIC DOMAIN IMPROVEMENTS         6       SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION	45 46 46 49 49 49
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN.         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY         5       PUBLIC DOMAIN IMPROVEMENTS         6       SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION         6.1       PRELIMINARY TRAFFIC AND PARKING ADVICE	45 46 46 49 49 49 50
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.6	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY         5       PUBLIC DOMAIN IMPROVEMENTS         6       SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION         6.1       PRELIMINARY TRAFFIC AND PARKING ADVICE	45 46 46 49 49 50 51
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.6 5.6	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN.         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY         5       PUBLIC DOMAIN IMPROVEMENTS         6       SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION         5.1       PRELIMINARY TRAFFIC AND PARKING ADVICE         5.2       PRELIMINARY HERITAGE ADVICE	45 46 46 49 49 50 51 51
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN.         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY         5       PUBLIC DOMAIN IMPROVEMENTS         6       SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION         5.1       PRELIMINARY TRAFFIC AND PARKING ADVICE         6.2       PRELIMINARY HERITAGE ADVICE         9       PLANNING PROPOSAL         1       PART 1 – OBJECTIVES AND INTENDED OUTCOMES	45 46 46 49 49 50 51 51 53 53
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 6 1	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT         1       OPPORTUNITIES         2       CONSTRAINTS         3       CONCEPT DESIGN.         4       DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY         5       PUBLIC DOMAIN IMPROVEMENTS         6       SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION         6.1       PRELIMINARY TRAFFIC AND PARKING ADVICE         6.2       PRELIMINARY HERITAGE ADVICE         9       PLANNING PROPOSAL         1       PART 1 – OBJECTIVES AND INTENDED OUTCOMES         2       PART 2 – EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS	45 46 49 49 50 51 51 53 53 54

#### Haskew de Chalain

O a ta la a a	0017
October	2017

6.3	3.2	SECTION B – RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK	.56
6.3	3.3	SECTION C - ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT	.65
6.3	3.4	SECTION D – STATE AND COMMONWEALTH INTERESTS	.66
6.4	4 F	PART 4 - MAPPING	66
6.	5 P	PART 5 – COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	66
6.6	6 F	PART 6 – PROJECT TIMELINE	66
7	co	NCLUSION	67


October 2017

# 1 INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared to accompany the lodgement of a request to initiate a Planning Proposal, which seeks to amend:

- the land zoning map;
- the Floor space ratio map;
- the Height of buildings map; and,
- Schedule 1 to permit an additional permissible use (shop top housing),

within the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 (ALEP 2013). This application relates to a number of properties forming a block bounded by Parramatta Road, Ormond Street, Gower Street and Liverpool Road situated south east of Ashfield Park.





Figure 2

Lots forming the subject site

October 2017

6

The subject site is partly zoned B6 – Enterprise Corridor and R3 – Medium Density Residential. Height of Building, Floor Space Ratio and land use permissibility do not permit development of the type and scale sought, hence the reason for this planning proposal.

This Planning Proposal has been prepared on the basis of detailed urban design and planning analysis which argues that the subject site is able to support of the scale of development as proposed and would act as a catalyst to the progress urban renewal of the Parramatta Road corridor.

It is further argued that transformation of the Parramatta Road corridor envisaged by State Planning Authorities under the existing zoning and development standards is unlikely. In some cases, maintenance of the status quo over some sites in favour of others may well be a desirable strategic planning outcome. However, that is not the case here. Current local planning controls and those suggested within the recently releases *Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy* will not encourage the acquisition and redevelopment of outdated and aged retail premises and numerous underdeveloped residential premises. Existing retail land uses results in a highly undesirable streetscape presentation and affords very little in the way of creating the renewed Parramatta Road envisaged in the *Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy*. The existing situation is highly undesirable and if it is to be redressed then it is clear that amendment of the current planning regime is required.

The solution which is advanced by the Planning Proposal is to maintain existing zonings over part of the site and to insert an additional permitted land use to the land zoned B6 – Enterprise corridor to permit redevelopment of the land for shop top housing. Furthermore, the current height of buildings and floor space ratio development standards be amended to enable redevelopment of the subject site in line with the concept plan submitted as part of this proposal.

It is argued that this is the most appropriate means of achieving a desirable development outcome because the development scheme envisaged for the site precisely accords with the standard instrument zone objectives, and would not undermine the desire to preserve a retail and urban hierarchy.

It is suggested that the amendment of planning controls applicable to the subject site would bring significant benefits to the locality. For instance, the subject site has contributed little to employment generation in the past and existing land uses are a less than ideal use of well-located and strategically significant land. Moreover, permitting development of the subject land as proposed would have the potential to bring about positive amenity improvements to the locality by creating a buffer and transition from Parramatta Road corridor and encouraging the evolution of green pedestrian/cycle way linkages to quality areas of public open space. In fact, this proposal will result in the dedication of additional land to public open space and the preservation of heritage items of significance.

In terms of land use permissibility, the greatest impact brought about by the proposed amendment would be the inclusion of residential land uses to the mix of permitted uses within the B6 – Enterprise Corridor Zone along Parramatta Road. With appropriate secondary local controls, land use mix and intensity can be managed to encourage a compatible use of land that would continue to serve as a buffer between existing non-residential and residential land uses.

With respect to secondary local controls, a Site Specific Development Control Plan could provide a suite of supplementary controls which would encourage the development of the land as detailed in this proposal.

Item 1

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

A fully resolved development control plan is not required in order to determine whether a Planning Proposal warrants referral to Gateway. If Council is of a mind to support this proposal, required studies can form part of Gateway's requirements to be completed prior to public exhibition of a Draft LEP.

It should be noted that this proposal is supported by a comprehensive architectural and urban design package. Furthermore, this proposal is also supported by heritage advice and preliminary traffic impact assessment.

# 1.1 Proposed LEP Amendment

This Planning Proposal has been prepared to initiate a change in land use permissibility to enable the provision for employment generating land uses, integrated with residential land uses within a defined precinct being the land bounded by the properties forming a block bounded by Parramatta Road, Ormond Street, Gower Street and Liverpool Road situated south east of Ashfield Park.

This Planning Proposal would seek to:

- permit shop top housing over those lots fronting Parramatta Road currently zoned B6-Enterprise Corridor;
- Rezone the portion of the site currently zoned R3 Medium Density Residential to R1-General Residential;
- amend the height of buildings (HOB) map to apply maximum building heights to the subject site ranging from 12.5 metres (no change) to 14 metres, 31 metres, 35 metres, 44 metres and 55 metres; and,
- amend the floor space ratio (FSR) map to apply a maximum FSR to the subject site ranging from of 0.7:1 (no change) to 2.3:1, 2.8:1 and 4.2:1.

The Concept Plan seeks to deliver a range of building heights and density. However, heritage items will be retained and incorporated into the total development of the site.

Following an assessment of the planning context and the relevant State and local planning policies, it can be concluded that there is planning merit for the preparation of a Planning Proposal. It is therefore recommended that this request to prepare a Planning Proposal be favorably considered by the Inner West Council and that Council resolve to forward a proposal to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment for Gateway determination in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 to prepare the necessary LEP amendment.



October 2017

Item 2

This page has been left intentionally blank



October 2017

# 2 SITE DETAILS

The subject Planning Proposal relates to all land within the street block bounded by Parramatta Road, Ormond Street, Gower Street and Liverpool Road, Ashfield. The site's location is shown in the Regional context as Figure 3. An Aerial Photograph (Neighbourhood Context) and Aerial Photograph (Local Context) are provided as Figure 4 and Figure 5 respectively. An extract of the current zoning map is included as Figure 6.



Figure 3: Regional Context



Figure 4: Neighbourhood Context

Attachment 1

Item 2

October 2017

10



Figure 5: Subject site - Local Context



Figure 6: Current Zoning

The subject site currently supports relatively marginal non-residential land uses and modest residential land uses and under current land use controls, is unlikely to attract redevelopment for more desirable uses of the land. In fact, it is argued that the more appropriate use of land has been restricted by an



October 2017

outdated and overly conservative approach to zoning and development standards for a site that is located within a highly accessible location. The existing restriction on residential permissibility in enterprise corridors has not kept up with contemporary approaches to urban living.

The subject site is particularly attractive in terms of access, size and location for modern mixed use development and with some amendment to ALEP 2013, a broader range of contemporary employment generating land uses may be encouraged and with the inclusion of residential land uses, a healthy mix of employment and residential opportunities are likely. A mix of employment and residential uses within the same precinct brings with it a variety of environmental, transport and economic advantages encouraged by state level planning.

The subject land is situated within walking distance of Ashfield and Summer Hill Railway Stations, adjacent to significant areas of open space and employment land. The Central Business District of Ashfield is close by with the Sydney CBD being easily accessible by rail, light rail and bus.

It is argued that increased population in this locality can be easily accommodated and would be consistent with State Government policy as a location appropriate for growth.

This Planning Proposal provides a Concept Plan for the subject site which indicates a mix of land uses that does not displace employment generation. Rather, this plan increases employment opportunity while also providing for additional housing.

# 2.1 Site Description

The site comprises forty-five (45) allotments, the descriptions of which are summarised in the following table.

Lot and DP	Area (sqm)	
Lot 1 DP 970495	388.764	
Lot 1 DP 921904	311.514	
Lot 10 DP 439	941.937	
SP 20457	434.056	
Lot X, DP 354900	613.931	
Lot 8, DP 439	932.629	
Lot 7, DP 439	924.780	
Lot 13, DP 6394	691.614	
Lot 12, DP 6394	690.807	
SP 85826	631.102	

ot and DP	Area (sqm)
ot 10, DP 6394	626.256
ot 2, DP 130500	480.529
ot 1, DP 130500	481.859
ot 1, DP 974797	479.668
ot 2, DP 974797	402.331
SP 66959	585.331
ot B, DP 343029	387.143
ot 1, DP 304202	658.643
ot 6, DP 1120	265.949
ot 5, DP 1120	259.600
ot 4, DP 1120	290.272
ot A, DP 341204	350.209
ot C, DP 341204	399.646
ot B, DP 341204	410.123
ot A, DP 346099	243.804
ot B, DP 346099	259.216
ot B, DP 188572	249.364
ot A, DP 188572	258.511
ot 4, DP 333011	367.186
ot A, DP 974913	232.824
ot B, DP974913	184.391
ot 9, DP 1120	257.078
ot 8, DP 1120	259.897
ot 1, DP 965671	539.792

October 2017

Item 2



Lot and DP Area (sam)		
Lot and Dr	Area (sqm)	
Lot 1, DP 965669	557.776	
Lot 1, DP 937574	555.747	
Lot 1, DP 937815	672.537	
Lot 1, DP 868921	306.801	
Lot 2, DP 868921	316.730	
Lot B, DP 445524	319.457	
Lot A, DP 445524	320.934	
Lot 1, DP 973430	566.227	
Lot 1, DP 948529	300.270	
Lot 1, DP 130481	159.588	
Lot 2, DP130481	157.786	
Total	20003.8	

October 2017

# 2.2 Existing Development

All allotments are developed for residential or commercial purposes. The land zoned B6 – Enterprise Corridor supports some bulky goods retail (Milano Furniture) and other lower order commercial uses. Residential land uses currently exist within the B6 zone fronting Parramatta Road. The existing uses contribute little to street level activation or aesthetic. Reference should be made to images below for an indication of existing development along Parramatta Road.



Figure 7: Long view of Parramatta Road towards subject site (red outline). Milano Furniture development marks the corner of Parramatta Road and Ormond Street.

October 2017



Figure 8: Parramatta Road Frontage, note little street level activity.



Figure 9: Parramatta Road frontage. Note extensive area of public open space (Ashfield Park)



**Figure 10:** Parramatta Road Frontage, lower order nonresidential land use adjoins existing residential land use. Though land is zoned enterprise corridor, no change in land use has occurred or likely Significant alteration in planning scheme required to encourage land acquisition and redevelopment.



Item 2

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

Finer grain residential development is found along Gower and Ormond Streets. Development of note along Ormond Street includes three (3) dwellings identified as having local heritage significance. This proposal does not seek any alteration to the heritage controls applicable to these parcels of land. In fact, the concept plan submitted with this proposal, if adopted, would see the retention and incorporation of these dwellings into the development scheme. Reference should be made to images below for an indication of existing development along Gower and Ormond Streets.



**Figure 11**: Corner of Parramatta Road and Ormond Street. Milano furniture building forms the corner. However, it is argued that this corner should support development that properly defines and activates the street edge at Parramatta Road wrapping around to Ormond Street.



Figure 12: Existing local heritage buildings-Gower Street. These buildings would be preserved and integrated into the proposed development. No change to planning controls proposed for these properties.



October 2017

16



Figure 13: Heritage listed Ashfield Park -Ormond Street



Figure 14: Corner Ormond and Gower Street



Figure 15: Gower Street

Existing development along Liverpool Road and Tideswell Street consists of residential land uses, a food and drink premises and public open space. It should be noted this proposal would result in the removal of the existing food and drink premises and the redevelopment and dedication of that land



October 2017

to public open space. Reference should be made to images below for an indication of existing development along Liverpool Road.



Figure 16: Corner Liverpool Road and Gower Street – View towards Parramatta Road



Figure 17: Liverpool Road - View towards Gower Street



Figure 18: Liverpool Road - view towards Tideswell Street

17

Attachment 1



October 2017



Figure 19: Tideswell Street



Figure 20: Corner of Liverpool Road and Parramatta Road

# 2.3 Vegetation

Existing vegetation is predominantly formal private landscaped gardens. Preliminary assessment has revealed that the existing vegetation is unlikely to have any ecological significance. It would be expected that the majority of existing vegetation would be removed but would be replaced by new plantings as part of the site redevelopment process. A comprehensive landscape plan has been prepared and accompanies this proposal indicating the potential to introduce significant landscape enhancement and the creation of "green corridors" linking existing areas of public open space.



Item 2

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

# 3 SITE CONTEXT

The site context is a function of locational context (where the subject site is located within the metropolitan area) and planning context (how the site should be considered in light of recent planning strategies and plans). The consideration of the site context then leads to the establishment of the opportunities and constraints influencing future development potential. These matters are discussed below.

## 3.1 Site Context – Locational

As the figure below shows, the subject site in located within the inner western ring of Sydney suburbs in very close proximity to the Sydney Central Business District and excellent public transport options.



#### Figure 21: Regional Context

The subject site is:

- accessible by bus with bus stops directly adjacent to the subject site on Parramatta Road and Liverpool Road;
- 510 metres to Summer Hill Railway Station;
- 815 metres to the Taverners Hill Light Rail Station;
- 1.2 Km to Ashfield Railway Station;
- 1.3 Km to Ashfield Town Centre;
- 2.3 Km to Norton Street Leichhardt;
- 4.6 Km to the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital;
- 4.7 Km to Burwood Town Centre; and,
- Sydney CBD 8.6 Km.



October 2017

Significant employment opportunities are in close proximity with the Sydney CBD being only 8.6 km from the subject site. Manufacturing/industrial employment opportunities are also in close proximity with Mascot/Alexandria/Botany being 7-10 km from the subject site.



Figure 22: Transport services



Figure 23: Contiguous land uses

Lower density residential and significant expanses of public open space surround the subject site.



October 2017

# 3.2 Site Context – Planning for change

The planning context for the Parramatta Road corridor is established by a number of significant planning strategies recently completed by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment, the Greater Sydney Commission and UrbanGrowth NSW. The strategies and plans provide a wide range of transformation plans and initiatives spanning higher level objectives to more specific actions supported by suggested planning controls and land use guidelines. All of which will influence land use and redevelopment decisions for the subject site and locality. The most relevant plans and strategies are listed and commentary on the relevance of the plan or strategy to the subject site provided below.

#### 3.2.1 A Plan for Growing Sydney



A Plan for Growing Sydney – December 2014 (NSW Department of Planning and Environment)

The most recent metropolitan strategy released by the Department of Planning and Environment lays the foundation for urban renewal and growth within the Sydney Metropolitan region. The strategy recognizes that significant population growth is inevitable and sets in place plans to meet the needs of growth. The Government's vision for Sydney is: a strong global city, a great place to live. To achieve this vision, the Government has set goals that includes:

- a city of housing choice with homes that meet our needs and lifestyles; and,
- a great place to live with communities that are strong, healthy and well connected.

Clearly, the strategy understands the need to increase housing supply and housing choice to meet the expected population growth. This proposal would result in the delivery of additional homes with exceptional access to public transport, employment, shopping and recreational opportunities.

A Plan for Growing Sydney includes four (4) planning goals that will arguably support sustainable growth while meeting the needs of an expanding population. **Goal 2: A city of housing choice, with homes that meet our needs and lifestyles** is of most relevance to this proposal. That is, this proposal will widen housing choice in a locality that is well serviced. The type and style of dwelling proposed is not well represented in the Inner West/Ashfield local government area. High quality mixed use development can be found further east of the subject site, however, despite the medium density zoning assigned to the subject site, the immediate locality is dominated by aging three (3) storey walk-up flat development and detached lower density residential development. The portion of the subject site zoned enterprise corridor supports little enterprise. In fact, the non-residential land uses are marginal at best.

The strategy seeks to accelerate housing supply and local housing choices in designated infill areas (established urban areas) through the Priority Precincts and UrbanGrowth NSW programs. Furthermore, the strategy seeks to accelerate urban renewal across Sydney by providing homes closer to jobs. Urban renewal in transport corridors which are being transformed by investment and around strategic centres are to be given priority.

Attachment 1

October 2017

22

The figure below is an extract from the strategy clearly showing the Parramatta Road Urban Renewal Corridor with the subject site clearly located within the renewal corridor.



Figure 24: Extract from A Plan for Growing Sydney - Urban Renewal Corridor

At **Direction 2.2:** Accelerate urban renewal across Sydney – providing homes closer to jobs the strategy articulates the governments intentions stating that:

ACTION 2.2.2: UNDERTAKE URBAN RENEWAL IN TRANSPORT CORRIDORS WHICH ARE BEING TRANSFORMED BY INVESTMENT, AND AROUND STRATEGIC CENTRES.

In this regard, the Parramatta Road Corridor is a transport corridor which is being transformed by significant investment and it is argued that this proposal will facilitate the urban renewal of the corridor and the provision of new housing in a location which has public transport that runs frequently and can carry large numbers of passengers. Furthermore, this proposal will provide housing within close

October 2017

proximity to jobs and social infrastructure such as schools, community facilities, open space and public spaces.

This proposal provides the opportunity to connect new homes to the job-rich areas of the Sydney CBD and North Sydney with easy access to rail and light rail. As the Government has predicted in the strategy, the significant investment in transport infrastructure is acting as a catalyst for new housing development giving the new community to potential for shorter commutes to major job centres.

The scale of investment in the Parramatta Road corridor, along with the light rail means that Parramatta Road will be transformed, provided there is support at the local level with an appropriate amendment to the local environmental plan to enable a viable redevelopment project to be devised.

This proposal is entirely consistent with A Plan for Growing Sydney. If supported, a prominent site within the Parramatta Road Urban Renewal Corridor, close to rail, light rail, jobs, shopping and social infrastructure will be transformed to provide new housing within a mixed use development contributing to the urban renewal of the locality.

#### 3.2.2 Towards our Greater Sydney 2056



Towards our Greater Sydney 2056 - November 2016 (Greater Sydney Commission)

Towards our Greater Sydney 2056, was prepared to update and supplement A Plan for Greater Sydney. It is to provide a framework that can better underpin strategic planning and foreshadowed the comprehensive review of the regional plan and is an essential companion to the exhibition of the draft District Plans.

This new central organising strategy of Greater Sydney as a metropolis of three cities has led to a reconsideration of the approach to centres in A

Plan for Growing Sydney. A new hierarchy of centres is proposed, which defines three types of centres: strategic, district and local. By 2036, the Growing City metropolitan priority aims to:

- support the generation of over 817,000 additional jobs
- accommodate 1.74 million additional people and more than 725,000 new homes
- increase Greater Sydney's economic growth rate
- increase total economic activity by 75% to approximately \$655 billion.

By 2036 the 30 minute City metropolitan priority aims to increase the range of jobs and services and other opportunities that people can get to within 30 minutes to improve overall quality of life and give businesses better access to a broad and deep labour pool. This metropolitan priority aims to:

- increase the proportion of people with good access to jobs and prioritise socially disadvantaged areas
- improve accessibility to jobs across all districts
- improve the ability to walk to local services and amenities.



Attachment 1

October 2017

It is argued that this proposal will support the provision of housing within a locality that is a defined renewal corridor that is receiving investment from Government, that is accessible to transport, jobs and social infrastructure. Accelerating housing opportunities is key to this transitional strategy which states that:

To accommodate new housing growth while also responding to housing affordability, there is a need to accelerate housing supply across Greater Sydney....., we have a key role to play in creating opportunities for new housing in the right locations...... Our vision for accommodating homes for the next generation is intrinsically linked to planning for and integrating with new infrastructure and services. ...... Plan for Growing Sydney identifies possible urban renewal corridors. .......In addition to the general guidance in A Plan for Growing Sydney, we propose the following criteria for investigating urban renewal corridors:

- Alignment with investment in regional and district infrastructure. This acknowledges the catalytic impacts of infrastructure such as Sydney Metro Northwest and Sydney Metro City & Southwest, NorthConnex, WestConnex, Sydney CBD and South East Light Rail, Parramatta Light Rail, Northern Beaches Hospital and any future NSW Government investments.
- Accessibility to jobs, noting almost half of Greater Sydney's jobs are in strategic and district centres.
- Accessibility to regional transport, noting that high-frequency transport services can create
  efficient connections to local transport services and expand the catchment area of people
  who can access regional transport within a decent travel time.
- The catchment area that is within walking distance of centres with regional transport.
- The feasibility of development, including financial viability across a range of housing configurations (one, two and three+ bedrooms) and consistency with market demand. Proximity to services including schools and health facilities.

While the Parramatta Road Urban Renewal Corridor is not new to NSW Planning Authorities, the aforementioned criteria further reinforces the suitability of the subject site as an appropriate location for new housing within a mixed use environment. The subject site will benefit from major infrastructure investment including WestConnex, is accessible by light rail, is within 30 minutes to jobs and services, is within walking distance of centres, schools and health facilities. Furthermore, this proposal enables a feasible development proposal that will provide a range of dwelling sizes to meet market demand.

## 3.2.3 Draft Central District Plan



Draft Central District Plan - November 2016 (Greater Sydney Commission)

The Draft District Plan seeks to meet the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) by:

progressing the directions of A Plan for Growing Sydney;

• identifying planning priorities for the District and the actions to achieve them.

The draft District Plan translates and tailors metropolitan planning priorities for each District by giving effect to the four goals of A Plan for Growing

tem

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

Sydney. The draft District Plan does this by describing proposed priorities and actions for the District in terms of:

- A productive city (Goal 1)
- A liveable city (Goals 2 and 3)
- A sustainable city (Goals 3 and 4).

Essentially the district plan bridges the gap between metropolitan level planning and local plans. Of importance is to this proposal is that, this draft District Plan is to:

- inform the preparation of local environmental plans;
- inform planning proposals;
- guide strategic land use, transport and infrastructure planning across local government areas; and,
- inform infrastructure planning.

It is noted that Section 75AI of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 requires local environment plans to be updated to give effect to each District Plan as soon as practicable after a District Plan is made.

In this regard, it is considered that Chapter 4 - Liveability priorities and actions are particularly relevant to this proposal as the overarching priorities for the Central region are:

- Improving housing choice
- Improving housing diversity and affordability
- Coordinating and monitoring housing outcomes and demographic trends
- Creating great places
- Fostering cohesive communities
- Responding to people's need for services

Improving housing choice, diversity and affordability go to the heart of this proposal. That is, this proposal seeks the opportunity to provide contemporary mixed use development in a highly accessible location. It should be noted that the draft district plan says that it will:

Leverage investment in transport infrastructure..... such as Sydney Metro City & Southwest, Sydney Metro West and the CBD and South East Light Rail present opportunities to increase connectivity between where we work, live and play with improvements to mass transit, cycling and walking routes.

Furthermore, the draft district plan confirms that three (3) planning principles:

- Principle 1: Increasing housing choice around all centres through urban renewal in established areas;
- Principle 2: Stronger economic development in strategic centres and transport gateways; and,
- Principle 3: Connecting centres with a networked transport system,

remain current and underpin many of the priorities of the draft District Plan.

Therefore, increasing housing close to centres and stations and increasing the variety of housing available remains central to the planning process.

October 2017

It is interesting to note that the draft District Plan acknowledges the *Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy* and Implementation Tool Kit as an integrated land use planning and transport framework that establishes the vision for a high quality multi-use Corridor with improved transport choices, better amenity and balanced growth of housing and jobs. It is stated that the

Strategy fosters communities that are walkable and connected, development that is of a high standard and respects heritage, with the facilities that enhance communities and cater for a diverse range of needs. Delivery of the Strategy is supported by the \$198 million Urban Amenity Improvement Plan which will deliver upgrades of existing facilities and fund new infrastructure to support growing communities. The plan includes including funding for streetscape upgrades, creation of new or improved open spaces, urban plazas and town squares, and new walking and cycling links to key transport nodes and open spaces.

It is argued that this proposal, while not exactly within a renewal precinct as defined by the *Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy* is able to deliver on the vision for the Parramatta Road Corridor. That is as the figure below shows, **the subject site is in close proximity to Ashfield Local Centre, rail and light rail, hence would enjoy the same locational advantages as the urban renewal precinct of Taverners Hill.** 





October 2017

# 3.2.3.1 The Liveability Framework

Greater Sydney's Liveability Framework provides an appropriate platform from which to consider the suitability for the subject site. Of the nine liveability outcomes that have been derived, the subject site meets those that relate to housing, urban design, community connection, access to jobs and environment as summarized below. Of the nine liveability outcomes, development of the subject site as proposed will directly support the attainment of six outcomes.

housing choice by supporting affordable and appropriate housing for all

**Comment**: This proposal will enable to provision of new housing of a type that is not well represented in the locality. Furthermore, a variety of dwelling size and type will be provided within the development comprising shop top housing, residential apartments and multi dwelling housing.

• urban design excellence by delivering high quality design that supports community safety, health and wellbeing, and enhances community assets and character

**Comment**: Attention has been given to urban design to provide a contemporary, well designed proposal that supports community safety and being easily accessible by methods other than the private motor vehicle will encourage healthy lifestyles.

 connected communities by supporting walking, cycling and public transport movement between destinations

**Comment**: The subject site is ideally located to provide easy access to public transport and being close to several town centres will encourage walking and cycling.

 sense of belonging and local identity by creating great places that are socially inclusive and promote respect and feelings of belonging

**Comment**: Should the site be developed as proposed, the design will provide the opportunity for the creation of a sense of place and community.

 diversity of job opportunities by providing access to a range of jobs and learning/skills development

**Comment**: The subject site is in close proximity to job opportunities and educational establishments easily accessible by public transport, walking or cycling.

environmental quality by managing the quality of and access to the natural environment.

**Comment**: This proposal is within a highly urbanized environment. However, the subject site is adjacent to vast areas of public open space.

## 3.2.3.2 Housing Targets

The Draft District Plan acknowledges that housing supply is essential to the support a growing population and says that:

27

Attachment 1

October 2017

..... Department of Planning and Environment estimates that Greater Sydney needs 725,000 additional dwellings over the next 20 years and **157,500 additional dwellings in the Central District**. We see this projection as a <u>minimum</u> requirement.....

The Central District's five-year target (2016-2021) is 46,550 new dwellings with the Inner West local government area to supply 5,900 by 2021.

The Draft plan seeks to work with authorities to accelerate the supply of housing in areas close to services and infrastructure through urban renewal projects and precincts. This proposal has the potential to deliver 515 dwellings consisting of approximately 480 apartments and 35 townhouses in a highly accessible location.

It is interesting to note that the Draft plan says that the Inner West Council will:

.....investigate local opportunities to address demand and diversity in and around local centres and infill areas with a particular focus on transport corridors and other areas with high accessibility.

The subject site is a unique opportunity to address housing demand being located close to local centres and transport corridors and being highly accessible. The subject site is worthy of consideration as a legitimate urban renewal project that could deliver high quality, accessible housing.

## 3.2.3.3 Safe and healthy places

The Draft Plan seeks to facilitate the delivery of safe and healthy places. In that regard the plan says that relevant planning authorities should demonstrate how these matters have been taken into account in any planning proposal. It is argued that this proposal would contribute to the enhancement and renewal of a neighbourhoods with good walking and cycling connections to schools, services and public transport. This proposal also has the ability to create an attractive and meaningful like to areas of public open space.

## 3.2.4 Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy



## Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy – November 2016 (UrbanGrowth NSW)

The Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy is the NSW Government's plan setting out how the Parramatta Road Corridor should be planned and will grow. The Strategy has been adopted by the NSW Government and is given statutory force by a Ministerial Direction under section 117 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. In this regard, the Strategy is a key consideration to this proposal.

The subject site is located with the Parramatta Road Corridor as shown on

the following figure.



October 2017



Figure 26: Extract from Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy. Figure shows subject site within the Corridor.





October 2017

The Strategy recognizes that the key strengths of this section of the Corridor including:

- proximity to the Sydney CBD
- access to a range of transport options, including public transport to key employment hubs
- proximity to nationally and internationally recognised health and education uses such as Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, eleven medical research institutes, University of Sydney, University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Notre Dame University the Ultimo TAFE and the Sydney Dental Hospital.



**Figure 28:** Extract from Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy. Figure shows subject site within easy access to public transport options.



October 2017

#### 1. Housing choice and affordability

- An additional 56,000 people live in the Corridor in 27,000 new homes.
- The community's housing needs are met with a mix of dwelling types, sizes and prices.
- A minimum of five per cent of new housing is Affordable Housing (or in line with Government policy of the day), new housing also caters for single households, older people or different household structures.

**Comment:** This proposal will facilitate the provision of new homes and contribute to housing mix to cater for single households, older people or different household structures.

Strategic Actions for housing diversity: This proposal will support the proponent strategic actions by providing housing mix that meets market demand, while satisfying with the objectives and design criteria of the Apartment Design Guide.

This proposal includes a mix of dwelling size and type including residential apartments, shop top housing and town house development.

Strategic Action for Affordable Housing: This proposal will support the proponent strategic actions by providing the opportunity to incorporate affordable housing within the proposal.

#### 2. Diverse and resilient economy

- \$31 billion of development value is realised.
- Parramatta Road Corridor is Sydney's 'economic spine' 50,000 workers across a diverse range
  of sectors and roles come into the Corridor each day to work.
- Auburn is recognised as Sydney's large format retail hub and Camperdown is a specialist precinct that supports the world class research, educational and health uses associated with the University of Sydney and the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital.
- Town centres at Granville and Kings Bay support new residents and workers.
- There is new life in the retail areas of Parramatta Road, and the Corridor is home to a variety of businesses, including small and medium enterprises, advanced technologies and creative industries.

**Comment**: This proposal will support the viability of growing town centres by locating new residents in close proximity to centres and employment opportunities. The existing retail spaces located upon the subject site will be expanded and modernized, attracting new business enterprises to the Parramatta Road corridor.

#### 3. Accessible and connected

- It is easier to move to, through and within the Corridor in both east-west and north-south directions.
- The urban transformation of the Corridor is supported by transit-oriented development. Existing
  and new desirable and affordable mixed use environments are enhanced by high-quality, high
  frequency public transport and safe active transport connections.

Attachment 1

October 2017

- The Corridor's inherent social, economic and environmental resources are optimised, including freight generating uses within and supporting the Corridor.
- Available road and rail capacity is utilised and public investments in transport are optimised.
- Non-infrastructure initiatives, such as encouraging visitors to use non-car modes of travel to help alleviate congestion, and modifying or altering timing of trips, are well utilised.
- People choose to walk and/or cycle for local trips along the Corridor's 34km of new and upgraded links, hop on buses and/or light rail for intermediate trips, and use rail and/or car for regional trips.
- The integrated transport network contributes to regional resilience and sustainable communities along the Corridor and beyond.

**Comment:** This proposal is located to be easily accessible by a variety of public transport options. It is argued that this proposal would be considered as a transitoriented development being a new mixed use development easily accessible by public transport. New residents will have access to viable transport alternatives to the private motor vehicle.

#### 4. Vibrant community places

- Residents can walk easily to public transport, local shops, schools, parks and open space areas, jobs and a range of community services and facilities that are all close by.
- Neighbourhoods include a mix of old and new buildings sitting well together creating attractive places for people to enjoy.
- New development respects and protects existing lower-scale development and heritage.
- New landmarks and high quality buildings and spaces are recognised and valued by the community.
- Residents and workers can easily access new and upgraded community facilities and services including libraries, community centres, child care centres, cultural facilities, schools and community health facilities.

**Comment:** This proposal will contribute to the creation and support the growth of existing places. This proposal includes substantial areas of common open space and protects heritage buildings with their incorporation into the redevelopment of this subject site. This proposal places new residents within easy access to public transport, shops and parks.

#### 5. Green spaces and links

- There is 66ha of new open space areas, linear parks and links along watercourses and infrastructure corridors, linked to pedestrian and cycle connections.
- Parramatta Road and the surrounding road network is greener and lined with trees.
- The Corridor's nine watercourses have been naturalised and are pleasant places for people to walk and cycle along and enjoy.

**Comment:** This proposal has been designed to provide a linkage between areas of open spaces. The potential for pedestrian and cycle connections are enhanced by this proposal.

October 2017

Haskew de Chalain

#### 6. Sustainability and resilience

- Smart parking strategies have reduced people's car dependence and fuel use leading to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Development is more feasible, meaning savings could be passed on to homebuyers, making housing more affordable and reducing the overall cost of living.
- Because thinking about parking has changed, the design of buildings transition between different uses ensuring community uses and facilities, or perhaps even open space to occur over time.
- A lush tree canopy and vegetation on buildings makes places cooler and greener, and residents and workers can enjoy the outdoors.
- Households enjoy improved living costs made possible by significant reductions in water and energy consumption in the Corridor.

**Comment**: This proposal is located with easy access to town centres and public transport. Dependence on the private motor vehicle is reduced. This proposal will also result in landscape enhancement and provision of community facilities.

#### 7. Delivery

- There is an effective governance structure in place.
- Decisions are made in a timely, transparent and coordinated way.
- Well understood benchmarks and indicators inform the planning and decision making processes.
- There is a clear monitoring, reporting and review process.

**Comment**: The preparation of this proposal provides the opportunity for government to demonstrate leadership and commitment to the urban renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor. This proposal is considered to be consistent with the Parramatta Road Strategy and is worthy of support.



**Figure 29:** Figure shows extract from Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (image left) compared with impression of proposed development (image right). Proposed development will realize the vision for Parramatta Road.

33

Attachment 1

October 2017

## 3.2.4.1 Delivering the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy

The Strategy and Implementation Tool Kit are the subject of a Section 117 Ministerial Direction, which requires that councils consider the vision, principles and strategic actions of the Corridor Strategy and the Implementation Tool Kit when assessing this planning proposal. In this regard it is argued that this proposal is consistent with the Corridor Strategy and should be supported as development as proposed will secure the outcomes envisioned for the Parramatta Road Corridor.

The Transformation strategy recognizes that the current planning controls constrain much of the proposed renewal activities identified in the Strategy, hence will need to be amended. This proposal seeks to initiate the amendment of planning controls.

## 3.2.4.2 Corridor East Precincts and Frame Areas

The Precincts in Corridor East are Homebush, Burwood-Concord, Kings Bay, Taverners Hill, Leichhardt and Camperdown. The subject site is within to the Taverner's Hill precinct.



Figure 30: Figure shows extract from Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation with subject site located within the Taverners Hill precinct.



October 2017

Haskew de Chalain

This proposal supports the desired land uses by:

- maintain an employment land uses along Parramatta Road;
- proposing higher density development along the Parramatta Road corridor without adversely impacting upon the existing low-density character away from the corridor; and,
- proposing appropriately scaled residential development in a key location to attract and retain people in the core of the Precinct.

