

INTEGRATED INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

67-75 LORDS RD LEICHHARDT

October 2018

For
Lord Sixty Seven Pty Ltd

Prepared for: Lord Sixty Seven Pty Ltd

Our Ref: 182583

Revision: Revision 1

Date: 22 October 2018

Prepared by: James Gilligan

Reviewed: Stephen Fryer

Contents

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 1 | Background | 4 |
| 2 | Planning Proposal | 7 |
| 3 | Infrastructure Contribution Calculation Methodology | 12 |
| 4 | Stakeholder Engagement..... | 13 |
| 5 | Taverners Hill Precinct Infrastructure Schedule | 15 |
| 6 | Section 94 Contributions..... | 16 |
| 7 | Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) – Works in Kind..... | 18 |
| 8 | Affordable Housing Contribution..... | 19 |
| 9 | Gap Analysis | 19 |
| 9.1 | Services | 19 |
| 9.1.1 | Potable Water, Sewer (Sydney Water) | 20 |
| 9.1.2 | Stormwater Water (Sydney Water) | 20 |
| 9.1.3 | Power (Ausgrid)..... | 20 |
| 9.1.4 | Communications (Telstra or NBN) | 20 |
| 9.1.5 | Stormwater Infrastructure / Flood Mitigation..... | 21 |
| 9.2 | Social Infrastructure and Benchmarking..... | 21 |
| 9.2.1 | Education | 21 |
| 9.2.2 | Early Childhood Education and Care..... | 22 |
| 9.2.3 | Seniors Centres | 23 |
| 9.2.4 | General Multipurpose Community Space..... | 24 |
| 9.2.5 | Performing Arts and Creative Arts Centre | 24 |
| 9.2.6 | Open Space | 25 |
| 10 | Infrastructure Contributions Assessment..... | 26 |
| 10.1 | Methodology 1: PRCUTS Infrastructure Schedule (Refer Appendix 5) | 26 |
| 10.2 | Methodology 2: Contributions under Leichhardt LEP S 94 Plan (Refer Appendix 4) | 27 |
| 10.3 | Applied Local Infrastructure Contribution | 27 |
| 10.4 | Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) – Works in Kind..... | 27 |
| 11 | Outcomes | 28 |
| 12 | Recommendations • | 28 |
| 13 | Appendix1 Pre-lodgment Advice from Inner West Council | 29 |
| 14 | Appendix 2 Correspondence from TFNSW | 30 |
| 15 | Appendix 3 Correspondence with Other Agencies..... | 31 |
| 16 | Appendix 4 Section 94 Contribution Calculations..... | 32 |
| 17 | Appendix 5 PRCUTS Infrastructure Calculations..... | 33 |

Executive Summary

This Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan ("IIDP") has been prepared as part of a Planning Proposal for 67-75 Lords Rd Leichhardt. The IIDP is a required element of the Implementation Plan Out of Sequence Checklist ("Checklist") that is required as part of the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy ("PRCUTS") because the site is not in the Stage 1 release area.

This IIDP sets out the consultations and other discussions and investigations that have occurred to ensure that satisfactory Infrastructure is available for the development, and the State and Local Contributions that may be required as part of the development process, to provide additional infrastructure, where required.

This IIDP:

- seeks to provide a transparent methodology to calculate an infrastructure contribution that adequately addresses Criteria 2 of the Checklist;
- addresses part of Criteria 3 of the Checklist and provides appropriate supporting documentation (Criteria 3 is addressed in more detail in the 'Stakeholder Engagement Report' prepared by Chikarovski and Associates, annexed as a separate Report to the subject Proposal); and
- seeks to determine an infrastructure contribution for the development utilising the PRCUTS guidelines, stakeholder engagement, gap analysis and interrogation of the Infrastructure schedules presented Part 6 PRCUTS – Infrastructure Schedule. The methodology is based upon principles of "reasonableness" and "apportionment" as used for the basis of determination of Section 94 calculations by local government.

Local social infrastructure stakeholders were contacted to provide an opportunity to advise of the impacts resulting from the planning proposal. The following stakeholders were approached, TfNSW, RMS, NSW Health, Sydney Local Health District, Sydney Water, NSW Dept. of Education, Sydney Catholic Schools, Dept. of Industry and Department of Planning.

For this proposal, we have estimated the contributions as follows:

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
| 1. State Infrastructure Contributions | \$3.863m | equal to \$150.56 psm of GFA |
| 2. Local Infrastructure Contributions | \$4.129m | equal to \$160.92 psm of GFA |

The calculations to establish these amounts are detailed in this report.

These amounts could include the VPA offer, which totals \$4.068m. This amount is broken down in detail in this report.

Note: the above Local Infrastructure Contribution is benchmarked against the current Leichhardt LEP Section 94 Plan (and calculation methodology assuming the rezoned site) and is offered in lieu of the Local Infrastructure Costs itemised in the PRCUTS Infrastructure schedule. The higher of the two contributions has been proposed, ensuring sufficient funding for Local Infrastructure in the PRCUTS Taverners Hill Precinct and consistency with the most relevant Section 94 Contribution Plan.

1 BACKGROUND

The site owner, Lord Sixty Seven Pty Ltd intends to lodge a Planning Proposal, to rezone the site at 67-75 Lords Rd Leichhardt ("The site") taking into account the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PCRUTS),

The site is 10,691m² and located in the suburb of Leichhardt, and in close proximity to neighbouring suburb Haberfield, in the Inner West Local Government Area (LGA) (Figure 1). The site is within 4 minutes walking distance of light rail station Marion and Taverners Hill, giving access to Sydney CBD within 30 minutes, and 15 minutes walking distance of Lewisham and Summer Hill train station, serviced by the Main South Line. The site is adjacent to Lambert Park football field, and a 5-minute walk from Leichhardt Marketplace shopping centre.

