

8 DECEMBER 2016

REPORT FOR ITEM 7 AND LATE PRECIS OF CORRESPONDENCE

**Ordinary Meeting of Council Meeting No. 14/16
TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2016.**

**Council Chambers, Level 1A
1 Pope Street, Ryde - 8.00pm**

English

If you do not understand this letter, please come to the Ryde Civic Centre, Devlin Street, Ryde, to discuss it with Council staff who will arrange an interpreter service. Or you may ring the Translating & Interpreting Service on 131 450 to ask an interpreter to contact Council for you. Council's phone number is 9952 8222. Council office hours are 8.30am to 4.30pm, Monday to Friday.

Arabic

إذا كنت لا تفهم محتويات هذه الرسالة، فالرجاء الاتصال بمركز مجلس بلدية رايد Ryde Civic Centre، وعنوانه: Ryde، و Devlin Street، لمناقشتها مع العاملين في المجلس عن طريق مترجم، يستعين به العاملون لمساعدتك. أو يمكنك، بدلاً من ذلك، أن تتصل بمكتب خدمات الترجمة TIS على الرقم 131 450 وأن تطلب من أحد المترجمين أن يتصل بالمجلس نيابة عنك. رقم تليفون المجلس هو 9952 8222، وساعات العمل هناك هي من الساعة 8.30 صباحاً إلى 4.30 بعد الظهر من يوم الاثنين إلى يوم الجمعة.

Armenian

Եթէ այս նամակը չէք հասկնար, խնդրեմ եկէք՝ *Բայր Սիվիք Սենթրը, Տելվին փողոց, Բայր, խոսակցելու*։ Բաղաքապետարանի պաշտօնետաներուն հետ, որոնք թարգմանիչ մը կրնան կարգադրել։ Կամ, կրնաք հեռաձայնել Թարգմանութեան Ապասարկութեան՝ 131 450, եւ խնդրել որ թարգմանիչ մը Բաղաքապետարանին հետ կապ հաստատէ ձեզի համար։ Բաղաքապետարի հեռաձայնի թիւն է՝ 9952 8222։ Բաղաքապետարանի գրասենեակի ժամերն են՝ կ.ա. ժամը 8.30 - կ.ե. ժամը 4.30, Երկուշաբթիէն Ուրբաթ։

Chinese

如果您看不懂這封信，請到位于 Devlin Street, Ryde 的禮特區市府禮堂 (Ryde Civic Centre) 與區政廳工作人員討論，他們將會給您安排傳譯員服務。或者您自己打電話給“翻譯及傳譯服務”，電話：131 450，請他們替您與區政廳聯係。區政廳的電話號碼是：9952 8222。區政廳工作時間是：週一至週五，上午 8.30 到下午 4.30。

Farsi

اگر این نامه را نمی فهمید لطفاً به مرکز شهرداری رايد در Devlin Street مراجعه کنید. کارمندان شهرداری ترتیب استفاده از يك مترجم را براي شما خواهند داد. یا میتوانید به سرویس ترجمه کتبی و شفاهی شماره 131 450 تلفن بزید و بخواهید که يك مترجم از جانب شما با شهرداری تماس بگیرد. شماره تلفن شهرداری 9952 8222 و ساعات کار از 8.30 صبح تا 4.30 بعد از ظهر می باشد.

Italian

Le persone che hanno difficoltà a capire la presente lettera, sono pregate di presentarsi al Ryde Civic Centre in Devlin Street, Ryde, e parlarne con gli impiegati municipali che provvederanno a richiedere l'intervento di un interprete. Oppure possono chiamare il Translating & Interpreting Service al 131 450 e chiedere ad uno dei loro interpreti di mettersi in contatto con il comune di Ryde. Il numero del comune è 9952 8222. Gli uffici comunali sono aperti dalle 8.30 alle 16.30, dal lunedì al venerdì.

Korean

이 편지를 이해할 수 없으시면 Ryde의 Devlin Street에 있는 Ryde Civic Centre로 오셔서 카운슬 직원과 상담하여 주십시오. 저희 직원이 통역 서비스를 연결해 드릴 것입니다. 아니면 131 450번으로 통번역 서비스(TIS)에 전화하셔서 통역사에게 대신 카운슬에 연락해 주도록 부탁하셔도 됩니다. 카운슬 전화 번호는 9952 8222번입니다. 카운슬의 업무 시간은 오전 8:30부터 오후 4:30, 월요일에서 금요일까지입니다.

Meeting Date: Tuesday 13 December 2016
Location: Council Chambers, Level 1A, 1 Pope Street, Ryde
Time: 8.00pm

*Council Meetings will be recorded on audio tape for minute-taking purposes
as authorised by the Local Government Act 1993. Council Meetings will also be webcast.*

NOTICE OF BUSINESS

Item	Page
COUNCIL REPORT FOR ITEM 7	
7 DRAFT MEDIUM HOUSING CODE AND DRAFT MEDIUM DENSITY DESIGN GUIDE	1
LATE PRECIS OF CORRESPONDENCE	
2 YMCA NSW - APPEARANCE BEFORE THE ROYAL COMMISSION HEARING INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE	22

COUNCIL REPORT FOR ITEM 7

7 DRAFT MEDIUM HOUSING CODE AND DRAFT MEDIUM DENSITY DESIGN GUIDE

Report prepared by: Strategic Planner
File No.: URB/08/1/2/3 - BP16/1495

REPORT SUMMARY

The NSW Government is seeking Council's feedback on the recently released draft Medium Density Design Guide (the Design Guide) and Draft Medium Density Housing Code (the Code). Council has received an extension to the submission period until the 17 December 2016.