## 3.2.5 Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Implementation Plan 2016-2023



The Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy does not directly rezone land, it establishes the framework for land use and transport planning to guide, coordinate and facilitate changes to local planning controls that will lead to the Corridor's transformation. The Implementation Plan clearly states that the Strategy will be implemented through **planning proposals prepared by landowners or developers**, comprehensive local environmental plan reviews undertaken by councils, and State environmental planning policies for future Priority Precincts. This proposal seeks to follow the implementation plan by initiating a planning proposal.

The Taverners Hill Action Plan says that from 2016, sequencing of planning

proposals in the Precinct and Frame Area to be consistent with the Taverners Hill Action Plan 2016 – 2023, hence it is argued that this proposal is consistent with anticipated sequencing.

#### 3.2.6 Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Planning and Design Guidelines



the subject site is:

- not constrained by a heritage conservation area;
- includes some items of heritage significance;
- should include a Green Edge Setback; and,
- adjacent to areas of accessible open space.

The recommended land use zones to implement the vision for the Taverners Hill Precinct and Frame Area are shown in Figure 10.17 – reproduced below.

October 2017

Corridor



#### Land Use Zone

The Design Guideline suggests that the western Frame Area (subject site within this area) from Iron Cove Creek to Hawthorne Canal will be maintained as B6 Enterprise Corridor. East of Hawthorne Canal, a wider range of mixed uses are proposed along both sides of Parramatta Road and the eastern side of Tebbutt Street. A B4 Mixed Use Zone is recommended to facilitate an appropriate quantum of residential development whilst ensuring a broad range of non-residential uses capable of delivering employment and other activities is able to be provided. Land uses will be sufficiently broad to retain and enhance the evolving pattern and character of small scale and businesses and bespoke services within the ground floor of premises. Alternatively a B6 Enterprise Corridor could be considered for these areas, subject to residential development being a permissible use in the B6 zone.

It is argued that the subject site should retain the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone with the inclusion of residential development being a permissible use in the B6 zone. This proposal seeks the inclusion of residential development as a permissible land use as a means of supporting redevelopment for a mix of land uses including ground floor commercial land uses with residential development above.

#### **Building Height**

The Guidelines suggest that the tallest buildings permitted will be located on Upward Street and will be up to 32 metres or 8 storeys to reflect the amendments to the local planning controls that have only recently been approved. A 32 metre height control is also recommended for land on Lords Road that is close to the Marion Light Rail stop and other nearby facilities and services such as Kegworth



Item 2

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

Public School and Leichhardt Marketplace. Building heights along Parramatta Road, Lords Road west of Tebbutt Street, the southern end of Tebbutt Street, and the southern end of Old Canterbury Road range from 17 - 21 metres, or 4 - 6 storeys. These parts of the Precinct are best served by existing or proposed public transport and therefore could be appropriate for some intensification. Low scale heights are recommended throughout the remainder of the Precinct. A maximum of 12 metres is suggested to enable infill uplift up to three storeys in select locations.



The subject site is not unduly constrained by heritage conservation areas and individual items of heritage can be integrated into the overall develop of the site. The resulting built form outcome is one that is consistent with the vision for Parramatta Road Corridor.

#### Density

The recommended floor space ratios (FSR) reflect the recommended heights and it is argued that the subject site is able to support a more generous FSR along with a more generous height control.



October 2017



This proposal is inconsistent with the suggested FRS. However, it is argued that the subject site can support a more generous FSR control due to its unique locational advantages, size and proximity to areas of open space.

## 3.2.7 Ashfiled Urban Planning Strategy 2010



The former Ashfield Council prepared the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy 2010 to provide the strategic underpinning for the preparation of Council's comprehensive Local Environmental Plan 2010. The Strategy was also to provide the long term direction for land use planning decisions within the Ashfield local government area and to consider strategic directions and actions, including additional dwelling and employment capacity targets, as set out in the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy 2005 and the Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy 2008. While the Strategy predates council amalgamations, more recent metropolitan and district planning, it is considered worthy of consideration, accepting that it has not been

reviewed and updated every five years (2015, 2020, 2025, and 2030) as part of the required five year review of the comprehensive Local Environmental Plan 2010.

The relevance of the Strategy with respect to population, housing and employment have been considered as demonstrated below.



tem

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

- Ageing population
- Ageing infrastructure and high amounts of residential flat buildings
- Deal with the impacts of WestConnex.

**Comment**: This proposal will provide the opportunity to provide suitable housing for an aging population in an accessible location, trigger urban renewal while responding/leveraging off the WestConnex project.

Council had identified that 17,500 sqm of new employment floor space would be required to cater for additional jobs and that opportunity for employment growth within the Ashfield LGA was likely to be within the Parramatta Road Corridor and Ashfield Town Centre.

**Comment**: This proposal does not displace employment opportunities. In fact, this proposal will result in an increased supply of commercial floor space within the Parramatta Road Corridor.

A specific housing strategy has not been published. However, the Urban Planning Strategy and Local Environmental Plan (2010) had identified capacity for an additional 1,400 dwellings by 2021. Key directions related to housing in the Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy (2010) include:

- Promote urban renewal in and around the Ashfield Town Centre;
- Implement proposed heritage listings and conservation areas;
- Ensure new housing meets the needs of the local community;
- Improve the residential amenity and urban design of new housing;
- Improve the quality, quantity and accessibility of our open space;

**Comment:** This proposal will result in urban renewal in close proximity to the Ashfield Town Centre, preserves heritage items, provides a housing mix within a high quality, contemporary mixed use development designed to comply with the Apartment Design Guide, linked to areas of open space, within easy access to public transport. However, this proposal is not consistent with the former Ashfield Council's view, as expressed in the 2010 Strategy in relation to built form, and maintaining medium density zonings. That is, this proposal exceeds the building height envisaged at the time, seeks to introduce residential development within an enterprise corridor zone and increase densities.



October 2017

This page has been left intentionally blank
October 2017

### 4 EXISTING STATUTORY PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 provides the local statutory planning framework for the subject site with the key provisions detailed below

### Zoning

The site is zoned part B6-Enterprise Corridor and part R3-Medium Density



Figure 34: Current Zone

The objectives of the B6 zone are:

- To promote businesses along main roads and to encourage a mix of compatible uses.
- To provide a range of employment uses (including business, office, retail and light industrial uses).
- To maintain the economic strength of centres by limiting retailing activity.

The following uses that are permissible with development consent;

Bulky goods premises; Business identification signs; Business premises; Community facilities; Garden centres; Hardware and building supplies; Hotel or motel accommodation; Kiosks; Landscaping material supplies; Light industries; Markets; Passenger transport facilities; Plant nurseries; Pubs; Roads; Shops; Timber yards; Vehicle sales or hire premises; Warehouse or distribution centres; Water recycling facilities; Any other development not specified in item 2 or 4

The following uses that are prohibited;

Agriculture; Air transport facilities; Airstrips; Animal boarding or training establishments; Biosolids treatment facilities; Boat launching ramps; Boat sheds; Camping grounds; Caravan parks; Cemeteries; Charter and tourism boating facilities; Correctional centres; Crematoria; Depots; Eco-tourist facilities; Electricity generating works; Environmental facilities; Exhibition homes; Exhibition villages; Extractive industries; Farm

October 2017

42

buildings; Forestry; Freight transport facilities; Heavy industrial storage establishments; Helipads; Highway service centres; Home occupations (sex services); Industries; Jetties; Marinas; Mooring pens; Moorings; Open cut mining; Recreation facilities (major); Residential accommodation; Resource recovery facilities; Restricted premises; Retail premises; Rural industries; Sewage treatment plants; Sex services premises; Signage; Transport depots; Truck depots; Vehicle body repair workshops; Waste disposal facilities; Water recreation structures; Water supply systems

**Comment:** This proposal does not seek a change in zone, but the inclusion of Residential accommodation in the form of Shop Top Housing as an additional permitted land use over the portion of the site zoned B6.

The objectives of the R3 zone are:

- To provide for the housing needs of the community within a medium density residential environment.
- To provide a variety of housing types within a medium density residential environment.
- To enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents.

The following uses that are permissible with development consent;

Attached dwellings; Bed and breakfast accommodation; Boarding houses; Business identification signs; Centre-based child care facilities; Community facilities; Group homes; Multi dwelling housing; Neighbourhood shops; Places of public worship; Respite day care centres; Roads; Seniors housing; Any other development not specified in item 2 or 4

The following uses that are prohibited;

Agriculture; Air transport facilities; Airstrips; Amusement centres; Animal boarding or training establishments; Biosolids treatment facilities; Boat building and repair facilities; Boat sheds; Camping grounds; Car parks; Caravan parks; Cemeteries; Charter and tourism boating facilities; Commercial premises; Correctional centres; Crematoria; Depots; Dual occupancies (detached); Eco-tourist facilities; Emergency services facilities; Entertainment facilities; Environmental facilities; Exhibition homes; Exhibition villages; Extractive industries; Farm buildings; Forestry; Freight transport facilities; Function centres; Heavy industrial storage establishments; Helipads; Highway service centres; Home occupations (sex services); Industrial retail outlets; Industrial training facilities; Industries; Information and education facilities; Recreation facilities (indoor); Recreation facilities (major); Recreation facilities (outdoor); Registered clubs; Research stations; Restricted premises; Signage; Storage premises; Tourist and visitor accommodation; Transport depots; Truck depots; Vehicle body repair workshops; Vehicle repair stations; Veterinary hospitals; Warehouse or distribution centres; Waste or resource management facilities; Water recreation structures; Water supply systems; Wholesale supplies

**Comment**: While residential flat development is not prohibited, the objectives of the R3 zone are considered inconsistent with development as proposed. Therefore, a change in zone to R1 General Residential is sought for the portion of the subject site currently zoned R3 – Medium Density.

Pursuant to the Standard Instrument Order the objectives of the R1 Zone are:

- To provide for the housing needs of the community.
- To provide for a variety of housing types and densities.

October 2017

 To enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents.

Land uses Permitted with consent should include:

Attached dwellings; Boarding houses; Centre-based child care facilities; Community facilities; Dwelling houses; Group homes; Hostels; Multi dwelling housing; Neighbourhood shops; Places of public worship; Residential flat buildings; Respite day care centres; Semi-detached dwellings; Seniors housing; Shop top housing

### **Height of Buildings**

The height of buildings standard applicable to the subject site is 12.5 metres and 15 metres.



Figure 35: Current Height of Buildings Standard

This proposal seeks the amendment of the height of buildings standard to permit buildings of height of 12.5 metres (no change) to 55 metres.

### Floor Space Ratio

The FSR standard applicable to the subject site is 0.7:1 and 2.0:1.



Figure 36: Current Floor Space Ratio Standard

This proposal seeks the amendment of the FSR standard to permit FSR of 0.7:1 (no change) to 4.2:1.



October 2017

This page has been left intentionally blank

ltem

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

### 5 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This planning proposal is required to enable the development of the subject site for a mix of land uses including commercial premises, shop top housing, residential flat buildings and multi dwelling housing. A concept plan is submitted with this proposal. This plan has been devised to respond to the site opportunities and constraints as summarised below.

### 5.1 Opportunities

The key site opportunities are considered to be:

### Transport and access

- The site fronts Parramatta Road which is currently serviced by regular bus services to key centres.
- The site is in close proximity (walking distance) to Railway and Light Rail Stations.

### Proximity to Centres and services

- The site is in close proximity to Ashfield and Summer Hill Town Centres and easy commute to Sydney CBD and major centres such as Burwood.
- The site is in easy access to professional, educational shopping and entertainment services.

### Ability to provide new local services and connections

- The site is a strategically located large site in within the Parramatta Urban Renewal Corridor and provides an opportunity for a carefully designed and planned mixed use precinct.
- This proposal offers the opportunity for street level activation and improved walking linkages to areas
  of open space.
- Mixed use development as proposed will make efficient use of existing services and infrastructure investment in in the Parramatta Road Corridor.
- Mixed use development as proposed will provide a mix of housing contributing to housing targets consistent with State Government policies towards locating housing close to jobs and services.
- This proposal will also provide an opportunity to accommodate commercial premises to cater for the future residents on the site and future residential developments in the locality.

### Site area

- The site has several street frontages providing alternative vehicular and pedestrian access points to the site.
- Site has a total site area of 20,000 sqm.

October 2017

46

### 5.2 Constraints

The physical constraints are considered to be:

### Vehicular access

- Vehicular movement to and from the site is constrained by Parramatta Road access restrictions and secondary street with constraints.
- Vehicular access has been considered by McLaren Traffic and is discussed later in this report.

### Noise

• Residential development is required to respond to noise originating primarily from high volumes of traffic on Parramatta Road. This is a residential design matter to be addressed at a DA stage.

### Solar Access

• The need to protect solar access to existing surrounding residential development and to achieve reasonable levels of solar access to apartments within the development.

### 5.3 Concept Design

This Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 to support a mixed use development over the subject site and will permit the subsequent lodgement of Development Applications for construction and use of these developments. The vision for the site is to

Unlocking the development potential of the strategic corner site, located at the junction of Parramatta and Liverpool Roads offers the opportunity for the site to act as an important catalyst. This would be achieved through the integration of built form, increased density, public amenity and green space to transform the area in line with the principles and intent of the UrbanGrowth NSW Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy.

Located within walking distance of three major train stations –Ashfield, Summer Hill and Lewisham , two planned light rail terminals, Marion and Traveners Hill, and on well serviced arterial roads, a transport oriented gateway building will provide connectivity to the vibrant local communities and a landmark for continued development along Parramatta Road

The future redevelopment for the site centers about the creation of a high quality mixed use development that includes the potential to integrate:

- commercial and/or retail land uses;
- Residential apartments;
- Preservation of heritage items;
- Linking Green Spaces; and
- Provision of Car parking

The concept includes the proposal to:

Provide high quality landscaped public domain spaces



October 2017

- Provide a high quality residential environment with significant landscaped spaces between buildings with excellent access to amenities and close proximity to public transport.
- Increased employment opportunities from new ground floor commercial premises.

The concept plan will efficiently utilise a site of significant to create a central landscaped plaza with pedestrian through links creating connections between existing areas of open space.



Figure 37: Concept connecting areas of green spaces



above.

October 2017

48

RESIDENTIAL RETAL / NON-RESIDENTIAL HERITAGE BUILDING RETAINED

Commercial space will be provided along the Parramatta Road corridor with residential development

Figure 38: Typical ground floor – mix of commercial, shop top housing, residential flat buildings and town house development

The residential component of the proposed development is to be provided in a number of block forms of varying heights. The inclusion of multi dwelling housing provides for a transition of building scale.



Figure 39: The concept design responds to context and regulation including the Residential Apartment Design Guide.



October 2017

Haskew de Chalain

### 5.4 Development Summary

Site Area:	20,003.8 m <sup>2</sup> (survey)
GFA Residential:	42,693.8 m <sup>2</sup>
GFA Non-residential:	3,315 m²
NSA Residential:	<b>36,290 m<sup>2</sup></b> approx.
NLA Non-residential:	<b>2,880 m²</b> approx.
Apartment No:	<b>480</b> approx.
Townhouse No:	<b>35</b> NOS.
GFA Total:	46,008.7 m <sup>2</sup>
FSR Total:	2.3:1

Figure 40: Development Summary

### 5.5 Public Domain Improvements

Envisaged public domain works include the enhancement of the pedestrian areas with landscape improvements and provision of cycle path and linkages. Improvements to roads servicing the subject site will also be carried out.

Notwithstanding the above, section 93F of the Act, provides for a proponent to enter into a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) where a change to an environmental planning instrument is sought. That is, the developer may pay a monetary contribution or provide a material public benefit to be used or applied towards a public purpose. In this regard, the proponent is willing to enter into a VPA. This process will be advanced at a later stage and will include consideration to a range of public benefits that could include further streetscape and public domain works in and around the site, or provision of a monetary contribution to Council.

### 5.6 Supporting Documentation

This Planning Proposal is supplemented by a number of supporting documents that provide further support for this proposal. This includes:

October 2017

50

- Comprehensive Urban Design and Architectural Package.
- Concept Landscape Plan;
- Preliminary Traffic and Parking Advice; and,
- Heritage Advice

A summary of the key findings of the Traffic and Heritage reports is provided below. The complete reports and plans are submitted with this Planning Report.

### 5.6.1 Preliminary Traffic and Parking Advice

Preliminary Traffic and Parking advice has been provided by McLaren Traffic and the key observations and findings have been extracted from their assessment and reproduced below.

Council's DCP specifies car parking rates for various land uses that must be provided in accordance with development proposals.

The site is located within 800m of Summer Hill Station and as such the RMS car parking rates apply for the residential component of the development. It is envisaged that all residential and nonresidential car parking will be provided within each Stages basement car park. It should be noted that the number of car parking spaces required for the planning proposal are subject to change based upon detailed design. The car parking requirement and provision of the proposed development can be detailed and further assessed during D.A stage.

Given the scale of the residential portion of the development and the required number of residential visitor spaces, consideration could be made to reduce the overall parking requirement for the retail portions of the developments by a shared parking arrangement between the retail visitors and residential visitors. It should be noted, that the peak parking demand for residential visitors typically occurs on a Friday or Saturday night after 6pm, hence after commercial and retail business hours

The development yield is expected to generate 247 and 222 vehicle movements during both the AM (94 in, 153 out) and PM (135 in, 87 out) peak period...... Furthermore, the impact of the traffic generation for the yield of the planning proposal will be assessed during the DA stage, when more detailed information is provided in relation to the proposed scale of the development.

...... consideration must be given to the existing land uses on-site and the net impact of the proposal, such that the estimated traffic generation can be discounted from the existing uses of the site. The assessment during D.A would identify the net impact of the proposal in comparison to the existing land uses.

As a preliminary assessment the following considerations should be made to provide vehicles and pedestrians a safe and convenient environment:

• Widening of the carriageway width by 3m along Ormond Street from the intersection Gower Street to Parramatta Road to facilitate heavy vehicles and improve two-way passing efficiency with the provision of kerbside parking on both sides of the road.



October 2017

- Upgrade of the intersection of Ormond street / Gower Street to a roundabout intersection to provide pedestrians safe access to nearby bus stops and Ashfield Park. Furthermore, the provision of a roundabout will allow safe U-turn manoeuvres. The upgrade of the intersection to a roundabout is subject to the assessment of the existing traffic flows in combination to the proposed traffic flows from the proposed development.
- Restriction of Tideswell Street to a left in / left out arrangement with the provision of a
  concrete median within the Hume Highway. The provision of this is subject to traffic flows
  under the future development. To retain the existing intersection of Tideswell Street and
  The Hume Highway the basement car park for Stage 1 will need to facilitate a low level
  of traffic generation during the AM and PM peak periods.
- Widening of the Hume Highway at the intersection of Gower Street / Hume Highway to
  provide a dedicated right turn lane into Gower Street with amendments to the signalised
  intersection phasing.

.....the subject planning proposal is supported on the grounds of traffic and parking. More detailed design and traffic impact assessment will be required at the DA stage, though important traffic and parking features in support of the proposal.....

### 5.6.2 Preliminary Heritage Advice

Preliminary Heritage advice has been provided by Heritage 21 and the key observations and findings have been extracted from their assessment and reproduced below.

The five heritage listed items fall into two broad categories of building types:

- Terrace (2) on Liverpool Road; and,
- Houses (3) on Ormond Street two of which are dual occupancies

It is also important to note that the current heritage listings do not extend to any interiors within the five listed sites. This allows for a total reconfiguration of internal spaces.

The site borders the locally listed Explorers Park and is with the visual catchment of a further three sites, Ashfield Park to the north of the site, Ashfield bowling club which is located within Ashfield park, and a locally listed house to the south......It is not anticipated that the proximity of these listed sites should necessitate revisions to the design sketches.....

The Haberfield heritage conservation area (HCA) lies to the north of the site, just beyond Parramatta Road.....Certain aspects of the proposed development may be within the visual catchment of the Haberfield HCA, but this will be limited due to distance and local topography and should appear only as a skyline feature.....

With regard to the integration of existing and new, the retention of onsite heritage listed houses and terraces for incorporation within the proposed development is to be commended.

51



October 2017



Figure 41: Artist Impression of proposal – Parramatta Road



Item

Haskew de Chalain

October 2017

### 6 Planning Proposal

This section of this report provides information to satisfy Section 55(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Reference has been made to the Department of Planning's Guide to preparing Planning Proposals (August 2016).

### 6.1 PART 1 – OBJECTIVES AND INTENDED OUTCOMES

The key objective of this Planning Proposal is to amend the provisions of the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 to:

- permit shop top housing along the portion of the subject site fronting Parramatta Road currently zoned B6 – Enterprise Corridor;
- permit high density residential development over the remainder of the subject site currently zoned R3 Medium Density Residential; and,
- enable building heights and density greater than the current height and floor space ratio controls permit.

The proposed amendments to zoning and built form controls aim to facilitate development which:

- recognizes the strategic location of the subject site, particularly being located within the Parramatta Road Urban Renewal Corridor;
- leverages the subject site's proximity to public transport, town centres and jobs;
- will be a catalyst to the urban renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor;
- increases employment opportunities from by increasing commercial floor space along Parramatta Road; and,
- provides a range of housing opportunities close to jobs and transport;

The intended outcome of this Planning Proposal is to amend the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan to permit development over the subject site for shop top housing, residential flat buildings, commercial floor space, multi dwelling housing and associated car parking. This development will include the upgraded and incorporation of existing heritage buildings.

Concept designs for future development has been prepared and discussed in Section 5 of this report and is separately attached. However, it should be noted that the scheme will be refined as part of the Development Application process once the Planning Proposal has been supported by Council and a favorable Gateway Determination has been received.

October 2017

54

### 6.2 Part 2 – Explanation of Provisions

This Planning Proposal will amend the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 by:

- Permitting "shop top housing" over land currently zone B6 Enterprise Corridor within the subject site. The amendment should be achieved by inclusion of that portion of the site and the additional uses into Schedule 1 Additional permitted uses;
- Rezoning the balance of the subject site to R1 General Residential to facilitate a variety of dwelling type including residential flat buildings, multi dwelling housing and dwelling house to meet the housing needs of the community;
- Amendment to the height of buildings (HOB) map to permit building heights heights to the subject site ranging from 12.5 metres (no change) to 14 metres, 31 metres, 35 metres, 44 metres and 55 metres; and,
- Amendment of the floor space ratio (FSR) map to apply a maximum FSR to the subject site ranging from of 0.7:1 (no change) to 2.3:1, 2.8:1 and 4.2:1.





October 2017



Figure 43: Proposed Amendment to Height of Buildings Map\_Sheet HOB\_001



Figure 44: Proposed Amendment to the Floor Space Ratio Map\_Sheet FSR\_001



October 2017

56

### 6.3 Part 3 – Justification

Justification for this proposal is outlined in accordance with the Department of Planning and Environment's Guide to preparing Planning Proposals.

### 6.3.1 Section A – Need for the Planning Proposal

### Q1. Is this Planning Proposal a result of any Strategic Study or Report?

The Planning Proposal is not the result of a strategic study or report prepared by Council but is consistent with State Government strategies as detailed in section 3 of this report. This Planning Proposal will enable the creation of a vibrant mixed use precinct that will contribute to the urban renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor. The concept plan seeks to create a vibrant precinct with central landscaped plaza linked to existing areas of open space. The submitted architectural package and additional investigations support this proposal.

### Q2. Is the Planning Proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

Yes. A planning proposal amending land zoning, inclusion of additional permitted use, amending permitted height of buildings and floor space ratio are the only means of achieving the objectives and intended outcomes.

Alternative land uses zones have been considered. For instance, the portion of the subject site currently zoned R3 does not make residential flat buildings a prohibited use, however, residential flat development is not consistent with the R3 zone objectives, hence, this request to amend the land use zone to R1 General Residential. The R1 zone provides a flexible approach to residential development permitting a wide variety of dwelling type, supporting the mix of dwelling sought.

Maintaining the B6 zone along the Parramatta Road corridor, with the inclusion of shop top housing is considered the most appropriate means of achieving the desired mix of land uses along the Parramatta Road corridor. Seeking an alternative zone, such as B4 Mixed use was considered, however, it is argued that an isolated rezoning of a portion of the subject site is not considered to be strategically appropriate.

### 6.3.2 Section B – Relationship to strategic planning framework

### Q3. Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional, sub-regional or district plan or strategy (including any exhibited draft plans or strategies)?

The applicable strategies are discussed in section 3.2 of this report. This proposal is considered to have strategic merit as this proposal is consistent with the applicable strategies and represents development that is responding to a change in circumstance triggered by significant investment into the renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor and the objectives of leveraging urban renewal in locations where there is significant government investment along with the potential to provide a variety of housing types close to jobs, transport and services.



October 2017

### Q4. Is the planning proposal consistent with a council's local strategy or other local strategic plan?

The former Ashfield Council adopted an Urban Planning Strategy in 2010 to inform the preparation of its comprehensive Local Environmental Plan. This proposal is consistent with this strategy as it will result in urban renewal in close proximity to the Ashfield Town Centre, preserves heritage items, provides a housing mix within a high quality, contemporary mixed use development designed to comply with the Apartment Design Guide, linked to areas of open space, within easy access to public transport. However, this proposal is not consistent with the former Ashfield Council's view, as expressed in the 2010 Strategy, with respect to built form, and maintaining medium density zonings. That is, this proposal exceeds the building height envisaged at the time, seeks to introduce residential development within an enterprise corridor zone and increase densities.

### Q5. Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?

The following table provides a summary of applicable State Environmental Planning Policies

Legislation and Provisions	Comments
State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 32 – Urban Consolidation	This Planning Proposal seeks to rezone and redevelop the subject land for higher density living in close proximity to public transport options in accordance with current NSW State Government policy. The proposed location is in an area where there is existing public infrastructure, transport and community facilities. This in turn enables people to live in a locality which is both close to employment and public transport enabling ease of travel to workplaces, leisure and other opportunities.
	The proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the subject land is considered an optimal solution to increased housing development while reducing the reliance on private with direct access to public transport options.
	It is also considered that the proposed redevelopment will provide a greater diversity of housing types within the locality to meet the demand generated by changing demographic and household needs.
SEPP 55 - Remediation of Land	Clause 7 of SEEP 55 requires that contamination be considered in the assessment of Development Applications. Given the existing and long term residential use of the subject land, it is not considered likely that the existing site has been contaminated. Appropriate investigation would be carried out at development stage.



Item 2

CERR (C. Desient	
SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential	The Planning Proposal seeks to provide residential apartment buildings that meet the design quality requirements specified in the SEPP.
Apartment Development	It is considered that the Proposal will provide sustainable housing in social and environmental terms and will be a long-term asset to the surrounding neighbourhood. It will provide a variety of dwelling types to meet population growth, and to support housing affordability, which is of crucial importance in NSW.
	It will also satisfy the increasing demand for housing, including the needs of a wide range of people from childhood to old age, including those with disabilities, acknowledging the changing social and demographic profile of our communities.
	The opportunity for existing residents to downsize from the family home to a residential unit is also an important outcome which allows residents to 'age in place'.
	The Planning Proposal seeks to maximise amenity, safety and security for the benefit of the occupants of each building and the wider community.
	The proposed residential buildings will achieve better built form and aesthetics including the surrounding streetscapes and the public spaces they define.
	It is intended to minimise the consumption of energy from non-renewable resources, to conserve the environment and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions both during the construction of the buildings and during the life of the property.
SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009	The Planning Proposal will not preclude new affordable rental housing under the Policy. Moreover, by increasing housing supply in a highly accessible location, the Planning Proposal is consistent with the aims of the SEPP regardless of whether subsequent Development Applications proposed affordable housing.
SEPP (BASIX) 2004	Future residential flat building development would be BASIX affected development. Future Development Applications would be expected to be accompanied by BASIX Certificates.
SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007	The Planning Proposal will facilitate the erection of more than 300 residential apartments and as such, any future Development Application subsequent to LEP amendment would be "traffic generating development" pursuant to clause 104 and Schedule 3 of SEPP



October 2017

(Infrastructure) 2007. It would be expected that the subject Planning Proposal will be referred to the RMS for comment. It is further expected that a requirement of Gateway will be the preparation of a comprehensive Traffic Impact Statement. Preliminary assessment of traffic impacts arising from the Planning Proposal is provided as an appendix to this report.

The applicable Ministerial Directions have been identified and comment provided below.

Ministerial Direction	Annlienhlett	Consistences	A				
Ministerial Direction	Applicable to	Consistency	Assessment				
	Planning	of Proposal					
	Proposal?	with Direction					
1. Employment and Resources							
1. Employment and Reso	JICES						
1.1 Business and	Yes	Yes	The proposal seeks maintain the current				
Industrial Zones			zoning. As demonstrated in the				
			concept plan and discussed in this				
The objectives of this			report this proposal relates to an				
direction are to:			integrated mixed use development				
5 m			that increases available commercial				
(a) encourage			floor space.				
employment growth							
in suitable locations,			Residential development will not				
			undermine the enterprise corridor zone				
(b) protect			objectives.				
employment land in							
business and			The development as proposed will				
industrial zones, and			strengthen the economic activity along				
			the Parramatta Road corridor.				
(c) support the viability							
of identified							
strategic centres.							
1.2 Rural Zones	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.				
1.3 Mining, Petroleum,	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.				
Production and							
Extractive Industries							
1.4 Oyster Production	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.				
1.5 Rural Lands	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.				



October 2017

2. Environment and Heritage					
2.1 Environmental Protection Zones	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.		
2.2 Coastal Protection	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.		
<ul> <li>2.3 Heritage</li> <li>Conservation</li> <li>(1) The objective of this direction is to conserve items, areas, objects and places of environmental heritage significance and indigenous heritage significance</li> </ul>	No	Yes	The contain items of environmental heritage. These matters have been considered and heritage items are to be preserved through integration and reuse within the proposal. The proposed amendment will not alter heritage provisions.		
2.4 Recreation Vehicle Area	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.		
2.5 Application of E2 and E3 Zones and Environmental Overlays in Far North Coast LEPs	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.		
3. Housing, Infrastructure	and Urban Develo	opment	1		
<ul> <li>3.1 Residential Zones</li> <li>The objectives of this direction are:</li> <li>(a) to encourage a variety and choice of housing types to provide for existing and future housing needs,</li> <li>(b) to make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services and ensure that new housing has appropriate access to infrastructure and services, and</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	This direction requires the Planning Authority to broaden housing choice, maximise infrastructure efficiency, minimise housing consumption on the urban fringe and be of good design. This Planning Proposal will add to the number of dwellings and broaden the choice of building types and locations in the housing market. The proposal will make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services, use existing developed land so as to avoid the consumption of land for housing and associated urban development and is of a good design complying with the Apartment Design Guide.		



October 2017

(c) to minimise the			The subject land is in close proximity to
impact of residential			public transport and employment, both
development on the			locally and regionally.
environment and			
resource lands.			
3.2 Caravan Parks and	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Manufactured Home			
Estates			
3.3 Home Occupations	Yes	Yes	The Planning Proposal will not affect the
			home occupation related provisions of
The objective of this			ALEP 2013.
direction is to			
encourage the carrying			
out of low-impact small			
businesses in dwelling			
houses.			
3.4 Integrated Land Use	Yes	Yes	The Planning Proposal will add to the
and Transport			number of dwellings in close proximity
			to public transport and employment,
The objective of this			both locally and regionally which is a
direction is to ensure			Key Priority of the NSW State
that urban structures,			Government
building forms, land use			
locations, development			This Proposal also encourages the
designs, subdivision and			choice of available transport and
street layouts achieve			reduces travel demand including the
the following planning			number of trips generated by
objectives:			development and the distances
			travelled, particularly by car whilst
(a) improving access to			encouraging pedestrian access to
housing, jobs and			nearby public transport.
services by walking,			
cycling and public			
transport, and			
(b) increasing the			
choice of available			
transport and reducing			
dependence on cars,			
and			
(c) reducing travel			
demand including the			
number of trips			
generated by			
development and the			
	I		1

165

61



October 2017

distances travelled,			
especially by car, and			
(d) supporting the			
efficient and viable			
operation of public			
transport services, and			
(e) providing for the			
efficient movement of			
freight.			
3.5 Development Near	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Licensed Aerodromes			
3.6 Shooting Ranges	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
4. Hazard and Risk			
4. Huzulu ullu kisk			
4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
4.2 Mine Subsidence	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
and Unstable Land			
4.3 Flood Prone Land	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
4.4 Planning for Bushfire	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Protection			
5. Regional Planning			
C 1 have been a shart's a set	_ NL-		Direction de constante
5.1 Implementation of	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Regional Strategies			
5.2 Drinking Water	No	N/A	Direction door not apply
Catchment	INO	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Calchment			
5.3 Farmland of State	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
and Regional			
Significance on the			
NSW Far North Coast			
5.4 Commercial and	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Retail Development			a second s
along the Pacific			
Highway, North Coast			
5.5 Development in the	No	N/A	Direction revoked.
vicinity of Ellalong,			
			I



October 2017

Paxton and Millfield			
(Cessnock LGA)			
(Cesshock LGA)			
5.6 Sydney to Canberra	No	N/A	Direction revoked.
Corridor			Diecionevoked.
Condor			
5.7 Central Coast	No	N/A	Direction revoked.
5.8 Second Sydney	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Airport: Badgerys Creek			
5.9 North West Rail Link	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Corridor Strategy			
5.10 Implementation of	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Regional Plans			
6. Local Plan Making			
6.1 Approval and	Yes	Yes	The Proposal seeks to minimise the
Referral Requirements			inclusion of provisions that would
			require the concurrence, consultation
The objective of this			or referral of development applications
direction is to ensure			to a Minister or public authority.
that LEP provisions			
encourage the efficient			
and appropriate			
assessment of			
development.			
6.2 Reserving Land for	Yes	Yes	No reservation of public land required
Public Purposes			
The objectives of this			
direction are:			
(a) to facilitate the			
provision of public			
services and facilities			
by reserving land for			
public purposes, and			
(b) to facilitate the			
removal of reservations			
of land for public			
purposes where the			
land is no longer			
required for acquisition.			



October 2017

6.3 Site Specific	Yes	Yes	The Planning Proposal does not
Provisions			propose site specific or development
			specific controls outside those listed
The objective of this			within this report.
direction is to			
discourage			
unnecessarily restrictive			
site specific planning			
controls.			
7. Metropolitan Planning			
7.1 Implementation of A	Yes	Yes	As discussed in this Report, this Planning
Plan for Growing			Proposal is considered to be consistent
Sydney			with A Plan for Growing Sydney
The objective of this			
direction is to give legal			
effect to the planning			
principles; directions;			
and priorities for			
subregions, strategic			
centres and transport			
gateways contained in			
A Plan for Growing			
Sydney.			
7.2 Implementation of	No	N/A	Direction does not apply.
Greater Macarthur			
Land Release			
Investigation			
7.3 Parramatta Road	Yes	Yes	As discussed in this Report, this Planning
Corridor Urban			Proposal is considered to be consistent
Transformation Strategy			with the Parramatta Road Corridor
indision fidegy			Urban Transformation Strategy.
The objectives of this			urban transformation strategy.
Direction are to:			
Direction die 10.			
(a) facilitate			
development within the			
Parramatta Road			
Corridor that is			
consistent with the			
Parramatta Road			
Corridor Urban			
Transformation Strategy			
(November, 2016) and			
the Parramatta Road			
me Fananalla Koad	1	1	



October 2017

Corridor		
Implementation Tool		
Kit,		
(b) provide a diversity		
of jobs and housing to		
meet the needs of a		
broad cross-section of		
the community, and		
(c) guide the		
incremental		
transformation of the		
Parramatta Road		
Corridor in line with the		
delivery of necessary		
infrastructure.		

### 6.3.3 Section C - Environmental, social and economic impact

### Q7. 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?

No, the subject land does not contain threatened or endangered ecological communities.

### Q8. Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

The primary causes for potential impacts are visual / streetscape impacts arising from a proposal which will be transformative to the existing character. Other impacts relate to traffic and additional demand for public services and utilities. It is argued that the impacts are not unacceptable and can be appropriately managed.

Streetscape and character impacts are to be managed/mitigated through high standards of architectural design. A site specific DCP could also be prepared in consultation with Council and other stakeholders. The introduction of mixed use development into the locality is necessarily to enable urban renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor.

Preliminary Traffic impact is considered acceptable and with the road improvements suggested would be beneficial to the subject site and also the broader community.