It is located adjacent to the light rail embankment, with Lords Road pedestrian and cyclist tunnel leading under the embankment and offering access to the GreenWay, a 5.8km environmental and active transport corridor linking the Cooks River with the Parramatta River. It falls within the PRCUTS as identified by Landcom (formerly Urban Growth NSW). The Parramatta Road Corridor is an urban renewal corridor that will transformed over the next 30 years. Although the PRCUTS does not rezone lands, it does set out the NSW Government's vision for the area and is given statutory force through a ministerial direction under the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

The subject Planning Proposal has been developed in accordance with the PCRUTS, the Greater Sydney Commission District Plans (Eastern City District) and other relevant Government planning Strategies and Policies. The following information derived from the PRCUTS is relevant to the subject Proposal.

The PCRUTS and associated suite of documents, including the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Implementation Plan 2016-2023 (the Implementation Plan) are supported by a Section 117 Ministerial Direction. This means the Implementation Plan has statutory force, and land use and development in the Corridor must be consistent with the PRCUTS suite of documents including the PRCUTS 'Out of Sequence Checklist' (p12 and p15 of the PRCUTS Implementation Plan).

The subject Proposal for rezoning of 67-75 Lords Road Leichhardt departs from the staging and sequencing identified by the PRCUTS Implementation Plan 2016-2023 and is therefore considered against the 'Out of Sequence Checklist'. It is considered "Out of Sequence" on the grounds that it facilitates transition from industrial uses to residential uses prior to 2023

The Checklist sets out 6 key Criteria for the assessment of a Proposal. PRCUTS notes:

Six key considerations have been identified as issues of greatest interest and concern to the community and government stakeholders relating to the Corridor's urban transformation. Each of these issues is supported by a threshold or benchmark that must be met in order to progress to redevelopment of land.

The Checklist Criteria are:

1. Strategic objectives, Land Use and Development
2. Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan
3. Stakeholder Engagement
4. Sustainability
5. Feasibility
6. Market Viability

This Report addresses Criteria 2.

Figure 1 – PRCUTS Checklist

| OUT OF SEQUENCE CHECKLIST | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Criteria 1 | Strategic objectives, land use and development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planning proposal can demonstrate significant delivery or contribution towards the Strategy's Corridor wide and Precinct specific vision. The planning proposal satisfies the Strategy's seven land use and transport planning principles and fulfills the relevant Strategic Actions for each Principle. The planning proposal can demonstrate significant net community, economic and environmental benefits for the Corridor and the Precinct or Frame Area within which the site is located. The planning proposal is consistent with the recommended land uses, heights, densities, open space, active transport and built form plans for the relevant Precinct or Frame Area. The planning proposal demonstrably achieves outcomes aligned to the desired future character and growth projections identified in the Strategy. The planning proposal demonstrates design excellence can be achieved, consistent with councils adopted design excellence strategy or the design excellence provisions provided in the Parramatta Road Corridor Planning and Design Guidelines (Planning and Design Guidelines). |
| Criteria 2 | Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which identifies advanced infrastructure provision and cost recovery for the local and regional infrastructure identified in the Infrastructure Schedule, must support the planning proposal. The Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan must demonstrate a cost offset to council and agency costs for a set period that aligns with the anticipated timing for land development identified in the Implementation Plan 2016 – 2023. Infrastructure to be considered includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> public transport active transport road upgrades and intersection improvements open space and public domain improvements community infrastructure, utilities and services. |
| Criteria 3 | Stakeholder engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation and engagement with relevant stakeholders (council, government agencies, business, community, adjoining properties and user or interest groups, where relevant) have been undertaken, including any relevant pre-planning proposal engagement processes required by local council. An appropriate level of support or agreement is documented. Provision of documentary evidence outlining the level of planning or project readiness in terms of the extent of planning or business case development for key infrastructure projects. |
| Criteria 4 | Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planning proposal achieves or exceeds the sustainability targets identified in the Strategy. |
| Criteria 5 | Feasibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planning proposal presents a land use and development scenario that demonstrates economic feasibility with regard to the likely costs of infrastructure and the proposed funding arrangements available for the Precinct or Frame Area. |
| Criteria 6 | Market viability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planning proposal demonstrates a land use and development scenario that aligns with and responds to market conditions for the delivery of housing and employment for 2016 to 2023. Viability should not be used as a justification for poor planning or built form outcomes. |

Urban renewal projects create for new or upgraded infrastructure and services to meet the needs of an increased residential and/or worker population. Some of this infrastructure would be at a regional scale, including open space and community facilities to be used by a wide catchment of people outside the immediate boundaries of the Taverners Hill Precinct. Other infrastructure would be required at a local scale to meet the needs of the adjacent population.

It is often difficult to fund the community infrastructure that is required to facilitate urban renewal on a project by project basis, both in terms of the quantum and timing of the funding required, when each project is of a different size and occurs with individual timing. In the PCUTS, it is set out that a number of projects across each precinct contributes to fund the infrastructure required and ultimately deliver urban renewal. A range of funding sources must therefore be considered in relation to the Corridor to ensure that infrastructure and services can be provided. The PRCUTS proposes a combination of State and local contributions in the Taverners Hill Precinct and wider corridor.