The Draft Code

Under the draft Code it is proposed to expand the land uses that can be fast tracked as complying development to include:

- Dual occupancy – 2 dwellings on one lot of land (attached or detached)
- Manor house – a building containing 3 or 4 dwellings on one lot where each dwelling is attached to another by a common wall and or floor (maximum 2 storeys)
- Multi dwelling housing (terraces) – 3 or more dwellings (attached or detached) on one lot of land where each dwelling has a frontage to a public road and no other dwellings are above or below
- Torrens title subdivision with the construction of two or more dwellings. Development standards are proposed and registration will occur only when the development is nearing completion.

The draft Code changes:

- Are restricted to the R1 General Residential, R2 Low Density Residential and R3 Medium Density Residential zones within the City of Ryde.
- Will introduce multi dwelling housing (terraces) as a form of multi dwelling housing, which will be permitted wherever multi dwelling housing is currently permitted.
- Will introduce manor houses as a permitted use wherever multi dwelling housing or residential flat buildings are permitted.

ITEM 7 (continued)

The changes do not relate to multi dwelling housing developments or dual occupancy developments where one dwelling is located behind another such as dwellings with no street frontage.

Draft Medium Density Design Guide (MDDG)

Refer to **ATTACHMENT 1** for an illustration of Medium density development (“Missing middle”) covered by the MDDG.

The MDDG provides planning and design standards for low-rise medium density residential development across NSW. The Draft Guide provides mandatory design criteria and desirable design guidelines relating to those criteria. Council may choose not to adopt the Guide and rely on its existing DCP controls. However, Council’s existing controls are not currently designed to address the density and development types that would be arise should the amendments to the Draft Code be implemented.

In particular, current DCP controls relating to the design of duplex and multi dwelling housing within R2 zones responds to a significantly different context given the minimum lot sizes, floor space ratio, and setback provisions proposed in the Draft Code. Moreover, Council currently does not permit terrace housing as a development type and therefore have no design controls for terraces within the RDCP 2014.

A submission has been prepared to address a number of concerns with respect to the proposed draft Medium Density Housing Code and Guide including:

- the impact of introducing multi dwelling housing (terraces) and manor houses on the character of the R2 Low Density Residential zone.
- the significant increase in the density of development that will occur in the R2 zone as a result of the minimum site requirements proposed for such development types.
- the inappropriate nature of the development standards proposed and how they will undermine Council’s current development standards in the R2 zone.
- current issues with the use of complying development and that complying development is not suitable for complex development types.
- the lack of information on the implementation of the proposed changes to the Codes SEPP and the implication to Council’s LEP and DCP.

The draft submission to the draft Medium Density Housing Code and Guide is **ATTACHED (ATTACHMENT 2)**.

ITEM 7 (continued)

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) That Council endorse the submission to the *Draft Medium Density Housing Code and Medium Density Guide* and that it be forwarded to the Department of Planning and Environment and the North District Commissioner of the Greater Sydney Commission.
- (b) That Council write to the Minister for Planning, North District Commissioner of the Greater Sydney Commission, and Local State Members seeking an urgent meeting to discuss the proposed changes to the Codes SEPP and Council's submission.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1 Medium Density Development ("Missing middle") Illustration
- 2 Draft Submission - Proposed Medium Density Housing Code and Guide

Report Prepared By:

Susan Wotton
Strategic Planner

Report Approved By:

Lexie Macdonald
Senior Coordinator - Strategic Planning

Dyalan Govender
Acting Manager - Strategic City

Liz Coad
Acting Director - City Strategy and Planning

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1





Figure 1: Medium density development (“Missing middle”) in the spectrum of residential accommodation

Source: Department of Planning and Environment (<http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Policy-and-Legislation/Housing/Medium-Density-Housing>)

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



Lifestyle and opportunity @ your doorstep

Codes and Approvals Pathways
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Cc: Dr Deborah Dearing
District Commissioner Greater Sydney Commission

7 December 2016

Our Ref: URB/08/1/2/3

Dear Sir/Madam,

City of Ryde's Submission - Draft Medium Density Housing Code (MDHC) and the Medium Density Design Guide (MDDG)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008* with respect to introduction of low rise medium density housing as complying development and the draft MDDG.

Introduction

The City of Ryde (CoR) is committed to providing sustainable and high quality housing choices to assist in accommodating necessary growth in Metropolitan Sydney and recognises the role of Medium Density Housing within this mix. This commitment is demonstrated in CoR's Local Environmental Plan which, unlike most metropolitan LEP's, permits appropriate Medium Density Housing in the R2 zone in conjunction with carefully devised controls, developed in consultation with the local community, to ensure the character and amenity of CoR's neighbourhoods.

The proposed changes undermine Council's efforts to provide balanced housing choices on appropriate sites, supplemented by greater density around centres and transport nodes.

Under the proposed amendments to the Codes SEPP the following new forms of development will be permitted in the largest zone within the City of Ryde, the R2 Low Density Residential Zone, as complying development:

- Manor houses
- Multi dwelling housing (terraces) and
- Torrens title subdivision of a minimum lot size of 200sqm and a 6m width.

Dual occupancy (attached), an existing permitted form of development in the R2 zone with development consent, will be permissible as complying development under the proposed amendments.