### Q9. Has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

The social and economic impacts of this proposal are significantly positive as it will facilitate additional supply and choice of housing within a highly accessible location. The development as proposed will also act as a catalyst to the urban renewal of the Parramatta Road Corridor. This proposal will enable the development of a large site with a high standard of amenity and deliver a high quality mixed use product which promotes healthy and sustainable living.

65

66

The Planning Proposal has been demonstrated to be consistent with the relevant strategies.

Given the mixed use nature of development which will be facilitated by this Planning Proposal, it is likely that the proposal will have significant long term economic impacts. The construction phase of future redevelopment will result in considerable employment and economic benefit. Increases in commercial floor space will also be an economic benefit to the locality. There are no identified negative economic impacts.

### 6.3.4 Section D - State and Commonwealth Interests

### Q10. Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

The subject site is located in an area which is well serviced by existing infrastructure as detailed within this proposal. The locality is provided with all necessary utilities and public transport services. It would be expected that liaison with utility providers will occur subsequent to Gateway Determination. It would be expected that any requirement to augment the capacity of existing services will be at the developer's expense.

### Q11. What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the gateway determination?

Consultation with other public authorities or the wider community has not yet occurred.

### 6.4 Part 4 - Mapping

This planning proposal will require amendments to LEP maps as indicated within this report.

### 6.5 Part 5 – Community Consultation

This is a matter for the Council to determine and then to be confirmed as part of the Gateway determination. The applicant is prepared to assist as appropriate.

### 6.6 Part 6 – Project Timeline

This is a matter for the Council to determine and then to be confirmed as part of the Gateway determination.

October 2017

### 7 Conclusion

This Planning Proposal has been prepared to initiate a change in land use permissibility to enable the provision for employment generating land uses, integrated with residential land uses within a defined precinct being the land bounded by the properties forming a block bounded by Parramatta Road, Ormond Street, Gower Street and Liverpool Road situated south east of Ashfield Park.

This Planning Proposal would seek to:

- permit shop top housing over those lots fronting Parramatta Road currently zoned B6-Enterprise Corridor;
- Rezone the portion of the site currently zoned R3 Medium Density Residential to R1-General Residential;
- amend the height of buildings (HOB) map to apply maximum building heights to the subject site ranging from 12.5 metres (no change) to 14 metres, 31 metres, 35 metres, 44 metres and 55 metres; and,
- amend the floor space ratio (FSR) map to apply a maximum FSR to the subject site ranging from of 0.7:1 (no change) to 2.3:1, 2.8:1 and 4.2:1.

The Concept Plan seeks to deliver a range of building heights and density. However, heritage items will be retained and incorporated into the total development of the site.

The amendment of planning controls applicable to the subject site would bring significant benefits to the locality. Permitting development of the subject land as proposed will have the potential to bring about significant urban renewal including positive amenity improvements to the locality by creating a buffer and transition from Parramatta Road corridor and encouraging the evolution of green pedestrian/cycle way linkages to quality areas of public open space. In fact, this proposal will result in the dedication of additional land to public open space and the preservation of heritage items of significance. The mixed use nature of the proposal will also contribute to improved economic performance.

This proposal is generally consistent with state strategic planning and would bring about beneficial change to the Parramatta Road Corridor. As such, Council's support to progress a planning proposal is sought.



ltem 2

**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 



Council Meeting 13 February 2018



VISION

Unlocking the development potential of the strategic corner site, located at the junction of Parramatta and Liverpool Roads offers the opportunity for the site to act as an important catalyst. This would be achived through the integration of built form, increased density, public amenity and green space to transform the area in line with the principles and intent of the Urban Growth NSW Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy. Located within walking distance of three major train stations - Ashfield, Summer Hill and Lewisham , two planned light rail terminals, Marion and Traveners Hill, and on well serviced arterial roads, a transport oriented gateway building will provide connectivity to the vibrant local communities and a landmark for continued development along Parramatta Road and

# TABLE OF CONTEN

STATE GOVERNMENT VISION	<b>GONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS</b>	URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY	DESIGN RESPONSE	ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL	SEPP 65 REPORT
PART 1	PART 2	PART 3	PART 4	<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	APPENDIX 2



Item 2

### 100 रे

### Item 2

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PROVIDED FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY

, C



## key delivery:

- 27,000 new homes and 50,000 new jobs in the next 30 years.
- Integrated land use and transport plan
- Eight focused growth precincts
- Seven Principles
- 1. Housing choice and affordability
  - 2. Diverse and resilient economy
- 3. Accessible and connected
- 4. Vibrant communities and places
  - - 5. Green spaces and links
- 6. Sustainability and resilience
- 7. Delivery



### **VINNER WEST COUNCIL**

**NTRODUCTION** 

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield

# WHY PARRAMATTA ROAD

- Parramatta Road is the central spine connecting the two CBDs of Sydney
- Sydney in the east and Parramatta in the west.
- It is a **strategically important transport route** for industrial, business and private purposes, and it is a valued home to many vibrant communities.
- The corridor offers little amenity for pedestrians, and businesses operate in a challenging environment.
  - Change is needed if the corridor is to realise its full potential



# Attachment 2



INNER WEST COUNCIL







# Attachment 2



SETBACK ZONE 6M GREEN



Break building form (max length 60m)

Setback above 4-5 storey Balcony/articulation zone

÷ сi

Local Street

Parr

5

Ð

0

Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017





10

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU







PRCINC

PARRAMATTA RD CORRIDOR

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield

Council Meeting 13 February 2018

ltem 2



Item 2

# **CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS**






Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield













INNER WEST COUNCIL

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield



**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 



Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PROVIDED FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY

ĵ

#### **INNER WEST COUNCIL**



Item 2

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield



Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017

ð

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PROVIDED FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY

Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017

°C

NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PROVIDED FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

### Attachment 2

#### CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS Site Area

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

	SUBJECT SITES	AREA (m <sup>2</sup> )
	1 TIDESWELL STREET	293.7
	1 A TIDESWELL STREET	354.1
	2 TIDESWELL STREET	487.7
うちかん とく いん いたけ いん くうしょう	3 TIDESWELL STREET	264.8
	4 TIDESWELL STREET	398.6
	5 TIDESWELL STREET	265.1
	6 TIDESWELL STREET	581.6
	7 TIDESWELL STREET	661.7
	8 TIDESWELL STREET	393.1
No.		0 407
130	114 PARRAMATTA RD	637.8
1 40 1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 1 10 10 10 10	<b>118 PARRAMATTA RD</b>	641.7
- 6	120 PARRAMATTA RD	695
100	122 PARRAMATTA RD	698.8
100	124 PARRAMATTA RD	935.4
2/2		0.000
		2.00.7
1	128 PARRAMAITA RD	436.8
/	130-140 PARRAMATTA RD	2429
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	TS UDMOND ST	312.8
11		012.0
1+1	33 OKMOND 31	317
	55 ORMOND ST	316.6
Month in the second sec	57 ORMOND ST	315.2
10/0	59 ORMOND ST	562.9
1 Contraction of the second seco	61 ORMOND ST	310.3
23	A3 ORMOND ST	290.7
	AF ODMOND ST	2 0 2 2
in the other is th		0,700
M Let Lion A	47 ORMOND ST	665.2
5	42 COMED STREET	371 4
0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		1 0 0 0 0
2 L 10 2 2		0.704
	4/ GOWER SIREEL	7'001
00 22 0 22 1 5 T	49 GOWER STREET	510.4
3.00	51 GOWER STREET	554.3
THOSE REAL PROPERTY AND	53 GOWER STREET	554.5
Sol Contraction of the second s	29 LIVEDPOOL POAD	408.2
	31 HVERPOOL ROAD	423.3
	23 INVERDOOL DOAD	5 170
		0 676
		6 1 70
		C 1 2 4
		1.142
	25 LIVERPOOL ROAD	7/0.4
	TOTAL	20003.8
Collection of the second sec		35.45
		0200
		2/2

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield



## PART 35 - -

Attachment 2



Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017

Council Meeting 13 February 2018

NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PROVIDED FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

Opportunities for improved street front activation, public open space and urban connectivity through built form.







**PLAGE MAKING** 

URBAN DESIGN STRATEG









NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PROVIDED FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

#### Item 2

Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017







**PROPOSED ENLARGED** EXPLORER'S PARK CARCANALY RO JRER'S PMRK CIN TOO ANTI á 1 CIHHISS A h

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield



**PUBLIC DOMAIN** 

URBAN DESIGN STRAT



Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield

URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY Site Access

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 



Propose through site link from Parramatta Road to central public open space improves site permeability. Heritage buildings fronting Ormond Street are retained, enable visual and physical connection from Ashfield park to the proposed public placa for the community.





WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

Ċ

\*

Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017





**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 



Council Meeting 13 February 2018







WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU







#### PART 4

Attachment 2



### Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017 Item 2





#### MASTERPLAN LANDSGAPE CONCEP





Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield

SITE ACCESS ANALYSIS

ANDSCAPE CONCE











Council Meeting 13 February 2018

Item 2

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield



0

1

B) Market /Event Space Lawn area suitable for markets and

events

s, hardscape zone with and dining areas

Plazza edges to service retail frontages, hardscape zone wit

A ) Retail Interface



The Green

0

Retail pedestrian laneways with dining and seating opportunities

c ) Ormond St Links

1



Ċ

Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017



Council Meeting 13 February 2018





Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield

Item 2

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield

STREETSCAPE AND FRONTAGES LANDSCAPE CONCEP

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 



Council Meeting 13 February 2018

Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017

Ċ

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU















# 

Attachment 2















Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield







<b>F</b>		
INNER	WEST	COUNCIL

Si	Site Area:	20,003.8 m <sup>2</sup> (survey)
U	GFA Residential:	42,693.8 m²
Q	GFA Non-residential:	3,315 m²
Ż	NSA Residential:	<b>36,290 m</b> <sup>2</sup> approx.
z	NLA Non-residential:	<b>2,880 m</b> ² approx.
Ā	Apartment No:	<b>480</b> approx.
To	Townhouse No:	<b>35</b> NOS.
U	GFA Total:	46,008.7 m <sup>2</sup>
FS	FSR Total:	2.3:1

NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PR WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU

# P 65 REPORT

-



**URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLE** 



ţ

Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017





Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield

Council Meeting 13 February 2018

Item 2

#### Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield



INNER WEST COUNCIL



Job: 16138 | Date: AUGUST 2017

ţ

WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU




Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield



Item 2

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield











### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

NOMINATED ARCHITECT: TONYLEUNG NSW Architects Registration No. 7133 APLUS DESIGN GROUP

A: Level 2, 89 Chandos Street, St. Leonards, NSW 2069 Ph: 1300 377 789 1 W: www.aplusdg.com.au

at Design Goup retains copyright and all present and future moral rights in intellectual property in all the materials authored by it and in any works executed from these drawings and documents.

Neither at Design Group nor any of its officers, employees, agents or contractors, will be liable for any direct or indirect loss or damage you may suffer or incur ansing directly or indirectly from the use of any manerlast from this document.

The scheme contained within this document has been prepared by a+Design Group solery for the purpose of providing information about potential schemes.

DISCLAIMER

sidered to be error free or to include all naterials shou

wart information. The provide the provided of the provided of a thing in this document in any way constitutes advice of a resentation by  $\alpha + Design Group nor does the frammission or ang of these materials create any contractual relationship.$ 

A+ design group's philosophy is to deliver projects that positively connect us with our surroundings and each other. Our award winning achthereutal practice specialises in multi-residential design and urban strategy. Through our expertise you can empower yourself to create the highest and best use for your site. We have a big-picture approvidy, via strategic planning we assist to integrate your vision into a community. By creating a sense of place that inspires and unifies an area, we balance social ideals with commercial values and principles. These market-driven developments can result in something of real value for everyone. CEO & Founder Tony Leung









Tideswell St & Parramatta Road Ashfield Landscape Concept August 2017



Attachment 3





7



Item 2

Masterplan





Council Meeting 13 February 2018



### **SINNER WEST COUNCIL**



# Attachment 3







## **VINNER WEST COUNCIL**



# Attachment 3









#### TRAFFIC AND PARKING ASSESSMENT

PLANNING PROPOSAL

TIDESWELL STREET & PARRAMATTA ROAD, ASHFIELD



Address: Shop 7, 720 Old Princes Highway Sutherland NSW 2232 Postal: P.O Box 66 Sutherland NSW 1499

> Telephone: +61 2 8355 2440 Fax: +61 2 9521 7199 Web: www.mclarentraffic.com.au Email: admin@mclarentraffic.com.au

Division of RAMTRANS Australia ABN: 45067491678

Transport Planning, Traffic Impact Assessments, Road Safety Audits, Expert Witness

17442.01FA - 16th October 2017





Development Type:	Planning Proposal
Site Address:	Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield
Prepared for:	HDC Planning
Document reference:	17442.01FA

	Status	Issue	Prepared by	Checked by	Date
-	Draft	Α	ММ		23 <sup>rd</sup> August 2017
-	Draft	В	ММ	СМ	29 <sup>th</sup> August 2017
-	Final	А	ММ	СМ	16 <sup>th</sup> October 2017

Please be aware that all information and material contained in this report is the property of McLaren Traffic Engineering. The information contained in this document is confidential and intended solely for the use of the client for the purpose for which it has been prepared and no representation is made or if to be implied as being made to any third party. Any third party wishing to distribute this document in whole or in part for personal or commercial use must obtain written confirmation from McLaren Traffic Engineering prior to doing so. Failure to obtain written permission may constitute an infringement of copyright and may be liable for legal action.

17442.01FA - 16th October 2017





#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 1.2	State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007	
1.2	Site Description Site Context	
2	EXISTING TRAFFIC AND PARKING CONDITIONS	3
2.1	Road Hierarchy	
2.2	Existing Traffic Management	4
2.3	Public Transport	4
2.4	Future Road and Infrastructure Upgrades	6
2.5	Proposed Scale	6
3	PARKING ASSESSMENT	7
3.1	Council Parking Requirement	7
3.2	SEPP 65 – Parking Requirements	8
3.3	Bicycle & Motorcycle Parking Requirements	9
3.4	Servicing & Loading	10
3.5	Disabled Parking	11
3.6	Car Park Design & Compliance	11
4	TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT	13
4.1	Traffic Generation	13
5	CONCLUSION	15

17442.01FA - 16th October 2017



#### 1 INTRODUCTION

*M<sup>c</sup>Laren Traffic Engineering (MTE)* was commissioned by *HDC Planning* to prepare a preliminary Traffic and Parking Assessment of the proposed Planning Proposal and land rezoning application at Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield NSW.

This traffic assessment will investigate future vehicular access to the site, public transport accessibility, car parking requirements and outline the traffic impact of the proposed development.

The site is located within the jurisdiction of Inner West Council (previously Ashfield Council) and is subject to their planning controls. Concept plans are provided in **Annexure A** for reference.

#### 1.1 State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007

The proposed development does qualify as a traffic generating development with relevant size and/or capacity under Clause 104 of the SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007. Accordingly, formal referral to the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) is necessary.

#### 1.2 Site Description

The subject site is currently occupied by low to medium density residential developments, fast food premises and commercial developments at Ormond Street, Parramatta Road, Gower Street and Tideswell Street and the Hume Highway.

The site has an area of approximately 20,004m<sup>2</sup> and is currently zoned B6 – Enterprise Corridor and R3 – Medium Density Residential under the Inner West Council Ashfield LEP 2017. The site fronts Tideswell Street, Gower Street to the southwest, Ormond Street to the northwest, Parramatta Road to the north and the Hume Highway to the south. The existing land uses on the Block have existing vehicular access from all street frontages.

Generally, the site is surrounded by medium to high density residential dwellings, commercial developments, Ashfield Park located to the northwest and Explorers Park adjacent to the site. Summer Hill Train Station is located to the south of the site and Ashfield Train Station to the west.

#### 1.3 Site Context

The site location is shown on aerial imagery and a map in Figures 1 & 2 respectively.

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 1 of 22





Site Location





Site Location



Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017

Page 2 of 22

#### 2 EXISTING TRAFFIC AND PARKING CONDITIONS

#### 2.1 Road Hierarchy

The Hume Highway has the following characteristics within close proximity to the site:

- Classified STATE road (No.2);
- Approximately 12m in width facilitating two traffic flow lanes in both directions including one parking lane on both sides of the road to the south of Tideswell Street. Approximately 17m in width facilitating two traffic lanes in the southwest direction and three traffic lanes in the northeast direction with no kerbside parking via "*No Stopping*" signage;
- Signposted 60km/h applies;
- "No Parking" signage to the northeast of Tideswell Street and unrestricted kerbside parking to the southwest of Tideswell Street with clearways in operation during the AM peak period on the north-eastern approach and south-western approach during the PM peak period.

Parramatta Road has the following characteristics within close proximity to the site:

- Classified STATE Road (No. 5);
- Approximately 17m in width facilitating two traffic flow lanes in the westerly direction and three traffic flow lanes in the easterly direction;
- Signposted 60km/h applies;
- "*No Stopping*" and "*No Parking*" signage on both sides of the road and clearways in operation during the AM and PM peak periods on both sides of the road.

Tideswell Street has the following characteristics within close proximity to the site:

- Unclassified LOCAL Road;
- Approximately 12m in width facilitating one traffic flow lane in both directions and kerbside parking on both sides of the road;
- No speed limit signposted 50km/h applies;
- Unrestricted kerbside parking along both sides of the road.

Gower Street has the following characteristics within close proximity to the site:

- Unclassified LOCAL Road;
- Approximately 12m in width facilitating one traffic flow lane in both directions and kerbside parking on both sides of the road;

Page 3 of 22



- Signposted 50km/h applies;
- Unrestricted kerbside parking along both sides of the road.

Ormond Street has the following characteristics within close proximity to the site:

- Unclassified LOCAL Road;
- Varying width of approximately 9m to the north of Gower Street and 12m to the south
  of Gower Street facilitating one traffic flow lane in both directions and kerbside parking
  on both sides of the road;
- Signposted 50km/h applies;
- Unrestricted kerbside parking along both sides of the road.

#### 2.2 Existing Traffic Management

- Priority controlled intersection of Ormond Street / Gower Street;
- Signalised intersection of Parramatta Road / The Hume Highway;
- Giveway controlled intersection of Tideswell Street / The Hume Highway;
- Signalised intersection of The Hume Highway / Gower Street;
- Priority controlled "Left Only" intersection of Ormond Street / Parramatta Road.

#### 2.3 Public Transport

The subject site has direct access to both bus and rail services within the area.

The subject site has access to existing bus routes 461, 480, 483, N60, N61, N70, N71 and N80 provided by State Transit and Nightride. Existing bus stops are located within 400m walking distance from the site. The bus routes provide access to Burwood Station, Concord, Haberfield, Leichhardt, Annandale, Glebe, Sydney CBD, Dundas, Rydalmere, Rosehill, Clyde, Auburn, Strathfield, Guildford West, Parramatta and Carlingford.

Summer Hill Train Station is located approximately 600m walking distance to the southeast of the site along Grosvenor Crescent providing access to the T1 - North Shore, Northern & Western Line and T2 – Airport, Inner West & South Line. Similarly, Ashfield Train Station is located within 1.1km walking distance from the site providing access to the T1 and T2 train lines. Furthermore, these train stations provide access to Central Station, further enabling resident and visitor's connection to broader Metropolitan Sydney.

The public transport infrastructure relative to the sites location is shown in Figure 3 below.

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 4 of 22





★ Site Location

FIGURE 3: PUBLIC TRANSPORT MAP

Page 5 of 22



#### 2.4 Future Road and Infrastructure Upgrades

According to Inner West Council's DA tracker, there are no significant developments proposed in the future within close proximity to the subject development that will have an influence on the surrounding road network or on-street parking demand.

#### 2.5 Proposed Scale

The planning proposal is a part of the State Government Vision to provide 27,000 new homes and 50,000 new jobs in the next 30 years and seeks an amendment to the current Land Use Zoning, Height and Floor Space Ratio controls that exist for the site.

Currently, the site is zoned B6 – Enterprise Corridor and R3 - Medium Density Residential under Ashfield Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2013 with a permissible Floor Space Ratio of 0.7:1 and 2:1 for the R3 and B6 zoning respectively. The northern boundary of the proposal has a maximum permissible building height of 15m (B6) while the southern end has a maximum permissible height of 12.5m (R3).

The planning proposal seeks to increase both the building height and FSR controls that currently exist across the site. The FSR is sought to be increased to roughly 2.3:1.

For the purpose of this planning proposal the following scale has been assumed for the purpose of the development assessment under the FSR of 2.3:1.

- 515 residential units;
  - o 176 x 1-bedroom unit;
  - 287 x 2-bedroom unit;
  - 52 x 3-bedroom unit.
- 2,880m<sup>2</sup> non-residential GFA

The above proposed scale of the development will be split into three stages with three basement car parks. All vehicular access into the basement car parks will be via Tideswell Street, Ormond Street and Gower Street for Stage 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 6 of 22



#### 3 PARKING ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1 Council Parking Requirement

Reference is made to the *Inner West Council Comprehensive Development Control Plan* 2016 Section 2A: Parking which lists the following objectives with respect to parking:

To ensure the provision of off-street parking satisfies the needs of occupants, residents and visitors, including people with disabilities. To minimise loss of on street parking To manage traffic safely and efficiently, and in particular, avoid conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles To ensure provision is made for loading and unloading facilities separated from resident and visitor parking in order to eliminate any conflicts To encourage sustainable transport such as bicycles, motorcycles and walking To consider the capacity of local roads and intersections

Council's DCP specifies car parking rates for various land uses that must be provided in accordance with development proposals. Council's parking requirements for the planning proposal land uses are outlined below:

Residential Flat buildings in B1 –Neighbourhood Centre Zone, B2 Local Centre Zone and B4 – Mixed Use Zone Minimum of 1 space for all dwellings Parking for visitors at the rate of 1 space for every 4 dwellings including serviced apartments plus 1 car wash bay; or In accordance with the Apartment Design Guide (whichever is lesser)

After calculating the total required number of car parking spaces (including car parking spaces required for people with disabilities and bicycle and motorcycle parking spaces) – if the result is not a whole number, it will need to be rounded UP to the next whole number for fractions that are 0.5 or greater or the figure is to be rounded DOWN to the next whole number for fractions that are less than 0.5.

Based upon the above car parking requirements, the proposed development would require the following car parking provisions as shown in **Table 1** below.

Land Use	Scale	Rate	Parking Required
Residential	515	1 space per dwelling	515 + CWB
Residential Visitor	515	1 space per 4 dwellings	128.75
Total	-	-	643.75 (644)

TABLE 1: COUNCIL'S DCP PARKING REQUIREMENT

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 7 of 22



Page 8 of 22

As shown above the proposed development would require **644** residential car parking spaces based upon the DCP car parking requirements. The car parking provision for the non-residential and residential component of the site can be detailed and further assessed during D.A stage. The parking requirement in **Table 1** above is for indicative purposes only.

In addition to the above, reference should also be made to the State Environmental Planning Policy 65 (SEPP 65) – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development which requires proposed developments to comply with the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). The parking requirements based upon the ADG are outlined in the following subsection.

#### 3.2 SEPP 65 – Parking Requirements

Referring to the ADG, Objective 3J-1 requires the following design criteria: For development in the following locations:

• On sites that are within 800 metres of a railway station or light rail stop in the Sydney Metropolitan Area

The minimum car parking requirement for residents and visitors is set out in the Guide to Traffic Generating Developments, or the car parking requirement prescribed by the relevant council, whichever is less.

The car parking rates within the RMS "*Guide to Traffic Generating Developments*" 2002 are as follows:

Section 5.4.3 – High density residential flat buildings Metropolitan Sub-Regional Centres
0.6 spaces per 1-bedroom unit
0.9 spaces per 2-bedroom unit
1.4 spaces per 3-bedroom unit
1 space per 5 units (visitor parking)

The site is located within 800m of Summer Hill Station and as such the RMS car parking rates outlined above apply for the residential component of the development. **Table 2** below summarises the RMS car parking requirements.

Land Use	Туре	Scale	Rate	Parking Required
	1 bedroom	176	0.6 spaces per dwelling	105.6
Residential	2 bedroom	287	0.9 spaces per dwelling	258.3
	3 bedroom	52	1.4 spaces per dwelling	72.8
Residential Visitor	-	513	1 space per 5 dwellings	102.6
Sub-total	-	-	-	539.3 (540)

#### TABLE 2: RMS PARKING REQUIREMENT

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017



As shown above the indicated unit split results in approximately **540** parking spaces based upon the RMS Guide.

It is envisaged that all residential and non-residential car parking will be provided within each Stages basement car park. It should be noted that the number of car parking spaces required for the planning proposal are subject to change based upon detailed design. The car parking requirement and provision of the proposed development can be detailed and further assessed during D.A stage.

Given the scale of the residential portion of the development and the required number of residential visitor spaces, consideration could be made to reduce the overall parking requirement for the retail portions of the developments by a shared parking arrangement between the retail visitors and residential visitors. It should be noted, that the peak parking demand for residential visitors typically occurs on a Friday or Saturday night after 6pm, hence after commercial and retail business hours.

#### 3.3 Bicycle & Motorcycle Parking Requirements

Council's DCP outlines the following bicycle and motorcycle parking requirements for the proposals land uses:

#### Bicycle Parking Requirement

#### Flats

1 per 10 flats in an accessible communal area if no lockable garage provided for occupants

1 per 10 flats in an accessible communal area for visitors

#### Motorcycle Parking Requirement

Motorcycle parking spaces 2.5m x 1.3m are required in addition to those for bicycles and are to be provided for sites containing 25 or more car parking spaces at the rate of 1 space per 25 car parking spaces in a communal area accessible to residents / staff / visitors or other users of the parking facility

Based on 515 units, **52** residential bicycle parking spaces and **52** residential visitor bicycle parking spaces would suffice in order to achieve the objectives of the DCP. The bicycle requirements for the non-residential portion of the development can be assessed at the DA stage.

Based upon the car parking requirements outlined in **Section 3.1 & 3.2**, the site would require the provision of **26** motorcycle parking spaces based upon the provision of **644** car parking spaces (Council's DCP) or **22** motorcycle spaces based upon the RMS parking requirements. The motorcycle requirements for the non-residential portion of the development can be assessed at the DA stage.

Page 9 of 22

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017



#### 3.4 Servicing & Loading

Reference is made to the *Council's Development Control Plan Section 2: Part C – Waste Management Design General Provisions* which outlines the following requirements for residential waste collection.

#### Residential

*i)* All residential developments must be designed to accommodate standard Council waste and recycling services and collection vehicles (see Guide 1: Inner West Council Standard Services).

Council's standard waste collection service has dimensions of 9.4m length by 3.8m height. The loading bays for residential waste collection (if any are proposed) should be designed to accommodate this vehicle for both circulation areas and headroom requirements unless specified by Council.

Councils DCP outlines the following in relation to non-residential loading facilities:

Loading and unloading facilities on property needs to be provided for all business, commercial, industrial, office, retail and storage uses and any other use where regular deliveries of goods are made to or from the site

Based upon the above requirements, all non-residential tenancies will require a loading / unloading facility based upon the operational use of the site. The number of retail tenancies are currently unknown and can be detailed during the DA stage. Furthermore, consideration could be made to providing a combined loading / unloading facilities for the non-residential components which could operate under a Plan of Management. It is envisaged that the site could accommodate up to a 12.5m length Heavy Rigid Vehicle given its proximity to the state road network.

All service vehicle access for the residential and non-residential developments is expected to be provided within each basement car park via the proposed entry and egress driveways from Tideswell Street, Gower Street and Ormond Street which can be detailed during the DA stage.

Furthermore, consideration should be made to provide loading bays on the ground floor of the development for residential and non-residential waste collection and deliveries. The provision of service vehicles within a basement car park requires additional driveway width, headroom (up to 4.5m clear for 12.5m length Heavy Rigid Vehicles), loading bays and circulation areas to facilitate safe and efficient access and egress. In addition, consideration could be made to providing a kerbside dedicated loading zonse within Tideswell Street/ Gower Street or Ormond Street for the provision of deliveries / waste collection for both residential and non-residential developments subject to Council approval.

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 10 of 22

Attachment 4



#### 3.5 Disabled Parking

Council's DCP outlines a rate of 1 accessible car parking space to be provided for each accessible and adaptable residential unit. Furthermore, Council's DCP requires a minimum ten (10) percent of dwellings on the site (rounded to the nearest whole number) shall also be capable of being adaptable housing. This results in a disabled car parking provision of 52 for the residential component of the site. The provision of adaptable spaces for the residential component can be detailed at the DA stage.

The provision of disabled parking for non-residential parking spaces will be based upon the BCA requirements and can be detailed during the DA stage for each land use.

#### 3.6 Car Park Design & Compliance

Car parking areas shall be designed in accordance with AS2890.1:2004, AS2890.2:2004, AS2890.3:2015 and AS2890.6:2009 where applicable. The notable design criteria of these three standards are as follows:

- Residential tenant car parking spaces shall measure a minimum of 2.4m in width by 5.4m in length;
- Residential visitor car parking spaces shall measure a minimum of 2.5m in width by 5.4m in length;
- Aisle widths for User Class1/1A shall be a minimum of 5.8m;
- A 1.0m aisle extension is required for blind aisles;
- An additional 300mm clearance on top of the base parking dimension is required to obstructions and walls;
- Disabled parking spaces shall measure 2.4m wide by 5.4m in length, with an adjacent shared zone of the same dimension;
- Headroom for passenger cars shall be minimum 2.2m in all locations, increasing to 2.5m above disabled parking spaces and shared zones;
- Driveway locations offset at least 6m from priority / Giveway controlled intersections;

Loading areas and bays shall be designed in accordance with AS2890.2:2002. Notably, the following design criteria should be met:

- Minimum Loading Bay Widths:
  - Small Rigid Vehicle (6.4m length) 6.4m x 3.5m;
  - Medium Rigid Vehicle (8.8m length) 8.8m x 3.5m;
  - Heavy Rigid Vehicle (12.5m length) 12.5 x 3.5m.
- Loading Area Grade:
  - No greater than 4% in any direction;
- Access Ramps to Loading Area:
  - SRV Maximum grade of 15.4% with grade changes of 8.3% over 4m;
  - MRV / HRV Maximum grade of 15.4% with grade changes of 6.25% over 7m.
- Headroom Requirements:
  - SRV 3.5m above loading and all areas within the vehicular path of travel;

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 11 of 22

 MRV / HRV– 4.5m above loading and all areas within the vehicular path of travel.

Swept path testing has been undertaken for a 12.5m length Heavy Rigid Vehicle (HRV) within the nearby road network, namely along The Hume Highway / Gower Street / Tideswell Street and Ormond Street to ensure access can be provided to the site for the expected largest service vehicle and is reproduced in **Annexure B** for reference. A detailed review of the access and basement car parking layout will be undertaken during the DA stage.

The results of the swept paths allow a 12.5m length HRV vehicular access to each proposed driveway location as per the following:

- Stage 1 Left in / left out from Tideswell Street;
- Stage 2 Right in from Gower Street / right out onto Ormond Street;
- Stage 3 Right in from Gower Street / left out onto The Hume Highway or right out onto Parramatta Road.

It should be noted that right turn out of the site onto Parramatta Road should not be permitted directly from the site.

Item 2

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 12 of 22



#### 4 TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT

The impact of the expected traffic generation levels associated with the subject proposal is discussed in the following sub-sections.

The traffic assessment of the development options has been conducted in accordance with the RMS *Guide to Traffic Generating Developments* (October 2002) and the RMS Technical Direction 2013/04a published in August 2013.

#### 4.1 Traffic Generation

As outlined above, reference is made to the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments and the RMS Technical Direction 2013/04a published in August 2013. The RMS Guide provides guidance on traffic generation rates for various land use developments and other matters relating to traffic and parking.

The following trip generation rates have been adopted for the scale of the planning proposal based upon the RMS Guide and recent updated supplements:

Residential – High Density Residential Morning peak hour - 0.19 trips per dwelling Evening peak hour - 0.15 trips per dwelling

The traffic generation for the indicative yield of 515 units is summarised in Table 3 below.

Land Use	Scale	Rate		Traffic Generation	
Lanu Ose		AM	PM	AM	РМ
Residential	515	0.19 per dwelling	0.15 per dwelling	98 (19 in, 79 out)	77 (62 in, 15 out)

As shown above the residential development yield is expected to generate **98** and **77** vehicle movements during both the AM (19 in, 79 out) and PM (62 in, 15 out) peak period. It should be noted that this does not include the traffic generation associated with the non-residential component which can be detailed during the DA stage when further information is available. Furthermore, the impact of the traffic generation for the yield of the planning proposal will be assessed during the DA stage, when more detailed information is provided in relation to the proposed scale of the development.

Additionally, consideration must be given to the existing land uses on-site and the net impact of the proposal, such that the estimated traffic generation can be discounted from the existing uses of the site. The assessment during D.A would identify the net impact of the proposal in comparison to the existing land uses.

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 13 of 22



#### 5 PRELIMINARY ROAD DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

As part of the proposed development consideration should be made to providing pedestrians and vehicular access into and out of the site in the most safe and convenient way. The site is located along two (2) state roads and as such consideration should be made to the existing traffic generation along the nearby state and local roads and the impact of the traffic generated from the proposed development.

The site is expected to provide three (3) basement car parking areas, it is currently unknown if the basement car park arrangement will provide circulation of vehicles between the three basements areas. The impact of the proposed development, namely the traffic generation impact upon the local roads will be completed during the DA stage. As a preliminary assessment the following considerations should be made to provide vehicles and pedestrians a safe and convenient environment:

- Widening of the carriageway width by 3m along Ormond Street from the intersection Gower Street to Parramatta Road to facilitate heavy vehicles and improve two-way passing efficiency with the provision of kerbside parking on both sides of the road.
- Upgrade of the intersection of Ormond street / Gower Street to a roundabout intersection to provide pedestrians safe access to nearby bus stops and Ashfield Park. Furthermore, the provision of a roundabout will allow safe U-turn manoeuvres. The upgrade of the intersection to a roundabout is subject to the assessment of the existing traffic flows in combination to the proposed traffic flows from the proposed development.
- Restriction of Tideswell Street to a left in / left out arrangement with the provision of a concrete median within the Hume Highway. The provision of this is subject to traffic flows under the future development. To retain the existing intersection of Tideswell Street and The Hume Highway the basement car park for Stage 1 will need to facilitate a low level of traffic generation during the AM and PM peak periods.
- Widening of the Hume Highway at the intersection of Gower Street / Hume Highway to provide a dedicated right turn lane into Gower Street with amendments to the signalised intersection phasing.
- No direct vehicular access shall be permitted along the Parramatta Road frontage.

The above preliminary considerations are subject to future assessment of the existing traffic flows in combination with the estimated traffic generation outlined in **Table 3**.

Page 14 of 22



#### 6 CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the subject planning proposal is supported on the grounds of traffic and parking. More detailed design and traffic impact assessment will be required at the DA stage, though important traffic and parking features in support of the proposal include:

- Council's DCP requires the provision of 644 residential spaces while the RMS Guide outlines a residential parking requirement of 540. It is envisaged that all residential and non-residential car parking will be provided within each Stages basement car park. It should be noted that the number of car parking spaces required for the planning proposal are subject to change based upon detailed design. The car parking requirement and provision for the proposed development can be detailed and further assessed during D.A stage.
- As shown above the residential development yield is expected to generate 98 and 77 vehicle movements during both the AM (19 in, 79 out) and PM (62 in, 15 out) peak period. It should be noted that this does not include the traffic generation associated with the non-residential component which can be detailed during the DA stage when further information is available. Furthermore, the impact of the traffic generation for the yield of the planning proposal will be assessed during the DA stage, when more detailed information is provided in relation to the proposed scale of the development. Additionally, consideration must be given to the existing land uses on-site and the net impact of the proposal, such that the estimated traffic generation can be discounted from the existing use of the site. The assessment during D.A would identify the net impact of the proposal in comparison to the existing land uses and the nearby road network.
- Car parking areas shall be designed in accordance with AS2890.1:2004, AS2890.2:2004 and AS2890.6:2009 where applicable. A detailed review of the access and basement car parking layout will be undertaken during the DA stage.
- Based upon 515 units, 52 residential bicycle parking spaces and 52 residential bicycle visitor parking spaces would suffice in order to achieve the objectives of the DCP.
- Based upon the car parking requirements outlined in Section 3.1 & 3.2, the site would require the provision of 26 motorcycle parking spaces based upon the provision of 644 car parking spaces (Council's DCP) or 22 motorcycle spaces based upon the RMS parking requirements. The motorcycle requirements for the non-residential portion of the development can be assessed at the DA stage.
- Council requires all non-residential tenancies that operationally require loading / unloading services to be provided with a loading bay. It is envisaged that all loading / unloading for residential / commercial developments will be undertaken from the basement car park. Furthermore, consideration could be made to provide a combined loading / unloading facilities for the non-residential components which could operate under a Plan of Management. Swept path testing has been undertaken for a 12.5m length Heavy Rigid Vehicle which is the expected largest vehicle that will be required to travel to the site and are reproduced in Annexure B for reference.