The subject Proposal contributes to the following State and Local Infrastructure such that a development outcome is in line with the funding component of Principle 7: Delivery of the PRCUTS. The following state and local infrastructure upgrades have been identified in relation to the Taverners Hill precinct.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| State Funded Infrastructure | Transport, Buses, Light Rail Trains etc |
| | Major (i.e. non-local) Roads |
| | Education Facilities |
| | Health Facilities |
| Council Funded Infrastructure | Footpaths and Cycleways |
| | Local Roads |
| | Local Stormwater Infrastructure |
| | Recreational Facilities |
| | Cultural Facilities |

Table 1.1 State and Local Infrastructure

2 PLANNING PROPOSAL

Statutory Outline

The proposal is consistent with the PRCUTS, in terms of FSR and Ht. The inconsistency is to allow additional employment uses in the r3 zone, as preferred by Council and the community.

| Control | Existing | Proposed |
|---------|----------------------|--|
| Zone | IN2 Light Industrial | R3 Medium Density Residential with additional uses allowed |
| Height | n/a | 30m |
| FSR | 1:1 | 2.4:1 |

Table 2.1 Planning Controls



Figure 2 Location Plan

Key points

- The planning proposal seeks to rezone the 10,691sqm site to allow for approximately 235 dwellings and at least 3,000sqm of non-residential floor space to support a range of employment generating and community uses.
- Of the non-residential floor space 500sqm is to be offered to Inner West Council for a multi-use facility for use by the APIA club.
- The applicant is committed to negotiating a commercial arrangement that will allow Art Est to return to the site when the development is completed.
- 35 affordable housing dwellings would be provided through an agreement with Bridge Housing, for a minimum period of 10 years.

- The proposal includes an offer to enter into a voluntary planning agreement with Inner West Council for delivery of local infrastructure contributions.
- The proposal responds to concerns raised in response to the previous proposal and further consultation has been carried out to inform the current proposal.
- The proposal is consistent with the Greater Sydney Region Plan and Eastern City District Plan which highlight that land within the Parramatta Road Corridor is not subject to the industrial land strategies and actions of the Plans, being to retain and manage industrial land.
- The proposal is entirely consistent with the PRCUTS, including the recommended land use height and FSR, with the exception of the inclusion of employment floorspace.
- The addition of the employment component has arisen directly as a result of the consultation conducted.
- The proposal includes a response to the PRCUTS out of sequence checklist. Whilst the proposal is considered to meet the requirements of the checklist it is noted that:
 - Take-up under the PRCUTS has been, and is expected to continue to be, slow and development within the Lords Road site is not likely to exceed the level of growth envisaged by 2023, and
 - Should rezoning proceed on this site it would not significantly deviate from the timing envisaged under the PRCUTS with the first building completions expected to occur around 2023.

Summary of benefits

The proposal seeks to enhance character and amenity of the local area, deliver employment and residential outcomes on the site, and make a wider contribution to the local community. The proposal would have significant local benefits as summarised below.

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Housing supply | Approximately 235 new apartments Greater housing diversity by addition of medium density housing stock and a range of dwelling sizes |
| Affordable housing | 35 affordable rental housing units |
| Employment outcomes | Inclusion of non-residential floor space with potential to retain 97 to 128 jobs on site Supports a range of different uses to respond to market demand over time |
| Community facilities | Multi-use facility for the APIA club (500sqm) Upgrade of lighting at Lambert Park Commitment to enabling Art Est to return to the site through negotiation of a suitable commercial arrangement |
| Connectivity | Improved pedestrian connection from light rail underpass to Kegworth Public School Central through site link and secondary GreenWay link with potential to connect to Marion light rail stop |
| Open space | Publicly accessible central open space within the site comprising 1,650sqm |
| Environment | Commitment to targeting delivery of 5-star Green Building Council rated buildings Contribution to bush regeneration along the GreenWay Increased canopy cover across the site and along Lords Road |



Figure 3 Proposed Masterplan

Outline of planning proposal

A planning proposal has been prepared for the site which seeks to rezone the site to allow for approximately 235 dwellings and at least 3,000sqm of non-residential floor space to support a range of employment generating and community uses.

An urban design scheme has been prepared for the site to be generally consistent with the PRCUTS, which includes:

- a total of 26,158sqm of floor space (2.4:1 FSR plus 500sqm bonus for provision of community space) comprising:
 - 23,158sqm of residential floor space delivering approximately 235 dwellings, and
 - at least 3,000 sqm of non-residential floor space on the ground floor which could adapt to demands over time and support a range of uses such as community uses, light industrial and urban services, creative industries, health facilities, education uses, gymnasium, restaurants/cafes and local service business
- five buildings located around the perimeter of the site ranging from three to nine stories with a maximum height of RL35m
- a central publicly accessible open space of approximately 1,650sqm
- a public through site link and a secondary GreenWay connection to the Marion light rail stop, and
- 35 affordable rental dwellings

The proposal presents a multi-use scheme with careful vertical integration of uses including a predominantly active and non-residential ground plane. While not required by the PRCUTS the addition of a non-residential component has arisen from stakeholder feedback and will make a significant contribution to local employment, services and amenity.

In the context of the Taverners Hill Precinct the following table shows the scale of the Proposal and associated uplift:

| | PRCUTS Taverners Precinct | Subject Site Existing Controls | Subject Site Proposed Controls | Proposed vs. Existing Controls | Proposed Site vs. Precinct |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | A | B | C | C vs B | C vs A |
| Site Area (m2) | 270,000* | 10,691 | 10,691 | n/a | 4% |
| Additional GFA (m2) | 205,000 | 10,691 | 25,658 | 14,967 | 13% |
| Employment GFA (m2) | 70,000 | 9,979 | 3,000 | | 4% |
| Employment Jobs FTE on Site | 4,100 | 120 | 128 | +8 | 3% |
| Residential GFA (m2) | 170,000 | Nil | 22,658 | n/a | 13% |
| Residential Dwellings – No | 1350 | Nil | 235 | n/a | 17% |
| Population | 3265 | nil | 423** | n/a | 13% |

* Site area for the Precinct inclusive of Roads and Open Space as mapped below. This is an approximate figure only. It does not include the Frame area. Additional Area is based on Frame and Precinct, short and long term.