1

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



The key issues raised in this submission relate to the following:

1. Impact of the Proposed Changes on the Character of an Area
2. Increase in Density and Lack of Supporting Infrastructure
3. Inappropriate Development Standards
4. Issues with Complying Development System
5. Issues with the Proposed MDDG
6. Issues with the required changes to existing LEPs and DCPs.

1. Impact of Proposed Changes on the Character of an Area

CoR has been highly proactive in ensuring that there has been housing choice available throughout the Local Government Area, and has sought to implement a housing strategy which balances the need for urban consolidation and urban renewal in a manner consistent with the values of the local community.

CoR's guiding principles for the provision of medium density housing has been to provide housing forms that are compatible and sympathetic with the conventional detached dwelling house while maintaining the existing character of residential neighbourhoods and preserving and enhancing the residential amenity of the City.

Since 1995, multi-dwelling housing and dual occupancy developments have been permitted within the R2 zone and more recently, Council has supported the Torrens title subdivision of dual occupancy developments. Successful integration of such development types in the R2 zone has been achieved through detailed consideration and community consultation of the required development controls needed to achieve high-quality design outcomes and the individual assessment of a site's suitability for such development. It has also been achieved through ensuring required infrastructure to support the changes had been available.

This proactive approach is far beyond that undertaken by most other local government areas and is successfully seeing the delivery of a mix of detached single dwellings, dual occupancies, and multi dwelling villa housing across the local government area. As a middle ring suburb of metropolitan Sydney, CoR is typified by larger allotments and buildings with larger setbacks in landscaped settings. The current LEP and DCP provisions are tailored to these characteristics to allow for the provision of medium density housing in significant numbers while still maintaining the overall character and amenity of existing neighbourhoods.

The proposed changes to the Codes SEPP to allow medium housing as complying development fail to protect the character and context of the R2 zone within the CoR which the proposed complying development would be permitted. This view is supported by the following comments.

2

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



2. Increase in Density and Lack of Supporting Infrastructure

The below table provides a comparison of sites in the R2 Zone within the CoR capable of being developed for multi dwelling housing and dual occupancy under the Ryde LEP 2014 and the number of sites that will be available for medium density housing under the proposed changes to the Codes SEPP.

Table 1 – Potential Development Sites

	Ryde LEP 2014 – R2 Zone	Codes SEPP – R2 Zone
<i>Potential number of allotments capable of dual occupancy development</i>	3,290	14,535
<i>Potential number of allotments capable of multi dwelling housing developments</i>	876 (also capable of being developed for dual occupancy)	4,727 (also capable of being developed for dual occupancy and manor houses)
<i>Potential number of allotments capable manor house developments</i>	0 - Not permitted	10,444 (also capable of being developed for dual occupancy)
<i>Total number of sites capable of medium density housing development</i>	3,290	14,535

The figures provided above exclude any R2 land that has been recently developed and strata subdivided.

Table 1 indicates an increase in the number of allotments capable of being developed for medium density housing in the R2 zone from 3,290 to 14,495 sites. This represents approximately 62.5% of all land zoned R2 in the City of Ryde (the total number of all sites zoned R2 is 23,255). These allotments are spread across the LGA and are not strategically located to accommodate medium density housing.

Even if this land was only developed for dual occupancies (regardless of its capability to be developed for manor homes or multi dwelling terrace housing) this represents an increase in potential population of approximately 32,000.

Insufficient consideration has been made to the volume of development that will result from the proposed changes to the SEPP Code and the impact on traffic, open space, waste services provision and all other forms of required infrastructure need to support the resultant increase in population. Moreover, large portions of the R2 Zone consist of areas where the local road and drainage networks have not been designed to accommodate the proposed levels of density.

The proposed changes to the SEPP and blanket provision of medium density housing is grossly inconsistent with other key State Government planning policies,

3

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2

such as the Draft District Plans, which seek to align increased density with transport systems to reduce car dependency and encourage alternate forms of travel modes. The proposed increase of density in the R2 zones which are generally located outside of the pedestrian catchment of major transport nodes such as train stations will result in increased traffic issues and a reduction in amenity to many areas that have existing congestion issues.

3. Inappropriate Development Standards

The below provides a comparison table of controls currently in Ryde LEP 2014 and DCP 2014 relating to the permitted forms of medium density residential development and those proposed under the Codes SEPP amendment.

Table 2 – Development Standards

Development Standard	Ryde LEP 2014/Ryde DCP 2014	Codes SEPP
Dual Occupancy (attached)	Min area – 580sqm Min road frontage – 20m Max FSR – 0.5:1	(Two Dwellings Side by Side) Min area – 200sqm per dwelling Min width – 6m per dwelling Maximum FSR for each lot: 200-300 sqm - 0.75:1 >300-400 sqm - 0.70:1 >400-500 sqm - 0.65:1 >500+ - 0.60:1
Multi dwelling housing (terraces)	Not permitted Controls for mews developments Min area – 900sqm Min road frontage – 20m Site Coverage – 40%	Min area – 200sqm per dwelling Min width – 6m each dwelling Maximum FSR for each lot: 200-300 sqm - 0.80:1 >300-400 sqm - 0.75:1 >400-500 sqm - 0.75:1 >500+ - 0.70:1
Manor houses	Not permitted	Min area – 600sqm Min width – 15m Maximum FSR for the site: >600 – 700sqm - 0.60:1 >700 – 920sqm - 0.50:1 >920sqm - 0.40:1
Subdivision pattern	Min area – 580sqm Min road frontage – 20m Dual Occupancy Min area for each resulting lot – 290sqm Min road frontage for each resulting lot – 10m	Min area – 200sqm Min road frontage – 6m

4

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



Lifestyle and opportunity @ your doorstep

CoR's current controls for both dual occupancy (attached) and multi dwelling housing such as lot size, density, site coverage, and FSR create a balanced relationship between the site area, dwelling size, and residential population living on the site. The controls ensure that the character of an area will be maintained by promoting a balance between built and unbuilt areas to allow for sufficient landscaping, retention of significant vegetation and trees, pervious areas, and internal amenity to the development. These controls have been developed and updated through detailed consultation with community and iterative evolution of controls to address emergent issues and improve design and amenity standards.

