

Submission on rezoning proposal – Bayside West (Banksia rezoning)

As a resident, I would like to request the following points be considered in the proposed rezoning of the Banksia Priority Precinct, specifically the proposed retention of the Enterprise Corridor zoning (zoning B6) for the subject land identified in **Figure 1** below.



Figure 1: Subject land highlighted by yellow boundary.

Recommend:

- Option 1: Rezone the subject land to a B4 Mixed Use Zone (as opposed to the currently proposed B6 Enterprise corridor zone); or
- Option 2: Remove the prohibition of 'residential accommodation' from the B6 Enterprise Corridor.

Note the standard definition provided for the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone already allows for residential development to be considered as part of any mixed use development as per Direction 2 (of the Standard Instrument – Principle Local Environmental Plan):

Direction 2.

The following objective must be included if any type of residential accommodation is permitted in this zone:

- To provide for residential uses, but only as part of a mixed use development.

(see Attachment 1).

The recommendation to reconsider a mixed use zone on the subject land and/or permit residential accommodation more accurately reflects the inherent constraints and opportunities of the subject land and promotes appropriate urban renewal along the Princes Highway corridor in a more feasible and flexible manner.

The justification for the above recommendation is discussed below.

1) Flawed justification for B6 Enterprise Corridor Zoning

The sole reasoning for retaining the B6 Enterprise Corridor within the subject land relies on the intention to retain employment uses in the precinct. Noting *'the zone does not allow for residential uses, its objective is to allow for a range of commercial uses, particularly showrooms and car dealerships'* which the Department concludes are expected to grow in demand in tandem with population growth.

This reasoning is flawed as there are number of planning strategies and zoning options available to retain employment uses in the area and also facilitate appropriate urban renewal. None of which have been further considered for the subject land.

In addition, the assumption that the subject land is suitable primarily for showrooms and car dealerships into the future is challenged, particularly noting the economic assessment finds that bulky good retailers (such as car dealerships), require large sites that provide co-location opportunities for multiple retailers. The conclusion that the land is suitable for bulky good retailers and showrooms appears to be based solely on observations that there are currently car dealerships operating from the area. There is no consideration of the inherent site area limitations and access constraints, which would generally preclude any feasible large scale expansion of additional bulky good uses use in this section of land.

2) Subject land not suitable solely for commercial (specifically showrooms and bulky good retailers)

The subject land is inherently constrained. It is bounded by the Princes Highway to the east, the Illawarra train line to the west, restricting its maximum width to 60m. An access road (Taylor Ave) and the Subway Road underpass bound the north and southern ends respectively. Access and egress is available only from the Princes Highway which is subject to high traffic volumes (particularly in the morning and afternoon peaks), clearways and a restricted ability to turn east or west apart from at the Forest Road/Wickham Street intersection to the north. These inherent site restrictions mean the land area available for future expansion for commercial uses (particularly bulky good retailers) is constrained.

The Banksia Priority Precinct – Economic & Feasibility Analysis, (the economic assessment) supporting the proposed rezoning proposal notes:

It is challenging to accommodate the floorspace requirements of bulky goods operators and other large format retailers including car dealerships in infill locations where large lots and those in consolidated ownership can be scarce.

Retail of items of a bulky nature, such as car dealerships, require large areas of land for handling, display, storage or direct vehicle access to the site for the purposes of loading and unloading large goods. As noted above, apart from the limited land area available, there are also constraints in relation to restricted access points, parking and manoeuvrability for the delivery and loading of bulky goods, such as cars. As a resident of the area it is noted that car retailers currently utilise Hattersley Street to load and unload vehicles outside their site, as there are simply no facilities available on their site for these activities.

Even if further lot consolidation was provided it is queried whether there is appropriate space available within the subject land to effectively support the requirements to retail bulky goods.

Noting the inherent demand for large land areas and the loading and access facilities required by bulky good retailers, the subject land which is limited in land area, has access restrictions onto a busy highway and rail infrastructure to the west, is not suitable to accommodate an expansion in bulky good retailers such as showrooms and car retailers – which are specifically promoted under the proposed retention of the B6 Enterprise corridor zoning for the land.

3) Increase employment opportunities in Precinct

One of the key justifications for retaining the zoning as a B6 Enterprise Corridor is to provide employment opportunities. However, it is likely the actual number of people employed in the subject land is low relative to the floor space required for bulky retailers (i.e. low employees/staff numbers for land area/m²). Noting the site area is inherently constrained as discussed above, more intense/mixed use employment opportunities should be pursued, such as office, childcares facilities and/or retail outlets. These type of land uses would increase employment opportunities in the area but also recognise the site constraints and the limited floor area available.

The low employment ratios for bulky goods commercial type uses does not recognise the opportunities provided by the land, which is in close proximity to good public transport services and amenities and could allow for greater employment options.

The retention of the existing zoning also does not acknowledge the future employment opportunities or changes in demand for services and or products resulting from the higher densities proposed to the the north and south of the subject land, which are identified to introduce higher density residential/mixed development type uses. Ultimately there will be more people and higher footfall in the area, which would promote the consideration of additional retail uses on the subject land to service the additional population. It would be difficult for any economic analysis to reasonably identify what the future demands for goods and services may be in the area, given the substantial changes proposed in the surrounding land areas, substantial increase in population and the substantial time line envisaged for the redevelopment of the area (>10 years). As such a more flexible zoning is appropriate as this would allow businesses to effectively respond to and pursue alternate employment and services options as trends emerge and alternate buying patterns are better understood as the area is redeveloped.