** Allows for 1.8 persons per apartment dwelling

Table 2.2 Site Uplift



Figure 4 PRCUTS Precinct Area Measurement

3 INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTION CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Infrastructure needs to support the PRCUTS vary along corridor making it necessary to break the corridor in precincts.

It would be unreasonable to assume that the development has a significant influence on infrastructure requirements beyond the Taverners Hill Precinct. Simply, the increase in population resulting from the development is quite small when compared to the projected population uplift of the entire corridor. Comparing the site uplift to the targeted growth in the PRCUTS Taverners Hill Precinct, the Proposal represents only 2.3% of the total proposed increase in floor space, and 10% of the proposed increase in residential floor space in the Taverners Hill Precinct (refer table 2.1 above).

Due to the timing of the development compared to the implementation of PRCUTS any infrastructure contribution this site will provide benefit to other sites.

Principal 7 of the PRCUTS document acknowledges the risk to development viability due to unreasonable infrastructure costs. It implies that a contribution towards future infrastructure costs is an appropriate way to address funding.

This report seeks to determine an infrastructure contribution for the development utilising the PRCUTS guidelines, stakeholder engagement, gap analysis and interrogation of the Infrastructure schedules presented Part 6 PRCUTS – Infrastructure Schedule. The methodology is based upon principles or “reasonableness” and “apportionment” as used for the basis of determination of Section 94 calculations by local government.

4 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

As set out in Criteria 3 of the Out of Sequence Checklist, Platino and our consultant team has engaged with a number of different stakeholders in the relation to this proposal, including:

- Inner West Council
- Greenway
- Local Residents
- Kegworth School
- On Site Business Owners
- NSW Government and non Government Agencies incl:
 - Dept of Planning and Environment
 - TfNSW
 - Department of Health
 - Department of Education
 - Sydney Catholic Schools

Our consultation process is detailed in our Consultation Report, prepared by Chickarovski and Associates.

Our community consultation activities are summarised in outline as follows:

| Date | Activities |
|---------------------------|--|
| w/c 14 th May | Visited Lords Road site to speak with available tenants |
| | Emailed tenants to respond to site visit |
| | Ongoing communications with tenants at Lords Road |
| | Canvassed local business owners regarding the development proposal |
| w/c 28 th May | Established Lords Road project website |
| | Contacted the Inner West Courier regarding advert for the feedback survey |
| | Requests for a meeting with Kegworth Public School via phone |
| w/c 4 th June | Ongoing communications with tenants |
| | Organised meeting with APIA soccer club |
| | Ongoing contact with Kegworth Public School regarding meeting request |
| w/c 11 th June | Site visit to APIA soccer club and meeting with key stakeholders |
| | Ongoing contact with Kegworth Public School regarding meeting request |
| w/c 25 th June | Advert placed in Inner West Courier print and online regarding feedback survey |
| | Contact with key community stakeholders regarding meeting requests |
| | Ongoing contact with APIA soccer club |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| w/c 2 nd July | Site visit and meeting with the APIA soccer club and Platino urban design architects to discuss potential amenity and recreational space |
| | Email reminder to key stakeholders regarding feedback survey |
| | Requests for meetings sent via phone and email with RMS, TfNSW and EPA |
| | Ongoing contact with key community stakeholders regarding meeting requests |
| w/c 16 th July | Ongoing contact with government agencies regarding meeting requests |
| w/c 30 th July | Met onsite with the APIA soccer club to discuss proposed inclusions to new proposal |
| w/c 6 th August | Met with DPE to discuss feedback obtained so far from the consultation process |
| W/C 3 rd September | Began organising community drop in session to provide local residents with more information about the proposal and seek their feedback to finalise it |
| W/C 10 th September | Door knocked residents on Lords Road and Davies Road to ask for feedback and provide information on the drop-in session |
| W/C 17 th September | Placed advertisement in print and online of the Inner West Courier notifying residents of the drop-in session |
| | Met one-on-one with a local resident who raised some concerns |
| 22 nd September | Community drop in session held from 10am-2pm with around 25 residents attending |
| 28 th September | Met with Kegworth School principal and P and F representative. |

Correspondence with various government agencies is summarised in the Appendices to this report.

5 TAVERNERS HILL PRECINCT INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE

The infrastructure schedule for the Taverners Hill Precinct presented in the PRCUTS Infrastructure Schedule Implementation Tool Kit is used as the basis of the determining total infrastructure cost for the precinct. For the purpose of this analysis the total long term infrastructure cost has been considered. The completed Infrastructure schedule is included in Appendix C.

To allocate cost to the un-costed infrastructure elements in the Taverners Hill Precinct these items were compared to similar elements in other precincts. A base unit rate (either per \$ / m² or \$ / item) was calculated for these items and applied to the Taverners Hill precinct. Typically the schedule provided total quantities for each un-costed element. Thus by applying the unit rate to this element a cost for an infrastructure element could be calculated.

Adopting the total infrastructure costs from the schedule the following costing options can be calculated.

The items listed on the infrastructure schedule have been further assessed to identify if they are either state or local infrastructure allowing contributions payable to the Department of Planning and Inner West Council to be proposed. Local infrastructure identified on the schedule may also be have contributions under Section 94 contributions. This overlap will be considered in the proposed contribution calculations.