Page 15 of 22

Attachment 4

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017



Consideration should be made to provide loading bays on the ground floor of the development for either residential or non-residential waste collection and deliveries. The provision of service vehicles within a basement car park requires additional driveway width, headroom (up to 4.5m clear for 12.5m length Heavy Rigid Vehicles) loading bays and circulation areas to facilitate safe and efficient access and egress. Furthermore, consideration could be made to provide a kerbside dedicated loading zones within Tideswell Street/ Gower Street or Ormond Street for the provision of deliveries / waste collection for both residential and non-residential developments subject to Council approval.

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 16 of 22



Council Meeting 13 February 2018



Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017

Page 17 of 22



Page 18 of 22

Item 2

(SHEET 2 OF 2) TVPICAL BASEMENT PLAN 16138 1 Date: JUNE 2017 Job: NOTE: ARCHITECTURAL PROPOSAL IS PROVIDED FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY Ormond St Parramatta Rd. Ashfield WWW.APLUSDG.COM.AU 0 10 20 m

ANNEXURE A: SITE PLAN

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017



248



#### ANNEXURE B: SWEPT PATHS (Sheet 1 of 4)



HRV Right Turn into Gower Street from the Hume Highway Tested @ 5km/h Successful

Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance



#### HRV Left Turn out of Gower Street onto The Hume Highway Tested @ 5km/h Successful

Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 19 of 22



#### ANNEXURE B: SWEPT PATHS (Sheet 2 of 4)



HRV Left Turn into Tideswell Street Tested @ 5km/h Successful

Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance



HRV Left Turn out of Tideswell Street Tested @ 5km/h Successful

Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 20 of 22





HRV Left Turn out of Ormond Street onto Parramatta Road Tested @ 5km/h Successful

Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance



HRV Left Turn into Ormond Street Tested @ 5km/h Unsuccessful – Vehicle body mounts median strip. Recommended road widening

Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 21 of 22



#### ANNEXURE B: SWEPT PATHS (Sheet 4 of 4)



HRV right turn from Gower Street onto Ormond Street Tested 5 km/h Successful – Road widening recommended.

Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance



HRV left turn from Ormond Street onto Gower Street Tested 5 km/h Unsuccessful – Road widening recommended and required.

> Blue – Vehicle Tyres Green – Vehicle Body Red – 300mm clearance

Planning Proposal Tideswell Street & Parramatta Road, Ashfield 17442.01FA - 16th October 2017 Page 22 of 22


### Heritage 21

Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031

August , 2017 Remolo Negro Ozzy States Pty Ltd and Hunter Hospitality Ltd /A+ Design Group PO Box 1791 Rozelle, NSW 2039

Preliminary Heritage Advice. Parramatta Road and Tideswell Street, Ashfield.

### PROPOSED MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT INVOLVING;

DEMOLITION OF ALL NON-HERITAGE LISTED BUILDINGS WITHIN THE SUBJECT SITE; RETENTION AND CONSERVATION OF ALL HERITAGE LISTED BUILDINGS WITHIN THE SUBJECT SITE FOR INTEGRATION WITHIN THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

### 1. Background

Heritage 21 has been engaged by Ozzy States Pty Ltd and Hunter Hospitality Ltd /A+ Design Group to review the relevant heritage controls and provide advice to the design team around potential heritage constraints and possibilities for the proposed development of a number of properties which for the purposes of this report are collectively named as Parramatta Road and Tideswell Street, Ashfield ('the site').

On July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Heritage 21 received a draft sketch design package by A + Design Group dated July 2017 ('the design') pertaining to the proposed works at the site. The preliminary heritage advice contained in this report is based upon those designs and has been informed by preliminary research and a site visit undertaken on August 4th, 2017.

Although the drawings are at an early stage of development, they allow Heritage 21 a good insight into the form that the site's master plan will eventually take and the architect's considered response to site restrictions. We understand that the drawings are design sketches and may need to be revised at a future stage in response to Heritage 21's advice.

Heritage 21 notes the intent to retain all on-site heritage listed buildings for the purpose of integration within the proposed development. This holistic approach to the site is to be commended.

Heritage21 20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria www.heritage21.com.au



TEL: 9519-2521 reception@heritage21.com.au Job No. 3031 – PHA



Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031

### 2. Site Identification

The subject site comprises 46 individual allotments and covers most of a city block at the eastern extremity of Ashfield, with main frontages to Parramatta Road (northeast) and Liverpool Road (southeast).

Ormond Street and Gower Street, both secondary frontages, border the site to the northwest and southwest respectively. Tideswell Street, a no through road, enters the site from Liverpool Road.

The proposed development covers all land within the boundaries of these four thoroughfares and streets, with the exception of Explorers park which is located on the eastern corner of the site and extends approximately half the length of the site's Liverpool Road frontage and along Parramatta Road to a lesser extent. The site is situated within the boundaries of the Inner West Council Local Government Area (formerly Ashfield Council).

The site is fairly level along Liverpool Road and Ormond Street. It falls gently down Parramatta Road, Gower Street and Tideswell Street as these head in a northerly direction.

Being located at a major intersection, the site has landmark potential, with Explorers park and Ashfield park strategically placed to act as green buffers to the proposed development.

The site contains a variety of vegetation, which must be considered for retention wherever possible. Mature street trees are in evidence along Ormond Street and Gower Street.

The dominant building form is free standing villas, with a number of small apartment blocks and some retail.

The five heritage listed items fall into two broad categories of building types;

Terraces (2) on Liverpool Road and;

Houses (3) on Ormond Street, - two of which are dual occupancies.

Each of the two building types will present its own set of challenges and will require intelligent and innovative design solutions when planning for their retention and future use. However, great opportunities for individual architectural expression exist in the integration of old and new. These are opportunities which should be seized by the architect.

For example, on the design sketch the three Ormond Street houses appear to be linked by glazed structures. A linkage of this kind, if treated in a recessive manner is considered acceptable from a heritage point of view. The intrusion on original fabric can be minimised and justified by overall improved functionality.

It is also important to note that the current heritage listings do not extend to any interiors within the five listed sites. This allows for a total reconfiguration of internal space. When planning for this, consideration should be given at an early design stage to the retention of significant features and fixtures, along with the sympathetic fitting of new services (their routing/ placement etc) so as to mitigate negative impact.

Heritage21	ī.ī.21	TEL: 9519-2521
20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria	H21	reception@heritage21.com.au
www.heritage21.com.au	Page   2 of 11	Job No. 3031 - PHA



### Heritage 21

### Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031

### 3. Historical Summary

An aerial photograph of the site from 1943 provides evidence of minor changes to the locality in the intervening years, the one major change being the establishment of Explorers Park.



Figures 1 and 2. Aerial view of the site in 1943 (left) and 2017 (right).

The site has changed little, apart from the establishment of Explorers Park. (Source: NSW Land and Property Information, 'SIX Maps', n.d., http://maps.six.nsw.gov.au/. Downloaded 03.08.17)

### 4. Heritage Listings



**Figure 3**. Heritage map of the site. The five listed items within the site are to be retained. The impact of the proposed development upon those items and any heritage items within the visual catchment of the site will need further assessment before inclusion within a Statement of Heritage Impact. (Source: A+ Design Group)

### Heritage Listings

There are five heritage items located within the subject site. All are locally listed and of moderate significance, yet certainly worthy of retention.

Heritage21	1121	TEL: 9519-2521
20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria	H21	reception@heritage21.com.au
www.heritage21.com.au	Page   3 of 11	Job No. 3031 - PHA



Preliminary Heritage Advice - Ashfield 3031

Future use will be a consideration when planning for these items, just as closer inspection would shed greater light on their possibilities and the contribution that they might offer the proposed development.

These sites are described within the heritage schedule of the Ashfield LEP 2013 as;

Listed Site	Address	Level of Significance	Item Number
Terrace	31 Liverpool Road, Ashfield	Local	187
Terrace	37 Liverpool Road, Ashfield	Local	188
Semi-detached Houses	51-53 Ormond Street, Ashfield	Local	236
Semi-detached Houses	55-57 Ormond Street, Ashfield	Local	237
House	59 Ormond Street, Ashfield	Local	238

Following an initial inspection of these items, the following summaries are provided. Closer inspection, particularly of the interiors, will assist in determining their present condition and the degree of conservation work necessary for their adaptive reuse.



### Item 187. Terrace.

Victorian. Rendered brick with tile roof. Pleasant front garden with mature tree. Good street presentation.

It is interesting to note that the adjacent terrace (29 Liverpool Road) is remarkably similar to item 187. Later additions to the street façade of number 29 may have rendered this terrace building unworthy of listing. These later additions are of a minor nature and easily reversible.

Heritage21	ī. ī. 21	TEL: 9519-2521
20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria	H21	reception@heritage21.com.au
www.heritage21.com.au	Page   4 of 11	Job No. 3031 - PHA





Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031



Item 188. Terrace. Victorian. Rendered brick with tile roof. Good detailing. Reasonable street presentation.

Heritage21 20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria www.heritage21.com.au



TEL: 9519-2521 reception@heritage21.com.au Job No. 3031 – PHA





Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031



Item 236. Semi- detached Houses.

Federation. Brick with tile roof. Fine detailing, particularly the chimneys. Well-developed gardens with picket front fence. Excellent street presentation.



Item 237. Semi-detached Houses.

Federation. Brick with tile roof. Fine detailing, particularly the chimneys. Excellent street presentation. Similar in many respects to 236

Heritage21	i i 21	TEL: 9519-2521
20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria	H21	reception@heritage21.com.au
www.heritage21.com.au	Page   6 of 11	Job No. 3031 – PHA



### Heritage 21

Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031



### Item 238. House.

Federation. Stucco or pebble dash with tile roof. Fine stained-glass windows. Pleasant garden with ornamental metal fence. Good street presentation.

### Heritage Items in the Vicinity of the Site

The site borders the locally listed Explorers park and is within the visual catchment of a further three sites, Ashfield park to the north of the site, Ashfield bowling club which is located within Ashfield park, and a locally listed house to the south.

Listed Site/HCA	Address	Level of Significance	Item Number
Public Reserve (Explorers Park)	11-23 Liverpool Road	Local	186
House	42 Liverpool Road	Local	189
Ashfield Bowling Club	Orpington Street	Local	243
Public Reserve (Ashfield Park)	Parramatta Road, Orpington, Pembroke and Ormond Streets	Local	272

It is not anticipated that the proximity of these listed sites should necessitate revisions to the design sketches at this early stage of the design process. Disruption of views from the parks and bowling club will need to be assessed at a future stage. However, the retention and integration of three heritage houses on Ormond Street and two heritage terraces on Liverpool Road are certainly mitigating factors in any proposed changes to streetscape presentation.

Heritage21 20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria www.heritage21.com.au



TEL: 9519-2521 reception@heritage21.com.au Job No. 3031 – PHA



Preliminary Heritage Advice - Ashfield 3031

### Haberfield Heritage Conservation Area

The Haberfield heritage conservation area (HCA) lies to the north of the site, just beyond Parramatta Road.

Haberfield is a distinct and highly intact garden suburb. Shielding the Haberfield HCA from the proposed development, is a row of single storey dwellings with some retail and two storey flats. Together with the five lanes of Parramatta Rd itself (and Explorers park to a lesser extent), this should act as an adequate visual buffer. Certain aspects of the proposed development may be within the visual catchment of the Haberfield HCA, but this will be limited due to distance and local topography and should appear only as a skyline feature. 3D rendering from certain viewpoints within Haberfield would provide a better illustration and should be considered when approaching Council.

### 5. Proposed works

Heritage 21 understands, from the drawings referred to in Section 1, that the following works are proposed:

- Demolition of all non heritage listed buildings within the site;
- Retention and conservation of all heritage listd buildings within the site;
- Incorporation of all retained buildings within new, mixed-use development.



**Figure 4.** Design sketch of the site. The intention of the architect is to open up the site through the provision of public space and the careful disposition of new mixed-use development. The five listed items within the site (here in yellow on Liverpool Road and Gower Street) are to be retained for integration within the site's master plan. (Source: A+ Design Group)

Heritage21	1121	TEL: 9519-2521
20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria	H21	reception@heritage21.com.au
www.heritage21.com.au	Page   8 of 11	Job No. 3031 – PHA

### Heritage 21

Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031

### 6. Conclusion & Recommendations

Here, where two of the Colony's oldest roads meet, is a site with the potential to become a landmark addition to Sydney's great western corridor.

The design sketches for development of this site propose an opening up through Tideswell Street, with additional pedestrian access by way of a major axis from Parramatta road and two minor axes from Ormond Street, all of which lead to a large, central public plaza designed as the focal point of the proposed new development. It should be noted that the entire site is to be free of motorised traffic.

Consideration for the human scale is also apparent by the careful manipulation of space within the site, examples being the placement of pockets of greenery and the orderly groupings of the various building forms and densities. This demonstrates an intelligent and site-sensitive approach; one which is necessary when designing a complex of this size and complexity.

With regard to the integration of existing and new, the retention of onsite heritage listed houses and terraces for incorporation within the proposed development is to be commended.

### In conclusion, it is recommended that;

- Heritage professionals be engaged for all aspects of the proposal that involve heritage items, or their relationship to the planned new development.
- Closer inspection of all heritage items be undertaken. By doing so, their current condition and any recommendations for conservation, retro fitting and future use may be incorporated into the site design at an early stage of development.
- Inspection of all non-heritage items for photographic archival recording purposes be undertaken prior to demolition. Notation of materials, fixtures etc. that may be retained or utilised throughout the proposed new development and repurposed for paving, walls, seating etc., or as part of an interpretation strategy.
- Where possible and practical, retain contextual elements such as gardens, walls and fences currently within the site.
- Existing street trees and important vegetation within the site be retained. Where
  removal of existing vegetation is necessary, replant with an equal or greater number
  of drought tolerant, easy maintained native trees. A list of Council approved/
  recommended trees may be obtained for that purpose.

Contained within the site is a number of non-listed buildings which are also worthy of retention when planning for the future of the site. Many are in remarkably good condition.

Heritage21	1121	TEL: 9519-2521
20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria	H21	reception@heritage21.com.au
www.heritage21.com.au	Page   9 of 11	Job No. 3031 - PHA



Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031

Among these is a number of brick and tile apartment blocks dating from the 1930s and 1940s. Ashfield is characterised by this building type with many examples displaying fine Art Deco detailing and stairwell windows of stained glass. Three such blocks are located along Tideswell Street, two on Liverpool Road, one on Gower Street, and two on Parramatta Road.

Examples are shown below.







Examples of typical Ashfield unit blocks. Note the fine brickwork and detailing.

Heritage21	1121	TEL: 9519-2521
20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria	H21	reception@heritage21.com.au
www.heritage21.com.au	Page   10 of 11	Job No. 3031 - PHA



Item 2



Preliminary Heritage Advice • Ashfield 3031

On a final note; when contemplating the vast scale of demolition that this development proposes, and the potential loss of embodied energy that will result, retention and reuse of existing building materials and stock (whenever possible) is always worthy of consideration as the viable and sensible approach to the built environment in general, and heritage conservation in particular.

Attachment 5

Heritage21

20-28 Maddox Street, Alexandria www.heritage21.com.au



**TEL: 9519-2521** reception@heritage21.com.au Job No. 3031 – PHA



### Attachment – Extract of Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy – Implementation Guidelines

114 Parramatta Road – Planning Proposal

Implementation Guidelines require that all Criteria in the Table below are satisfied in order for an "Out of sequence" Planning Proposal to be supported.

OUT OF S	EQUENCE CHECKLIST	
Criteria 1	Strategic objectives, land use and development	•
	<ul> <li>The planning proposal can demonstrate significant delivery or contribution towards the Strategy's Corridor wide and Precinct specific vision.</li> <li>The planning proposal satisfies the <u>Strategy's</u> seven land use and transport planning principles and fulfils the relevant Strategic Actions for each Principle.</li> </ul>	The proposal is contrary to the "vision" stated in the PRCUTS
	The 7 Principles listed in the Strategy are:	
	1 Housing Choice and affordability	1 There is no proposal for 5 percent of housing to be provided as Affordable Housing as recommended in this Principle.
	2 Diverse and resilient economy	2 The LEP amendment will not provide a wider range of employment uses, and a shop top housing use will potentially reduce employment floorspace since development will likely be predominantly residential, and not provide new models of large retail stores or commercial buildings at ground level.
	3 Accessible and connected.	3 The Proposal is adequately located.
	4 Vibrant communities and places	4 There is a poor relationship to the existing neighbourhood character and nearby Conservation Areas.
	5 Green spaces and Links	5 Approximately 30 percent of land is illustrated as communal open space, for the reasons stated in the report a large part of this is not likely to be feasible.
	6 Sustainability and resilience	6 Achievement of the Strategic Actions has not been demonstrated.
	7 Delivery	7
	<ul> <li>The planning proposal can demonstrate significant net community, economic and environmental benefits for the Corridor and the Precinct or Frame Area within which the site is located.</li> </ul>	This has not been demonstrated.
	<ul> <li>The planning proposal is consistent with the recommended land uses, heights, densities, open space, active transport and built form plans for the relevant Precinct or Frame Area.</li> </ul>	The proposal is substantially inconsistent with the recommendations of the PRCUTS as found in the Planning and Design Guidelines.
	<ul> <li>The planning proposal demonstrably achieves outcomes aligned to the desired future character and growth projections identified in the Strategy.</li> </ul>	The Proposal does not align with the recommended future character as found in the Planning and Design Guidelines.

•	The planning proposal demonstrates design excellence
	can be achieved, consistent with councils adopted
	design excellence strategy or the design excellence
	provisions provided in the Parramatta Road Corridor
	Planning and Design Guidelines (Planning and Design
	Guidelines).

The Proposal disregards the PRCUTS objectives with regard to maximum building scale, and a sympathetic transitionary building scale next to "sensitive areas".

It is evident that Architectural Design excellence is something demonstrated at Development Application stage since it is dependent on the content of the architectural documents being put forward. An illustrative depiction at rezoning stage does not mean that such a depiction will be replicated at DA stage.

Criteria 2	Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan	
	<ul> <li>An integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which</li> </ul>	
	identifies advanced infrastructure provision and cost	
	recovery for the local and regional infrastructure	
	identified in the Infrastructure Schedule, must support	
	the planning proposal. The Integrated Infrastructure	
	Delivery Plan must demonstrate a cost offset to	
	council and agency costs for a set period that aligns	
	with the anticipated timing for land development	
	identified in the Implementation Plan 2016 – 2023.	
	Infrastructure to be considered includes:	
	<ul> <li>Public transport</li> </ul>	Refer to the Action List on the following pages.
	<ul> <li>Active transport</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Road upgrades and intersection</li> </ul>	Many of these works are not realistically able to be
	improvements	delivered at this point in time. Eg a "fast" bus route
	<ul> <li>Open space and public domain</li> </ul>	along Parramatta Road is dependent on the actions
	improvements	of the Transport for NSW in cooperation with RMS.
	<ul> <li>Community infrastructure, utilities and</li> </ul>	
	services.	
Criteria 3	Stakeholder engagement	There has not been any "Pre Planning Proposal
	<ul> <li>Consultation and engagement with relevant</li> </ul>	application" process followed and community
	stakeholders (council, government agencies, business,	consultation carried out.
	community, adjoining properties and user or interest	
	groups, where relevant) have been undertaken,	
	including any relevant pre-planning proposal	
	engagement processes required by local council.	
	<ul> <li>An appropriate level of support or agreement is</li> </ul>	
	documented.	
	<ul> <li>Provision of documentary evidence outlining the level</li> </ul>	
	of planning or project readiness in terms of the extent	
	of planning or business case development for key	
	infrastructure projects.	
Criteria 4	Sustainability	No such documentation has been submitted, such
	<ul> <li>The planning proposal achieves or exceeds the</li> </ul>	that would exceed BASIX and the BCA Energy
	sustainability targets identified in the Strategy.	Provisions.
Criteria 5	Feasibility	No such information has been submitted.
	<ul> <li>The planning proposal presents a land use and</li> </ul>	
	development scenario that demonstrates economic	
	feasibility with regard to the likely costs of	
	infrastructure and the proposed funding arrangements	
	available for the Precinct or Frame Area.	
Criteria 6	Market viability	
	<ul> <li>The planning proposal demonstrates a land use and</li> </ul>	No such information has been submitted.
	development scenario that aligns with and responds to	Compliance with this criteria is affected by other
	market conditions for the delivery of housing and	overriding criteria that must be complied with,
	employment for 2016 to 2023. Viability should not be	including the extent of development that is
	used as a justification for poor planning or built form	appropriate for a good planning outcome, which
	outcomes.	determines acceptable FSR (floorspace) and so
		feasibility.



## Item 2

### **Taverners Hill**

The Out of Sequence checklist requires compliance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which includes: Public transport, Active transport, Road upgrades and intersection improvements, Open space and public domain improvements, Community infrastructure, utilities and services. The required works are found in the following table.

### Action Plan 2016 - 2023

TAVERNERS HILL	PRECINCT 2016 – 2023	
Timing of release	<ul> <li>From 2016</li> <li>Sequencing of planning proposals in the Precinct and Frame Area to be consistent with the Taverners Hill Action Plan 2016 – 2023.</li> </ul>	Development of the land is not within the 2016-2023 period.
Strategic land uses	<ul> <li>A maximum of 47,000m<sup>2</sup> residential gross floor area.</li> <li>Consistent with the requirements of the Strategy:         <ul> <li>A minimum of 5% of new housing is to be provided as Affordable Housing, or in lines with Government policy of the day.</li> <li>Provision of housing diversity types identified within the Strategy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	There is no proposal for Affordable Housing to be provided such as an inclusionary LEP clause of Voluntary Planning agreement.
	<ul> <li>A minimum 35,000m<sup>2</sup> employment gross floor area of predominantly light industrial, enterprise, commercial, retail and community uses.</li> </ul>	Introduction of "shoptop housing" in the B6 Enterprise Zone use will likely lead to a substantial reduction loss of employment gross floor area, as development will likely seek a predominantly residential use.
Public transport	<ul> <li>TfNSW to implement the strategic initiatives of <i>Sydney CBD to</i> <i>Parramatta Strategic Transport Plan.</i></li> <li>Operation of the rapid bus solution along Parramatta Road from Burwood to the Sydney CBD.</li> </ul>	This public transport system is not yet available.
	Note: TfNSW is undertaking detailed planning for public transport services along Parramatta Road and the surrounding road network. Consultation with TfNSW should be undertaken during the preparation of planning proposals within the Corridor in the short term.	
Active transport	<ul> <li>Completion of the GreenWay connection under Parramatta Road.</li> <li>Completion of the GreenWay Link connection Longport Street.</li> <li>Development in the Precinct to make appropriate contributions to the delivery of new cycleways as indicated Planning and Design Guidelines, including:         <ul> <li>New cycle connections running east-west along Nestor Lane</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	This is not completed, and work has not commenced.
	<ul> <li>Development in the Precinct to be designed to deliver through- site links as indicated in the Planning and Design Guidelines, including:         <ul> <li>New east-west through-site link connecting Upward Street and George Street.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Open space and recreation	<ul> <li>In Accordance with the Infrastructure Schedule, provision of contributions towards the medium and long term open space facilities.</li> </ul>	There is no contributions plan in place. Any upfront contributions would be provided as part of Voluntary Planning Agreement.
Community facilities	<ul> <li>Development in the Precinct to make an appropriate contribution to:</li> </ul>	Any upfront contributions would be provided as part of Voluntary Planning Agreement.



	<ul> <li>Embellishment of existing community facilities as identified by Council, such as Summer Hill Community Centre or Ashfield Civic Centre</li> <li>Appropriate upgrade to Ashfield or Haberfield Library.</li> <li>Public art to be provided within the Taverners Hill Town Centre.</li> <li>Provision of an additional:         <ul> <li>36 childcare places</li> <li>4 Before School Care places</li> <li>14 After School Care places</li> <li>10 Vacation Care places</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	-
Education facilities	<ul> <li>In accordance with the Infrastructure Schedule, provision of appropriate contributions towards primary and secondary schools.</li> </ul>	Any upfront contributions would be provided as part of a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA). Nevertheless provision of additional school spaces, is dependent on the State Government and its Department of Education.
Health facilities	<ul> <li>The Sydney Local Health District has undertaken detailed planning for its assets at Royal Prince Alfred Hospital and Canterbury Hospital. Consultation with the Ministry of Health should be undertaken during the preparation of planning proposals within the Corridor in the short term and satisfactory arrangements entered into, as relevant.</li> </ul>	Any upfront contributions would be provided as part of Volunteery Planning Agreemnt . Nevertheless provision of additional public health care is dependant on the State Government and relevant Heath Department.
Road improvements and upgrades	<ul> <li>Prior to any rezoning commencing, a Precinct-wide traffic study and supporting modelling is required to be completed which considers the recommended land uses and densities, as well as future Westconnex conditions, and identifies the necessary road improvements and upgrades required to be to be delivered as part of any proposed renewal in the Precinct.</li> </ul>	No study has been produced.
Funding framework or satisfactory arrangements	<ul> <li>New and upgraded roads, community facilities and open space to be delivered by development and funded through Section 94 contributions, the SIC levy and/or works in kind. The value of the contribution shall be consistent with the Infrastructure Schedule.</li> </ul>	There is no Section 94 plans in place specifically for the Parramatta Road corridor. Any upfront contributions would be provided as part of a VPA.

END





### DEVELOPMENT SERVICES HERITAGE ADVISOR'S REFERRAL COMMENTS

ADDRESS:	114 Parramatta Road Ashfield	File No:
ADVISOR	Robert Moore	
DATE	25 <sup>th</sup> January 2018	
STATUS	Heritage items upon the proposed site, and ne	ar Haberfield
	Heritage Conservation Area and other HCAs a	and Heritage Items
DESCRIPTION	Planning proposal for rezoning to facilitate high	n-rise apartments
PREVIOUS COMMENTS	nil	
	HIS/CMP recommended for archiving in library	1
Note: These comments relate to heritage issues only. They do not include a planning review.		
Planning comments	will, however, be provided separately in relation to Pre-lo	odgement Applications
or Provisional Devel	opment Applications.	

I refer to the request that I provide comments on the planning proposal for lands comprising a site described by Parramatta Road, Liverpool Road, Tideswell Street, Gower Street and Ormond Streets. The proposed rezoning would facilitate multistorey construction of up to 16 Storeys.

The proposal raises a number of heritage issues, including that of impact upon the five (5) items included within the site itself, a number of heritage items nearby, and importantly, that of impact upon the Heritage Conservation Areas near the site. This latter includes most crucially the Haberfield Conservation Area, but located nearby are also three other HCAs and numerous individual heritage items.

The submission includes a report of Preliminary Heritage Advice by Heritage 21. The report notes the quality of the heritage items upon the site and their intended retention (Nos. 31 and 37 Liverpool Road and Nos. 51-53, Nos. 55-57, and No. 59 Ormond Street). While commenting that future use of these properties will be "*a consideration*", it does not comment on issues of their setting and juxtaposition with the proposed new development, or what their context might be.

Further heritage items noted are the Explorers Park Public Reserve, the house at No. 42 Liverpool Road, the Ashfield Bowling Club in Orpington Street, and Ashfield Park, defined by Parramatta Road, Orpington, Ormond and Pembroke Streets. While the retention of the five items on site is seen and nominated as a mitigating factor, no action is seen as necessary in respect of the other items "*at this stage*".

../2

2.



In respect of the Haberfield HCA, the importance of this area and its live, ongoing discussion by Council and the State Government as a HCA of State Significance are not mentioned. The advice offered is : *"Certain aspects of the proposed development may be within the visual catchment of the HCA, but this will be limited due to distance and local topography and should appear only as a skyline feature".* 

The impact of the development upon the visual catchment of other nearby HCAs, including C13 (Federal-Fyle HCA), C47(North Summer Hill HCA), and C48 (Oaklands Avenue HCA) is not examined.

### **Preliminary Comment**

In my opinion, quite simply put, the core premise of this proposal that development of the scale and bulk proposed will not adversely affect its context, is profoundly wrong. While the heritage items upon the site will be at risk of trivialised retention and placed in wholly inappropriate contexts and settings, the monumental and elephantine planning disaster that would be consequent would be the complete and utter visual domination of the Haberfield Conservation Area – a single storey, Model Garden Suburb of arguably international significance.

In my opinion, the proposed development would be visible from numerous houses and streets within the Haberfield HCA. The buildings would overlook and dominate its houses, backyards and streetscapes. The buildings would terminate vistas along its tree-lined streets and be visible from a more than significant proportion of its houses south of Ramsay Street, in the central "basin" of the suburb. All these impacts would be accentuated by the site's relative elevation.

The development would also adversely influence an expansive visual catchment including the Heritage Items mentioned above and shown upon Council's Heritage Map. The development would be isolated and removed from other developments of its scale which are generally located closer to the Ashfield town centre. Clearly, similar development would be encouraged nearby, and the emergence of a wall of buildings, overlooking Haberfield and borrowing while at the same time, compromising its amenity, would ensue.

Commercial and residential development planned along Parramatta Road within recent years, has been considered carefully with regard to its impacts upon the Haberfield HCA. East of the confluence of Liverpool Road and Parramatta Road, development has maintained a scale and bulk responsive to its context. Prior to WestConnex, development west of the intersection was similarly subject to evaluation of its impacts upon Haberfield, including in those matters that went to the NSW Land and Environment Court.

This proposal would see that concern thrown away. If the consistent planning measures and decisions implemented by the State Government and Ashfield (now Inner West) Council are to be respected and maintained, together with the community's commitment through the efforts of owners past and present to conserve their homes, this proposal must be withdrawn or rejected.

3.

../3



In my opinion, it is abundantly clear that development of a lesser, more appropriate scale, bulk and character could achieve an infinitely preferable outcome to this misscaled and in heritage terms, utterly inappropriate proposal. The relationship with heritage items upon the site, and with the Haberfield Conservation Area adjacent, could be respectful, constructive and positive, rather than one of conflict, dominance, and exploitation.

Robert Allan Moore



Item 2



Attachment 8



Item No: C0218 Item 3

Subject: SHADE SAILS IN PLAYGROUNDS

**Prepared By:** Cathy Edwards-Davis - Group Manager Trees, Parks and Sports Fields

Authorised By: Elizabeth Richardson – A/Deputy General Manager Assets and Environment

### SUMMARY

To respond to the Council Reolution of 12 December 2017 requesting staff to prioritise the installation of shade sails in playgrounds.

### RECOMMENDATION

### THAT:

Pending the adoption of the budget, Council install shade sails in 2018/2019 at the following playgrounds:

- Campbell Street, Balmain;
- College Street, Balmain;
- J.F. Laxton Reserve, Union Street, Dulwich Hill;
- Marr Reserve, Cary Street, Leichhardt;
- Nestor Park, Hearn Street, Leichhardt;
- O'Connor Reserve, Rozelle;
- Pine Square, Leichhardt; and
- William Street, Ashfield.

### BACKGROUND

At the Council meeting on the 12 December 2017, the following was resolved:

THAT Council:

1. Officers report on the suitability and rank the priority of the following playgrounds for installation of shade sails, to be considered in the preparation of the 2018/19 Budget:

Chester Street Annandale
Hearn Street Leichhardt
Marr Reserve Leichhardt
O'Connor Reserve Rozelle
Cary Street Leichhardt
Ann Cashman Reserve Balmain
Lambert Park Leichhardt
War Memorial Park Leichhardt
Elkington Park Balmain
Bridgewater Rozelle
Orange Grove Lilyfield
Gray Street Annandale
North Street Leichhardt
Mort Bay Birchgrove
Gladstone Park Balmain
36 Battalion Park Leichhardt



2. Have a review of all playgrounds in the LGA for the prioritisation of the installation of shade sails in preparation for the 2018/19 budget.

The following comments are made regarding the nominated playgrounds:

Proposed	Comments
Location	
Douglas Grant Memorial Park, Chester Street, Annandale	New trees have been planted for shade. There is an existing shade sail. The "rocket ship" is uncovered. However, any shade sail over this piece of equipment would have to be very high. It would then overshadow the neighbor and it is therefore not recommended.
Nestor Park, Hearn Street, Leichhardt	This is a new playground. Agreed, this playground requires a shade sail. Funding recommended for 2018/2019.
Marr Reserve, Cary Street, Leichhardt	Natural shade already available from trees. Suitable for shade sail. Funding recommended for 2018/2019.
O'Connor Reserve, Rozelle	There is an existing shade sail. Suitable for additional shade sail. Funding recommended for 2018/2019.
Ann Cashman Reserve, Balmain	Natural shade already available from trees. A shade sail is not needed.
Lambert Park, Leichhardt	Natural shade already available from trees. A shade sail is not needed.
War Memorial Park, Leichhardt	Natural shade already available from trees. A shade sail is not needed.
Elkington Park, Balmain	Natural shade already available from trees. A shade sail is not needed.
Bridgewater, Rozelle	Complete. A shade sail has been installed.
Orange Grove, Lilyfield	Complete. A shade sail has been installed.
Gray Street, Annandale	Complete. A shade sail has been installed.
North Street, Leichhardt	This location was reviewed for 2017/2018 shade sail program. The location was found not suitable for shade sails as the sails would cause overshadowing of house on southern side.
Mort Bay, Birchgrove	There is an existing shade sail. The shade sail was repaired as part of the 2017/2018 program.
Gladstone Park, Balmain	Complete. A shade sail was installed as part of the 2017/2018 program.
36 Battalion Park, Leichhardt	Complete. A shade sail was installed as part of the 2017/2018 program.

In addition to the above nominated shade sails, staff have identified the need for shade sails at the following locations:

Proposed		Comments
Location		
J.F. Reserve, Street, Dul	Laxton Union wich Hill	Whilst undertaking inspections at this park, this playground was identified as requiring a shade sail.
William Ashfield	Street,	An adjacent developer has removed a number of trees, which has reduced shade in this location. Council has received resident requests for a shade sail at this playground.



### Shade Sail Program

The draft capital works budget includes the following funding for shade sails:

Project	2018/2019	2019/2020
Shade sail program (Leichhardt s94)	400,000	90,000
Shade sail program	30,000	150,000
Minor Parks – Shade sails	70,000	0

The shade sails funded from the Leichhardt Developer Contributions Plan Open Space and Recreation (s94) must be located within the former Leichhardt LGA. The other funding may be spent throughout the LGA.

The draft budget is subject to public exhibition and adopted by Council.

In 2018/2019, it is recommended that the following shade sails be installed:

- Campbell Street, Balmain
- College Street, Balmain
- J.F. Laxton Reserve, Union Street, Dulwich Hill
- Marr Reserve, Cary Street, Leichhardt
- Nestor Park, Hearn Street, Leichhardt
- O'Connor Reserve, Rozelle
- Pine Square, Leichhardt
- William Street, Ashfield

The above projects will be subject to further detailed design investigation.

It is recommended that part of the shade sail program funding in 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 be utilised for the development of a Shade Sail Program Strategy which will be developed in conjunction with a Playground Program Strategy for the LGA. Both Strategies will also be informed by the Recreation Needs Study: A Healthier Inner West. The Shade Sail and Playground Strategies will ensure that these two important programs are delivered to meet the prioritised needs of the community and that they inform each other, such that shade sails, if needed, are delivered in conjunction with any new playgrounds.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The shade sail program has been identified in the draft capital works budget for 2018/2019 and future financial years. The funding implications are outlined in the report.

