



16 Memorial Avenue
PO Box 42
Merrylands NSW 2160

T 02 9840 9840
F 02 9840 9734
E hcc@holroyd.nsw.gov.au
www.holroyd.nsw.gov.au
DX 25408 Merrylands
TTY 02 9840 9988
ABN 20 661 226 966

Environmental & Planning Services

Our Reference:
Contact:
Telephone:

HC-23-04-38
Amberley Moore
9840 9808

30 October 2014

Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir / Madam

HOLROYD CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 65 AND RESIDENTIAL FLAT DESIGN CODE

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the proposed amendments to SEPP 65 and supporting Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC). Council recognises the positive impact the current SEPP 65 and RFDC have had on the standard of development within Holroyd to date and wishes to raise a number of matters on the proposed changes, which are detailed below.

Car parking

The proposed Apartment Design Guide (ADG) applies the Roads and Maritime Services' (RMS) Guide to Traffic Generating Development, which provides two parking rates: those for 'Metropolitan Sub-Regional Centres' and those for 'Metropolitan Regional (CBD) Centres'. Concern is raised over the use of these guidelines as both rates are lower than Council's rate and if applied will result in overflow parking into surrounding streets. This may affect the amenity and viability of local businesses.

The 'Metropolitan Regional (CBD) Centres' rate would be substantially lower, which is of particular concern. Although it is expected that Holroyd centres would be subject to the 'Metropolitan Sub-Regional Centres' rates, confirmation is sought that this would be the case. The Holroyd Residential Centres Strategy Transport Review by Stapleton Transportation & Planning Pty Ltd March 2011 found that (based on 2006 Census data) car ownership within 400m of the rail stations is an overall average of 0.90 vehicles per dwelling, and between 400m to 800m, 1.09 vehicles per dwelling. The 'Regional (CBD) Centres' rate would result in a typical average provision in the order of 0.72 vehicles per dwelling (a decrease of approximately 30%) compared to 0.9 to 1.0 per dwelling under the 'Sub-Regional Centres' or Council's current rates under the Holroyd Development Control Plan (DCP) 2013.

The new guidelines also encourage the installation of parking restrictions, which will impact on commuters and town centre staff who rely on all-day unrestricted parking. Additionally, the proposed changes aim to improve affordability for buyers who don't require on-site car parking and encourage public transport use, however, concern is raised that this may not prove to be realistic and will only result in a higher demand for on-street car parking. Further information and evidence is requested regarding the assumption that residents will use public transport instead of a motor vehicle.

Minimum studio apartment size

There is concern over the introduction of a new minimum apartment size of 35sq.m and how this may compromise the effectiveness of the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP. Introducing a new minimum apartment size of 35sq.m, which is the same size as the minimum contained in the State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing), may compromise the intent of this SEPP as it may skew the supply of privately owned (less affordable) studio units to this size and reduce the availability of studio units that are larger in size. If the market standard for unit size becomes 35sq.m, the capability of the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP to provide cost effective development (and therefore affordable rental housing development) may be reduced. The minimum apartment size should be increased to ensure that provision of units under the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP remain affordable.

Void areas compromising design quality outcomes

Since the commencement of Holroyd LEP 2013 in August 2013, Council has received a number of development applications for residential flat buildings and mixed use developments proposing a large amount of 'external' hallway spaces, referred to as a 'void', in order to maximise the floor space ratio (FSR) for the site. Under the Standard Instrument definition of 'gross floor area' these spaces provide the circulation space to apartments, but may not constitute floor space. These voids are compromising the design of developments and resulting in bulky buildings and issues relating to residential amenity

While Council realises that the definition is unable to be modified as part of this review, it may be possible to address this issue through the use of stronger controls that relate to the requirement for where building separation requirements apply, and overall building envelope depths, as well as setbacks and other amenity concerns relating to cross ventilation and solar access. This would provide clarification on the intended outcomes and expectations of the SEPP for these types of developments and reduce the risk of buildings containing spaces that are not well utilised by residents and don't contribute significantly to the visual appeal and functionality of the development.

Other comments

- There does not appear to be a specific provision for minimum sizes of 4 bedroom apartments, and this should be incorporated into the SEPP. The requirements for 3 bedroom apartments is currently being utilised for such developments but this is not considered to be an appropriate solution.
- There is currently inconsistency in the design verification process and concern about the lack of involvement from registered architects after variations to the original application have been made. The SEPP should incorporate measures to ensure consistency in the verification process, involving registered architects throughout the application and approval process.
- The requirement for development within B2 Local Centre and B4 Mixed Use zones to provide deep soil zones should be reassessed. Deep soil zones are not considered necessary or feasible within these land use zones and shouldn't be required.



- It is not clear when Council DCP provisions can be applied if the ADG is silent on a matter. Clarification is sought regarding which document takes precedence when the ADG does not contain controls that are included in Council's DCP.
- More solutions should be provided regarding visual privacy, solar and daylight access for development on sites with a north-south orientation, as well as apartment layout, balconies and private open space, natural ventilation and storage.
- Clarification is sought regarding building separation requirements for buildings with balconies.
- The importance of incorporating a merit-based assessment approach into the use of the ADG should be emphasised.

Should you require any further information regarding this submission, please contact Amberley Moore of Council's Strategic Planning section on 9840 9808.

Yours faithfully

Merv Ismay
GENERAL MANAGER

Per: ADAN DAVIS
MANAGER STRATEGIC PLANNING