Infrastructure Cost Summary is presented below which summarises the costs of regional, local and Section 94 contributions. The detailed calculations are presented in Appendix C and Appendix D.

| Stakeholder | Calculated Cost |
|----------------------|------------------|
| State Infrastructure | \$ 30,865,235.98 |
| Local Infrastructure | \$ 32,989,212.98 |

Table 5.1 Infrastructure Summary - PRCUTS

6 SECTION 94 CONTRIBUTIONS

Section 94 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 permits Inner West Council to levy or require provision of facilities or land where, as a consequence of development, the increased number of residents or workers will result in an increased demand for those services.

Section 94 contributions for development within the subject proposal is made up from Contributions to three different plans, being:

- Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation
- Part 2 - Community Facilities and Services
- Part 3 - Transport and Access

Section 94 contributions have been calculated for two scenarios being “existing planning controls” and “proposed planning controls” which are presented below. The purpose of this is to identify the difference in Section 94 contribution Inner West Council will receive if the uplift to the site is realised.

Existing Planning Conditions

The following Section 94 contributions have been based on the site remaining as IN2 zoning achieving an FSR of 1:1. Detailed calculations are provided in Appendix D.

Proposed Planning Conditions

The following Section 94 contributions have been based on the site being rezoned to R3 achieving an FSR of 2.4:1. Detailed calculations of Section 94 contributions are presented in Appendix D. The Section 94 contribution for the older style industrial building that exists on the site has been credited against this amount.

The Section 94 contributions in this instance would overlap with items nominated with the PRCUTS Infrastructure Scheduled. This overlap is addressed in Section 6 of this report.

| Section 94 Contribution Plan | Existing Planning Controls (\$) | Proposed Planning Controls (\$) |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Zoning | IN2 Light Industrial | R3 Med Density with allowed uses |
| GFA (Allowable) | 10691 | 25658.4 |
| Residential GFA | n/a | 22218 |
| Employment GFA | 9979 | 3000 |
| Proposed Multi Unit Residential | | |
| Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation | | \$ 4,531,505.00 |
| Part 2 - Community Facilities & Services | | \$ 692,545.00 |
| Part 3 - Transport & Access | | \$ 214,202.97 |
| Total | | \$ 5,438,252.97 |
| Proposed Employment Generating Development (3000m2) | | |
| Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation | | \$ 50,248.71 |
| Part 2 - Community Facilities & Services | | \$ 231,560.89 |
| Part 3 - Transport & Access | | \$ 122,528.40 |
| Total | | \$ 404,338.01 |
| Total Contribution before Deduction | | \$ 5,842,590.97 |
| Existing Older Style Industrial Building (Avg) | | |
| Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation | \$ 90,095.03 | |
| Part 2 - Community Facilities & Services | \$ 46,223.87 | |
| Part 3 - Transport & Access | \$ 798,796.88 | |
| Total Amount not Payable (Building existing) | \$ 935,115.78 | |
| Total Contribution | | \$4,907,475.19 |

Table 6.1 Infrastructure Summary – Section 94

Rezoning of the site to R3 attracts a much larger Section 94 contribution that would not be made available to Council if the current industrial (IN2) zoning remains. The site uplift from the planning proposal attracts a total Section 94 contribution of \$4,907,475.19 compared to nil if existing planning conditions were to remain. This equates to additional \$4,907,475.19 due to the change in use and increase in FSR from 1:1 to 2.4:1. Both these changes are as set out in PRCUTS.

7 VOLUNTARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (VPA) – WORKS IN KIND

The proposal includes an offer to enter into a Voluntary Planning Agreement with the Inner West Council for the delivery of public benefits, local infrastructure items and affordable housing which are summarised and costed in the table below. The cost to provide public benefits and local infrastructure items is proposed to be offset against the payment of local infrastructure contributions .

The costs of the proposed Domain Works are summarized below:

| Item | Description | Quantum | Proposed Value of Contribution (excluding GST) |
|--|--|------------|---|
| Public Benefit Items | | | |
| Multi-purpose space to be transferred to Council | The space will be stratum titled and will have an area of 500 sqm with a minimum floor to ceiling height of 3.6m. It will be directly accessible from Lambert Park. Construction will be with concrete floor, and roof, and brick walls. | 500 sq m | \$2,480,000 |
| | The offer is made on the basis that the space that is the subject of the VPA will not form part of the floor area for the purpose of calculating the FSR of the site. | | |
| Upgrade to lighting in Lambert Park | Upgrade lighting on Lambert Park, which is leased by Council to the APIA Club, including design, engineering and project management | | \$160,000 |
| | TOTAL VALUE | | \$2,640,000 |
| Local Infrastructure Items | | | |
| Public art | Public art in the form of a sculpture and water feature near the entrance to the tunnel under the railway | | \$130,000 |
| Public open space | The central open space area will be accessible to members of the public. | 1,650 sq m | Public easement for recreation \$1,680,000 |
| | Shareway and through site links and provision of a pedestrian path with the potential to connect to the Marion Street Light Rail Station on the eastern side of the light rail corridor (should access through Lambert Park eventuate) | 1,832 sq m | Right of carriageway and footway \$1,860,000 |
| | Maintenance of central open space for the life of the building (80 years) | | \$60,000 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------|--------------------|
| Railway land bush regeneration | Clear out weeds, remove privet, and provide self maintaining planting to satisfaction Council's landscape officers, and Transport for NSW, including negotiations for access with and subject to permission of Transport NSW | 780 sqm | \$188,000 |
| Streetscape planting | Improved streetscape with plantings of street trees on Kegworth Street and Lords Road | | \$50,000 |
| Public domain | Public domain upgrades, roadworks, landscaping works | | \$100,000 |
| | TOTAL VALUE | | \$4,068,000 |
| Affordable Housing | | | |
| Affordable housing | A total of 35 affordable apartments within the development, to be owned and managed by Bridge Housing, for a minimum of 10 years. The apartments will be located in a separate stratum as required by Bridge. | | |

8 AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION

The planning proposal provides 35 Affordable Housing Dwellings, which reflects 15% of the total proposed dwellings, to be retained as Affordable for a minimum of 10 years.