The following comments are made in relation to each of the proposed housing types and the key controls.

Dual Occupancy

Ryde has recently undergone a revision of its development standards for dual occupancy (attached) developments to ensure they remain part of the housing mix within the CoR, to address a range of issues expressed by the community around such development, and to reduce impacts on the local character and amenity. CoR recently increased the minimum road frontage for dual occupancy (attached) from 15m to 20m to improve issues such as streetscape presentation, extent of hard-paved surfaces and amenity issues for the dwellings comprising the dual occupancy development and adjoining properties (a 580sqm minimum lot size has been maintained). The proposed reduction and design standards would break faith with the community, transforming the local character and delivering poorer quality streetscapes.

Multi dwelling housing

As well as the controls identified Table 2 for multi dwelling housing *Ryde LEP 2014* provides a density requirement of 300sqm for each 1,2, or 3 bedroom dwelling and 365sqm for each 4 or more bedroom dwelling.

Under the proposed amendments to the Codes SEPP the density requirement will be reduced to 200sqm per dwelling regardless of size. This will result in insufficient provision of on-site open space, significant reduction in off-street parking to accommodate site access, inadequate retention of mature vegetation, and a detrimental impact on amenity and privacy.


Manor homes and Multi dwelling housing (terraces)

Manor houses and terrace housing are prohibited in the R2 zone in the City of Ryde. As part of the Ryde Local Planning Study (2010), which formed the basis of Ryde LEP 2014 extensive community consultation confirmed that this type of development is considered to be entirely inconsistent with the existing character of neighbourhood

5

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



Lifestyle and opportunity @ your doorstep

areas in the CoR. The study also found that such development types were more suited to zones where residential flat buildings were permitted as these zones could better sustain the increased density and deliver the required supporting infrastructure and services.

Subdivision

The proposed Torrens titling of dual occupancy and multi dwelling housing at a lot size of 200sqm and 6m width will undermine the consistent approach Council has taken since 1979 to ensuring a minimum lot size of 580m and road frontage of 20m (or 10m for each resulting lot). In permitting the Torrens titling of dual occupancy developments, Council considered the precedent that would be set and the impact upon LEP 2014 minimum subdivision requirements for residential lot sizes. The CoR's requirements (10m minimum road frontage and combined area of 580sqm for the two newly created lots) have been based on a detailed understanding of the character, current allotment profile in the CoR, and the level of development that can be sustainably provided within Low Density areas of the LGA. It is considered that the creation of lots of 200sqm and 6m road frontage will set a precedent that will result in undermining the subdivision controls within Ryde LEP 2014 and completely transform the character of low density neighbourhoods.

Floor space

Under Ryde LEP 2014 the maximum FSR permitted is 0.5:1. Currently the gross floor area (GFA) for a dual occupancy (attached) development on a 580sqm allotment is 290sqm. Under the development standards within the MDHC, the GFA for a 580sqm allotment could be increased to 435sqm, representing an FSR of 0.75:1. This is a 50% increase in FSR that will be widely available to developers across the low density residential areas of the CoR. This increase is not commensurate with infrastructure levels available and the increased needs have not been envisaged in existing Section 94 Contributions Plans or Council Delivery Plans.

The existing controls in Ryde DCP 2014 result in multi-dwelling housing developments typically having a FSR at or below the maximum FSR of 0.5:1 FSR permitted under the LEP. Under the proposed complying development standards, FSRs of up to 0.8:1 could be experienced within the R2 Low Density Residential zone. This represents a 60% increase in the 0.5:1 FSR currently permitted.


With respect to Manor Houses the, gross floor area under the MDHC on a 600sqm allotment could be 360sqm, representing an FSR of 0.6:1 for manor houses or dual occupancy (attached – one dwelling over the other). This is a 20% increase in FSR that will be widely available to developers across the low density residential areas of the CoR.

This will not result in a balanced mix of housing typologies and opportunities. The impact of the FSR increases will transform the R2 zone to a medium density environment, leaving the CoR with no distinguishable low density neighbourhoods.

6

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



Lifestyle and opportunity @ your doorstep

Landscaping

The development standards under the MDHC for dual occupancy (attached) developments will require only a 20% landscaped area, with landscaping forward of the building line being only 25%. These rates are less than half of what is typically required under CoR's current planning provisions, and as such will transform the existing landscape character of the low density areas and streetscapes. For example, little opportunity will be available for mature tree planting to support continuity of vegetation corridors along rear setback areas, and impacts on microclimatic conditions and rainwater percolation are also envisaged with such low levels of landscaping.

Similar concerns are also held with the development standards for multi-dwelling housing (terrace) developments. For example, only 25% of the area forward of the building line is required to be landscaped for multi dwelling housing (terrace) developments, whereas under the current development controls in the R2 zone, development's typically include 60% of the front setback area as landscaped area.