### **OTHER STAFF COMMENTS**

Nil.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

### ATTACHMENTS

Nil.



Item No: C0218 Item 4	
-----------------------	--

Subject: INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2017

Prepared By: Brendhan Barry - Manager Financial Services

Authorised By: Michael Tzimoulas - Deputy General Manager Chief Financial and Administration Officer

### SUMMARY

In accordance with the requirements of clause 212 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005, Council is provided with a listing of all investments made pursuant to section 625 of the Local Government Act 1993 and reported for period ending 30 November 2017.

### RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report be received and noted.

### BACKGROUND

Clause 212 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 requires that a report be presented to Council each month listing all investments with a certification from the Responsible Accounting Officer. Attached to this report are further reports from Council's Investment Advisors, Prudential Investment Services.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Investment Holdings report (**Attachment 1**) for the period ending 30 November 2017 reflects Council's holding in various investment categories these are listed in the table below. Council's portfolio size has remained at \$218m of which 87% was rated A rated or above.



ADI Lending Status *	Current Mont	:h (\$)	Previous Mont	th (\$)
Fossil Fuel Lending ADIs				
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	10,527,704		10,527,230	
National Australia Bank	19,500,000		21,500,000	
Westpac Group	14,000,000		14,000,000	
	44,027,704	20%	46,027,230	21%
Non Fossil Fuel Lending ADIs				
ANZ Group (Green)	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Auswide Bank	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Bank of Queensland	42,000,000		40,500,000	
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	36,000,000		36,000,000	
Credit Union Australia	7,000,000		7,000,000	
Greater Building Society	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Heritage Bank			1,000,000	
Members Equity Bank	41,000,000		37,000,000	
Newcastle Permanent Building Society	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Non ADI	1,623,769		1,629,895	
Rural Bank	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Suncorp Bank	32,000,000		32,500,000	
Teachers Mutual Bank	1,200,000		1,200,000	
	174,323,769	80%	170,329,895	<b>79</b> %
	218,351,473		216,357,125	

\* source: http://www.marketforces.org.au



### **Investment Performance**



Council's annualised return of continues to exceed the bank bill index benchmark. The period ending 30 November 2017, the portfolio for Inner West Council had a One-Month Portfolio Investment Return (2.83%) was above the UBSWA Bank Bill Index Benchmark (1.71%).



Council has a well-diversified portfolio with 87% of the portfolio spread among the top three credit rating categories (A long term / A2 short term and higher).



### Individual Exposures



Council has a well-diversified portfolio invested among a range of term deposits and floating rate notes from highly rated Australian ADIs. The graph above shows Council's individual institution exposure compared with the investment policy limits.



The graph above demonstrates the term to maturity for Council's investments compared to Council's approved investment policy limits.



### **Environmental Commitments**



The graph above illustrates the gap between yields received from Fossil Fuel versus Non Fossil Fuel Investments. The Big 4 banks (which comprise the FF investments) continue to provide a higher interest rate yield in the current economic environment within Council's investment portfolio.



Council's holdings in Non-Fossil investments were \$170.3m with the relative total portfolio percentage increasing slightly to 80% in Non-Fossil investments. The attachments to this report summarise all investments held by Council and interest returns for periods ending 30 November 2017.

The Current Market value is required to be accounted for by the accounting. The Current Market Value is a likely outcome if Council were to consider recalling the investment prior to its due date.

All investments made for the month of November 2017 have been made in accordance with the Local Government Act, Local Government Regulations and the Inner West Council Investment Policy.



### **ATTACHMENTS**

- 1.<u>↓</u> 2.<u>↓</u> 3.<u>↓</u> IWC Nov17 summary
- IWC Nov17
  - IWC Economic and Investment Portfolio Commentary Nov 17





Investment Summary Report November 2017



### Item 4

## Inner West Council

Executive Summary - November 2017

**Investment Holdings** 



**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 



Dec 16 Jan 17 Feb 17 Mar 17 Apr 17 May 17 Jun 17 Jul 17 Aug 17 Sep 17 Oct 17 Nov 17

0%0

Bloomberg BB Index Annualised Return

Portfolio Annualised Return



### Item 4







Inner West Council

Council Meeting 13 February 2018

## Item 4

**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 

# **Inner West Council**

Historical Graphs - November 2017



284

% of portfolio





## Item 4

# **Inner West Council**

Executive Summary - November 2017



	Investment Holdings	dings			Investment Performance
				l	-
By Product	Face Value (\$)	Current Value (\$)	Current Yield (%)	4%	
Bonds	2,000,000.00	2,070,644.29	3.2500	30%	
Cash	527,704.03	527,704.03	1.1000	2	
Floating Rate Note	30,200,000.00	30,421,179.85	2.9042		)
Mortgage Backed Security	1,623,769.42	1,173,825.39	2.3548	2%	
Term Deposit	184,000,000.00	185,814,803.85	2.6568		
	218,351,473.45	218,351,473.45 220,008,157.41	2.6904	1 %	

Dec 16 Jan 17 Feb 17 Mar 17 Apr 17 May 17 Jun 17 Jul 17 Aug 17 Sep 17 Oct 17 Nov 17

0%0

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 



100

8

8 % of portfolio

4

2

%0

>5yr, <10yrs

MBC 1WB NNS หกษ

S8dN

8AN MEB รยว

8 blm3 A blm3 AUD CBA-BWA BoQ N38 WsuA ZNA

Investment Policy Limit

FF ADIS

NFF ADIS

PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

## Item 4

## PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

	527,704.03 1.1000%	1.1000%					527,704.03			
Term Deposits	osits									
Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Rate	Institution	Credit Rating	Purchase Price (\$)	Purchase Date	Current Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Interest (\$)	Accrued Coupon Reference Interest (\$) Frequency
12-Dec-17	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	2,000,000.00	12-Dec-16	2,054,312.33	534660	54,312.33	AtMaturity
12-Dec-17	2,000,000.00	2.7000%	ME Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	7-Jun-17	2,026,186.30	535325	26,186.30	AtMaturity
13-Dec-17	3,000,000.00	2.6500%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	3,000,000.00	15-Jun-17	3,036,809.59	535447	36,809.59	AtMaturity
18-Dec-17	8,000,000.00	2.5500%	ME Bank	A-2	8,000,000.00	28-Jul-17	8,070,421.92	535464	70,421.92	AtMaturity
19-Dec-17	2,500,000.00	3.6500%	National Australia Bank	A-1+	2,500,000.00	16-Dec-14	2,587,500.00	498161	87,500.00	Annually
19-Dec-17	2,000,000.00	2.7000%	ME Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	7-Jun-17	2,026,186.30	535326	26,186.30	AtMaturity
19-Dec-17	3,000,000.00	2.6500%	Bankwest	A-1+	3,000,000.00	19-Dec-16	3,075,579.45	534670	75,579.45	AtMaturity
10-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.7300%	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-1+	2,000,000.00	10-Jan-17	2,048,616.44	534756	48,616.44	AtMaturity
10-Jan-18	1,000,000.00	2.8000%	ME Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00	11-Jan-17	1,024,854.79	534757	24,854.79	AtMaturity
10-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.9000%	Credit Union Australia	A-2	2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	2,047,194.52	534852	47,194.52	AtMaturity
17-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	ME Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	18-Jan-17	2,048,635.62	534787	48,635.62	AtMaturity
18-Jan-18	8,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	8,000,000.00	28-Jul-17	8,071,802.74	535463	71,802.74	AtMaturity
29-Jan-18	5,000,000.00	2.5500%	ME Bank	A-2	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5,039,123.29	535609	39,123.29	AtMaturity
31-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	2,046,641.10	534845	46,641.10	AtMaturity
5-Feb-18	5,000,000.00	2.4500%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5,037,589.04	535610	37,589.04	AtMaturity
6-Feb-18	3,000,000.00	2.7500%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	3,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	3,068,712.33	534807	68,712.33	AtMaturity
7-Feb-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	2,045,567.12	534853	45,567.12	AtMaturity
12-Feb-18	5,000,000.00	2.5500%	ME Bank	A-2	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5,039,123.29	535611	39,123.29	AtMaturity
14-Feb-18	1,000,000.00	2.7000%	ME Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00	14-Feb-17	1,021,452.05	534872	21,452.05	AtMaturity
5-Mar-18	2,500,000.00	2.7000%	Rural Bank	A-2	2,500,000.00	2-Mar-17	2,550,671.23	534931	50,671.23	Annually

# **Inner West Council**

Investment Holdings Report - November 2017



Reference

 
 Current Value (\$)
 Deal No.

 527,704.03
 535861

Institution Credit Rating

Current Yield

Face Value (\$)

**Cash Accounts** 

527,704.03 1.1000%

Commonwealth Bank of Australia A-1+

### INNER WEST COUNCIL

287

## Item 4

## Inner West Council

Investment Holdings Report - November 2017

ST
R WEST CIL
造록
NNS

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

Term Deposits	osits									
Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Rate	Institution	Credit Rating	Purchase Pu Price (\$)	Purchase Date	Current Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Interest (\$)	Accrued Coupon Reference Interest (\$) Frequency
12-Mar-18 14-Mar-18	5,000,000.00 4,000,000,00	2.6000% 2.7300%	Bank of Oueensland Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-2 A-1+	5.000.000.00 11-Aug-17 4.000.000.00 14-Mar-17	1-Aug-17 1-Mar-17	5.039.890.41 4.078.384.66	535612 535001	39,890.41 78,384,66	AtMaturity AtMaturity
19-Mar-18	5,000,000.00	2.4500%	Suncorp Bank	A-1	5,000,000.00 18	18-Aug-17	5,035,239.73	535624	35,239.73	AtMaturity
22-Mar-18	1,000,000.00	2.7000%	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-1+	1,000,000.00 22	22-Mar-17	1,018,789.04	535012	18,789.04	AtMaturity
26-Mar-18	5,000,000.00	2.4500%	Suncorp Bank	A-1	5,000,000.00 18	18-Aug-17	5,035,239.73	535625	35,239.73	AtMaturity
5-Apr-18	5,000,000.00	2.5000%	National Australia Bank	A-1+	5,000,000.00 18-Aug-17	3-Aug-17	5,035,958.90	535623	35,958.90	AtMaturity
10-Apr-18	4,000,000.00	2.4500%	Suncorp Bank	A-1	4,000,000.00 31	31-Aug-17	4,024,701.37	535670	24,701.37	AtMaturity
11-Apr-18	2,000,000.00	2.8500%	Auswide Bank	A-3	2,000,000.00 12	12-Apr-17	2,036,386.30	535179	36,386.30	AtMaturity
17-Apr-18	9,000,000.00	2.5500%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	9,000,000.00 31	31-Aug-17	9,057,846.58	535671	57,846.58	AtMaturity
17-Apr-18	7,000,000.00	2.5500%	Suncorp Bank	A-1	7,000,000.00 28-Sep-17	8-Sep-17	7,031,298.63	535811	31,298.63	AtMaturity
1-May-18	8,000,000.00	2.6000%	ME Bank	A-2	8,000,000.00 31	31-Aug-17	8,052,427.40	535672	52,427.40	AtMaturity
1-May-18	6,000,000.00	2.5500%	Suncorp Bank	A-1	6,000,000.00 28	28-Sep-17	6,026,827.40	535810	26,827.40	AtMaturity
24-May-18	1,000,000.00	2.7500%	ME Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00 26-May-17	-May-17	1,014,239.73	535268	14,239.73	AtMaturity
31-May-18	2,000,000.00	2.7500%	Rural Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00 1	1-Jun-17	2,027,575.34	535279	27,575.34	AtMaturity
7-Jun-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	Credit Union Australia	A-2	2,000,000.00	9-Jun-17	2,026,849.32	535350	26,849.32	AtMaturity
13-Jun-18	6,000,000.00	2.5900%	National Australia Bank	A-1+	6,000,000.00 28	28-Sep-17	6,027,248.22	535809	27,248.22	AtMaturity
13-Jun-18	1,000,000.00	2.7000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00 14-Jun-17	4-Jun-17	1,012,575.34	535359	12,575.34	AtMaturity
28-Jun-18	3,000,000.00	3.0000%	Westpac Group	A-1+	3,000,000.00 29	29-Aug-16	3,023,178.08	534181	23,178.08	Annually
28-Jun-18	4,000,000.00	2.4800%	National Australia Bank	A-1+	4,000,000.00 30	30-Oct-17	4,008,696.99	535898	8,696.99	AtMaturity
2-Jul-18	4,000,000.00	2.5000%	Suncorp Bank	A-1	4,000,000.00 30	30-Oct-17	4,008,767.12	535899	8,767.12	AtMaturity
11-Jul-18	2,000,000.00	2.8200%	National Australia Bank	A-1+	2,000,000.00 11	11-Jan-17	2,050,064.66	534758	50,064.66	Annually
12-Jul-18	4,000,000.00	3.0000%	Westpac Group	A-1+	4,000,000.00 12	12-Aug-16	4,035,835.62	534129	35,835.62	Annually
30-Aug-18	6,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	6,000,000.00 30	30-Nov-17	6,000,427.40	536009	427.40	AtMaturity
4-Sep-18	2,000,000.00	2.6200%	ME Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00 30	30-Nov-17	2,000,143.56	536011	143.56	AtMaturity
9-0ct-18	2,000,000.00	3.1000%	Westpac Group	A-1+	2,000,000.00	7-0ct-16	2,009,002.74	534428	9,002.74	Annually
30-Oct-18	8,000,000.00	2.7000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	8,000,000.00 30	30-Oct-17	8,018,936.99	535896	18,936.99	AtMaturity

PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP
2
÷
Φ
C
G
÷
÷

# 

Floating <b>R</b>	Floating Rate Notes									
Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Current Coupon	Security Name	Credit Rating	Purchase Price (\$)	Purchase Date	Current Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Interest (\$)	Next Coupon Reference Date
27-Feb-18	3,000,000.00	2.8300%	NPBS Snr FRN (Feb18) BBSW+1.10%	A-2	3,000,000.00	27-Feb-15	3,003,572.69	502254	930.41	27-Feb-18
14-Nov-18	3,000,000.00	2.9800%	BEN Snr FRN (Nov18) BBSW+1.27%	A-2	3,000,000.00	7-Nov-13	3,026,423.84	402080	4,163.84	14-Feb-18
25-Feb-19	1,000,000.00	2.6700%	WBC Snr FRN (Feb19) BBSW+0.94%	-AA-	1,000,000.00 14-Feb-14	14-Feb-14	1,007,792.60	421808	292.60	26-Feb-18
29-Apr-19	1,000,000.00	2.8400%	BoQ Snr FRN (Apr19) BBSW+1.15%	BBB+	1,002,330.00	18-Feb-16	1,009,709.86	533203	2,489.86	29-Jan-18
10-May-19	2,000,000.00	2.7100%	WBC Snr FRN (May19) BBSW+1.00%	-AA-	2,000,000.00	11-Mar-16	2,021,318.36	533332	3,118.36	12-Feb-18
28-Oct-19	1,200,000.00	3.0900%	TMB Snr FRN (Oct19) BBSW+1.40%	BBB	1,200,000.00	28-Oct-16	1,204,498.85	534461	3,250.85	29-Jan-18
21-Feb-20	3,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	3,000,000.00 21-Nov-16	21-Nov-16	3,020,947.81	534538	2,317.81	21-Feb-18
24-Feb-20	1,000,000.00	3.1800%	GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	BBB	1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	1,000,607.58	534887	609.86	26-Feb-18
24-Feb-20	1,000,000.00	3.1800%	GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	BBB	1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	1,000,607.58	534888	609.86	26-Feb-18
20-Mar-20	1,500,000.00	3.0100%	CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	BBB	1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	1,515,176.30	534992	8,906.30	20-Dec-17
20-Mar-20	1,500,000.00	3.0100%	CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	BBB	1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	1,515,176.30	534993	8,906.30	20-Dec-17
6-Apr-20	2,000,000.00	2.9450%	ME Bank Snr FRN (Apr20) BBSW+1.25%	BBB	2,000,000.00	6-Apr-17	2,012,556.71	535107	9,036.71	8-Jan-18
18-Aug-20	2,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	2,000,000.00 18-Aug-15	18-Aug-15	2,015,739.73	505171	1,699.73	19-Feb-18
18-Aug-20	1,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	1,000,000.00 18-Aug-15	18-Aug-15	1,007,869.86	505174	849.86	19-Feb-18
18-Aug-20	2,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	2,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	2,015,739.73	505175	1,699.73	19-Feb-18
9-Nov-20	2,000,000.00	2.9550%	ME Bank Snr FRN (Nov20) BBSW+1.25%	BBB	2,000,000.00	9-Nov-17	2,003,462.19	535918	3,562.19	9-Feb-18
18-May-21	1,000,000.00 3.2000%	3.2000%	BoQ Snr FRN (May21) BBSW+1.48%	BBB+	1,000,000.00 18-May-16	18-May-16	1,018,374.38	533606	964.38	19-Feb-18

# Inner West Council

Investment Holdings Report - November 2017



Accrued Coupon Reference Interest (\$) Frequency

> Deal No. 536010 534764 534873 534873 535897

Current Value (\$)

Purchase Purchase Price (\$) Date 5,000,000.00 30-Nov-17

Institution Credit Rating

Rate

Face Value (\$)

Maturity Date

**Term Deposits** 

5,000,000.00 2.6000% 2,000,000.00 3.0000% 2,000,000.00 3.0000% 4,000,000.00 2.9000%

5,000,356.16 2,053,095.89 2,047,671.23

356.16 AtMaturity

Annually Annually Annually

53,095.89

47,671.23 10,169.86

4,010,169.86

4,000,000.00 30-Oct-17

Bendigo and Adelaide Bank

184,000,000.00 2.6568%

30-0ct-19

14-Jan-19 14-Feb-19

29-Nov-18

184,000,000.00

2,000,000.00 12-Jan-17 2,000,000.00 14-Feb-17

A-2 BBB+ AA-BBB+

Bank of Queensland Bank of Queensland Westpac Group 185,814,803.85

1,814,803.85

(* )		
INNER	WEST	COUNCIL

Item 4

### Item 4

### **Inner West Council**

Investment Holdings Report - November 2017

**Floating Rate Notes** 



Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Current Coupon	Security Name	Credit Rating	Purchase Price (\$)	Purchase Purchase Price (\$) Date	Current Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Interest (\$)	Next Coupon Reference Date
16-Aug-22	1,000,000.00 2.6900%	2.6900%	SUN Snr FRN (Aug22) BBSW+0.97%	A+	1,000,000.00 16-Aug-17	16-Aug-17	1,021,605.48	535607	1,105.48	1,105.48 16-Feb-18
	30,200,000.00 2.9042%	2.9042%			30,202,330.00		30,421,179.85		54,514.13	
<b>Fixed Rate Bonds</b>	e Bonds									
Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Coupon	Security Name	Credit Rating	Purchase Price (\$)	Purchase Date	Current Deal No. Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Interest (\$)	Accrued Purchase Reference vield Yield
3-Jun-20	2,000,000.00 3.2500%	3.2500%	ANZ 'Green' Snr Bond (Jun20) 3.25%	AA-	1,987,680.00 3-Jun-15	3-Jun-15	2,070,644.29	505284	31,964.29 3.3850%	3.3850%
	2,000,000.00				1,987,680.00		2,070,644.29		31,964.29 3.3850%	3.3850%

**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 

	Reference			
	Accrued Interest (\$)	370.84	676.71	1,047.56
	Deal No.	310321	310334	
	Current Deal No. Value (\$)	493,148.68 310321	680,676.71 310334	1,173,825.40
	Purchase Date	17-Jul-06	17-Jul-06	
	Purchase Purchase Price (\$) Date	1,000,000.00 17-Jul-06	1,000,000.00 17-Jul-06	2,000,000.00
	Rating	AAA	AA	
	Security Name Rating	623,769.42 2.1700% Emerald Reverse Mortgage (A Tranche)	1,000,000.00 2.4700% Emerald Reverse Mortgage (B Tranche)	
ities	Current Coupon	2.1700%	2.4700%	2.3548%
		2		N
Mortgage Backed Securities	Weighted Face Avg Life Value (\$)	623,769.4	1,000,000.00	1,623,769.42 2.3548%



(N
÷
Φ
Ĉ
C
a
÷
7
<b>A</b>

~ 1

### Item 4

# 

<b>Monthly Accrued Interest</b>									
Asset Type	Deal Number	Entity	Face Value (\$)	Settlement Date	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$)	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
ANZ 'Green' Snr Bond (Jun20) 3.25%	505284		2,000,000.00	3-Jun-15	3-Jun-20	00.00	30	5,357.14	3.25%
Bonds						0.00		5,357.14	3.25%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	535861		527,704.03			476.67	30	476.67	1.10%
Cash						476.67		476.67	1.10%
NPBS Snr FRN (Feb18) BBSW+1.10%	502254		3,000,000.00	27-Feb-15	27-Feb-18	21,017.26	30	6,935.34	2.81%
BEN Snr FRN (Nov18) BBSW+1.27%	402080		3,000,000.00	14-Nov-13	14-Nov-18	22,382.47	30	7,326.58	2.97%
WBC Snr FRN (Feb19) BBSW+0.94%	421808		1,000,000.00	25-Feb-14	25-Feb-19	6,824.66	30	2,180.27	2.65%
BoQ Snr FRN (Apr19) BBSW+1.15%	533203		1,000,000.00	22-Feb-16	29-Apr-19	00.00	30	2,334.25	2.84%
WBC Snr FRN (May19) BBSW+1.00%	53332		2,000,000.00	11-Mar-16	10-May-19	13,560.55	30	4,444.93	2.70%
TMB Snr FRN (Oct19) BBSW+1.40%	534461		1,200,000.00	28-Oct-16	28-Oct-19	00.00	30	3,047.67	3.09%
BEN Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.10%	534538		3,000,000.00	21-Nov-16	21-Feb-20	21,096.99	30	6,904.11	2.80%
GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	534887		1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	24-Feb-20	7,990.14	30	2,607.40	3.17%
GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	534888		1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	24-Feb-20	7,990.14	30	2,607.40	3.17%
CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	534992		1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	20-Mar-20	0.00	30	3,710.96	3.01%
CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	534993		1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	20-Mar-20	0.00	30	3,710.96	3.01%
ME Bank Snr FRN (Apr20) BBSW+1.25%	535107		2,000,000.00	6-Apr-17	6-Apr-20	0.00	30	4,841.10	2.94%
BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	505171		2,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	18-Aug-20	14,370.41	30	4,604.38	2.80%
BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	505174		1,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	18-Aug-20	7,185.21	30	2,302.19	2.80%
BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	505175		2,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	18-Aug-20	14,370.41	30	4,604.38	2.80%
ME Bank Snr FRN (Nov20) BBSW+1.25%	535918		2,000,000.00	9-Nov-17	9-Nov-20	00.00	22	3,562.19	2.96%
BoQ Snr FRN (May21) BBSW+1.48%	533606		1,000,000.00	18-May-16	18-May-21	8,163.84	30	2,614.52	3.18%
SUN Snr FRN (Aug22) BBSW+0.97%	535607		1,000,000.00	16-Aug-17	16-Aug-22	6,704.66	30	2,198.63	2.68%



Inner West Council Accrued Interest Report - November 2017

### **SINNER WEST COUNCIL**

### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

### Item 4

### **Inner West Council**

Accrued Interest Report - November 2017



**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 

<b>Monthly Accrued Interest</b>									
Asset Type	Deal Number	Entity	Face Value (\$)	Settlement Date	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$)	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
Floating Rate Note						151,656.71		70,537.26	2.89%
Emerald Reverse Mortgage (A Tranche)	310321		623,769.42	17-Jul-06	22-Aug-22	3,397.64	30	1,109.46	2.16%
Emerald Reverse Mortgage (B Tranche)	310334		1,000,000.00	17-Jul-06	23-Aug-27	6,150.14	30	2,013.70	2.45%
Mortgage Backed Securities						9,547.77		3,123.16	2.34%
Heritage Bank	535581		1,000,000.00	12-Jul-17	1-Nov-17	7,671.23	0	0.00	
Suncorp Bank	535582		500,000.00	5-Jul-17	1-Nov-17	3,912.33	0	0.00	
Bank of Queensland	535383		2,000,000.00	27-Jun-17	7-Nov-17	18,947.95	9	854.79	2.60%
Bank of Queensland	535580		500,000.00	12-Jul-17	8-Nov-17	4,075.34	7	239.73	2.50%
National Australia Bank	534519		2,000,000.00	10-Nov-16	9-Nov-17	54,849.32	8	1,205.48	2.75%
Bank of Queensland	535462		7,000,000.00	25-Jul-17	28-Nov-17	60,894.25	27	13,048.77	2.52%
Bank of Queensland	534660		2,000,000.00	12-Dec-16	12-Dec-17	0.00	30	4,602.74	2.80%
ME Bank	535325		2,000,000.00	7-Jun-17	12-Dec-17	0.00	30	4,438.36	2.70%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535447		3,000,000.00	15-Jun-17	13-Dec-17	0.00	30	6,534.25	2.65%
ME Bank	535464		8,000,000.00	28-Jul-17	18-Dec-17	0.00	30	16,767.12	2.55%
National Australia Bank	498161		2,500,000.00	16-Dec-14	19-Dec-17	0.00	30	7,500.00	3.65%
Bankwest	534670		3,000,000.00	19-Dec-16	19-Dec-17	0.00	30	6,534.25	2.65%
ME Bank	535326		2,000,000.00	7-Jun-17	19-Dec-17	0.00	30	4,438.36	2.70%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	534756		2,000,000.00	10-Jan-17	10-Jan-18	0.00	30	4,487.67	2.73%
ME Bank	534757		1,000,000.00	11-Jan-17	10-Jan-18	0.00	30	2,301.37	2.80%
Credit Union Australia	534852		2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	10-Jan-18	0.00	30	4,767.12	2.90%
ME Bank	534787		2,000,000.00	18-Jan-17	17-Jan-18	0.00	30	4,602.74	2.80%
Bank of Queensland	535463		8,000,000.00	28-Jul-17	18-Jan-18	0.00	30	17,095.89	2.60%
				PRIDENTIAL					
			INVESTMENT	INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP					

Accrued Interest Report - November 2017

Monthly Accrued Interest									
Asset Type	Deal Number	Entity	Face Value (\$)	Settlement Date	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$)	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
ME Bank	535609		5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	29-Jan-18	0.00	30	10,479.45	2.55%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	534845		2,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	31-Jan-18	0.00	30	4,602.74	2.80%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535610		5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5-Feb-18	0.00	30	10,068.49	2.45%
Bank of Queensland	534807		3,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	6-Feb-18	0.00	30	6,780.82	2.75%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	534853		2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	7-Feb-18	0.00	30	4,602.74	2.80%
ME Bank	535611		5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	12-Feb-18	0.00	30	10,479.45	2.55%
ME Bank	534872		1,000,000.00	14-Feb-17	14-Feb-18	0.00	30	2,219.18	2.70%
Rural Bank	534931		2,500,000.00	2-Mar-17	5-Mar-18	0.00	30	5,547.95	2.70%
Bank of Queensland	535612		5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	12-Mar-18	0.00	30	10,684.93	2.60%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	535001		4,000,000.00	14-Mar-17	14-Mar-18	0.00	30	8,975.34	2.73%
Suncorp Bank	535624		5,000,000.00	18-Aug-17	19-Mar-18	0.00	30	10,068.49	2.45%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	535012		1,000,000.00	22-Mar-17	22-Mar-18	0.00	30	2,219.18	2.70%
Suncorp Bank	535625		5,000,000.00	18-Aug-17	26-Mar-18	0.00	30	10,068.49	2.45%
National Australia Bank	535623		5,000,000.00	18-Aug-17	5-Apr-18	0.00	30	10,273.97	2.50%
Suncorp Bank	535670		4,000,000.00	31-Aug-17	10-Apr-18	0.00	30	8,054.79	2.45%
Auswide Bank	535179		2,000,000.00	12-Apr-17	11-Apr-18	0.00	30	4,684.93	2.85%
Bank of Queensland	535671		9,000,000.00	31-Aug-17	17-Apr-18	0.00	30	18,863.01	2.55%
Suncorp Bank	535811		7,000,000.00	28-Sep-17	17-Apr-18	0.00	30	14,671.23	2.55%
ME Bank	535672		8,000,000.00	31-Aug-17	1-May-18	0.00	30	17,095.89	2.60%
Suncorp Bank	535810		6,000,000.00	28-Sep-17	1-May-18	0.00	30	12,575.34	2.55%
ME Bank	535268		1,000,000.00	26-May-17	24-May-18	0.00	30	2,260.27	2.75%
Rural Bank	535279		2,000,000.00	1-Jun-17	31-May-18	0.00	30	4,520.55	2.75%



INNER WEST COUNCIL

PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

### Item 4

### Inner West Council

Accrued Interest Report - November 2017



**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 

<b>Monthly Accrued Interest</b>									
Asset Type	Deal Number	Entity	Face Value (\$)	Settlement Date	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$)	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
Credit Union Australia	535350		2,000,000.00	9-Jun-17	7-Jun-18	0.00	30	4,602.74	2.80%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535359		1,000,000.00	14-Jun-17	13-Jun-18	0.00	30	2,219.18	2.70%
National Australia Bank	535809		6,000,000.00	28-Sep-17	13-Jun-18	0.00	30	12,772.60	2.59%
Westpac Group	534181		3,000,000.00	29-Aug-16	28-Jun-18	0.00	30	7,397.26	3.00%
National Australia Bank	535898		4,000,000.00	30-Oct-17	28-Jun-18	0.00	30	8,153.42	2.48%
Suncorp Bank	535899		4,000,000.00	30-Oct-17	2-Jul-18	0.00	30	8,219.18	2.50%
National Australia Bank	534758		2,000,000.00	11-Jan-17	11-Jul-18	0.00	30	4,635.62	2.82%
Westpac Group	534129		4,000,000.00	12-Aug-16	12-Jul-18	0.00	30	9,863.01	3.00%
Bank of Queensland	536009		6,000,000.00	30-Nov-17	30-Aug-18	0.00	1	427.40	2.60%
ME Bank	536011		2,000,000.00	30-Nov-17	4-Sep-18	0.00	1	143.56	2.62%
Westpac Group	534428		2,000,000.00	7-0ct-16	9-0ct-18	0.00	30	5,095.89	3.10%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535896		8,000,000.00	30-Oct-17	30-Oct-18	0.00	30	17,753.42	2.70%
Bank of Queensland	536010		5,000,000.00	30-Nov-17	29-Nov-18	0.00	1	356.16	2.60%
Bank of Queensland	534764		2,000,000.00	12-Jan-17	14-Jan-19	0.00	30	4,931.51	3.00%
Westpac Group	534873		2,000,000.00	14-Feb-17	14-Feb-19	0.00	30	4,931.51	3.00%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535897		4,000,000.00	30-Oct-17	30-Oct-19	0.00	30	9,534.25	2.90%
Term Deposit						150,350.41		390,252.60	2.66%
						312,031.57		469,746.84	2.69%





VT 14A

VI 16M

Leb 17

ZT UBC

Dec 16

%00.0

295

LT VON

**71 150** 

	Out
	lex
	3 Inc
	d BE
	Portfolio AusBond BB Index
lary	ΡN
Historical Performance Summary	folio
S.	ort
ŭ	-
ma	
Ę	
Pe	
ical	
itor	
His	

1.09% 1.09% 1.06%

1.63% 1.70% 1.71% 1.71% 1.75%

2.72%

Nov 2017

2.78%

2.79%

2.83%

Financial Year to Date

Last 6 Months Last 3 Months

Last 12 months

2.79%

performance

1.13% 1.04%

AusBond BB Index Annu
nnualised Return

Portfolio An

4.00%

3.00%

2.00%

1.00%

Investment Performance Report - November 2017

**Inner West Council** 

**Annualised Monthly Return** 



Item 4

### Item 4

INNER WEST COUNCIL

### Inner West Council

Environmental Committments Report - November 2017



Accounts

PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

# 

			0%09	80% 100%	NINC					1	0% 20	40	60	80	100
		% of portfolio	rtfolio		NAB					1		% of portfolio	olio		
Portfoli	Portfolio Exposure	Investment Policy Limit	nent Polic	:y Limit		0% 20 % use	40 d vs Investm	20406080% used vs Investment Policy Limit	80 <b>nit</b>	100	Portfolio Exposure	Investment Policy Limit	nent Polic	y Limit	
	Credit Rating	Face Value (\$)		Policy Max					% used vs Investment		Maturity Profile	Face Value (\$)	e ()	Policy Max	
Long Term	A	8,000,000							Policy Limit		Less than 1yr	182,527,704			
I ond Term	AAA	623 769			Bank	Bank of Queensland (A-2, BBB+)	\-2, BBB+)		%96	اری ا	Greater than 1yr	35,823,769	_	- 11	<b>`</b>
		001/030			- Month	dana Panta			040	,	a. Between 1 and 3yrs	32,200,000	Ч	%09	- 1
Short Term	A-1	31,000,000			Memc	Members Equity bank (A-2, bbb)	(A-2, DDD)		24%	<b>.</b>	D. Between 5 and 10vrs C. Between 5 and 10vrs	2,623,769	%1 C	30%0	>>
Short Term	A-1+	39,027,704			Bendi	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank (A-2, BBB+)	Bank (A-2, BB	B+)	82%	>		218,351,473			
		78,651,473	36% 100%	100% ~	Sunco	Suncorp Bank (A-1, A+)	Ŷ		49%	<u>ъ</u>	Detailed Maturity Profile		Face Value (\$)	Face	
Long Term	A	1,000,000			Natio	National Australia Bank (A-1+, AA-)	k (A-1+, AA-)		20%	) )	00. Cash + Managed Funds		527,704	704	%0
Short Term	A-2	110,500,000			Credit	Credit Union Australia (A-2, BBB)	(A-2, BBB)		16%	>	01. Less Than 30 Days		22,500,000		10%
		111,500,000	51%	70% ~	Worts	Machase Group (A-1+ AA-)	1-00		1 10/2	, o	02. Between 30 Days and 60 Days	Days	15,000,000	000	7%
Long Term	BBB	26,200,000			AV COL		1-111		0/ 1-1		03. Between 60 Days and 90 Days	Days	26,000,000		12%
		26.200.000	12%	20%	Comn	Commonwealth Bank of Australia (A-1+, AA-)	of Australia (A	-1+, AA-)	11%	>	04. Between 90 Days and 180 Days	0 Days	64,500,000		30%
t Taring	C V				Rural	Rural Bank (A-2, BBB+)	(-		10%	>	05. Between 180 Days and 365 Days	65 Days	54,000,000		25%
	C-4	z,000,000			Great	Greater Building Society (A-2, BBB)	V (A-7 RR)		00V	,	06. Between 365 Days and 3 Years	Years	32,200,000		15%
		2,000,000	1%	× %0	dicar		(000 'Z-W) 4-		0/ 0	1	07. Between 3 Years and 5 Years	ears	2,623,769		1%
	2	218,351,473 100%	100%		Newc	Newcastle Permanent Building Society (A-2, BBB)	Building Societ	:y (A-2, BBB)	7%	>	08. Between 5 Years and 10 Years	Years	1,000,000	000	%0
					Teach	Teachers Mutual Bank (A-2, BBB)	(A-2, BBB)		5%	>		21	218,351,473	73	
	= = > X	= compliant = non-compliant			ANZ 0	ANZ Group (A-1+, AA-)			3%	>					