This is consistent with current Government policy. The Greater Sydney Commission and the Department of Planning target is between 5% to 10% of the increase in residential GFA to be allocated to affordable housing.

The affordable housing contribution in this Proposal is being offered in addition to the Regional and Local Infrastructure Contributions outlined in this IIDP.

9 GAP ANALYSIS

We have calculated the total infrastructure cost of the Taverners Hill Precinct the PRCUTS Implementation Plan when compared to the existing state and local infrastructure identified in Section 1 (table 1,1) of this report.

9.1 SERVICES

The site is currently serviced by all utility services, water, sewer, power etc. The utility authorities that would service this site are, Sydney Water, Ausgrid, Telstra and NBN.

The cost of provision of these services will be applied directly by the relevant authority, which will be agreed once the development consent has been granted. The mechanism for utility authority to recoup cost for infrastructure upgrade works is already in place and would be activated by the submission of a development application.

Nevertheless, an initial high-level review of the additional demand due to the proposal's uplift and existing utility capacity, indicates spare capacity within the existing infrastructure can accommodate the

additional demands of the proposal. If the site is rezoned, this assessment would be subject to a review at the time of DA consent.

9.1.1 Potable Water, Sewer (Sydney Water)

Floth were asked to advise on the capacity of the existing Sydney Water network. They noted:

- We have been asked to comment on whether there is at present capacity in Sydney Water's systems to allow the development to be serviced by sewer and water.
- Attached is a copy of the Sydney Water diagram depicting the site and the adjacent water and sewer services in Lords Road and the laneway.
- We confirm that there is sufficient capacity in Sydney Water's system to allow the proposed development to be serviced by amplification of the existing sewer and water mains by Sydney Water.
- The cost of these works would be borne by the developer

9.1.2 Stormwater Water (Sydney Water)

ING have advised on the existing stormwater infrastructure. They note:

- We understand that a Planning proposal has been lodged to redevelop the above property into 235 apartments and Commercial Space.
- We have been asked to comment on whether there is at present sufficient stormwater drainage infrastructure to adequately drain runoff from the above development.
- Reference is made to the letter by Tooker & Associates dated 11 September 2018 which we are informed has been submitted with the Planning Proposal.
- We note that the site has an area of 10,617m² and that 96% of the site is covered by impervious surfaces: - being either roof, concrete or bitumen.
- With appropriate engineering design, the site is capable of accommodating the requirements of the proposed development.
- We confirm that there will be no requirements for Council or any other authority to provide any additional infrastructure or services to adequately manage the surface runoff and stormwater discharge from the proposed development.

9.1.3 Power (Ausgrid)

An advice has been obtained from AAPE in regard to power supply

- AAPE can confirm there is an existing Ausgrid substation located on the property, which currently services both the existing site and the low voltage network in the surrounding area.
- To facilitate the proposed development, the existing substation located on site would be required to be decommissioned/removed, followed by the installation of two new substations.
- The proposed substations are required to maintain the existing services to the Ausgrid network and supply the development at 67-69 Lords Rd. Ausgrid high voltage feeders are located along the duration of the property boundary on Lords Rd, which is the current connection point for substation S.2386 (located on site) and the most likely connection point for the proposed substations.
- AAPE can confirm power will be available to the development site, subject to the installation of new substations.

9.1.4 Communications (Telstra or NBN)

As an existing Light Industrial development with over 9700m² of floorspace, the site is already well serviced by telecommunication services.

9.1.5 Stormwater Infrastructure / Flood Mitigation

The stormwater and flooding report prepared by Tooker and Associates notes that a small corner of the site is affected by the 1:100 flood line. Compensatory storage, if required, can be provided on site, and the development will be designed to be above the 1:100 level, and freeboard, in compliance with Councils policies.

9.2 SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND BENCHMARKING

Social Infrastructure is dealt with in detail in the Social Impact Assessment prepared by Cred and part of the Planning Proposal Documents. Nevertheless these issues are considered here as part of the PRCUTS Checklist Criteria 2 considerations.

9.2.1 Education

The site is well serviced by School infrastructure in the local area, with 20 schools within 2 km of the site, as set out in the following table.

Based on a benchmark of 1 primary school for 500 students aged 5 to 11 years the proposal would not result in demand for an additional primary school, however would be home to approximately 11 people aged 5 to 11 years.

Based on benchmark of 1 government high school for up to 1,200 students aged 12 to 17 years, the proposal would not result in demand for an additional secondary school. However, the development would be home to approximately 6 young people aged 12 to 17 years.

Table - 6 Primary and secondary schools

(source: myschool.edu.au)