4) Residential land use essential to allow flexibility and promote renewal

To truly pursue renewal in the inherently constrained subject land, a more flexible zoning is required that enables multiple uses, including residential, to acknowledge both the site constraints and opportunities afforded to the site. A flexible zoning approach can still promote the retention of employment opportunities in the area but in a practical and feasible manner through varied co-located land uses.

The Banksia Priority Precinct – Economic & Feasibility Analysis (the economic assessment) supports this approach, quoting:

New mixed use developments which accommodate a diverse range of uses such as retail, bulky goods, modern showrooms and light industrial uses coupled with residential development have been met with success. These include East Village at Zetland, Stockland Balgowlah, Peninsula Village Matraville, Central Park at Broadway and the Broadway at Punchbowl which reflect the willingness of businesses to co-locate with a range of uses.

Numerous examples across Sydney demonstrate the ability of innovative developments that combine a range of uses are able to overcome feasibility issues and succeed.

Without enabling true flexibility in this area, but retaining the status quo in terms of land use zoning, it is unlikely the area will be renewed. As discussed, the industries currently promoted under the existing zoning and their correspondingly high floorspace requirements are unsuitable for this highly constrained land. The ability for businesses to consolidate or acquire existing residential or other uses are limited, given the high value/demand for residential uses versus lower value/demand for warehousing /retail floor area and would ultimately undermine the viability of future renewal and employment opportunities for the precinct.

As noted by the economic assessment, *'the ability to combine different uses within a multi-storey development will be critical for new development. For example, the co-location of a retail showroom (cars, homewares and bulky goods) with commercial floorspace, retail/convenience facilities above enables site intensification which will be in many cases needed for development to be feasible'*. The introduction of a residential uses at higher floor levels may also be required to make the subject land feasible for redevelopment. Any planning strategy or land use zoning that restricts the residential element ultimately restricts the investment potential of the area and associated options for redevelopment. This is acknowledged by the economic assessment:

'In established urban areas in close proximity to transport networks and major centres, site amalgamation and assembly are arguably the largest challenge for development and renewal'

The introduction of residential uses within the subject land, not only reflects what is happening in the area to the north (under a current approved mixed use development containing over 300 residential apartments) and to the south under this proposed rezoning proposal which introduces residential uses, it will provide the financial viability required to enable developers to pursue innovative and flexible redevelopment options. As noted in the economic assessment (above) innovative and flexible redevelopment options are required to make redevelopment feasible.

The exclusion of residential development on the subject land also ignores the opportunity to provide quality housing in an area that is in close proximity to transport, can provide opportunities for people to live close to where they work and will be able to take advantage of additional infrastructure planned to be delivered in the local area under the rezoning proposal (i.e. better cycling connections and access to open spaces to name a few).

Pursuing no residential development at all on the subject land is contrary to the State Government's remit to address Sydney's housing affordability crisis through increased supply. Noting this policy, any sites which are well serviced by public transport and services, such as the subject land, should be at a minimum considered for higher density residential development. In addition, there is no justification to preclude residential development in the subject site, apart from the assumption that allowing it will constrain or reduce employment opportunities in the area. In fact, the economic assessment suggests the opposite, noting that a component a residential development can help deliver flexible development outcomes, including feasible and viable opportunities for employment.

As outlined above, the economic assessment specifically references mixed use developments which include commercial/retail facilities with a residential component, have been a successful in delivering good development outcomes.

It is unclear how the inclusion of residential development would compromise employment opportunities, particularly as there are planning options available to ensure any residential component is pursued and integrated with other commercial/retail and mixed use proposals to ensure employment options are retained in the precinct.

Summary

The current proposal to retain and promote commercial land uses such as bulky retailers and preclude residential development in the B6 Enterprise Corridor, is not supported by the economic analysis, does not consider the inherent site constraints or opportunities and is not justified.

There is an opportunity to ensure employment opportunities can be enhanced within the subject land by providing a flexible mixed use zoning and allowing a residential component to provide viable incentives for renewal, while also delivering high quality residential accommodation in close proximity to public transport.

I request you give due consideration to these above comments in reviewing all submissions and amend the rezoning proposal according to the recommendation provided.

Kind regards

Socrates and Konstandina Tokitsis

34 Hattersley Street Arncliffe

(email: georgetokitsis@optusnet.com.au)

Attachment 1:

Extract from the Standard Instrument which provides that residential uses can be provided for within the Zone B6 Enterprise Corridor

Zone B6 Enterprise Corridor**Direction 1.**

The following must be included as either "Permitted without consent" or "Permitted with consent" for this zone:
Roads

Direction 2.

The following objective must be included if any type of residential accommodation is permitted in this zone:

- To provide for residential uses, but only as part of a mixed use development.

1 Objectives of zone

- 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.

2 Permitted without consent**3 Permitted with consent**

Business premises; Community facilities; Garden centres; Hardware and building supplies; Hotel or motel accommodation; Landscaping material supplies; Light industries; Passenger transport facilities; Plant nurseries; Warehouse or distribution centres

4 Prohibited