With regard to Manor Houses the development standards under the MDHC require a 50% minimum landscaping forward of the building line. Given the existing provisions under RDCP 2014 generally prescribe a minimum 60% landscaped area forward of the building line, this change will permit a greater level of hard surface areas within the front setback. This is considered to be to the detriment of many streetscapes within the low density residential area which are characterised by dwellings located in a landscape setting that includes a clearly defined front garden and capability for mature tree growth.

Further, the overall landscaped area for this type of development can be as low as 30% under the complying development provisions of the MDHC. Given the minimum requirements under RDCP 2014 are 35%, this represents a 14% variation of CoR's current provisions.

This lower level of landscaping would exacerbate the result imbalance between built and unbuilt areas created by the proposed blanket increase in density.

Setbacks

Most existing areas in the CoR have 6m street frontage setbacks, changing the setback requirements would significantly affect the overall character and aesthetic of established low-scale areas. A consistent build-to line is preferred (where existing dwellings are within 40m, minimum of 6m or the average of two closest dwellings, if surrounding setbacks are less than or more than 6m) to maintain the existing landscape character of low density areas within the City.

7

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



4. Issues with the Complying Development System

The proposed changes affect each Council differently and therefore do not ensure a consistent approach throughout the Metropolitan Area. It is unclear how any reasonable strategic argument can be made for the appropriateness of medium density housing and grossly inflated levels in just a handful of LGAs (i.e. The LGAs where medium density housing is an established part of the housing mix and permitted in R2 zones¹), while the majority of Metropolitan Sydney will see the proposed changes limited to smaller areas. The intended improvements to the mix of housing will therefore be the worst of both worlds, that is, beyond sustainable for those Councils already providing medium density housing across their LGAs and insubstantial for those Councils who currently limit the provision of medium density to higher density zones.

Low density residential area (R2 zone) within the City and Inner Suburbs is inherently different to the low density residential areas within Sydney's middle ring and outer suburbs. As noted above, in the middle ring LGAs such as CoR the low density residential areas are typified by larger allotments and buildings with larger setbacks in landscaped settings while in the inner areas comparable smaller allotments with denser built forms are commonplace. The proposed expansion of the Codes SEPP makes no regard for this significant difference.

The inclusion of these provisions in the Codes SEPP with existing permissibility used as the only mechanism for the strategic increase in delivery of medium density housing is not appropriate for those LGAs that already permit medium density in R2 zones and consideration should be given to either reviewing this mechanism or excluding those LGAs detrimentally affected such as CoR.

In addition, the CoR has a comparatively high take-up of complying development against inner and middle ring metropolitan Councils. This experience with the SEPP and with the private certification system upon which it relies, suggests that the

¹ Multi dwelling Housing is a permissible use within the R2 Zone in only 9 (out of 40) Local Environmental Plans in Metropolitan Sydney, which include:

1. Bankstown LEP 2015
2. Botany Bay LEP 2013 (only in special circumstances)
3. Campbelltown LEP 2015
4. Hurstville LEP 2012
5. Lane Cove LEP 2009
6. Manly LEP 2013
7. Marrickville LEP 2011 (only in special circumstances)
8. Ryde LEP 2014
9. Sutherland LEP 2015

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



addition of medium density housing to the SEPP extends the risk profile beyond the mitigation capacity of the current system. In particular the following issues are raised.

Individual Site Issues

To ensure that Council's permitted housing forms in the R2 Low Density Zone are of high quality and sensitive to their environment, the site layout and building design must consider the existing characteristics, opportunities, and constraints of both the site and its surrounds. This is done through the submission of a site analysis that must show in particular how future dwellings relate to their immediate surrounding and how the design minimises the negative impact on the amenity of adjoining developments and the street/neighbourhood.

The introduction into the Codes SEPP of new forms of medium density housing with standardised development controls does not take into consideration the unique issues or characteristics that may exist with the land being developed or the surrounding area such as:

- Topography
- Established views
- Steep slopes (including landslip and slope instability)
- Bushland and bushfire risk
- Poor residential amenity to the development
- Overland flow
- Foreshore impacts
- Architectural characteristic of an area
- Significant and threatened vegetation
- Traffic issues
- Proximity to heritage items and conservation areas

Medium density housing has the potential for significant impacts upon the environment and community. Existing Council controls around such development have been developed in consultation with the local community in order to adequately consider these impacts through the development application process. Furthermore, within the Council areas themselves there are specific precincts and specific land parcels which differ in character and are impacted upon by different constraints and need to be able to be assessed on a lot by lot basis.

In particular it is considered that basement parking in any form of complying development is undesirable because of the issues associated with levels, drainage and topography.

There is great concern that the proposed changes to the Codes SEPP will result in the application of blanket numerical controls. The Codes SEPP makes no provisions for a merit based assessment to allow for the consideration and protection of diversity.

9

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



Current problems with implementation of Complying Development

There is no consideration of the problems with complying development as it currently operates, and the impact of these deficiencies will exponentially increase given the proposed increase in the number of developments as well as the increased intensity of impact associated with the proposed development types. All too often, Council is required to pick up the pieces of a complying development application or construction certificate that has gone wrong. Some of these issues area identified below:

- *Construction not in accordance with Complying Development Requirements.*
Many private certifiers need to be pressed by Council to take action where developments do not accord with the CDC approval. This then requires additional Council resources to investigate and take enforcement action.
- *Payment of Section 94 contributions and other Council requirements.*
Council currently has difficulty in collecting payment of Section 94 contributions and other bonds and infrastructure payments as there are gaps in the CDC certification process that often requires significant resources to police by Council due to the legislation not being rigorous enough in this area.