| | Level | Name | Type | Enrolment 2017 | Enrolment 2016 | Enrolment 2015 | Distance from site |
|-----|-----------|---|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Primary | Kegworth Public School | Government | 329 | 318 | 308 | <100m |
| 2. | Special | Eileen O'Connor Catholic College | Non-government | 39 | 20 | NA | 788m |
| 3. | Special | The John Berne School | Non-government | 38 | 37 | 60 | 822m |
| 4. | Secondary | Fort Street High School | Government | 927 | 941 | 941 | 823m |
| 5. | Primary | St Joan of Arc Primary School | Non-government | | | | 1.1kms |
| 6. | Secondary | Christian Brothers Lewisham | Non-government | 1352 | 1359 | 1376 | 1.23km |
| 7. | Primary | Leichhardt Public School | Government | 735 | 705 | 674 | 1.25km |
| 8. | Secondary | Sydney Secondary College Leichhardt Campus | Government | 945 | 893 | 849 | 1.43km |
| 9. | Primary | Taverners Hill Public School | Government | 86 | N/A | N/A | 1.45kms |
| 10. | Primary | Lewisham Public School | Government | 193 | 179 | 150 | 1.7kms |
| 11. | Primary | St Vincent's Primary | Non-Government | 275 | 302 | 314 | 1.8km |
| 12. | Secondary | Bethlehem College | Non-Government | 695 | 730 | 726 | 1.9km |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|--|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| 13. | Secondary | De La Salle College | Non-Government | 528 | 548 | 551 | 1.9km |
| 14. | Primary | Stanmore Public School | Government | 664 | 644 | 617 | 1.9kms |
| 15. | Secondary | Newington College incl Wyvern Prep | Non-government | 2036 | 2036 | 1989 | 1.9kms |
| 16. | Combined | Trinity Grammar School | Non-government | 2084 | 2012 | 2030 | 1.96km |
| 17. | Secondary | Dulwich Hill High School of Visual Arts and Design | Government | 784 | 700 | 675 | 1.95km |
| 18. | Primary | Summer Hill Public School | Government | 807 | 824 | 830 | 2.00km |
| 19. | Primary | Dobroyd Point Public School | Government | 240 | 254 | 260 | 2.00km |
| 20. | Primary | Orange Grove Public School | Government | 428 | 381 | 345 | 2.00km |
| TOTAL: | | | | 4904 | 4748 | 4694 | |

9.2.2 Early Childhood Education and Care

Leichhardt is well known for its high quality and high-end child care. The majority of centres are exceeding or meeting the National Quality Standard rating and have a daily fee of over \$120, ranging up to \$168. There are only two centres with a daily fee less than \$100.

Based on a benchmark of 0.4 places per child aged 0 to 4 years the proposal would result in demand for an additional 5 early education and care places. There are currently 782 places available in the suburb of Leichhardt, and additional places available within walking distance in the suburb of Haberfield (see Tables below).

Table 7 - Childcare within 2km of the site (source: ACECOA National Register)

| Name | Approved places | NQS rating | Distance from site |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Kindy4Kids Leichhardt | 25 | Exceeding NQS | 135m |
| Kegworth Public School Preschool | 20 | Meeting NQS | 263m |
| Explore & Develop Leichhardt | 90 | Exceeding NQS | 412m |
| Rise and shine kindergarten - Summer hill | 116 | NA | 829m |
| Little Ark Preschool | 37 | Exceeding NQS | 878m |
| My Stepping Stones Haberfield | 44 | Exceeding NQS | 925m |
| Uniting Ella Early Learning Haberfield | 42 | Exceeding NQS | 940m |
| Goodstart Early Learning Haberfield | 57 | Exceeding NQS | 980m |
| Little Learning School | 44 | Meeting NQS | 994m |
| Mary's Kindy | 21 | Working Towards NQS | 1km |
| Only About Children Leichhardt Elswick Street | 75 | Exceeding NQS | 1.06km |
| Leichhardt Montessori Academy | 90 | Working Towards NQS | 1.09km |
| Leichhardt Little Stars Nursery and Early Learning Centre | 29 | Working Towards NQS | 1.14km |
| Only About Children (Leichhardt Norton Plaza) | 101 | Exceeding NQS | 1.14km |
| Jenny's Kindergarten & Early Learning Centre - Leichhardt | 48 | Working Towards NQS | 1.25km |
| KU Leichhardt Preschool | 25 | Working Towards NQS | 1.32km |
| Leichhardt Children's Centre | 45 | Meeting NQS | 1.33km |
| Rose Cottage Childcare | 39 | Meeting NQS | 1.54km |
| Styles Street Children's Community Long Day Care Centre | 60 | Exceeding NQS | 1.52km |
| My Stepping Stones Leichhardt | 54 | Exceeding NQS | 1.75km |
| TOTAL PLACES: 946 | | | |

Table 8 - OSHC within 2km of the site

| Name | Approved places | NQS rating | Distance from site |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Kegworth Out of School Hours Care Inc. | 130 | Working Towards NQS | 187m |
| St Joan of Arc OSHC Centre | 96 | Exceeding NQS | 982m |
| Whoosh Care Leichhardt | 53 | Meeting NQS | 1.09km |
| Leichhardt OOSH | 180 | Exceeding NQS | 1.14km |
| Haberfield OSHC Centre | 179 | Meeting NQS | 1.3km |
| St Fiacre's OOSH | 68 | Meeting NQS | 1.45km |
| TOTAL PLACES: 610 | | | |

9.2.3 Seniors Centres

Based on population benchmarks, 30 future residents are expected to be over 60 years of age. There are a number of local community centres offering senior's program including the Leichhardt Community Centre.

9.2.4 General Multipurpose Community Space

The population does not trigger demand for additional multipurpose community space. However, given that 100% of residents will be living in high-density apartments, there would be demand for communal spaces within the apartment complex for social and recreational activities (e.g. music practice rooms, meeting rooms, party rooms). Applying a benchmark of 80m² per 1000 people indicates a need for 40m² of community space. This will be provided by through the proposal. There will be a strata common room / community space for the residents of the proposal, and the developer has also offered to provide a 500m² Multi-Purpose room to Council via a VPA agreement, to be used in conjunction with the Lambert Park Football field, which is directly adjacent to the site.

