

## Comments on SEPP 65 changes

If the Overall thrust is to take into account of population change. It is interesting with our aging population increasing the overall there is an increasing lack of flexible adaptable housing including residential units and flexible public transport, This moves these people to being reliant on personal transport rather than public transport, In a world where the government's disability and aging policies that promote living at home rather than living in a village or nursing home, it appears that these Changes are designed to disadvantage the aging population Under the guise of making apartments more affordable.

Specifically the inclusion of car parking, as an item that cannot be used as grounds to refuse development applications if the recommended minimums set out in the Apartment Design Guide are satisfied.

### Parking

- For sites located within 400m of a railway station or light rail stop in the Remainder of metropolitan Sydney, the relevant minimum will be the requirement set out in the Roads and Maritime Services' Guide to Traffic Generating Development or the Council's requirements, whichever is less.
- For sites located within 400m – 800m of a railway station or light rail stop, the relevant requirement set out in the Roads and Maritime Services' Guide to Traffic Generating Development or the Council's requirements will apply, whichever is less.
- Where less car parking compared to my Council's requirements is provided; *Councils are encouraged to limit on-street resident parking for these new residents, this then just forces those who task it to service these aged or disabled residents increasing difficult, as many of those a volunteers or unpaid relatives.*

RMS guide provides two rates and it is not specified in the amended policy which will apply. How do we know which will apply at this stage, this issue will need to be clarified. In addition, both the RMS rates are lower than my Council's rate and my inner city aged parent LGA's if applied will result in overflow of parking onto surrounding streets which will affect residential amenity and access to such services as Doctors and general business too, resulting from the increased demand on on-street parking affecting the viability of the town centre, where my aging parent shops and gains services.

### What community Gain?

I expect the new policy will encourage Council to install harsher parking restrictions and have an impact on commuters and town centre staff who rely on all-day parking. It is noted that existing residential parking schemes shall not apply to new residential developments. So inner metropolitan Town centre renewal like where my Parent lives will create new physical and social boundaries. All this, under the guise of making it cheaper for developers to build.

As there is no Government initiative to pass on savings from lower developer cost, so it seems that SEPP 65 amendments is all about moving the Aged & disability into villages, these would only be viable in outer metro region where land prices won't be driven to increase by introduction of requirement creating Cheap to build FLATS

In my location I am concerned that the proposed changes to the SEPP 65 will have an impact on the local community, where both residents and businesses who rely on existing on-street parking. The concept of forcing people to catch the trains by reducing parking within developments, is all on the superstition that the Trains and other public transport actually exists and that it actually goes to employment centres, however this does not occur, as there is a CBD centric transport plan that State government has entrenched by tender process, No new services despite creating employment lands and surcharging current employment zones with mixed development including high rise residential and still no SEPP that caters for the lack of transport infrastructure that widely exists across Sydney. So reducing car parking within developments is not a solution, its adding to the problems that past generations and plans have so successfully adopted the "DO Nothing" at our expense.

**This SEPPs, Option of Do Nothing, A plan on increasing residential development by targeting reducing onsite parking equals:**

- Residential developments need parking and if not provided on-site they will just park on-street. The proposal should not be supported due to the impact on "on street" parking, potentialy to destroy existing communities.
- The proposal indicated that Council should install parking restrictions on-street, which will discourage train commuters and increase overall car trips in general.

*The State Government Planning controls like SEPP 65 should provide link between its residential planning policy and it transport delivery policies, So that our sprawling city has the a SEPP that addresses transport infrastructure, employment zones and residential developments integrated solution to providing for sustainable population growth,*

*Rather than picking on a symptom of past bad integration planning , for why development costs and affordability of decent housing, it is not fixing development costs by limiting parking in developments. In the meantime create developments that have better transport access and it includes better railway station with better car parks and focus in its planning on alternate transport developments rather that as set on creating planning infrastructure like Car hungry Toll way's like Westconnex.*

*I am opposed to this planned amendment, As a way to encourage lower build costs and lower dependency on private transports than just reducing Car Parking on site alone as proposed by SEPP 65 Amendments creates issues true good Urban planning controls are those that benefits our communities.*

- The press release indicated that the proposal will reduce the cost of development. Yes the developer will benefit, There is no guarantee provided within the SEPP or other controls that the reduction in cost will be passed on to buyers and/or to the community. To offset the larger community costs of not providing parking that adequate and ensuring alternate transport to private car use globally in Sydney

The rise of T Ways in Western Sydney The SEPP changes does not define in anyway if T way stations are included, which would be an equivalent to Light Rail stop.