# Inner West Council

Investment Policy Compliance Report - November 2017



**Term to Maturities** 

Individual Institutional Exposures

<1yr >1yr

>1yr, <3yrs >3yr, <5yrs

MEB BEN

BoQ

**Total Credit Exposure** 

A-1, A-1+, AA, AAA

BBB A-3

A, A-2

### INNER WEST COUNCIL

### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

Item 4

### Item 4

### **Inner West Council**

Individual Institutional Exposures Report - November 2017

INNER WEST	

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

Individual	Individual Institutional Expo	Exposures		Individual Institutional Exposure Charts	tional Exposure	Charts				
				100,000,000	-	-		-	-	
Parent Group	<b>Credit Rating</b>	Portfolio Exposure (\$)	Portfolio Investment Exposure (\$) Policy Limit (\$)	80.000.000						
ANZ Group	A-1+, AA-	2,000,000	65,505,442							
Auswide Bank	A-3, BBB-	2,000,000	0	60,000,000				T		
Bank of Queensland	A-2, BBB+	42,000,000	43,670,295							
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2, BBB+	36,000,000	43,670,295	40,000,000						
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-1+, AA-	10,527,704	98,258,163					1		
Credit Union Australia	A-2, BBB	7,000,000	43,670,295	20,000,000				T		
Emerald Reverse Mortgage (A Tranche)	AAA	623,769	98,258,163	c		_				
Emerald Reverse Mortgage (B Tranche)	AA	1,000,000	65,505,442	Do N3 Ms ZN	1	84	ง รย	NU	84	sс
Greater Building Society	A-2, BBB	2,000,000	21,835,147	enA 8 8 78-A					Ц	M
Members Equity Bank	A-2, BBB	41,000,000	43,670,295	CB						
National Australia Bank	A-1+, AA-	19,500,000	98,258,163	Investment Policy Limit	: Policy Limit					
Newcastle Permanent Building Society	A-2, BBB	3,000,000	43,670,295							
Rural Bank	A-2, BBB+	4,500,000	43,670,295							
Suncorp Bank	A-1, A+	32,000,000	65,505,442							
Teachers Mutual Bank	A-2, BBB	1,200,000	21,835,147	BoQ	BoQ 19.24%					
Westpac Group	A-1+, AA-	14,000,000	98,258,163	CBA-BWA 4.82% CIIA 3.21%		BEN 1	BEN 16.49%			
		218,351,473								
				MEB 18.78%		WB	WBC 6.41%	%		
					Ū	SLIN 14 66%	/0/			
				NAB 8.93%	Other 7.49%		2			

### Item 4

# 

				COUNCIL
Current Month Cashflows				
Transaction Date Deal No.	Cashflow Counterparty	Asset Type	Cashflow Description Ca	<b>Cashflow Received</b>
1-Nov-17 535581	Heritage Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	7,671.23
	Heritage Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	1,000,000.00
			Deal Total	1,007,671.23
535582	Suncorp Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	3,912.33
	Suncorp Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	500,000.00
			<u>Deal Total</u>	503,912.33
			Day Total	1,511,583.56
7-Nov-17 535383	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	18,947.95
	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			<u>Deal Total</u>	2,018,947.95
			Day Total	2,018,947.95
8-Nov-17 535580	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	4,075.34
	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	500,000.00
			<u>Deal Total</u>	504,075.34
			Day Total	504,075.34
9-Nov-17 534519	National Australia Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	54,849.32
	National Australia Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			<u>Deal Total</u>	2,054,849.32
535918	ME Bank	Floating Rate Note	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-2,000,000.00
			<u>Deal Total</u>	-2,000,000.00
			Day Total	54,849.32
10-Nov-17 533332	Westpac Group	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	13,560.55
			<u>Deal Total</u>	13,560.55
			Day Total	13,560.55
14-Nov-17 402080	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	22,382.47
			<u>Deal Total</u>	22,382.47
			Day Total	22,382.47
16-Nov-17 535607	Suncorn Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	6 704 66



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Council Meeting 13 February 2018

### Item 4



Cash Flows Report - November 2017



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Current Month Cashflows				
Transaction Date Deal No.	Cashflow Counterparty	Asset Type	Cashflow Description Cas	<b>Cashflow Received</b>
			Deal Total	6,704.66
			Day Total	6,704.66
20-Nov-17 505171	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	14,370.41
			Deal Total	14,370.41
505174	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	7,185.21
			<u>Deal Total</u>	7,185.21
505175	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	14,370.41
			<u>Deal Total</u>	14,370.41
533606	Bank of Queensland	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	8,163.84
			<u>Deal Total</u>	8,163.84
			Day Total	44,089.86
21-Nov-17 310321	Emerald Reverse Mortgage (A Tranche)	Mortgage Backed Securities	Coupon - Received	3,397.64
	Emerald Reverse Mortgage (A Tranche)	Mortgage Backed Securities	Amortised Face Value - Received	6,125.79
			Deal Total	9,523.43
310334	Emerald Reverse Mortgage (B Tranche)	Mortgage Backed Securities	Coupon - Received	6,150.14
			Deal Total	6,150.14
534538	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	21,096.99
			<u>Deal Total</u>	21,096.99
			Day Total	36,770.55
24-Nov-17 534887	Greater Building Society	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	7,990.14
			Deal Total	7,990.14
534888	Greater Building Society	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	7,990.14
			<u>Deal Total</u>	7,990.14
			Day Total	15,980.27
27-Nov-17 421808	Westpac Group	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	6,824.66
			Deal Total	6,824.66
502254	Newcastle Permanent Building Society	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	21,017.26
			Deal Total	21,017.26
	INVESTMEN			



Council Meeting 13 February 2018

Transaction Date Deal No. Cashflo   4-Dec-17 505284 Al   12-Dec-17 534660 Ba	Cashflow Counterparty ANZ Banking Group Bank of Ouesneland	<u>Asset Type</u> Bonds	<b>Cashflow Description</b>	Cashflow Due
505284 534660	NZ Banking Group	Bonds		
534660	brelanded of An		Coupon - Received	32,500.00
534660	hadanaan fa du		Deal Total	32,500.00
534660	nk of Oueencland		Day Total	32,500.00
	IIIN OF QUESTISIATIO	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	56,000.00
Ba	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			Deal Total	2,056,000.00
535325	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	27,813.70
	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			Deal Total	2,027,813.70
			Day Total	4,083,813.70
13-Dec-17 535447 Bendigo a	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	39,423.29
Bendigo a	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	3,000,000.00
			Deal Total	3,039,423.29

<b>Current Month Cashflows</b>	ashflows				
Transaction Date Deal No.	Deal No.	Cashflow Counterparty	Asset Type	Cashflow Description Cashflow Received	Cashflow Received
				Day Total	27,841.92
28-Nov-17	535462	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	60,894.25
		Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	7,000,000.00
				Deal Total	7,060,894.25
				Day Total	7,060,894.25
30-Nov-17	536009	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-6,000,000.00
				Deal Total	-6,000,000.00
	536010	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-5,000,000.00
				Deal Total	-5,000,000.00
	536011	ME Bank	Term Deposits	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-2,000,000.00
				Deal Total	-2,000,000.00
				Day Total	-13,000,000.00
			21	<u>Net Cash Movement for Period</u>	-1,682,319.31



Cash Flows Report - November 2017

**Inner West Council** 

### INNER WEST COUNCIL

### **32,319.31** hflow Due 32,500.00 <u>32,500.00</u> 56,000.00 56,000.00

### Item 4



Cash Flows Report - November 2017



**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

Next Month Cashflows				
Transaction Date Deal No.	<u>Cashflow Counterparty</u>	Asset Type	<b>Cashflow Description</b>	<b>Cashflow Due</b>
			Day Total	3,039,423.29
18-Dec-17 498161	National Australia Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	91,750.00
			Deal Total	91,750.00
535464	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	79,923.29
	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	8,000,000.00
			Deal Total	8,079,923.29
			Day Total	8,171,673.29
<b>19-Dec-17</b> 498161	National Australia Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	250.00
	National Australia Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,500,000.00
			Deal Total	2,500,250.00
534670	Bankwest	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	79,500.00
	Bankwest	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	3,000,000.00
			Deal Total	3,079,500.00
535326	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	28,849.32
	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			Deal Total	2,028,849.32
			Day Total	7,608,599.32
20-Dec-17 534992	Credit Union Australia	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	11,256.58
			Deal Total	11,256.58
534993	Credit Union Australia	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	11,256.58
			Deal Total	11,256.58
			Day Total	22,513.15
			Net Cash Movement for Period	22,958,522.74







PRUDENTIAL

INVESTMENT SERVICES COR



With the low inflation environment now expected to be in place for another 18 months or so, the market is pricing in no change to the official cash rate for all of 2018:









Item No: C0218 Item 5

### Subject: INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2017

Prepared By: Brendhan Barry - Manager Financial Services

Authorised By: Michael Tzimoulas - Deputy General Manager Chief Financial and Administration Officer

### SUMMARY

In accordance with the requirements of clause 212 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005, Council is provided with a listing of all investments made pursuant to section 625 of the Local Government Act 1993 and reported for period ending 31 December 2017.

### RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report be received and noted.

### BACKGROUND

Clause 212 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 requires that a report be presented to Council each month listing all investments with a certification from the Responsible Accounting Officer. Attached to this report are further reports from Council's Investment Advisors, Prudential Investment Services.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Investment Holdings report (**Attachment 1**) for the period ending 31 December 2017 reflects Council's holding in various investment categories these are listed in the table below. Council's portfolio size sits at \$210m of which 86% was rated A rated or above.

### **VINNER WEST COUNCIL**

ADI Lending Status *	Current Month (\$	) Previous Mont	th (\$)
Fossil Fuel Lending ADIs			
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	11,528,195	10,527,704	
National Australia Bank	17,000,000	19,500,000	
Westpac Group	14,000,000	14,000,000	
	42,528,195 20%	6 44,027,704	20%
Non Fossil Fuel Lending ADIs			
ANZ Group (Green)	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Auswide Bank	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Bank of Queensland	42,000,000	42,000,000	
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	33,000,000	36,000,000	
Credit Union Australia	7,000,000	7,000,000	
Greater Building Society	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Members Equity Bank	38,000,000	41,000,000	
Newcastle Permanent Building Society	3,000,000	3,000,000	
Non ADI	1,623,769	1,623,769	
Rural Bank	4,500,000	4,500,000	
Suncorp Bank	32,000,000	32,000,000	
Teachers Mutual Bank	1,200,000	1,200,000	
	168,323,769 80%	6 174,323,769	80%
	210,851,964	218,351,473	

\* source: http://www.marketforces.org.au



**Investment Performance** 



Council's annualised return of continues to exceed the bank bill index benchmark. The period ending 31 December 2017, the portfolio for Inner West Council had a One-Month Portfolio Investment Return (2.80%) was above the UBSWA Bank Bill Index Benchmark (1.70%).



Council has a well-diversified portfolio with 86% of the portfolio spread among the top three credit rating categories (A long term / A2 short term and higher).



### **Individual Exposures**



Council has a well-diversified portfolio invested among a range of term deposits and floating rate notes from highly rated Australian ADIs. The graph above shows Council's individual institution exposure compared with the investment policy limits.



The graph above demonstrates the term to maturity for Council's investments compared to Council's approved investment policy limits.

### **Environmental Commitments**





The graph above illustrates the gap between yields received from Fossil Fuel versus Non Fossil Fuel Investments. The Big 4 banks (which comprise the FF investments) continue to provide a higher interest rate yield in the current economic environment within Council's investment portfolio.



Council's holdings in Non-Fossil investments were \$168.3m with the relative total portfolio percentage of 80% in Non-Fossil investments. The attachments to this report summarise all investments held by Council and interest returns for periods ending 31 December 2017.



The Current Market value is required to be accounted for by the accounting. The Current Market Value is a likely outcome if Council were to consider recalling the investment prior to its due date.

All investments made for the month of December 2017 have been made in accordance with the Local Government Act, Local Government Regulations and the Inner West Council Investment Policy.

### ATTACHMENTS

- 1.4 IWC Dec17 summary
- 2. UWC Dec17
- **3.** IWC Economic and Investment Portfolio Commentary Dec 17







**Investment Summary Report** December 2017



### **INNER WEST COUNCIL**

**Inner West Council** 



### Item 5

### Inner West Council

Environmental Committments Report - December 2017



INNER WEST COUNCIL



### **SINNER WEST COUNCIL**

Item 5





**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 



Investment Summary Report December 2017 Council Meeting 13 February 2018

# 



# Bloomberg BB Index Annualised Return

1%

2.6781

2.3548 2.6392

1,177,072.82 178,311,112.61 212,517,517.40

1,623,769.42

Mortgage Backed Security

Term Deposit

176,500,000.00 210,851,963.95

100 8 8 % of portfolio \$ ន %0 >3yr, <5yrs >5yr, <10yrs MBC **BMT** NNS หกษ S8dN 8AN MEB SBD g pjw3 A blm3 AUD CBA-BWA BoQ 8EN WsuA ZNA MO 20M 100% 80% Investment Policy Limit %09 **Total Credit Exposure** 40% 16% 20% FF ADIs BBB 12% A-3 1% %0 A, A-2 A-1, A-1+, AA, AAA NFF ADIS

### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

Item 5



INNER WEST

vestment Performance

	Investment Holdings	ings			Ę
By Product	Face Value (\$)	Current Value (\$)	Current Yield (%)	4%	
Bonds	2,000,000.00	2,035,420.00	3.2500	700	
Cash	528,194.53	528,194.53	1.1000	0/.0	
Floating Rate Note	30,200,000.00	30,465,717.44	2.9127		
Mortoade Backed Security	1 623 769 42	1 177 077 82	2 3548	2%	

Executive Summary - December 2017

**Inner West Council** 

### Item 5

### **Inner West Council**

Investment Holdings Report - December 2017

**Cash Accounts** 



**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

	Face Value (\$)	Current Yield	Institution	Credit Rating			Current Value (\$)	Deal No.		Reference
	528,194.53	1.1000%	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-1+			528,194.53	535861		
	528,194.53	1.1000%					528,194.53			
<b>Ferm Deposits</b>	osits									
Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Rate	Institution	Credit Rating	Purchase Price (\$)	Purchase Date	Current Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Coupon Interest (\$) Frequency	Coupon Reference
10-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.7300%	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-1+	2,000,000.00	10-Jan-17	2,053,253.70	534756	53,253.70	AtMaturity
10-Jan-18	1,000,000.00	2.8000%	ME Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00	11-Jan-17	1,027,232.88	534757	27,232.88	AtMaturity
10-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.9000%	Credit Union Australia	A-2	2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	2,052,120.55	534852	52,120.55	AtMaturity
17-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	ME Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	18-Jan-17	2,053,391.78	534787	53,391.78	AtMaturity
18-Jan-18	8,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	8,000,000.00	28-Jul-17	8,089,468.49	535463	89,468.49	AtMaturity
29-Jan-18	5,000,000.00	2.5500%	ME Bank	A-2	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5,049,952.05	535609	49,952.05	AtMaturity
31-Jan-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	2,051,397.26	534845	51,397.26	AtMaturity
5-Feb-18	5,000,000.00	2.4500%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5,047,993.15	535610	47,993.15	AtMaturity
6-Feb-18	3,000,000.00	2.7500%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	3,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	3,075,719.18	534807	75,719.18	AtMaturity
7-Feb-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	2,050,323.29	534853	50,323.29	AtMaturity
12-Feb-18	5,000,000.00	2.5500%	ME Bank	A-2	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5,049,952.05	535611	49,952.05	AtMaturity
14-Feb-18	1,000,000.00	2.7000%	ME Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00 14-Feb-17	14-Feb-17	1,023,745.21	534872	23,745.21	AtMaturity
5-Mar-18	2,500,000.00	2.7000%	Rural Bank	A-2	2,500,000.00	2-Mar-17	2,556,404.11	534931	56,404.11	Annually
12-Mar-18	5,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5,050,931.51	535612	50,931.51	AtMaturity
14-Mar-18	4,000,000.00	2.7300%	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-1+	4,000,000.00	14-Mar-17	4,087,659.18	535001	87,659.18	AtMaturity
19-Mar-18	5,000,000.00	2.4500%	Suncorp Bank	A-1	5,000,000.00	18-Aug-17	5,045,643.84	535624	45,643.84	AtMaturity
22-Mar-18	1,000,000.00	2.7000%	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	A-1+	1,000,000.00	22-Mar-17	1,021,082.19	535012	21,082.19	AtMaturity

### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

45,643.84 AtMaturity

AtMaturity AtMaturity

46,575.34 33,024.66

535623 535670

535625

5,045,643.84 5,046,575.34 4,033,024.66

5,000,000.00 18-Aug-17 5,000,000.00 18-Aug-17 4,000,000.00 31-Aug-17

A-1 A-1+ A-1

Suncorp Bank National Australia Bank Suncorp Bank

5,000,000.00 2.4500%

26-Mar-18 5-Apr-18 10-Apr-18

2.5000% 2.4500%

4,000,000.00 5,000,000.00

PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

### Item 5

# 

HattiffFace balanceRate balanceInstitutionRate balanceCurches ba	<b>Term Deposits</b>	psits								
Display Display A-3 Sp00,0000 S 3-Amg-17 S 401,2333-5   7,000,0000 S 5500% Bank of Queensland A-2 9,000,0000 S 4-Amg-17 2,041,333-5   7,000,0000 S 5500% Bank of Queensland A-2 9,000,0000 S 4-Bm-17 7,046,458-90   8,000,0000 S 5500% ME Bank A-1 6,000,000 S 4-m-17 2,045,458-90   1,000,0000 S 5500% ME Bank A-2 1,000,000 S 4-m-17 2,032,445-58   2,000,0000 S 5500% Meral Bank A-2 2,000,000 S 4-m-17 2,016,548   2,000,0000 S 5500% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-1 4,000,000 S 4-m-47 2,014,654   1,000,0000 S 5500% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-1 4,000,000 S 4-m-47 2,014,02743   1,000,0000 S 5500% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-1 4,000,000 S 4-m-47 2,000,000   1,000,0000 S 5500% Benkord Queensland A-2 1,000,0000 S 5-m-47 2,0	Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Rate	Institution	<b>Credit</b> Rating	Purc	Current Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Interest (\$)	Accrued Coupon Reference Interest (\$) Frequency
Jonotoon	11-Apr-18	2.000.000.00	2.8500%	Auswide Bank Bank of Outpand	A-3		2.041.227.40	535179	41.227.40	AtMaturity
8,000,0000 5600% Member of bound A.2 8,000,0000 31.4ug-17 8,070,093.15   6,000,0000 25500% Wneorp Bank A-1 6,000,000.00 25494.7 1,016,575.34   1,000,000.00 2.7500% Wneorp Bank A-2 1,000,000.00 2,932,246.58   2,000,000.00 2.8000% Credit Union Australia A+2 2,000,000.00 2,91un-17 2,032,246.58   2,000,000.00 2.8000% National Australia A+2 2,000,000.00 2,91un-17 2,032,246.58   1,000,000.00 2.8000% National Australia A+2 2,000,000.00 2,014,445.88   1,000,000.00 2.5900% Bank of Queensiank A-1 4,000,000.00 2,044,445.88   1,000,000.00 2.5900% Bank of Queensiank A-1 4,000,000.00 2,022,445.89   1,000,000.00 2.5900% Bank of Queensiank A-1 4,000,000.00 2,022,445.89   1,000,000.00 2.5000% Bank of Queensiank A-1 4,000,000.00 2,024,445.89   1,000,000.00 <td< td=""><td>17-Anr-18</td><td>2 000 000 000 00</td><td>2 5500%</td><td>Suncorn Bank</td><td>A-1</td><td></td><td>7 046 458 90</td><td>535811</td><td>46.458.90</td><td>AtMaturity</td></td<>	17-Anr-18	2 000 000 000 00	2 5500%	Suncorn Bank	A-1		7 046 458 90	535811	46.458.90	AtMaturity
6,000,000.102:550%Suncorp BankA-16,000,000.002:5-Be-176,039,21321,000,000.102:750%ME BankA-21,000,000.0026-May-171,016,575.342,000,000.002:750%Kural BankA-22,000,000.001-Jun-172,032,246.582,000,000.002:500%Credit Union AustraliaA-22,000,000.002-Jun-172,031,605.486,000,000.002:500%National Australia BankA-16,000,000.002-Jun-172,031,605.481,000,000.002:500%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-21,000,000.002-Sep-174,001,712.331,000,000.002:500%BankwestA-14,000,000.002-Sep-171,014,864.491,000,000.002:500%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.002-Sep-174,007,712.333,000,000.002:500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000.002-May-163,036,821.924,000,000.002:500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000.002-May-164,017,122.194,000,000.002:500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000.002-Sep-174,017,122.194,000,000.002:500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000.002-Cec174,017,122.194,000,000.002:500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000.002-Cec174,017,122.191,000,000.002:500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000.002-Cec174,017,123.191,000,000.002:500%Bank of Queens	1-May-18	8,000,000.00	2.6000%	ME Bank	A-2		8,070,093.15	535672	70,093.15	AtMaturity
1,000,000:002.7500%ME BankA-21,000,000:001-Jun-171,016,575.342,000,000:002.500%Credit Union AustraliaA-22,000,000:009-Jun-172,032,46.582,000,000:002.5900%National AustraliaA-22,000,000:009-Jun-172,031,605.486,000,000:002.5900%National Australia BankA-16,000,000:0014-Jun-171,014,866.491,000,000:002.5500%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-14,000,000:0028-Sep-176,040,445.581,000,000:002.5500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000:0028-Sep-171,000,712.333,000,000:002.5500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000:0029-Mar-164,000,712.333,000,000:002.5500%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000:0029-Mar-164,007,712.333,000,000:002.5000%0.0002.00020-00-171,000,712.334,000,000:002.5000%2.4800%National Australia BankA-14,000,000:0029-Mar-164,017,122.194,000,000:002.5000%2.4800%National Australia BankA-14,000,000:0029-Cot-174,017,122.194,000,000:002.500%2.500%0.00029-Mar-164,017,122.192,017,2034,000,000:002.500%2.4800%National Australia BankA-14,0002,0002,017,2034,000,000:002.500%2.500%2.500%2.500%2,000%2,004%2,005,405%1,00	1-May-18	6,000,000.00	2.5500%	Suncorp Bank	A-1		6,039,821.92	535810	39,821.92	AtMaturity
2,000,000.00 $2.7500%$ Rural Bank $A-2$ $2,000,000.00$ $1-1nn-17$ $2,032,245.58$ $2,000,000.00$ $2.800%$ National Australia $A-1$ $6,000,000.00$ $9-1nn-17$ $2,031,605.48$ $6,000,000.00$ $2.5900%$ National Australia Bank $A-1$ $6,000,000.00$ $28-5ep-17$ $6,004,46.58$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.500%$ Bendigo and Adelaide Bank $A-2$ $1,000,000.00$ $28-5ep-17$ $1,014,868.49$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.500%$ Bendigo and Adelaide Bank $A-1$ $4,000,000.00$ $2-5-6p-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.500%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000.00$ $2-5-6p-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $3,000,000.00$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000.00$ $2-5-6p-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000.00$ $2-6-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000.00$ $2-6-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000.00$ $2-600%$ $2-6-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000.00$ $2-6-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $2,000,000.00$ $2-600%$ $2-6-17$ $1,000,712.33$ $1,000,000.00$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $2,000,000.00$ $2-600%$ $2-600%$	24-May-18	1,000,000.00	2.7500%	ME Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00 26-May-17	1,016,575.34	535268	16,575.34	AtMaturity
2,000,000:0 2.900,000:0 2.900,000:0 2.900,000:0 2.900,000:0 2.900,000:0 2.900,000:0 2.900,46:58   6,000,000:0 2:590% National Australia Bank A:1 6,000,000:0 28-58-17 6,001,46:58   1,000,000:0 2:500% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A:2 1,000,000:0 24-96-17 1,014,868.49   1,000,000:0 2:500% Bank of Queensiand A:2 1,000,000:0 22-56-17 1,000,712:33   3,000,000:0 2:500% Bank of Queensiand A:1 4,000,000:0 2-9-449 4,000,712:33   3,000,000:0 2:600% Bank of Queensiand A:1 4,000,000:0 2-9-449 4,017,122:19   1,000,000:0 2:600% Bank of Queensiand A:1 4,000,000:0 2-6-617 4,017,122:19   1,000,000:0 2:000,000:0 2:000,000:0 2-5-667 4,017,122:19 2,000,000:0   1,000,000:0 2:000% 2:000,000:0 2-600% 2-600% 2-600% 2-66477 2,017,1251.19   1,0000,000:0 2:000% 2:00% </td <td>31-May-18</td> <td>2,000,000.00</td> <td>2.7500%</td> <td>Rural Bank</td> <td>A-2</td> <td></td> <td>2,032,246.58</td> <td>535279</td> <td>32,246.58</td> <td>AtMaturity</td>	31-May-18	2,000,000.00	2.7500%	Rural Bank	A-2		2,032,246.58	535279	32,246.58	AtMaturity
6,000,000:02:590%National Australia BankA-16,000,000:02:590%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-21,000,000:02:4-Inr-171,014,868.491,000,000:02:500%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-21,000,000:02:0-ec-174,002,794.521,000,000:002:600%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000:02:0-ec-174,002,794.523,000,000:002:600%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000:02:0-ec-174,002,794.524,000,000:002:600%National Australia BankA-14,000,000:02:0-ec-174,017,12.334,000,000:002:5000%National Australia BankA-14,000,000:02:0-6c-174,017,12.334,000,000:002:5000%0:0-000:002:000,000:02:0-0c-174,017,12.332,007,100:001,000,000:002:5000%0:0-000:002:0-0c-174,017,12.332,007,100:002:0-6c-174,017,12.331,000,000:002:5000%0:0-000:002:0-0c-174,017,12.332,007,000:002:0-6c-174,017,12.331,000,000:002:5000%0:0-000:002:0-0c-172,000,000:002:0-6c-174,017,12.331,000,000:002:5000%0:0-000:000:0-000:002:0-6c-174,017,12.331,000,000:002:5000%0:0-000:000:0-000:000:0-6c-172,007,12.331,000,000:002:000%0:0-000:000:0-000:000:0-000:000:0-6c-172,007,12.331,000,000:002:000%0:0-00%0:0-00%0:0-00% </td <td>7-Jun-18</td> <td>2,000,000.00</td> <td>2.8000%</td> <td>Credit Union Australia</td> <td>A-2</td> <td></td> <td>2,031,605.48</td> <td>535350</td> <td>31,605.48</td> <td>AtMaturity</td>	7-Jun-18	2,000,000.00	2.8000%	Credit Union Australia	A-2		2,031,605.48	535350	31,605.48	AtMaturity
1,000,000:0 $2.700%$ Bendigo and Adelaide Bank $A-2$ $1,000,000:0$ $1.014,868,49$ $4,000,000:0$ $2.5500%$ Bank of Queensland $A-2$ $1,000,000:0$ $2.500%$ $4,002,794,52$ $1,000,000:0$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-2$ $1,000,000:0$ $2.000;12:33$ $3,000,000:0$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000:0$ $2.000;17:33$ $3,000,000:0$ $2.600%$ National Australia Bank $A-1$ $4,000,000:0$ $2.0-0c+17$ $4,017,122:19$ $4,000,000:0$ $2.600%$ National Australia Bank $A-1$ $4,000,000:0$ $2.0-0c+17$ $4,017,122:19$ $1,000,000:0$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-2$ $1,000,000:0$ $2.0-0c+17$ $4,017,123:19$ $1,000,000:00:0$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000:0$ $2.0-0c+17$ $4,017,123:19$ $1,000,000:00:0$ $2.600%$ Bank of Queensland $A-1$ $4,000,000:0$ $2.0-0c+17$ $4,017,123:19$ $2,000,000:00:0$ $2.8200%$ National Australia Bank $A-1$ $2,000,000:0$ $2.0-0c+17$ $4,017,123:19$ $2,000,000:00:02.8200%National Australia BankA-12,000,000:02.0-0c+172,054,854,792,000,000:00:02.8200%National Australia BankA-12,000,000:02.0-0c+172,054,854,792,000,000:00:02.8200%National Australia BankA-12,000,000:02.000,900:02.000,900:02,000,000:00:02.0000,00$	13-Jun-18	6,000,000.00	2.5900%	National Australia Bank	A-1+		6,040,446.58	535809	40,446.58	AtMaturity
4,000,000.02.5500%BankwestA-14,000,000.02Dec-174,002,794.521,000,000.02.6000%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.022-Dec-171,000,712.333,000,000.003.0000%0.3000%2.4800%National Australia BankA-1+4,000,000.0029-Aug-163,030,81224,000,000.002.4800%National Australia BankA-1+4,000,000.003,000,712.334,017,122.194,000,000.002.5000%National Australia BankA-14,000,000.003,000,712.334,017,223.191,000,000.002.5000%National Australia BankA-14,000,000.0022-Dec-174,017,223.191,000,000.002.6000%National Australia BankA-14,000,000.0022-Dec-174,017,223.192,000,000.002.6000%0.5000%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002,054.4792,000,000.002.8200%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002,014.563.792,000,000.002.8200%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002,014.563.792,000,000.002.6600%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002,014.563.792,000,000.002.6600%2.6600%Nestpac GroupA-22,000,000.0030-Nov-176,013.667.192,000,000.002.6600%2.6600%2.6600%Nestpac GroupA-22,000,000.0030-Nov-172,044.593.572,000,000.002.6600%2.6000%2.700%30-Nov-172,044.593.5	13-Jun-18	1,000,000.00	2.7000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2	1,000,000.00 14-Jun-17	1,014,868.49	535359	14,868.49	AtMaturity
1,000,000.012.600%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.012.2-Dec-171,000,712.333,000,000.013.000%Westpec GroupA-143,000,000.013-40g-163,038,21.924,000,000.012.4800%National Australia BankA-144,000,000.013-0-ct-174,017,122.194,000,000.012.5000%Bank of QueenslandA-14,000,000.0130-ct-174,017,263.214,000,000.012.5000%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.0122-Dec-171,000,712.339,000,000.012.5000%Bank of QueenslandA-29,000,000.0110-007.129,06410.962,000,000.012.8200%National Australia BankA-142,000,000.0111-Jan-172,054,854.792,000,000.012.8200%National Australia BankA-144,000,000.012,064,10.962,000,000.012.8200%National Australia BankA-144,000,000.012,054,603.972,000,000.012.8200%National Australia BankA-144,000,000.012,044,633.972,000,000.012.8200%National Australia BankA-144,000,000.012,044,633.972,000,000.012.8000%0.8000%Nestpac GroupA-144,000,000.012,044,633.972,000,000.012.6200%National Australia BankA-22,000,000.012,044,533.972,000,000.012.600%0.800%Nestpac GroupA-142,000,000.012,044,533.972,000,000.012.600%2.700%National Australia Bank	19-Jun-18	4,000,000.00	2.5500%	Bankwest	A-1+		4,002,794.52	536097	2,794.52	AtMaturity
3,000,000.03.000%0.00%0.2-Aug-163,030,821:924,000,000.002.4800%National Australia BankA-14,000,000.0030-0ct-174,017,122.194,000,000.002.5000%National Australia BankA-14,000,000.0030-0ct-174,017,126.191,000,000.002.5000%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.0020-0ct-171,000,712.331,000,000.002.5000%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.0020-0ct-171,000,712.339,000,000.002.5000%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002,054,854.792,000,000.002.8000%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002,045,037.404,000,000.002.8000%3.0000%0.11-Jan-172,054,854.792,000,000.002.6000%0.8000%0.12-Aug-164,046,027.402,000,000.002.6000%0.8000%0.12-Aug-164,046,027.402,000,000.002.6000%0.8000%0.12-Aug-162,014,568.492,000,000.002.0000%0.1000.000.12-Aug-162,014,568.492,000,000.002.000%0.000%0.000%0.000%0.004,593.572,000,000.002.000%0.000%0.000%0.000%0.044,593.572,000,000.002.000%0.000%0.00%0.00%0.044,593.572,000,000.002.000%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.044,593.572,000,000.002.00%0.00%0.00%0.00%0.044,593.572,000,000.00 <td>19-Jun-18</td> <td>1,000,000.00</td> <td>2.6000%</td> <td>Bank of Queensland</td> <td>A-2</td> <td></td> <td>1,000,712.33</td> <td>536098</td> <td>712.33</td> <td>AtMaturity</td>	19-Jun-18	1,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2		1,000,712.33	536098	712.33	AtMaturity
4,000,000 $2.4800%$ National Australia Bank $A-1$ $4,000,000.0$ $3-0-ct-17$ $4,017,250.27$ $4,000,000.0$ $2.5000%$ $2.5000%$ $Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.03-0-ct-174,017,260.271,000,000.02.6000%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000.02-bec-171,000,712.339,000,000.002.6000%Bank of QueenslandA-29,000,000.002-bec-179,006,410.962,000,000.002.8000%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002-bec-179,006,410.962,000,000.002.8000%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002-bec-172,054,854.794,000,000.002.6000%National Australia BankA-12,000,000.002-bec-172,045,93.744,000,000.002.6000%2.6000%A-12,000,000.002-bec-172,045,93.772,000,000.002.6000%National Australia BankA-22,000,000.002-bec-172,045,93.772,000,000.002.6000%A-2A-22,000,000.002-bec-172,045,93.772,000,000.002.6000%A-2A-22,000,000.002-bec-172,045,93.772,000,000.002.0000,0002.0000.002-bec-172,045,93.772,004,93.722,000,000.002.0000,0002.0000,0002-bec-172,045,93.772,000,000.002.0000,0002.0000,000$	28-Jun-18	3,000,000.00	3.0000%	Westpac Group	A-1+		3,030,821.92	534181	30,821.92	Annually
4,000,000:02:5000%Suncorp BankA-14,000,000:030-Oct-174,017,260.271,000,000:02:6000%Bank of QueenslandA-21,000,000:022-Dec-171,000,712.339,000,000:002:6000%DecoredME BankA-12,000,000:002,054,854.799,006,410:962,000,000:002:8200%National Australia BankA-1+2,000,000:0011-Jan-172,054,854.792,000,000:003:0000%3:0000%Bank of QueenslandA-1+4,000,000:002,054,854.796,000,000:002:6000%Bank of QueenslandA-1+4,000,000:002,045,037.902,000,000:002:6000%2:6000%Bank of QueenslandA-22,000,000:002,045,037.902,000,000:002:6000%3:1000%Bank of QueenslandA-1+2,000,000:002,045,937.952,000,000:003:1000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-12,000,000:003:0-0c+172,014,268.492,000,000:003:1000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-12,000,000:003:0-0c+172,014,268.498,000,000:003:1000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-12,000,000:003:0-0c+172,014,268.498,000,000:003:000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-25,000,000:003:0-0c+172,014,268.498,000,000:003:000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-25,000,000:003:0-0c+172,014,268.491,000,000:003:000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-25,000,000:003:0-0c+172,014,26	28-Jun-18	4,000,000.00	2.4800%	National Australia Bank	A-1+		4,017,122.19	535898	17,122.19	AtMaturity
1,000,000:0 2.6000% Bank of Queensland A-2 1,000,000:0 2.2-Dec-17 1,000,712:33   9,000,000:0 2.6000% 2.6000% 7.000,000:00 2.2-Dec-17 9,006,410:96   2,000,000:00 2.8200% National Australia Bank A-1+ 2,000,000:00 11-Jan-17 2,054,854.79   4,000,000:00 2.8200% National Australia Bank A-1+ 2,000,000:00 2,054,854.79   4,000,000:00 3.0000% Bank of Queensland A-2 5,000,000:00 2-Mug-16 4,046,027.40   2,000,000:00 2.6200% Bank of Queensland A-2 2,000,000:00 2-Nov-17 5,014,508.49   2,000,000:00 2.6200% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-2 2,000,000:00 2-Nov-17 5,014,508.49   2,000,000:00 3.1000% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-1 2,000,000:00 2-Oct-16 8,037,582.19   2,000,000:00 2.5000% 2.000,000:00 3-Nov-17 5,014,568.49 2,014,568.49   2,000,000:00 2.000% 2.000,000:00 3-Nov-17 8,037,582.19	2-Jul-18	4,000,000.00	2.5000%	Suncorp Bank	A-1		4,017,260.27	535899	17,260.27	AtMaturity
9,000,000:02.6000%Dec.100,006,410.662,000,000:02.8200%National Australia BankA-12,000,000:01-Jan-172,054,854.792,000,000:03.0000%3.0000%0National Australia BankA-14,000,000:0012-Aug-164,046,027.404,000,000:003.0000%3.0000%Bank of QueenslandA-26,000,000:002,014,693.975,013,676.716,000,000:002.6000%DecomBank of QueenslandA-22,000,000:003-Nov-172,004,593.972,000,000:003.1000%Bank of QueenslandA-22,000,000:003-Oct-162,014,568.492,000,000:003.1000%Bank of QueenslandA-28,000,000:007-Oct-162,014,568.498,000,000:002.7000%Bank of QueenslandA-28,000,000:003-Oct-178,037,283.195,000,000:002.600%Bank of QueenslandA-25,000,000:003-Oct-178,037,283.195,000,000:003.000%Bank of QueenslandA-25,000,000:003-Oct-172,014,397.262,000,000:003.000%Bank of QueenslandBBH2,000,000:002-Jan-172,058,191.782,000,000:003.000%3.000%BBH2,000,000:0012-Jan-172,058,191.782,000,000:003.000%Bank of QueenslandBBH2,000,000:0012-Jan-172,058,191.782,000,000:003.000%3.000%BBH2,000,000:0012-Jan-172,053,191.782,000,000:003.000%	2-Jul-18	1,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2		1,000,712.33	536099	712.33	AtMaturity
2,000,000:02:8200%National Australia BankA-1+2,000,000:01:-Jan-172,054,854.794,000,000:03:000%0:000%0:00%0:00%0:00%4,045,027.406,000,000:002:600%Bank of QueenslandA-26,000,000.000:0-40-176,013,676.712,000,000:002:6200%Bank of QueenslandA-26,000,000.000:0-40-172,004,593.972,000,000:003:1000%Bank of QueenslandA-12,000,000.000:0-40-172,004,593.972,000,000:003:1000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-28,000,000.007-0ct-162,014,268.498,000,000:002:7000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-28,000,000.003-0-0ct-178,037,282.195,000,000:002:600%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-25,000,000.003-0-0ct-178,037,282.195,000,000:003:000%0:00%0:0-00%0:0-162,014,268.492,000,000:003:000%Bank of QueenslandA-25,000,0000:0-172,014,397.262,000,000:003:000%0:0-00%0:0-00%0:0-10%0:0-172,058,1131.782,000,000:003:000%0:0-00%0:0-00%0:0-16%0:0-16%2,058,1131.782,000,000:003:000%0:0-00%0:0-00%0:0-01%0:0-17%2,058,1131.782,000,000:000:00%0:00%0:0-00%0:0-00%0:0-17%2,058,1131.782,000,000:000:00%0:00%0:00%0:0-00%0:0-17%2,057	2-Jul-18	9,000,000,6	2.6000%	ME Bank	A-2		9,006,410.96	536100	6,410.96	AtMaturity
4,000,000:00 3:0000% Westpac Group A-1+ 4,000,000:00 12-Aug-16 4,046,027.40   6,000,000:00 2:6000% Bank of Queensland A-2 6,000,000:00 30-Nov-17 6,013,676.71   2,000,000:00 2:6200% Bank of Queensland A-2 2,000,000:00 30-Nov-17 2,004,593.97   2,000,000:00 3:1000% Westpac Group A-1+ 2,000,000:00 7-Oct-16 2,014,268.49   8,000,000:00 2:7000% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-2 8,000,000:00 30-Ov-17 8,037,282.19   5,000,000:00 2:6000% 2:000,000:00 30-Ov-17 8,037,282.19 30-Si - Si	11-Jul-18	2,000,000.00	2.8200%	National Australia Bank	A-1+	2,000,000.00 11-Jan-17	2,054,854.79	534758	54,854.79	Annually
6,000,000:02.6000%Denk of QueenslandA-26,000,000:030-Nov-176,013,676.712,000,000:02.6200%2.6200%ME BankA-22,000,000:0030-Nov-172,004,593.972,000,000:003.1000%Westpac GroupA-1+2,000,000:007-Oct-162,014,568.498,000,000:002.7000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-28,000,000:0030-Oct-178,037,283.198,000,000:002.600%Benk of QueenslandA-25,000,000:0030-Oct-178,037,283.192,000,000:003.000%Bank of QueenslandA-25,000,000:0030-Nov-175,011,397.262,000,000:003.000%Bank of QueenslandBBB+2,000,000:0012-Jan-172,058,191.782,000,000:003.000%3.000%Mestpac GroupA-22,000,000:0012-Jan-172,058,191.78	12-Jul-18	4,000,000.00	3.0000%	Westpac Group	A-1+	4,000,000.00 12-Aug-16	4,046,027.40	534129	46,027.40	Annually
2,000,000:00 2.6200% ME Bank A-2 2,000,000:00 3-100%-17 2,004,593.97   2,000,000:00 3.1000% 3.1000% Mestpac Group A-1 2,000,000:00 7-0ct-16 2,014,593.97   8,000,000:00 3.1000% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-2 8,000,000:00 7-0ct-17 8,037,283.19   8,000,000:00 2.7000% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-2 8,000,000:00 8,037,283.19   5,000,000:00 2.6000% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-2 5,000,000:00 30-0ct-17 8,037,282.19   2,000,000:00 3.0000% Bank of Queensland A-2 5,000,000:00 30-Nov-17 5,011,397.26   2,000,000:00 3.0000% 3.0000% Bank of Queensland BBH 2,000,000:00 12-13n-17 2,058,11178   2,000,000:00 3.0000% 3.0000% A-4 2,000,000:00 12-13n-17 2,052,757.12	30-Aug-18	6,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	6,000,000.00 30-Nov-17	6,013,676.71	536009	13,676.71	AtMaturity
2,000,000.003.100%Westpac GroupA-1+2,000,000.007-Oct-162,014,268.498,000,000.002.7000%Bendigo and Adelaide BankA-28,000,000.0030-Oct-178,037,282.195,000,000.002.6000%Bank of QueenslandA-25,000,000.0030-Nov-175,011,397.262,000,000.003.000%3.000%Bank of QueenslandBBH2,000,000.0012-Jan-172,058,191.782,000,000.003.000%3.000%Westpac GroupAA-2,000,000.0012-Jan-172,058,191.78	4-Sep-18	2,000,000.00	2.6200%	ME Bank	A-2		2,004,593.97	536011	4,593.97	AtMaturity
8,000,000:00 2.7000% Bendigo and Adelaide Bank A-2 8,000,000:00 30-Oct-17 8,037,282.19   5,000,000:00 2.6000% 8-60000 7-5 5,000,000:00 7-17 5,011,397.26   2,000,000:00 3.0000% 8-600000 7-2 5,000,000:00 7-5,058,191.78   2,000,000:00 3.0000% Bank of Queensland BBH 2,000,000:00 12-Jan-17 2,058,191.78   2,000,000:00 3.0000% Mestpac Group AA- 2,000,000:00 14-Feb-17 2,052,767.12	9-0ct-18	2,000,000.00	3.1000%	Westpac Group	A-1+		2,014,268.49	534428	14,268.49	Annually
5,000,000:00 2.6000% Bank of Queensland A-2 5,000,000:00 3.0Nov-17 5,011,397.26   2,000,000:00 3.0000% Bank of Queensland BBH+ 2,000,000:00 12-Jan-17 2,058,191.78   2,000,000:00 3.0000% Mestpac Group AA- 2,000,000:00 14-Feb-17 2,052,757.12	30-Oct-18	8,000,000.00	2.7000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	A-2		8,037,282.19	535896	37,282.19	AtMaturity
2,000,000.00 3.0000% Bank of Queensland BBH+ 2,000,000.00 12-Jan-17 2,058,191.78 2,000,000.00 3.0000% Westpac Group AA- 2,000,000.00 14-Feb-17 2,052,757.12	29-Nov-18	5,000,000.00	2.6000%	Bank of Queensland	A-2	5,000,000.00 30-Nov-17	5,011,397.26	536010	11,397.26	AtMaturity
2,000,000.00 3.0000% Westpac Group AA- 2,000,000.00 14-Feb-17 2,052,767.12	14-Jan-19	2,000,000.00	3.0000%	Bank of Queensland	BBB+		2,058,191.78	534764	58,191.78	Annually
	14-Feb-19	2,000,000.00	3.0000%	Westpac Group	-AA-	2,000,000.00 14-Feb-17	2,052,767.12	534873	52,767.12	Annually