Furthermore, certifiers often do not provide clear and detailed information with respect to the Section 94 liability associated with proposed and approved complying developments. This leaves a number of owners surprised by the amount payable and unprepared to pay the required contributions to Council. This will be exacerbated significantly with the addition of medium density housing types.

- *Communication with the public and consultation.*
The notification process for complying development applications is often inadequate, with neighbours regularly seeking information from Council. Inadequate notice of commencement to adjoining neighbours as well as tardy submission of CDC's to Council, this will be exacerbated with the expansion of the CDC process and the increased intensity of impacts associated with medium density developments.
- *Inspections and compliance of approved CDC sites.*
Many private certifiers do not regularly inspect constructions sites to ensure compliance with their CDC and often do not respond to customers in a timely manner leaving additional workloads with Council's compliance teams. The Building Professionals Board is under resourced and unable to provide the required oversight to prevent underperformance of private certifiers.
- *Misinterpretation of the CDC legislation and combination of multiple CDC approvals.*
Often certifiers misinterpret the requirements of complying development as a one size fits all approach does not cover all possible scenarios of development sites. Council has also had experiences where certifiers have

10

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



issued approvals under combined areas of the SEPP, that is, a dwelling may be approved under the Exempt and Complying Development Codes SEPP (Housing Provisions), while at the same time an approval is issued under the Affordable Housing Code SEPP for a secondary dwelling. Often these approvals comply with the technical provisions of the relevant individual SEPPs, however, the cumulative impact and negative amenity impacts were never envisaged under the legislation.

- *Occupation of developments under complying development.*
Private certifiers often issue interim occupation certificates on completion of developments even if there are outstanding matters to be resolved. The increased requirements associated with medium density housing significantly increases the risk associated with this practice. Again, the Building Professionals Board is not resourced to adequately deal with current issues in this area and the proposed increase will unacceptably exacerbate issues.
- *Site controls.*
Insufficient on-site sediment and erosion controls are often provided by private certifiers, this will only be exacerbated with more complex developments.
- *Site constraints.*
CDCs issued by private certifiers do not address filling of sites and required retention measures. The issuing of occupation certificates without considering these measures requires considerable Council resources to resolve issues specifically relating to such sites.

The unfunded burden on Council of dealing with compliance and enforcement work (to the levels expected by the community) will substantially increase. It is anticipated that the complexity and impact of the issues arising from practical deficiencies in the private certification system will increase with the increase in the number and intensity of development under the SEPP.

5. Issues with the Draft Medium Density Design Guide (MDDG)


The Explanation of Intended Effects with respect to the Medium Density Design Guide (MDDG) states:

"Part 3 contains objectives and design criteria. The design criteria set a clear and measurable standard of how each objective can be practically achieved. The proposed development can comply with the design criteria or use an alternate solution that satisfies the objective. The development application will be required to include a Design Verification Statement from the person that designed the development that confirms that the design of the proposed development is consistent with the design principles and objectives in the MDDG and provide evidence of how the objectives have been achieved".

11

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



Lifestyle and opportunity @ your doorstep

The MDDG states the following with respect to complying development:

"Where the Design Criteria are not met, the statement should describe how an alternate solution achieves the Objectives, in some instances this may require supporting reports or diagrams".

The MDDG also states that the assessment of complying development can be carried out by a Council or private certifier and must comply with all the standards and Design Criteria.

A third party such as a qualified architect should be required to undertake the Design Verification Statement to ensure that all requirements have been met or that any alternate solution is adequate. To permit a certifier to ensure the Statement is a true reflection of what has been proposed is to open to abuse. The following issues are raised with respect to development standards proposed under the MDHC.

Basement Car Parking

The complying development provisions under the MDHC prescribe that dual occupancy (attached - two dwellings side by side) developments may contain a basement for the purpose of car parking and access to that car parking.

While basement car parking is allowable under the provisions of the Ryde Development Control Plan 2014 (RDCP 2014) for dwelling houses and dual occupancy (attached) developments, its utilisation for such developments is limited under RDCP 2014 to only those sites where it is appropriate with regard to the topography of the land. This appropriate responsive application of controls is possible under the merit based assessment process. It is not possible under the codes SEPP and private certification system.

The complying development provisions, and the provisions of the MDDG would allow for basement excavation up to 3m in depth for the purposes of basement car parking as close as 1m from a boundary. Given the significant number of development sites across the low density residential zone which could accommodate a dual occupancy (attached - two dwellings side by side) development, significant concerns are raised over the following:

- The ability to retain natural ground levels and existing landforms in the low density residential zone given basement car parking for such development is permitted to protrude up to 1m above the existing ground level.
- The poor streetscape presentation that could result from the proliferation of basement garages protruding up to 1m above existing ground level, and within 1m of boundaries.
- The geotechnical risks associated with the proliferation of such basement excavation through the CoR's low density residential areas, particularly with the inherent constraints the CoR experiences with undulating topography, areas of slope instability and steeply sloping waterfront land.

12

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



- Water table impacts from the prolific basement excavations that could be possible across the low density residential areas.
- Given basement parking is permitted to within a metre of boundaries, concerns are raised over the ability to achieve deep soil areas that are consistent with the prevailing character of the low density residential environment.
- Compromised deep soil areas and the reduced ability for landscaping to soften the appearance and improve the amenity of development.

