

16 April 2018

Director, Housing and Infrastructure Policy
Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Sir / Madam,

**Canterbury-Bankstown Council Submission –
SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) Review – Boarding Houses**

I refer to the proposed changes to the off-street parking rates for boarding houses under the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP.

Following a review, Council raises the following issues:

1. The proposed changes should provide a higher parking rate in the low density residential zone to protect the local character.

The proposed changes do not adequately address community concerns in relation to the impact of boarding house developments on on-street parking, particularly in the low density residential zone.

The off-street parking rate should be higher in Zone R2 Low Density Residential, noting the need to protect the low density residential character.

As zones and zone objectives differ, a 'one size fits all approach' is inappropriate and can contradict what local councils are seeking to achieve in the suburban neighbourhoods.

The proposed changes should require boarding houses in Zone R2 Low Density Residential to provide at least one parking space for each boarding room. The proposed changes should also retain the requirement to provide at least one parking space for each person employed in connection with the development and who is resident on site.

It is recommended that the off-street parking rates for boarding houses read:

- (i) *at least 1 parking space is provided for each boarding room on land within Zone R2 Low Density Residential;*
- (ii) *at least 0.5 parking space is provided for each boarding room on land within a zone other than Zone R2 Low Density Residential; and*
- (iii) *at least 1 parking space is provided for each person employed in connection with the development and who is resident on site.*

2. The parking rates should be discretionary development standards.

The current off-street parking rates are non-discretionary development standards. This means that a consent authority cannot refuse a boarding house development on the basis of car parking if the proposed development meets the parking rates.

The proposed changes should ensure the parking rates are discretionary development standards. This would enable a consent authority to address community concerns by:

- Requiring additional off-street parking spaces in residential streets where on-street parking is restricted e.g. state roads, clearways, narrow streets and culs-de-sac.
- Requiring additional off-street parking spaces in residential streets where there is a cumulative impact of boarding house and secondary dwelling developments on on-street parking.

3. The boarding house review should incorporate the concerns raised in Council's letter dated 5 September 2017.

According to the exhibition material, the Department of Planning & Environment's review of other boarding house provisions and the wider ARHSEPP is continuing.

This review should incorporate the concerns raised in Council's letter dated 5 September 2017 (see attached). These concerns consider matters such as the design, amenity and compatibility of boarding houses.

If you have any enquiries or require further information, please contact Council officer Amita Maharjan on 9707 9806.

Yours sincerely,



Mauricio Tapia
A/Manager Spatial Planning



**CANTERBURY
BANKSTOWN**

5 September 2017

The Hon. Anthony Roberts MP
Minister for Planning
GPO Box 5341
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Minister,

Request to review State Policies on boarding houses

The City of Canterbury Bankstown is closely monitoring development activity within the LGA to ensure Council is meeting dwelling targets set by the Department and that development is occurring in a sustainable manner.

Our recent analysis shows a steady increase in boarding house development applications since the introduction of SEPP (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 (ARHSEPP). The community acceptance for boarding houses, particularly in suburban areas, has not improved for a number of reasons including the design and compatibility of boarding houses.

The ARHSEPP provides a general framework for the approval of boarding houses. However, it is not robust enough to ensure appropriate amenity is provided for the occupants and neighbouring residents. Council requests the Minister initiate a review of relevant SEPPs to consider the following matters:

Permissibility of boarding houses in suburban areas

Permissibility of boarding houses in Zone R2 Low Density Residential is a major concern for both the Council and the community. Boarding houses are generally comparable with residential flat buildings which are better located in existing town centres rather than low density suburban areas due to the bulk, size and the nature of their operation.

Setbacks, visual privacy, parking requirements

The ARHSEPP currently does not require provisions for minimum site area, frontage, setbacks and visual privacy for boarding houses. Council considers inclusion of these provisions will ensure amenity for boarding houses and the surrounding areas. The current parking rates, particularly for the suburban area is very low, the adverse impact of which is spilling onto the suburban onstreet parking.

Solar access

The ARHSEPP currently requires certain provisions to be met for solar access for communal rooms. However, there are no controls to ensure adequate solar access to the boarding rooms. There are many examples of boarding houses being built with extremely poor solar access in the absence of such controls. In addition, there are no controls to avoid detrimental loss of solar access to neighbouring property owners.

**Room design and layout**

The general layout of rooms in boarding houses (particularly for change of use/in-fill development) is often poorly designed. Apart from the minimum room size, there are no controls or objectives to rely on to ensure that the design of the rooms will provide good amenity for the future occupants.

Room Size

It is recommended that a review of ARHSEPP consider rooms of 16m² or more as 2-lodger rooms, and rooms between 12m²–16m² as single-lodger rooms. There have been many cases where rooms are shown as over 16m² but showing only a single bed (i.e. single lodger only) in order to try and avoid having a boarding house manager.

Bonus FSR

Under the ARHSEPP, boarding houses currently receive floor-space ratio bonus regardless of any evidence that these building stocks are reaching the relevant demographics at an affordable cost. There is currently no framework present under the ARHSEPP that compels the boarding houses to be 'affordable'.

Application of SEPP 65

The ARHSEPP and SEPP 65 do not set design requirements for boarding houses. It is recommended that SEPP 65 applies to boarding houses to ensure that boarding houses achieve a high standard of building design and amenity.

It is also recommended that Clause 30A of the ARHSEPP should not be limited to the 'design' of the development. The 'character compatibility' test should also include the nature of the use and its compatibility with the character of the locality.

Council considers a review of relevant SEPPs to amend and introduce appropriate design controls will ensure the amenity for the future occupants and the surrounding neighbours. I ask you to consider these requests to initiate a review of relevant SEPPs.

If you would like to discuss this letter further, please contact Council's Strategic Planner, Ms Amita Maharjan on 02 9707 9806.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Colley
Administrator