Investment Holdings Report - December 2017



### INNER WEST COUNCIL

### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

319

### Item 5

### **Inner West Council**

Investment Holdings Report - December 2017



Accrued Coupon Reference Interest (\$) Frequency

Deal No.

Current Value (\$)

Price (\$) Date

**Credit Rating** 

Institution

Rate

Face Value (\$)

Maturity Date

Term Deposits

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

30-Oct-19	4,000,000.00	2.9000%	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	BBB+	4,000,000.00	30-Oct-17	4,020,021.92	535897	20,021.92	Annually
	176,500,000.00 2.6392%	2.6392%			176,500,000.00	17	178,311,112.61		1,811,112.61	
Floating	Floating Rate Notes									
Maturity Date	Face Value (\$)	Current Coupon	Security Name	Credit Rating	Purchase Price (\$)	Purchase Date	Current Value (\$)	Deal No.	Accrued Interest (\$)	Next Coupon Reference Date
27-Feb-18	3,000,000.00	2.8300%	NPBS Snr FRN (Feb18) BBSW+1.10%	A-2	3,000,000.00	27-Feb-15	3,009,717.96	502254	8,141.10	27-Feb-18
14-Nov-18	3,000,000.00	2.9800%	BEN Snr FRN (Nov18) BBSW+1.27%	A-2	3,000,000.00	7-Nov-13	3,031,916.71	402080	11,756.71	14-Feb-18
25-Feb-19	1,000,000.00	2.6700%	WBC Snr FRN (Feb19) BBSW+0.94%	-AA-	1,000,000.00	14-Feb-14	1,009,450.27	421808	2,560.27	26-Feb-18
29-Apr-19	1,000,000.00	2.8400%	BoQ Snr FRN (Apr19) BBSW+1.15%	BBB+	1,002,330.00	18-Feb-16	1,011,541.92	533203	4,901.92	29-Jan-18
10-May-19	2,000,000.00	2.7100%	WBC Snr FRN (May19) BBSW+1.00%	-AA-	2,000,000.00	11-Mar-16	2,024,761.64	533332	7,721.64	12-Feb-18
28-Oct-19	1,200,000.00	3.0900%	TMB Snr FRN (Oct19) BBSW+1.40%	888	1,200,000.00	28-Oct-16	1,208,212.11	534461	6,400.11	29-Jan-18
21-Feb-20	3,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	3,000,000.00	21-Nov-16	3,027,833.01	534538	9,503.01	21-Feb-18
24-Feb-20	1,000,000.00	3.1800%	GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	BBB	1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	1,003,211.71	534887	3,310.68	26-Feb-18
24-Feb-20	1,000,000.00	3.1800%	GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	BBB	1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	1,003,211.71	534888	3,310.68	26-Feb-18
20-Mar-20	1,500,000.00	3.0950%	CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	BBB	1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	1,508,036.30	534992	1,526.30	20-Mar-18
20-Mar-20	1,500,000.00	3.0950%	CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	888	1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	1,508,036.30	534993	1,526.30	20-Mar-18
6-Apr-20	2,000,000.00	2.9450%	ME Bank Snr FRN (Apr20) BBSW+1.25%	BBB	2,000,000.00	6-Apr-17	2,017,919.18	535107	14,039.18	8-Jan-18
18-Aug-20	2,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	2,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	2,019,929.86	505171	6,489.86	19-Feb-18
18-Aug-20	1,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	1,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	1,009,964.93	505174	3,244.93	19-Feb-18
18-Aug-20	2,000,000.00	2.8200%	BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	BBB+	2,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	2,019,929.86	505175	6,489.86	19-Feb-18
9-Nov-20	2,000,000.00	2.9550%	ME Bank Snr FRN (Nov20) BBSW+1.25%	BBB	2,000,000.00	9-Nov-17	2,008,381.64	535918	8,581.64	9-Feb-18
18-May-21	1,000,000.00	3.2000%	BoQ Snr FRN (May21) BBSW+1.48%	BBB+	1,000,000.00	18-May-16	1,020,272.19	533606	3,682.19	19-Feb-18
16-Aug-22	1,000,000.00	2.6900%	SUN Snr FRN (Aug22) BBSW+0.97%	4+	1,000,000.00	16-Aug-17	1,023,390.14	535607	3,390.14	16-Feb-18
	30,200,000.00 2.9127%	2.9127%			30,202,330.00	3	30,465,717.44		106,576.52	

PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

2
nt
Je
hm
acl
Atta
-





INNER WEST COUNCIL

	Reference		
	Purchase Yield	5,000.00 3.3850%	5,000.00 3.3850%
	Accrued Purchase Reference Interest (\$) Yield	5,000.00	5,000.00
	Deal No.	505284	
	Current Value (\$)	1,987,680.00 3-Jun-15 2,035,420.00	2,035,420.00
	Purchase Date	3-Jun-15	
	Purchase Price (\$)	1,987,680.00	1,987,680.00
	Credit Rating	AA-	
	Security Name	ANZ 'Green' Snr Bond (Jun20) 3.25%	
	Coupon	3.2500%	
e Bonds	Face Value (\$)	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00
<b>Fixed Rate Bonds</b>	Maturity Date	3-Jun-20	

Investment Holdings Report - December 2017

**Inner West Council** 

Mortgage I	lortgage Backed Securities	ities								
Weighted Avg Life	Face Value (\$)	Current Coupon	Security Name Rating	Rating	Purchase Purchase Price (\$) Date	Purchase Date	Current Value (\$)	Current Value (\$)	Accrued Interest (\$)	Reference
22-Aug-22	623,769.42 2.1700%	2.1700%	Emerald Reverse Mortgage (A Tranche)	AAA	1,000,000.00 17-Jul-06	17-Jul-06	494,298.30	310321	1,520.46	
23-Aug-27	23-Aug-27 1,000,000.00 2.4700%	2.4700%	Emerald Reverse Mortgage (B Tranche)	AA	1,000,000.00 17-Jul-06	17-Jul-06	682,774.52	310334	2,774.52	
	1,623,769.42 2.3548%	2.3548%			2,000,000.00		1,177,072.82		4,294.98	

### Item 5



Accrued Interest Report - December 2017



**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 

Monthly Accrued Interest									
Asset Type	Deal Number	Entity	Face Value (\$)	Settlement Date	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$)	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
ANZ 'Green' Snr Bond (Jun20) 3.25%	505284		2,000,000.00	3-Jun-15	3-Jun-20	32,500.00	31	5,535.71	3.25%
Bonds						32,500.00		5,535.71	3.25%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	535861		528,194.53			493.00	31	493.00	1.10%
Cash						493.00		493.00	1.10%
NPBS Snr FRN (Feb18) BBSW+1.10%	502254		3,000,000.00	27-Feb-15	27-Feb-18	0.00	31	7,210.68	2.83%
BEN Snr FRN (Nov18) BBSW+1.27%	402080		3,000,000.00	14-Nov-13	14-Nov-18	0.00	31	7,592.88	2.98%
WBC Snr FRN (Feb19) BBSW+0.94%	421808		1,000,000.00	25-Feb-14	25-Feb-19	0.00	31	2,267.67	2.67%
BoQ Snr FRN (Apr19) BBSW+1.15%	533203		1,000,000.00	22-Feb-16	29-Apr-19	0.00	31	2,412.05	2.84%
WBC Snr FRN (May19) BBSW+1.00%	533332		2,000,000.00	11-Mar-16	10-May-19	0.00	31	4,603.29	2.71%
TMB Snr FRN (Oct19) BBSW+1.40%	534461		1,200,000.00	28-Oct-16	28-Oct-19	0.00	31	3,149.26	3.09%
BEN Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.10%	534538		3,000,000.00	21-Nov-16	21-Feb-20	0.00	31	7,185.21	2.82%
GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	534887		1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	24-Feb-20	0.00	31	2,700.82	3.18%
GBS Snr FRN (Feb20) BBSW+1.45%	534888		1,000,000.00	24-Feb-17	24-Feb-20	0.00	31	2,700.82	3.18%
CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	534992		1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	20-Mar-20	11,256.58	31	3,876.58	3.04%
CUA Snr FRN (Mar20) BBSW+1.30%	534993		1,500,000.00	20-Mar-17	20-Mar-20	11,256.58	31	3,876.58	3.04%
ME Bank Snr FRN (Apr20) BBSW+1.25%	535107		2,000,000.00	6-Apr-17	6-Apr-20	0.00	31	5,002.47	2.94%
BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	505171		2,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	18-Aug-20	0.00	31	4,790.14	2.82%
BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	505174		1,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	18-Aug-20	0.00	31	2,395.07	2.82%
BEN Snr FRN (Aug20) BBSW+1.10%	505175		2,000,000.00	18-Aug-15	18-Aug-20	0.00	31	4,790.14	2.82%
ME Bank Snr FRN (Nov20) BBSW+1.25%	535918		2,000,000.00	9-Nov-17	9-Nov-20	0,00	31	5,019.45	2.96%
BoQ Snr FRN (May21) BBSW+1.48%	533606		1,000,000.00	18-May-16	18-May-21	0.00	31	2,717.81	3.20%
SUN Snr FRN (Aug22) BBSW+0.97%	535607		1,000,000.00	16-Aug-17	16-Aug-22	0.00	31	2,284.66	2.69%
				PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP					

(N
÷
Φ
Ž
Ξ
C
σ
÷
7
~



Nuu age (A Tranche) 31 age (B Tranche) 33 curities 53 iank 55	Deal Entity   310321 310334   310334 534660   535465 535447   535464 535447   535464 535464	Face Value (\$) 623,769.42 1,000,000.00 2,000,000.00	Settlement Date 17-Jul-06	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$) 22.513.15	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
	321 334 660 325 447 464 161	623,769.42 1,000,000.00 2,000,000.00	17-Jul-06	CC 2014 CC	22.513.15			7010
	321 334 660 325 447 464 161	623,769.42 1,000,000.00 2,000,000.00	17-Jul-06	CC_2114_CC			74,575.56	7.91%
	334 660 325 447 464 161	1,000,000.00 2,000,000.00		77-Bn8-77	0.00	31	1,149.62	2.17%
	660 325 447 464 161	2,000,000.00	17-Jul-06	23-Aug-27	0.00	31	2,097.81	2.47%
ank	660 325 447 464 161	2,000,000.00			0.00		3,247.42	2.35%
Хце	325 447 464 161		12-Dec-16	12-Dec-17	56,000.00	11	1,687.67	2.80%
ank	447 464 161	2,000,000.00	7-Jun-17	12-Dec-17	27,813.70	11	1,627.40	2.70%
	464 161	3,000,000.00	15-Jun-17	13-Dec-17	39,423.29	12	2,613.70	2.65%
	161	8,000,000.00	28-Jul-17	18-Dec-17	79,923.29	17	9,501.37	2.55%
National Australia Bank 4981		2,500,000.00	16-Dec-14	19-Dec-17	92,000.00	18	4,500.00	3.65%
Bankwest 534670	670	3,000,000.00	19-Dec-16	19-Dec-17	79,500.00	18	3,920.55	2.65%
ME Bank 5353	326	2,000,000.00	7-Jun-17	19-Dec-17	28,849.32	18	2,663.01	2.70%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia 5347!	756	2,000,000.00	10-Jan-17	10-Jan-18	0.00	31	4,637.26	2.73%
ME Bank 5347	757	1,000,000.00	11-Jan-17	10-Jan-18	0.00	31	2,378.08	2.80%
Credit Union Australia 5348	852	2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	10-Jan-18	0.00	31	4,926.03	2.90%
ME Bank 53476	787	2,000,000.00	18-Jan-17	17-Jan-18	0.00	31	4,756.16	2.80%
Bank of Queensland 5354	463	8,000,000.00	28-Jul-17	18-Jan-18	0.00	31	17,665.75	2.60%
ME Bank 535609	609	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	29-Jan-18	0.00	31	10,828.77	2.55%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank 534	534845	2,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	31-Jan-18	0.00	31	4,756.16	2.80%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank 5356:	610	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	5-Feb-18	0.00	31	10,404.11	2.45%
Bank of Queensland 534	534807	3,000,000.00	31-Jan-17	6-Feb-18	0.00	31	7,006.85	2.75%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank 5348	853	2,000,000.00	7-Feb-17	7-Feb-18	0.00	31	4,756.16	2.80%
ME Bank 5356	611	5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	12-Feb-18	0.00	31	10,828.77	2.55%



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Accrued Interest Report - December 2017

**Inner West Council** 

### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

Item 5

### Item 5



Accrued Interest Report - December 2017



**SINNER WEST COUNCIL** 

Monthly Accrued Interest									
Asset Type	Deal Number	Entity	Face Value (\$)	Settlement Date	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$)	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
ME Bank	534872		1,000,000.00	14-Feb-17	14-Feb-18	0.00	31	2,293.15	2.70%
Rural Bank	534931		2,500,000.00	2-Mar-17	5-Mar-18	0.00	31	5,732.88	2.70%
Bank of Queensland	535612		5,000,000.00	11-Aug-17	12-Mar-18	0.00	31	11,041.10	2.60%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	535001		4,000,000.00	14-Mar-17	14-Mar-18	0.00	31	9,274.52	2.73%
Suncorp Bank	535624		5,000,000.00	18-Aug-17	19-Mar-18	0.00	31	10,404.11	2.45%
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	535012		1,000,000.00	22-Mar-17	22-Mar-18	0.00	31	2,293.15	2.70%
Suncorp Bank	535625		5,000,000.00	18-Aug-17	26-Mar-18	0.00	31	10,404.11	2.45%
National Australia Bank	535623		5,000,000.00	18-Aug-17	5-Apr-18	0.00	31	10,616.44	2.50%
Suncorp Bank	535670		4,000,000.00	31-Aug-17	10-Apr-18	0.00	31	8,323.29	2.45%
Auswide Bank	535179		2,000,000.00	12-Apr-17	11-Apr-18	0.00	31	4,841.10	2.85%
Bank of Queensland	535671		9,000,000,6	31-Aug-17	17-Apr-18	0.00	31	19,491.78	2.55%
Suncorp Bank	535811		7,000,000.00	28-Sep-17	17-Apr-18	0.00	31	15,160.27	2.55%
ME Bank	535672		8,000,000.00	31-Aug-17	1-May-18	0.00	31	17,665.75	2.60%
Suncorp Bank	535810		6,000,000.00	28-Sep-17	1-May-18	0.00	31	12,994.52	2.55%
ME Bank	535268		1,000,000.00	26-May-17	24-May-18	0.00	31	2,335.62	2.75%
Rural Bank	535279		2,000,000.00	1-Jun-17	31-May-18	0.00	31	4,671.23	2.75%
Credit Union Australia	535350		2,000,000.00	9-Jun-17	7-Jun-18	0.00	31	4,756.16	2.80%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535359		1,000,000.00	14-Jun-17	13-Jun-18	0.00	31	2,293.15	2.70%
National Australia Bank	535809		6,000,000.00	28-Sep-17	13-Jun-18	0.00	31	13,198.36	2.59%
Bankwest	536097		4,000,000.00	22-Dec-17	19-Jun-18	0.00	10	2,794.52	2.55%
Bank of Queensland	536098		1,000,000.00	22-Dec-17	19-Jun-18	0.00	10	712.33	2.60%
Westpac Group	534181		3,000,000.00	29-Aug-16	28-Jun-18	0.00	31	7,643.84	3.00%
				PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP					
## 

Item 5



<b>Monthly Accrued Interest</b>									
Asset Type	Deal Number	Entity	Face Value (\$)	Settlement Date	Maturity Date	Interest Received (\$)	Days Accrued	Interest Accrued (\$)	Percentage Return
National Australia Bank	535898		4,000,000.00	30-0ct-17	28-Jun-18	0.00	31	8,425.21	2.48%
Suncorp Bank	535899		4,000,000.00	30-0ct-17	2-Jul-18	0.00	31	8,493.15	2.50%
Bank of Queensland	536099		1,000,000.00	22-Dec-17	2-Jul-18	0.00	10	712.33	2.60%
ME Bank	536100		9,000,000,00	22-Dec-17	2-Jul-18	0.00	10	6,410.96	2.60%
National Australia Bank	534758		2,000,000.00	11-Jan-17	11-Jul-18	0.00	31	4,790.14	2.82%
Westpac Group	534129		4,000,000.00	12-Aug-16	12-Jul-18	0.00	31	10,191.78	3.00%
Bank of Queensland	536009		6,000,000.00	30-Nov-17	30-Aug-18	0.00	31	13,249.32	2.60%
ME Bank	536011		2,000,000.00	30-Nov-17	4-Sep-18	0.00	31	4,450.41	2.62%
Westpac Group	534428		2,000,000.00	7-0ct-16	9-0ct-18	0.00	31	5,265.75	3.10%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535896		8,000,000.00	30-Oct-17	30-Oct-18	0.00	31	18,345.21	2.70%
Bank of Queensland	536010		5,000,000.00	30-Nov-17	29-Nov-18	0.00	31	11,041.10	2.60%
Bank of Queensland	534764		2,000,000.00	12-Jan-17	14-Jan-19	0.00	31	5,095.89	3.00%
Westpac Group	534873		2,000,000.00	14-Feb-17	14-Feb-19	0.00	31	5,095.89	3.00%
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	535897		4,000,000.00	30-0ct-17	30-Oct-19	0.00	31	9,852.05	2.90%
Term Deposit						403,509.59		399,818.36	2.65%
						459.015.74		483,670.06	2.69%



Accrued Interest Report - December 2017

**Inner West Council** 

### Item 5

INNER WEST COUNCIL

**INNER WEST COUNCIL** 

# Inner West Council

Investment Performance Report - December 2017



PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

### Item 5

## PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP

Inner West Council Environmental Committments Report - December 2017	ients Report - C	Jecember 2017	COUNCIL
Curren	Current Breakdown		Historical Portfolio Exposure to Non Fossil Fuel Lending ADIs
ADI Lending Status *	Current Month (\$)	Current Month (\$) Previous Month (\$)	250M
Fossil Fuel Lending ADIs			
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	11,528,195	10,527,704	200M Bortfolio Portfolio
National Australia Bank	17,000,000	19,500,000	Size
Westpac Group	14,000,000	14,000,000	150M - 60% (LHS)
	42,528,195 20%	44,027,704 20%	
Non Fossil Fuel Lending ADIs			100M
ANZ Group (Green)	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Auswide Bank	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Bank of Queensland	42,000,000	42,000,000	50M - 20% ADI (RHS)
Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	33,000,000	36,000,000	
Credit Union Australia	7,000,000	7,000,000	Cherd Chick Cherd Chick Chick
Greater Building Society	2,000,000	2,000,000	ANTI' FEDIL' MALI' MAYI' MAYI' JUNI', JUNI' ANY I SEPI' OCLI' NOVI' DECI'
Members Equity Bank	38,000,000	41,000,000	
Newcastle Permanent Building Society	3,000,000	3,000,000	Weighted Average Yield - Fossil Fuel vs Non Fossil Fuel Lending ADI
Non ADI	1,623,769	1,623,769	
Rural Bank	4,500,000	4,500,000	3.10%
Suncorp Bank	32,000,000	32,000,000	
Teachers Mutual Bank	1,200,000	1,200,000	3.00%
	168,323,769 80%	174,323,769 80%	
	210,851,964	218,351,473	2:90% ADI Yield
	* source: h	* source: http://www.marketforces.org.au	Non Excel
			2.80%
			ADI Yield
			2.70%
			2.60% ] ** Excludes funds held ] Jul 17 Aug 17 Sep 17 Oct 17 Nov 17Dec 17 in Transactional Accounts
			Accounts



INNER WEST COUNCIL

### Council Meeting 13 February 2018

## Item 5

INNER WEST COUNCIL

INNER WEST COUNCIL

## Inner West Council

Investment Policy Compliance Report - December 2017



> >

6% 3%

Teachers Mutual Bank (A-2, BBB)

ANZ Group (A-1+, AA-)

compliant
 non-compliant

PRUDENTIAL INVESTMENT SERVICES CORP





MBC BMT NNS WBC 6.64% в∪я BEN 15.65% SBGN SUN 15.18% Individual Institutional Exposure Charts **AAN** MEB SBD Investment Policy Limit g pjwg Other 7.74% BoQ 19.92% A blm∃ AUD CBA-BWA NAB 8.06% BoQ CBA-BWA 5.47% CUA 3.32% BEN MEB 18.02% WauA ZNA 0 100,000,000 60,000,000 40,000,000 20,000,000 80,000,000 0 42,170,393 Portfolio Investment Exposure (\$) Policy Limit (\$) 42,170,393 63,255,589 42,170,393 94,883,384 63,255,589 21,085,196 42,170,393 94,883,384 42,170,393 42,170,393 63,255,589 21,085,196 94,883,384 94,883,384 Individual Institutional Exposures Report - December 2017 2,000,000 42,000,000 11,528,195 38,000,000 3,000,000 1,200,000 2,000,000 33,000,000 7,000,000 623,769 1,000,000 2,000,000 17,000,000 4,500,000 32,000,000 14,000,000 210,851,964 Individual Institutional Exposures ¥ **Credit Rating** A-1+, AA-A-1+, AA-A-2, BBB+ A-2, BBB+ A-2, BBB AAA A-2, BBB A-2, BBB A-2, BBB A-2, BBB+ A-1, A+ A-2, BBB A-1+, AA-A-1+, AA-A-3, BBB-Emerald Reverse Mortgage (A Tranche) Emerald Reverse Mortgage (B Tranche) Newcastle Permanent Building Society Commonwealth Bank of Australia Bendigo and Adelaide Bank Greater Building Society National Australia Bank Credit Union Australia Members Equity Bank Teachers Mutual Bank Bank of Queensland Parent Group Westpac Group Auswide Bank Suncorp Bank Rural Bank ANZ Group

INNER WEST

Inner West Council

### Item 5



Cash Flows Report - December 2017



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Current Month Cashflows	Cashflows				
<b>Transaction Date</b>	Deal No.	<b>Cashflow Counterparty</b>	Asset Type	Cashflow Description Cashflow Received	ashflow Received
4-Dec-17	505284	ANZ Banking Group	Bonds	Coupon - Received	32,500.00
				Deal Total	32,500.00
				Day Total	32,500.00
12-Dec-17	534660	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	56,000.00
		Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
				Deal Total	2,056,000.00
	535325	ME Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	27,813.70
		ME Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
				Deal Total	2,027,813.70
				Day Total	4,083,813.70
13-Dec-17	535447	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	39,423.29
		Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	3,000,000.00
				<u>Deal Total</u>	3,039,423.29
				Day Total	3,039,423.29
18-Dec-17	498161	National Australia Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	91,750.00
				Deal Total	91,750.00
	535464	ME Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	79,923.29
		ME Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	8,000,000.00
				Deal Total	8,079,923.29
				Day Total	8,171,673.29
19-Dec-17	498161	National Australia Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	250.00
		National Australia Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,500,000.00
				<u>Deal Total</u>	2,500,250.00
	534670	Bankwest	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	79,500.00
		Bankwest	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	3,000,000.00
				Deal Total	3,079,500.00
	535326	ME Bank	Term Deposits	Interest - Received	28,849.32
		ME Bank	Term Deposits	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
				<u>Deal Total</u>	2,028,849.32
			IAL scorp		



Next Month Cashflows				
Transaction Date Deal No.	Cashflow Counterparty	Asset Type	<b>Cashflow Description</b>	<b>Cashflow Due</b>
8-Jan-18 535107	ME Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	15,168.77
			Deal Total	15,168.77
			Day Total	15,168.77
10-Jan-18 534756	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	54,600.00
	Commonwealth Bank of Australia	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			Deal Total	2,054,600.00
534757	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	27,923.29
	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	1,000,000.00
			Deal Total	1,027,923.29

Current Month Cashflows				
Transaction Date Deal No.	<u>Cashflow Counterparty</u>	<u>Asset Type</u>	Cashflow Description Cashflow Received	<b>Cashflow Received</b>
			Day Total	7,608,599.32
20-Dec-17 534992	Credit Union Australia	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	11,256.58
			Deal Total	11,256.58
534993	Credit Union Australia	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	11,256.58
			Deal Total	11,256.58
			Day Total	22,513.15
22-Dec-17 536097	Bankwest	Term Deposits	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-4,000,000.00
			Deal Total	-4,000,000.00
536098	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-1,000,000.00
			Deal Total	-1,000,000.00
536099	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposits	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-1,000,000.00
			Deal Total	-1,000,000.00
536100	ME Bank	Term Deposits	Settlement Face Value - Paid	-9,000,000,0-
			Deal Total	-9,000,000.00
			Day Total	-15,000,000.00
			Net Cash Movement for Period	7,958,522.74



Inner West Council Cash Flows Report - December 2017

INNER WEST COUNCIL

## Item 5



Cash Flows Report - December 2017



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Next Month Cashflows				
Transaction Date Deal No.	Cashflow Counterparty	Asset Type	<b>Cashflow Description</b>	<b>Cashflow Due</b>
534852	Credit Union Australia	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	53,550.68
	Credit Union Australia	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			Deal Total	2,053,550.68
			Day Total	5,136,073.97
11-Jan-18 534758	National Australia Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	56,400.00
			Deal Total	56,400.00
			Day Total	56,400.00
12-Jan-18 534764	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	60,000.00
			Deal Total	60,000.00
			Day Total	60,000.00
17-Jan-18 534787	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	55,846.58
	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			Deal Total	2,055,846.58
			Day Total	2,055,846.58
18-Jan-18 535463	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	99,156.16
	Bank of Queensland	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	8,000,000.00
			Deal Total	8,099,156.16
			Day Total	8,099,156.16
29-Jan-18 533203	Bank of Queensland	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	7,080.55
			Deal Total	7,080.55
534461	Teachers Mutual Bank	Floating Rate Note	Coupon - Received	9,244.60
			Deal Total	9,244.60
535609	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	59,732.88
	ME Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	5,000,000.00
			Deal Total	5,059,732.88
			Day Total	5,076,058.03
31-Jan-18 534845	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Term Deposit	Interest - Received	56,000.00
	Bendigo and Adelaide Bank	Term Deposit	Maturity Face Value - Received	2,000,000.00
			Deal Total	2,056,000.00
			Day Total	2,056,000.00
			Net Cash Movement for Period	22,554,703.51
		<b>NTIAL</b>		
	INVESTMENT SERV	VICES CORP		

Council Meeting 13 February 2018





Item 5









Rates on longer dated term deposits moved higher in December while short dated terms were largely unchanged. The best indicative 3 & 6 month TDs from Australian majors closed the month in the 2.45%-2.55% area. Meanwhile, 12 month rates from the four majors ranged between 2.55%-2.60%, up 5bps from the end of November. A few lower rated banks continue to offer 2.60% in the 6-9 month area, representing good value depending upon cash flow and policy compliance.

#### **Investment Portfolio Commentary**

Council's investment portfolio posted a return of 2.60%pa for the month of December versus the bank bill index benchmark return of 1.70%pa. For the financial year to date, the investment portfolio returned 2.80%pa, exceeding the bank bill index benchmark's 1.70%pa by 1.09%pa.

Without marked-to-market influences, Council's investment portfolio yielded 2.69%pa for the month. This is based on the actual interest rates being received on existing investments and excludes the underlying changes to the market value of the securities/deposits.

During the month Council had \$22.5m in term deposits maturities. \$15m in new term deposit investments were placed in the 6 month time period at rates of between 2.55%pa and 2.60%pa.

80% of the portfolio was invested in non fossil fuel lending ADIs at the end of the month, the same as the month prior. Non-fossil fuel lending ADIs yielded 2.67% pa during the month while fossil fuel lending ADIs yielded 2.77% during the month.

Council has a well-diversified portfolio invested among a range of term deposits and floating rate notes from highly rated Australian ADIs. 87% of the portfolio is spread among the top three credit rating categories (A long term/A2 short term and higher). It is expected that Council can continue to achieve above benchmark returns with prudent investment selection for its short and long term holdings.

**Disclaimer:** The statements and opinions contained in this report are based on currently prevailing conditions in financial markets and are so contained in good faith and in the belief that such statements and opinion are not false or misleading. In preparing this report, Prudential Investment Services Corp has relied upon information which it believes to be reliable and accurate. Prudential Investment Services Corp believes that this report and the opinions expressed in this report are accurate, but no warranty of accuracy or reliability is given. Prudential Investment Services Corp does not warrant that its investigation has revealed all of the matters which a more extensive examination might disclose. This report may not be reproduced, transmitted, or made available either in part or in whole to any third party without the prior written consent of Prudential Investment Services Corp. AFS Licence No. 468145.