Car Parking Numbers

Currently, under Ryde DCP 2014 at least one visitor parking space is required per four (4) multi dwelling house dwellings. Given fractions of numbers are required to be rounded up under RDCP 2014, this means at least one visitor parking space is provided for each multi dwelling house development constructed.

Under the provisions of the MDDG, development for the purposes of multi dwelling housing (terraces) is only required to provide visitor parking where a basement car park serves more than 10 dwellings. In which case, visitor parking is to be provided at 1 space per 5 dwellings.

Parking impacts are typically a key concern with DAs for multi dwelling housing developments in the low density R2 zone. This significant reduction in visitor parking permitted by the MDDG will have a negative impact on available on-street parking within the low density residential areas. This is in addition to the impact of reduced on street parking provision resulting from the reduced minimum street frontages and lot sizes proposed and the loss of parking as a result of driveways and access arrangements.

Waste

Specific design criteria on Waste Management relating to collection point locations, vertical clearances, circulation spaces, storage and the like, should be in accordance with individual Council policies. Some of the proposed provisions may also be difficult to monitor resulting in poor outcomes. These issues are raised in addition to the potential collection issues that are likely to occur as a result of increased density in areas where the existing infrastructure limits the size of service vehicles.

Additional provisions

Additional provisions are required to address the following matters:

- Retention of tree canopy, habitation value, preservation of green networks and WSUD (Water Sensitive Urban Design).
- Increase in setback distances where minimum soil standards and areas cannot be achieved for tree types as outlined in Table 1 Section 2C.
- Guiding principles for street and footpath planting and coordination with Council to be included.

13

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



6. Issues with the Required Changes to existing LEPs and DCPs

The Explanation of Intended Effects Proposed Medium Density Housing Code states that the development type must be permissible on the subject land to be carried out as complying development. For example, to construct a dual occupancy as complying development, dual occupancies must be a permitted development in the zone that applies to the land. The only exception to this is the manor house, which is proposed to be inserted as a defined term in the Standard Instrument LEP. It is proposed to allow a manor house as a new complying development type on any land where multi-dwelling housing or residential flat building is permitted.

The Ryde Local Environmental Plan 2014 is one of only 9 planning instruments of the 40 (refer to footnote in Page 8 of this document) that relate to the Sydney Metropolitan Area that permit multi dwelling housing in the R2 zone. As such only a small group of Council's will in fact be under the SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 provisions as it applies to manor houses and multi dwelling housing (terraces).

As previously noted the strategic merit of this approach is unclear given the effect of the proposed changes will be such that Councils that have already been proactive in their approach to housing diversity will have inappropriate densities and dwelling types introduced into R2 zones, breaking faith with those communities who have engaged in the effort to deliver housing and housing choice, whilst other areas that have not embraced dwelling choice and urban consolidation will be exempt from the required changes to improve delivery and choice.

Amendments to existing LEPs and DCPs

The Explanation of Intended Effects states that *"It is not proposed that the MDDG would automatically override council controls. Council would need to adopt the MDDG by reference within a development control plan.....Where a council does adopt the MDDG it is to be adopted in its entirety.....Where council does adopt the MDDG it will still need (to) prepare the principal development standards that include height, floor space ratio, landscaped area and setbacks."* (pages 7 and 8)

The MDDG states that:


"The purpose of this Design Guide is intended to inform the strategic planning of a local area and assist councils and communities to determine the future form of development in the area. Part 2 provides specific guidance for developing local controls....."

The future character of an area is to be determined by the local council and community. The Design Guide encourages a design-led strategic planning process to determine the type, scale and built form of medium density housing permitted in an area.

14

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



Lifestyle and opportunity @ your doorstep

The development controls established as a result of this process will be expressed in the Local Environmental Plan (LEP) and Development Control Plan (DCP) that applies to the site".

Principal development standards relating to height and floor space ratio are contained within environmental planning instruments. A planning proposal would be required to make any amendments to those development standards.

Adopting the MDDG by reference within a development control plan would require an amendment to be made to that DCP. Amendments to DCPs are required to follow the procedures as outlined in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

Making amendments to a Council's planning controls are complex, resource intensive and time consuming endeavours requiring considerable community consultation, particularly in light of the specific changes proposed. There would be a considerable time gap required between the amended SEPP coming into effect and any changes to an LEP or DCP to introduce the required new controls.

The Explanation of Intended Effects states that:

"It is proposed to amend the Standard Instrument LEP to add the manor house, which is currently not a defined term.

As a new development type, to enable it across NSW it is proposed to allow a manor house as complying development on any land where multi-dwelling housing or a residential flat building is permitted.

Further it is proposed to restrict complying development to R1, R2, R3 and RU5 land use zones. R4 zoned land is excluded as typically larger scale residential flat buildings are anticipated in this zone." (page 16)

It is unclear from the Explanation of Intended Effects as to how the Department intends to make "manor houses" a type of development "Permitted with consent" on all "land where multi-dwelling housing or a residential flat building is permitted."

A manor house, "being a building containing 3 or more dwellings" and not being an "attached dwelling" or "multi dwelling housing", would constitute a "residential flat building" under the definitions currently contained within the Standard Instrument. "Residential flat buildings" are a type of development that is "Prohibited" in the R2 Low Density Residential zone in all 39 environmental planning instruments that apply to land in the Sydney metropolitan area that contain the R2 zone.

Apart from stating that "It is proposed to amend the Standard Instrument LEP to add the manor house, which is currently not a defined term", the Explanation of Intended Effects does not include specific details as to how the relevant planning legislation is proposed to be amended to address permissibility issues.

15

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2



The Explanation of Intended Effects does not give any indication as to whether any amendments are proposed to be made to the Land Use Tables of environmental planning instruments. It is contended that in the case of most environmental planning instruments where the Land Use Table for the zone is a "closed zone" as opposed to an "open zone", that a "manor house" would not "be permissible, with consent, under an environmental planning instrument applying to the land", and as such would not be able to be carried out as "complying development".

It is considered inappropriate "to publicise an explanation of the intended effect of the proposed instrument and to seek and consider submissions from the public on the matter" when the "Explanation of Intended Effects" does not provide a clear indication or understanding as to how the amendments proposed are to be implemented. To have any meaningful public consultation, the Explanation of Intended Effects needs to be clearer and outline what amendments are proposed to the state policy on exempt and complying development, the Standard Instrument, and if any consequently amendments are proposed to environmental planning instrument(s) made under the Standard Instrument, what those amendments are.

Conclusion

Medium density housing, if designed and implemented correctly can lead to vibrant connected and thriving communities. The locations considered most suited to medium density development are those with appropriate infrastructure in close proximity to public transport, commercial areas, public open space and other community facilities.


While Council agrees such forms of medium density residential development are a key part of the required housing mix to accommodate Sydney's growth Council sees little benefit in including them in the Complying Development system, which is better suited to lower impact developments.

It is considered that insufficient consideration has been made to:

- Impact of the Proposed Changes on the Character of an Area;
- Increase in Density and Lack of Supporting Infrastructure;
- Inappropriate Development Standards;
- Issues with Complying Development System;
- Issues with the Draft MDDG; and
- Issues with the required changes to existing LEPs and DCPs.

ITEM 7 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 2




Lifestyle and opportunity @ your doorstep

The City of Ryde has a proud tradition of housing provision stretching back to the post-war Ryde Housing Scheme. Over the years, Council has always met and has even exceeded all housing targets set by the State Government. Recent changes to its controls for dual occupancy have opened new opportunities for that form of medium density development in Ryde. These changes are an exemplar for carefully considered strategic planning combined with dedicated community consultation and engagement as it is necessary to ensure that such development is sympathetically integrated into the existing urban fabric so that amenity of both existing and future residents is genuinely protected. Thorough and careful assessment is required because of the variety of contexts that arise including the characteristics of the land and local community interests. Local Council controls are designed specifically to provide appropriate and timely provision of medium density options. Complying Development only works effectively for simple and uncomplicated developments. The City of Ryde sees no benefit in expanding complying development to include the much more complex style of proposal that is manifested in medium density development.

For all of the above reasons, Council strongly opposes the introduction of medium density residential development as complying development and proposes that the approach be reconsidered entirely having regard to local planning instruments and controls already delivering sufficient medium density housing options to the community.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Dyalan Govender, Acting Manager – Strategic City on 9952 8188.

Liz Coad
Acting Director – City Strategy and Planning

LATE PRECIS OF CORRESPONDENCE

2 YMCA NSW - APPEARANCE BEFORE THE ROYAL COMMISSION HEARING INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Report prepared by: Acting General Manager
File No.: GRP/09/7/10 - BP16/1547

CORRESPONDENCE:

Submitting correspondence from YMCA NSW, dated 2 December 2016, providing notification of their appearance before the Royal Commission hearing into Institutional Response to Child Sexual Abuse.

YMCA appeared before the Royal Commission on 5 and 6 December 2016, noting the hearing is ongoing.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the correspondence be received and noted.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1 NOTICE - YMCA NSW to appear before the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse - Email from Leisa Hart (YMCA) to Roy Newsome dated 2 December 2016**

Report Prepared and Approved By:

Roy Newsome
Acting General Manager

PRECIS OF CORRESPONDENCE 2 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

From: Leisa Hart [mailto:Leisa.Hart@ymcansw.org.au]
Sent: Friday, 2 December 2016 1:59 PM
To: Roy Newsome
Subject: Notice - YMCA NSW Royal Commission

Dear Roy,

I write to advise that on 5 and 6 December 2016, YMCA NSW will appear before the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Our organisation was first called to the Commission in 2014, in relation to a case involving Jonathan Lord, who was convicted of child abuse while working at the YMCA NSW.

In this appearance we will outline the steps we have taken over the past three years to significantly improve child safety at YMCA NSW. Since 2013, we have thoroughly reviewed our organisation, and taken advice from the Royal Commission and child welfare authorities including the Australian Childhood Foundation. We have put in place new procedures and processes to safeguard children, including mandatory and regular training for existing staff and rigorous recruitment procedures for new staff.

We put the safety of children at the forefront of everything we do, and are much better placed to prevent abuse from happening again.

We know that the work of keeping children safe is an ongoing commitment and that we will continue to make the safety of children our number one priority. We will continue to review and improve our policies and procedures and to do our very best to uphold our responsibility to care for our clients, their families and our communities.

Take care,

Leisa Hart | CEO

YMCA NSW | Level 5, 20 Smith Street, Parramatta NSW 2150

p 02 9687 6233 | f 02 9687 6244

e leisa.hart@ymcansw.org.au | w ymcansw.org.au

Follow us! [facebook](#) | [twitter](#) | [youtube](#) | [instagram](#)