Item No:C0218 Item 6Subject:TABLING OF PECUNIARY INTEREST RETURNS OF COUNCILLORSPrepared By:Ian Naylor - Manager Civic and Executive SupportAuthorised By:Nellette Kettle - Group Manager Integration Customer Service & Business<br/>Excellence

#### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to table Pecuniary Interest Returns of Councillors elected in September 2017 in accordance with the requirements of Section 450A of the Local Government Act.

#### RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council note the tabling of Pecuniary Interest Returns of Councillors elected in September 2017.

#### BACKGROUND

Councillors are required to lodge a return of pecuniary interests with the General Manager on an annual basis. Section 449(1) of the Local Government Act 1993 requires Councillors to complete and lodge their first return within three months of being elected.

Section 450A(2)(a) of the Local Government Act 1993 requires these returns to be tabled at the first Council Meeting after the last day for lodgement which was 16 December 2017. All returns for Councillors were submitted by the required lodgement date and are tabled at this Meeting to fulfil the requirements of the legislation.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

**OTHER STAFF COMMENTS** 

Nil.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Nil.

CONCLUSION

Nil.

#### ATTACHMENTS

Nil.



tem 7

Item No: C0218 Item 7

Subject: BUSINESS EXCLUDED FROM THE COUNCIL AGENDA OF 12 DECEMBER 2017

**Prepared By:** Ian Naylor - Manager Civic and Executive Support

Authorised By: Nellette Kettle - Group Manager Integration Customer Service & Business Excellence

#### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to advise that an item of business was excluded by the General Manager from the Council Agenda for the Meeting on 12 December 2017. Clause 240(2) of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 requires this to be reported to the next Ordinary Council Meeting.

#### RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report be received and noted.

#### BACKGROUND

An item of business was excluded from the Agenda of 12 December 2017, as the General Manager considered the inclusion of the business would be unlawful. The General Manager determined that implementation of the business proposed would be unlawful as it would deny procedural fairness with respect to an investigative process. Clause 240(2) of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 as shown below, requires this matter to be reported to the next meeting of Council without giving any details of the item of business.

Clause 240(2) of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 states;

"The general manager must not include in the agenda for a meeting of the council any business of which due notice has been given if, in the opinion of the general manager, the business is (or the implementation of the business would be) unlawful. The general manager must report (without giving details of the item of business) any such exclusion to the next meeting of the council".

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

OTHER STAFF COMMENTS

Nil.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Nil.

CONCLUSION

Nil.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil.



Item No: C0218 Item 8

Subject: COUNCILLOR SUPPORT STAFF

**Prepared By:** Ian Naylor - Manager Civic and Executive Support

Authorised By: Nellette Kettle - Group Manager Integration Customer Service & Business Excellence

#### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to outline the number, costs and process for appointing support staff for Councillors and recommend that Council begin the process of recruitment of up to 6 support staff for Councillors.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### THAT:

- 1. Council consider support requirements for Councillors to effectively undertake their civic role and alter the organisational structure so as to create up to 6 new positions to function as support staff for Councillors;
- 2. The General Manager carry out any necessary Staff Consultative Committee process for the creation of the positions and any future recruitment process;
- 3. The Manager, Civic and Executive Support consult with each Councillor to determine what their requirements are so as to inform any future recruitment process on how many of the newly created positions need to be filled;
- 4. The Code of Conduct be amended as follows:

a. The obligation under clauses 6.2(a) and 6.2(b) is subject to the following exceptions:

i. the Mayor may, pursuant to, and in accordance with, any specific authorisation and/or rules provided by the General Manager for the purposes of this clause, direct or influence council staff that are employed by council to work in the Office of the Mayor as specified in a relevant position description; and

ii. a Councillor may, pursuant to, and in accordance with, any specific authorisation and/or rules provided by the General Manager for the purposes of this clause, direct or influence council staff that are employed by Council to work in the office of the councillor who is giving the direction or influence.

#### BACKGROUND

At the Council Meeting on 21 November, Council considered a report on the appointment of support staff for Councillors and resolved to defer the matter to a briefing. A briefing was held for Councillors on 1 February 2018 to detail the proposal to appoint support staff and give Councillors an opportunity to discuss how the support staff would operate.

The purpose of this report is to provide advice and information to Councillors on how such staffing might function should Councillors consider the creation of such positions to be appropriate.

Councillors should also be aware of limitations that exist with respect to any support staff that may ostensibly be reporting to them. Under the *Local Government Act 1993*, the power to

Item 8

direct staff rests with the General Manager (section 335(i)). This power is reflected in clause 6.2 of the *Code of Conduct* which prohibits a Councillor from directing staff. In order for Councillors to be able to direct support staff lawfully, they must do so in accordance with an overarching direction from the General Manager that effectively authorises the Councillor's direction.

There are rules and limitations that will be imposed by the General Manager to ensure that support staff operate in accordance with their fundamental status as Council staff. In other words, the role of support staff will be to perform Council business insofar as that business aligns with the role and responsibilities of Councillors. It would not be the role of support staff to assist Councillors in their personal or political roles save where those roles intersect with Council business.

#### Appropriate Number of Support Staff

With the election of the new Inner West Council, we now have 15 councillors representing approximately 12,400 residents each and make decisions on an LGA 3 times as big as previously. This is a significant increase from the previous Ashfield, Leichhardt and Marrickville Councils, where the ratio of Councillors to residents was as follows:

- Ashfield: 1 councillor for every 3,708 residents;
- Leichhardt: 1 councillor for every 4,845 residents; and
- Marrickville: 1 councillor for every 6,807 residents.

With this increased level of representation and potential demands on Councillors, support staff may be necessary to assist the Councillors in performing their civic duties and responding to requests and correspondence from the constituents they represent.

The tasks that a support staff could undertake for Councillors is to submit Councillor Requests on behalf or residents, assist in gathering baseline information for Councillors to develop policy positions, respond to correspondence, Councillor diary management, manage reimbursement for legitimate Councillor expenses and request/access public information on projects, plans, budgets and work programs. Councillors will play a key role in providing direction to staff in undertaking these duties including being part of the recruitment process subject to the rules mentioned above and explained further below. A generic position description for the roles is shown as Attachment 1.

The City of Sydney provide one support staff person per councillor to assist them in performing their civic duties. Given the increase in workload for Inner West Councillors, Council staff have reviewed the role of the support staff in comparison to the scope and scale of the support staff for the City of Sydney and believe 0.4 support staff per Councillor is comparable, being the equivalent of 2 days support per week. If all 15 councillors were provided with this support it would equate to 6 Councillor Support staff. Council staff will consult with each Councillor to determine if they require support staff.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The City of Sydney has implemented a similar system of support for Councillors. Council staff have sought advice from the City of Sydney on position descriptions and the salary range for Councillor support staff. The salary cost for support staff is approximately \$72,000 per support person and there would be a fitout cost of approximately \$10,000 per support person to provide offices for support staff including computer and telephone equipment. Funding for these positions can be provided within the next quarterly budget review. At such time, Councillors will need to assess how the positions are to be funded having regard to any budgetary constraints.

#### System of Oversight and Management



Staff from the City of Sydney have advised that it is important to have a strong framework for oversight and management of the support staff to ensure the work they conduct is in line with their role described above. It is also important to manage issues that can arise as per any industrial relations framework (such as bullying, harassment and other work, health and safety issues).

The following measures will be put in place to maintain a strong framework of oversight and management:-

- Councillor Support Staff will have the same rights of access as Councillors to council information, resources, interaction with Council staff and submitting Councillor Requests. In other words, support staff will not be permitted to contact staff below Group Manager level or direct Council staff.
- Councillor Support staff will be accommodated within a council building independent and separated from the Administration of the Council.
- Councillor Support Staff will be given resources to undertake their role but operate on a standalone computer system with no access to Council's network or internal systems.
- The General Manager will approve a generic position description for all support staff and they will be appointed as a council staff member on contract for the term of the council plus a 3 month handover period. The position description will clearly outline what the staff are permitted and not permitted to do having regard to the fact they are ultimately Council staff.
- Councillors will be involved in the recruitment of support staff but the ultimate decision rests with the General Manager.
- Councillor Support staff will be provided with staff induction, training and performance management like other council staff. Specific training and guidance will be given on interaction with staff, Code of Conduct and not using Council resources for political purposes outside the scope of local government.
- The Civic and Executive Support Manager will supervise, provide advice and manage the Councillor support staff and relationship between councillors and the support staff.

#### Code of Conduct

The Model Code of Conduct issued by the Office of Local Government states that Councillors cannot direct staff in the conduct of their work, except through the General Manager. As the relationship between a Councillor and their support staff will require some level of direction in terms of the work to be undertaken an amendment to the Code of Conduct is required. It is recommended that Council's Code of Conduct be amended to reflect the same changed made by the City of Sydney in March 2017 to allow councillors to direct their support staff. There is no requirement for Council to publicly exhibit this change. It is important that any change to the Code of Conduct is not inconsistent with the existing provisions of clause 6.2 as an inconsistency will result in the change being unenforceable (section 440(4) of the Act).

#### Selection Criteria

The following selection criteria is proposed to be included in the position descriptions based on a review of the City of Sydney position descriptions:-

#### Essential

- High level secretarial or administrative experience.
- High level of administrative and organisational ability.
- Experience and high level skill in dealing with people at executive and representative level.
- Ability to work cooperatively in a team environment and meet deadlines.

Item 8

INNER WEST COUNCIL

- Excellent oral communication skills, including excellent telephone manner and customer service skills.
- A clear and concise written communication style.
- Computer experience, including advanced word processing and database skills.
- Maturity, flexibility, discretion and judgement and the ability to represent the Councillor to a wide range of individuals and organisations.
- Demonstrate a commitment to Equal Employment Opportunity, Work, Health and Safety and Cultural Diversity principles.

#### Desirable

- Tertiary qualifications would be highly regarded
- Research skills and /or experience with policy development or analysis

The following limitations will be imposed:

- Councillor support staff are to provide the following services to Councillors:
  - o submit Councillor Requests on behalf of Councillors/residents,
  - $\circ\,$  assist in gathering baseline information for Councillors to develop policy positions,
  - respond to correspondence,
  - councillor diary management insofar as the diary matters relate to Council business,
  - manage reimbursement for legitimate Councillor expenses
  - request/access public information on projects, plans, budgets and work programs
  - any other services authorised by the General Manager or the General Manager's delegate.
- Councillor support staff are not to assist Councillors with matters personal to the Councillor.
- Councillor support staff are not to assist Councillors in matters of a political nature save where those matters fall under the permitted items above.

Councillor support staff will be required to immediately report to the General Manager any conduct that the staff members considers to be in breach of the Code of Conduct including, without limitation, directions given by a Councillor that fall outside the permitted actions identified above.

#### **OTHER STAFF COMMENTS**

Nil.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Nil.

#### CONCLUSION

Nil.

#### ATTACHMENTS

1. Position Description for Councillor Support Staff



### **POSITION DESCRIPTION**

Position Title		Officer
Position Title	Councillor Support	Officer
Directorate	General Manager	
Section / Location	ТВА	
Responsible to	Civic and Execu Councillors	tive Support Manager and allocated
Position	Direct: Nil	
Supervises	Indirect: Nil	
Position No.	ТВА	Remuneration
		\$54,616 pa \$66,782 pa
Allowances	Nil	
Status and Hours	Temporary full-time position based on a 35 hour week, after- hours work may be required.	
	Explanatory Note:	
		to change in accordance with any adopted Industrial instrument.
Legislative requirements	Local Government	Act
Date reviewed: Nove		<b>Reviewed by:</b> Group Manager Human Resources

The Inner West Council was formed on Thursday 12 May 2016 as a result of the amalgamation of Ashfield, Leichhardt & Marrickville Councils by the NSW State Government through the Local Government Proclamation 2016 (Council Amalgamations). The new Council has a population of 185,000 people and covers an area of 36 sq km and employs 1,250 people.

The Inner West Council operates across the areas previously governed by the former Ashfield, Leichhardt and Marrickville Councils. All Inner West Council employees may be transferred to any of these areas to allow sustained productivity and opportunities for skills growth.

#### POSITION PURPOSE

To provide Councillors with high quality, accurate, timely and professional executive support and to ensure effective communication, administration and co-ordination with the Mayor, Councillors, Residents under the guidance of the Civic and Executive Support Manager

#### **SELECTION CRITERIA**

The Inner West Council has a strong commitment to the principles of EEO, WHS and Sustainability. We value excellence, customer focus, creativity, collaboration, integrity and respect. All employees

Item 8

are expected to demonstrate commitment to these principles in performing their respective roles. In addition to these, the following criteria outline those that are relevant to this specific position.

#### **Essential Criteria:**

- 1. Certificate level qualification or equivalent in office/business administration and/or equivalent industry experience.
- 2. Excellent skills in using office computer applications and the ability to adopt new technology
- 3. Well-developed administrative, organisational and problem solving skills with a capacity to undertake research
- 4. Excellent written and verbal communication skills including excellent telephone manner and customer service skills to respectfully handle enquiries and resolve or refer complaints
- 5. Strong interpersonal, tact, diplomacy, liaison and negotiation abilities including the ability to build and maintain respectful relationships with staff at all levels and with external entities including executive and representative level
- 6. Ability to work cooperatively in a team environment, under pressure and organise priorities to meet deadlines.
- 7. Demonstrated ability to deal with information with high sensitivity and confidentiality
- 8. Maturity, flexibility, discretion and judgement and the ability to represent the Councillor to a wide range of individuals and organisations.
- 9. Understanding of local government functions, issues and local government political structure
- 10.Demonstrate a commitment to Equal Employment Opportunity, Work, Health and Safety and Cultural Diversity principles.

#### **Desirable Criteria**

- 1. Current NSW Driver's Licence (minimum Class C)
- 2. Advanced word processing and database skills.
- 3. Tertiary qualifications.
- 4. Demonstrated research skills and/or experience with policy development or analysis.

#### **KEY DUTIES, ACCOUNTABILITIES & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- 1. Manage the daily activities of the Councilors office and provide top level professional executive and a full range of secretarial assistance to the Councillor.
- 2. Develop and maintain effective systems and procedures to maintain smooth, organised and efficient operations of the Councillor's office including receiving, administration and distribution of files, correspondence and other documents
- 3. Professional telephone reception and manage a high volume of telephone calls for the Councillor and where appropriate, personally handle enquiries and problems compassionately, effectively, accurately and in a timely manner, to maintain a high degree of confidence in the Councillor's office.
- 4. Coordinate the Councillor's busy diary by ensuring appropriate timing for meetings, Planning and scheduling meetings and appointments, that appropriate people attend meetings and

that the Councillor is provided with papers, files and relevant information with enough time to read and consider prior to scheduled meetings.

- 5. Maintain effective correspondence and records management processes and coordinate, prioritise and monitor correspondence including submitting Councillor Requests on behalf or residents for the Councillor and identify matters which require immediate attention.
- 6. Assist in attending to and addressing or referring complaints to the appropriate person within Council, or appropriate organisation if the matter is outside of Council's jurisdiction
- 7. Assist in gathering collating, summarising and synthesising baseline information for Councillors to develop policy positions, for Councillors. Research and prepare draft correspondence and reports for the Councillor when required.
- 8. Liaise closely with the Civic and Executive Support Manager and members of the Leadership Group to follow up specific issues and / or correspondence.
- 9. Request/access public information on projects, plans, budgets and work programs.
- 10. Coordinating stationery orders, work functions, catering, conference attendance, and travel arrangements when necessary and manage reimbursement for legitimate Councilor expenses
- 11. Maintain the highest ethical standards, exercise discretion, maintain confidentiality of sensitive issues handled within the Office and ensure no work of a political nature outside the scope of local government is undertaken. Any breaches of Council's Code of Conduct, legislation or other Council policies are to be reported immediately to the Civic and Executive Support Manager.
- 12. Ensure no Council resources (both labour and materials) are used to support any political campaigns.
- 13. Ensure confidentiality when dealing with a range of complex and sensitive matters and act with a high degree of maturity, judgement and discretion at all times.
- 14. Liaise effectively with the Mayor, other Councillors, Councillors' staff, the Civic and Executive Support Manager, members of the Leadership Group, community members and external organisations to ensure productive and highly cooperative relationships are maintained.
- 15. Undertake any other duties as directed by the Councillors. These duties must not include any personal matters or political matters outside the scope of local government.
- 16. Ensure compliance with legislative and Council policy requirements and standards in the areas of Equal Employment Opportunity and Work, Health and Safety and Rehabilitation and Records management.
- 17. Comply with and keep abreast of any relevant legislation, codes and policies, applicable to the performance of the duties of this position.

#### **KEY RELATIONSHIPS:**

- 1. **Internal:** You have regular contact with the Mayor, other Councillors, Councillors' staff, the Civic and Executive Support Manager, members of the Leadership Group, community members and external organisations to ensure productive and highly cooperative relationships are maintained. You will also liaise with other Councillor Support Officer and the Mayors staff
- 2. **External:** You will also communicate at times with community organisations, local authorities and agencies, Members of Parliament, government departments, residents, and consultants.



Item 8

#### WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT EMPLOYEES WITH NO STAFF REPORTING TO THEM AND/OR NO MAJOR PROJECT RESPONSIBILITY

#### **LEVEL 6**

Level 6 staff are required to perform their duties in accordance with their job description and safe working practices. It is the responsibility of each staff member to ensure that they comply with Work Health & Safety legislation as well as Council policies, procedures and safe work practices and that their actions do not subject any person to risk. The responsibility of this position requires:

Responsibilities	Performance Measures
Ensuring all work is performed in accordance with requirements of the Health and Safety policy, procedure and legislation	<ul> <li>Conformance to WH&amp;S policy and procedures</li> <li>Knowledge of, and use of Safe Work Method Statement (SWMS) and Standard operating procedures</li> </ul>
Taking reasonable care for their own Health and Safety as well as that of others	Use of SWMS and Standard operating procedures
Having an understanding of the Health and Safety requirements associated with their employment	Training records
<ul> <li>Reporting all identified hazards, accidents/incidents and near misses to their manager/supervisor</li> <li>Ensure all potential or actual areas of danger within the workplace are immediately made safe, repaired and reported to the appropriate person/s as soon as possible;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Hazard identification reports</li> <li>Workplace inspection reports</li> </ul>
Using and maintaining all safety equipment and personal protective equipment (PPE) in accordance with relevant standards.	<ul> <li>PPE maintenance records</li> <li>Knowledge and use of Standard operating procedures</li> </ul>
Working in accordance with relevant competency standards	<ul><li>Training records.</li><li>Supervisor site inspection records</li></ul>
Knowledge of WH&S and related     legislation within scope of job description	Attendance at training sessions

#### **Applicant Declaration**

I, \_\_\_\_\_\_ have read and understood the position description for the **Councillor Support Officer** as detailed in this document. Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



Item No:	C0218 Item 9
Subject:	NOTICE OF MOTION TO RESCIND: ITEM 4 POST EXHIBITION REPORT - SYDENHAM STATION CREATIVE HUB PLANNING PROPOSAL
From:	Councillors The Mayor, Darcy Byrne, Anna York, Mark Drury, Lucille McKenna OAM and Sam Iskandar

#### MOTION:

THAT Council Rescind the resolution of 12 December 2017, regarding Item 4 of the 21 November 2017 Ordinary Council Meeting, 'Post Exhibition report – Sydenham Station Creative Hub Planning Proposal'. Should the rescission motion be carried, we seek to move the following motion:-

THAT Council:

1. Note:

a. The existing Sydenham Creative Hub proposal has been endorsed repeatedly by the former Marrickville Council and the NSW Department of Planning;

b. The large body of work that has been dedicated to the development of the policy for the Sydenham Station Creative Hub involving input from a wide range of stakeholders over a substantial period of time, and the careful consideration of the development of that policy by the former Marrickville Council;

c. The independent support for the policy from academic and planning experts including the City Futures Research Centre, Professor Peter Phibbs and SGS Economics in their 2014 Study of Marrickville Employment lands;

d. The very large proportion of submissions received during the consultation process in support of the existing proposal; and

e. The original intent of the Sydenham Creative Hub proposal, which was to prote current industrial uses in the precinct, by adapting our planning Instruments to ensu emerging additional artistic and creative uses are permitted, as a means of securing the vibrancy and visitation to the area.

2. Defer consideration of the matter pending further investigation into options to achieve the original intent of the proposal, by further specifying and limiting new use including potentially;

a. Removing office space from the list of permissible uses;

b. A narrower focus on live performance and artistic uses to operate after existing businesses hours;

c. Further limiting the scope for small bars and restaurants;

- d. Mandating a review period for the proposed controls following adoption; and
- e. Further measures to mitigate the perceived risks identified in the most recent SGS report

#### ATTACHMENTS



Item 10

Item No:	C0218 Item 10
Subject:	NOTICE OF MOTION: UPGRADE AND BEAUTIFICATION OF HABERFIELD MAIN STREET / SHOPPING VILLAGE
From:	Councillor Vittoria Raciti and Deputy Mayor, Councillor Julie Passas

#### MOTION:

#### THAT:

- 1. Council develop a holistic strategy for the Haberfield town centre including public domain master planning, streetscape improvements and economic sustainability; and
- 2. Officers provide a report in March 2018 outlining process, timelines and indicative costs for the development and implementation of the strategy.

#### **Background**

After years of neglect it is now time for the Inner West Council to ensure that the Haberfield community, receives the attention of this Council.

I move a motion with a strong expectation that my fellow Councillors, will support the upgrading and beautification, of the Haberfield Main Street/Shopping Village. Haberfield has no vibe, no dynamic, lacks charm, so bland, abandoned looking and desperately needs a lift.

For years Haberfield's main street and shopping village has been totally neglected, whilst other neighbouring suburbs, have been upgraded, beautified and today enjoy a flourishing, vibrant and busy local neighbourhood shopping strip. Due to years of neglect, Haberfield's Main strip/Shopping Village has become totally neglected, and in the absence of the local IGA, and some hard-working small businesses, it would be a virtual ghost town. It is for this reason that I propose this motion, with a view to allocate an initial \$100,000, for an upgrading and beautification program to add weight, to my respectful submission to my fellow Councillors. Haberfield today has half the shops either For Sale, For Lease or about to close their business down, or many months in rental arrears.

Most businesses in Haberfield are struggling. Some small owners today have in recent years closed down after a major shop upgrade, then the business failed, and yet again a further attempt was made, the business changed to another concept, a further upgrade, and still resulted in business closure.

The Chinese Restaurant at the corner of Dalhousie St and Ramsay St, which opened less than 12 months ago, at considerable expense, closed their doors, just last week.

The former Haberfield Post office site in Dalhousie St, Haberfield has been empty for a "lifetime", and remains empty. The current premises to which the Post Office moved to, had been closed for a large number of years (maybe up to 4 years) for whatever reason, The following premises in Haberfield are either closed, again for whatever reason, with no business trading from them – just simply – closed doors!



70 Dalhousie St – Florist - current owner states she will give it a go for another 12 months, and then will have to cease trading.

62 Dalhousie St – Former wedding shop closed down 3 months ago.

64 Dalhousie St – Former Thai restaurant – closed.

71 Dalhousie St – Former post office – remains empty.

80 Dalhousie St – Former Commonwealth Bank site. Empty for more than approximately 3 years.

104 Ramsay St – Has had a multitude of failed businesses over the past 12 years or so. Currently empty, and has been for the past 11 months.

115 Ramsay St – Empty over 4 years.

129 Ramsay St – Chocolate Shop closed down due to poor customer flow in the suburb.

171 Ramsay St – Empty.

125 Ramsay St – Bendigo Bank pulled out the ATM due to lack of use.

191 Ramsey St- 12 shops with no passing trade, this small centre opened in 2008, it has always been half empty, as is the case today.

With the utmost respect, nothing less than a Concord upgrade/beautification will suffice. Concord flourished once the main street was implemented and has continued to do so.

As a community, we need to take pride in our appearance and delivery of amenities to the ratepayers. They will also share in the benefit of these community projects and the pride it instils in the community, so they will spend more time in the area that they live in as well as attracting new visitors to the area.

#### Officer's Comments:

### Comment from Group Manager Recreation and Aquatics and Group Manager Strategic Planning

Preparation of the report will take approximately 30 staff hours, being an estimated \$2,000 funded from existing staff budgets.

#### ATTACHMENTS

Nil.



Item No:C0218 Item 11Subject:NOTICE OF MOTION: TREES POLICYFrom:Councillors Deputy Mayor, Julie Passas, Vittoria Raciti and Victor Macri

#### MOTION:

THAT Council:

- 1. Call on the State Government to amend the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act to allow Council to review decisions made by staff on tree matters;
- 2. Urgently review the DCP controls on trees relating to issues arising around damage to residents and properties and the financial burden to residents of tree retention ie. The requirement to obtain engineers and arborist reports; and
- 3. Consider funding this work as part of the next quarterly budget review in 2017/18 or as part of the budget considerations for 2018/19.

#### Officer's Comments:

#### **Comment from Group Manager Trees, Parks and Sports Fields:**

Point 2 of the motion would require additional resources as this work is not programmed. The cost of engaging consultants to urgently undertake Point 2 would be \$24,800.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil.



Item No:	C0218 Item 12
Subject:	NOTICE OF MOTION: FERRIS LANE ANNANDALE GREEN SPACE
From:	Councillor Marghanita Da Cruz

#### MOTION:

THAT Council Staff bring back a report on the conversion of Ferris Lane to a Park incorporating a community garden, rain capture and flood mitigation elements.

#### Background

Ferris Lane is located in the North Western Part of Annandale. This part of Annandale has no green or community spaces.

Ferris Lane has been blocked off to vehicles for sometime now as evidenced by the historical white wooden fencing.

The area is flood prone and Sydney Water has identified the need to expand the capacity of the pipes containing White's Creek and two tributaries in the vicinity including one which runs under Ferris Lane.

Local resident Cathy O'Donnel has mobilized her local community into transforming this laneway from one where rubbish was dumped and the walls were graffitied to a welcoming community green space. Cathy has made several unsuccessful applications for community grants to fund the landscaping and provide a tap to water the garden.

Cathy's work in the laneway has been embraced by the local community and a petition to improve this open space already has 428 signatures. Water is currently provided by an adjoining property owner.

Rain Gardens and other elements to manage rain and storm water were included in a design in the grant application which is attached.

#### **Officer's Comments:**

#### **Comment from Group Manager Trees, Parks and Sports Fields:**

The preparation of this report will take approximately 8 hours. This will delay the preparation of the IWC Sporting Ground Allocation Policy.

#### ATTACHMENTS

- **1.** Ferris Lane Proposal
- 2. J Ferris Lane Proposal Photos

### Ferris Lane\_Green Space Proposal

Prepared for: Marghanita Da Cruz Prepared by: Michael & Kathy O'Donnell 29 December 2017

#### Objective

The creation of a vibrant, sustainable, shared, inclusive Green Space, building on the National 202020 Vision and Local Government Sustainability Plans.

The Green Space will promote community physical health and wellbeing, connecting people, enhancing urban liveability and place-making, environmental benefits include regenerating natural habitat, attracting native fauna and planting species will reflect local cultural diversity.

Ferris Lane has the potential to be an integral pedestrian and cycling link between Annandale, Leichhardt and Whites Creek Valley Parkland.

#### Background

Over the past 3 years unfunded local volunteers have worked to remove litter, weeds, dumped items and drug implements from Ferris Lane and in its place line the laneway with potted plants, grow herbs for the residents to share and provide a space for people to spend time together. Ferris Lane today is no longer a passage way to be avoided but one that people choose to come to and share with others.

Plans by Sydney Water to increase the carrying capacity of Whites Creek canal and the underground services in Ferris Lane, has meant previous government grant submissions for Ferris Lane Green Space need to be scaled back and reconsidered.



#### **Revised Concept**

**428** local residents have signed a petition in support of the creation of the laneway Green Space and are seeking the support of the council to further develop Ferris Lane in the following areas:

- Water Supply installation of a garden tap to ensure longevity of plantings.
- Creation of a Bog Garden at the southern end of the laneway bordering Whites Creek Lane to filter some of the 50,000 square metres of hard surface that drains via this laneway, which collect leaves and pollutants blocking the drain pipes that feed into Whites Creek underground canal, all of which flows into Roselle Bay.



Item 12

- Construct rainwater gardens long the length of Ferris Lane adjacent to the existing curb & gutter + helping absorb and filter run off and soften the hard edge of the old tar surface with native plantings.
- Create a meandering permeable pedestrian/cyclist pathway from Ferris Street through to Whites ٠ Creek Lane, retaining the pedestrian and cycle way but making it more invitingly and environmentally sound.
- Construct a demountable shade pergola with seating and planter box for vine coverage.



- Community Pergola
- Provide large scale planters for deciduous and fruit trees which can be relocated if access is + needed to underground service providers.
- Retain the existing communal herb gardens.







Ferris Lane, Annandale Michael & Kath O'Donnell, 29 Dec 2017



A. . . Marken . .













ltem 13

Item No:C0218 Item 13Subject:NOTICE OF MOTION: TED FLOYD WAYFrom:Councillor Marghanita Da Cruz

#### MOTION:

THAT:-

- 1. Council name the path through the White's Creek wetlands in Lilyfield, "Ted Floyd Way".
- 2. The budgetary implications of this resolution be considered at the next quarterly budget review.

#### **Background**

Ted Floyd was a resident of Coulon Street Rozelle for over 40 years.

Around 1986, Ted was invited to be a member of the Leichhardt Council Transport Committee. There he raised concerns about pollution from cars and advocated for pedestrian safety. As a result of his advocacy, 40km speed limits were introduced on the Balmain Peninsula.

In the 1990s, Ted took his advocacy to the Environment and Planning Committee meetings.

Working for Friends of the Earth, Ted produced pamphlets on Solar Hot Water and passive solar design. In 1994, Ted's strong advocacy helped Leichhardt Council to mandate Solar hotwater, natural ventilation and passive solar design for new buildings in planning instrument DCP17. These policies were a first in Australia (and the world) and had to overcome opposition from Energy providers Sydney Electricity & AGL.

Ted was proudest of his part in the creation of White's Creek Wetlands in 2002. Ted identified the Sydney Water owned site and then championed the project through organisational and community resistance. Though the original purpose of the wetlands was to remove pollutants and nutrients from storm water running off the streets, Ted believed it could also play a very important role in education and community awareness of our natural environment. The wetlands are now home to Turtles and Frogs.

Ted embraced any and every way to communicate his ideas, including the printed word, art, poetry, websites, blogs, journal articles, letters to the editor, emails to council and government officers and to members of parliament and ministers.

Ted's words on transpiration and evapotranspiration by trees was picked up in Wikipedia and translated into Thai, Telagu, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch and possibly other languages.

There are two more recent contributions, Ted made to our community:

- Successfully advocated for the removal of advertising panels from the bus shelters on Victoria Road to improve pedestrian safety, and

- As a Soil Scientist he critically reviewed the soil contamination report for the orchard in Whites Creek Valley to pin point contamination for capping and so increasing the land available to plant trees.

Ted passed in hospital after being found injured on a footpath in Rozelle in 2017.



This motion has the support of Ted's sister Robyn Floyd, Annandale Resident, David Lawrence and Friends of White's Creek's Gillian Leahy.

#### Officer's Comments:

#### **Comment from Group Manager Trees, Parks and Sports Fields:**

The implementation of this motion will require preparing a submission to the Geographical Names Board and associated consultation and will take approximately 14 hours of staff time and if approved \$5,000 for signage. This will delay the preparation of the IWC Sporting Ground Allocation Policy.

#### ATTACHMENTS

Nil.



 Item No:
 C0218 Item 14

 Subject:
 NOTICE OF MOTION: RECOGNISING JANUARY 26 AS A DAY OF

 INVASION, MOURNING AND SURVIVAL

 Erom:
 Counciller Tem Kist

From: Councillor Tom Kiat

#### MOTION:

THAT:

- 1. Acknowledge that January 26 marks the beginning of the British invasion of the lands of First Nations people, and in particular that of the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation, and oppression of First Nations people, and is therefore not an appropriate date for an inclusive national celebration;
- 2. Acknowledge that First Nations people never ceded sovereignty of their land and have continuously cared for their country for over 60,000 years as the world's oldest living culture;
- 3. Acknowledge the first Day of Mourning was held 80 years ago on January 26, 1938, being the 150th anniversary of the British invasion. The day was attended by Indigenous Australians and non-Indigenous supporters in protest of the national holiday and the callous treatment of Aboriginal people and the date continues to be commemorated annually as a Day of Mourning or Invasion Day;
- 4. Support the Change the Date campaign and advocate to the Federal Government to change the date on which Australia Day is commemorated, consistent with the resolution passed by the National General Assembly of Local Government in June 2017;
- 5. Cease holding an "Australia Day" event on January 26 from 2019, and cease referring to the January 26 public holiday as "Australia Day" in its communications; and
- 6. Provide a report to Councillors by May 2018, based on consultation with local First Nations people considering:
  - a) Whether and how Council could host or fund a commemoration of January 26 led by First Nations people;
  - b) How Council can continue to annually recognise community service in the Inner West through its Citizen of the Year awards;
  - c) Whether and how Council can appropriately hold an annual event to commemorate Australia as a nation.
- 7. The budgetary implications of this resolution be considered at the next quarterly budget review or as part of the 2018/19 budget considerations, with input from the relevant Council officers.

#### **Background**

The Report sitting behind the Uluru Statement from the Heart declares that:

Australia was not a settlement and it was not a discovery. It was an invasion... Now is an opportunity for the First Nations to tell the truth about history in our own voices and from our own point of view.17 And for mainstream Australians to hear those voices and to reconsider what they know and understand about their nation's history. This will be challenging, but the truth about invasion needs to be told.

On 18 January of this year, the Guardian reported comments from peak First Nations bodies regarding the celebration of Australia Day on January 26:

- Reconciliation Australia chief executive Karen Mundine: *"asking Indigenous people to celebrate on January 26 is like asking them to dance on their ancestors' graves"*
- National Congress of Australia's First Peoples co-chair Rod Little: "There are 364 other days that would be more suitable for reconciliation, provided our history is understood and respected."
- Healing Foundation CEO Richard Weston: "It is impossible to celebrate when it brings to mind the deep hurt borne by our ancestors and how that suffering continues to impact today."

Last year we asked our own ATSI advisory group to comment on this issue. They stated that January 26 is not an appropriate date to celebrate Australia Day.

I spoke to Mr Nathan Moran, CEO of the Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council which covers all of the Inner West and beyond. He said *"The arrival of the First Fleet and the raising of the Flag of Great Britain at Sydney Cove by Governor Phillip is a date of significance, but for MLALC it's not a day for National celebration;"* and, *"We will always refer to January 26 as "Day of Mourning", Invasion Day or Survival Day."* 

I also spoke with Mr Ken Canning, one of the organisers of Sydney's Invasion Day rally and the first Indigenous graduate of UTS. He said: *"If we are ever going to walk together as a nation, the full and true history must be and should be told. What better way than to commence by recognising that for First Nations Peoples, January 26 is the beginning of the attempted genocide of over 500 different Tribal Nations in what is now called Australia. To have people out celebrating in a nation-wide party is purely an insult to Our Peoples and continues to reinforce the inaccuracies of the history of this country."* 

Council currently celebrates January 26 as "Australia Day" with a festival at Enmore Park including amusement rides, live music, a citizenship ceremony, Citizen of the Year awards, and fireworks.

Finding a new way for Council to commemorate January 26 is not going to solve the serious ongoing injustices faced by First Nations people in our LGA. However it is a good step toward listening to First Nations voicing speaking about historic and ongoing oppression, and an important way to communicate to the broader community the truth about this nation's history. By consulting with and listening to the First Nations community in the Inner West, we will work toward establishing a new commemoration for January 26 based on truth, justice and inclusion.

#### Officers Comment:

### Comment from Group Manager Communication, Engagement and Events and Group Manager Community Services and Culture:

The cost of holding an event of Australia Day is approximately \$85,000 which will be a cost saving if Point 5 of the motion is supported.

The cost savings in Point 5 of the motion would need to be utilised to fund the events described in Point 6 of the Motion.



The consultation referred to in Point 6 of the Motion would require funding of \$10,000 to engage an external consultant to conduct the consultation as Council does not have the specialist skills required to undertake this.

#### ATTACHMENTS

Nil.