Table 5 - Existing community facilities

| Name | Type | Distance from site |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| Leichhardt Marketplace Community Room | Meeting room | 290m |
| Graham Yarroll Room | Meeting room | 900m |
| Mervyn Fletcher Hall | Meeting room | 900m |
| Haberfield Library | Library | 900m |
| Michael Maher Meeting Room | Meeting room | 900m |
| Summer Hill Community Centre | Community centre | 1.08km |
| Yanada Community Meeting Room | Meeting room | 1.1km |
| Leichhardt Town Hall and meeting room | Hall | 1.1km |
| Leichhardt Community Garden | Community garden | 1.2km |
| Leichhardt Library | Library | 1.28km |
| Leichhardt Men's Shed | Men's shed | 1.39km |
| Seaview Street Hall | Hall | 1.95km |
| Ashfield civic centre & meeting rooms | Civic centre / meeting rooms | 2km |

9.2.5 Performing Arts and Creative Arts Centre

Based on a benchmark of 1:50,000 people, the proposal does not indicate demand for a performing arts or creative arts centre. However, the site currently has located within it Art Est which provides a community accessible (but commercially for profit operated) creative arts centre servicing the local community. There are currently no Council-owned or managed performing arts or creative arts centres in the LGA. The land owner recognises that its tenant, Art Est, is a private for profit art school that has developed a strong client base in the area. If the development is approved, the land owner is committed to:

- Trying to help Art Est find a temporary location during the construction period; and
- Negotiating a commercial arrangement that will allow Art Est to return to the site when the development is completed.

9.2.6 Open Space

Open space benchmarking is based on a range of benchmarks including population, proximity, and site size in line with the Draft Government Architect's Office Open Space for Recreation Guidelines.

Table 12 - Open space proximity benchmarking

| Proximity benchmark | Existing open space | Meeting benchmark? |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 regional park within 5 to 10km (approx 2 - 5ha) [Department of Planning Guidelines] | Hawthorne Canal Reserve | Yes |
| 1 district park within 2km (approx 0.5ha - 2ha) [Department of Planning Guidelines] | Richard Murden Reserve | Yes |
| All residents should be within 400m of at least 1 level 1 local park with walkable connections and no major barriers (approx 0.5 to 2ha) [Department of Planning Guidelines] | Lambert Park | Yes |
| All residents living in high density should be within 200m of at least a level 2 local park with walkable connections and no major barriers (approx. 0.1 to 0.5ha) [Department of Planning Guidelines] | Lambert Park | Yes |

Population benchmark

Based on a benchmark of 13.3m² (current provision with the LGA), the proposal indicates that 5,931m² of open space should be provided to support the incoming community and 687.6m² should be provided for workers (City of Sydney and Government Architect's Office benchmark). Currently there is 129,460m² within 400 metres of the site.

Proximity benchmarks

NSW Department of Planning recommends that dwellings should be within proximity to a range of open space areas in accordance with Table 12 below. The Study Area currently meets these benchmarks.

The population does not trigger demand for additional regional or district social infrastructure or open space.

The study area is within 200 meters of local open space (Lambert Park). However, given the density of the area, a local park of between 0.1 and 0.5ha should be provided onsite in a publicly accessible location to ensure there is no loss of open space supply in the area.

This has been provided as part of the proposal.

10 INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS ASSESSMENT

Infrastructure contributions have been calculated by comparison of the total site GFA proposed under the planning proposal and comparing that to the total residential GFA uplift for the Taverners Hill precinct. The site under the planning proposal represent 12.5% of the total residential GFA uplift proposed for the Taverners Hill precinct. This percentage was checked against population growth and number of dwellings. The planning proposal represents 12.9% of precinct populations and 17.0% of precinct dwellings.

Apportionment of infrastructure costs by GFA is reasonable as this aligns with similar proportions of population and dwellings as well as accounting for both commercial and residential uplift.

Planning proposal infrastructure contributions made up of three components being state infrastructure contributions to the department of planning, local infrastructure contributions to Inner West Council, and Section 94 Contributions to Inner West Council. Contributions amounts are detailed below.

10.1 METHODOLOGY 1: PRCUTS INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE (REFER APPENDIX 5)

State Infrastructure Contributions

Total State Infrastructure Cost = \$ 30,865,235.98

Taverners Hill Precinct GFA = 205,000 m² (Residential + Employment GFA)

Planning Proposal GFA = 25658.4 m²

***Infrastructure Cost per m² GFA* = \$ 30,865,235.98 / 205,000 = \$ 150.56 / m²**

Total planning proposal state infrastructure contribution = 25658.4 x \$150.56 = \$ 3,863,183.27

Local Infrastructure Contributions

Total State Infrastructure Cost = \$ 32,989,212.98

Taverners Hill Precinct GFA = 205,000 m²

Planning Proposal GFA = 25658.4 m²

***Infrastructure Cost per m² GFA* = \$ 32,989,212.98 / 205,000 = \$ 160.92 / m²**

Total planning proposal local infrastructure contribution = 25658.4 x \$160.92 = \$ 4,128,949.73

10.2 METHODOLOGY 2: CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER LEICHHARDT LEP S 94 PLAN (REFER APPENDIX 4)

Section 94 Contributions

| Section 94 Contribution Plan | Proposed Planning Controls (\$) |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Part 1 – Open Space and Recreation | 4,491,658.68 |
| Part 2 – Community Facilities & Services | 887,882.02 |
| Part 3 – Transport & Access | -462,065.51 |
| Total | 4,910,475.19 |
| Contribution per GFA (\$/m²) | 191.38 |

$$\text{Contribution} = \$4,910,475.19 / 25658.4 = \$191.38 / \text{m}^2$$

Table 10.1 Section 94 Payment Summary

10.3 APPLIED LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTION

The Proposal is to allow the higher of the two Local Contribution methodologies, ensuring that: 1. Local Infrastructure Contribution is sufficient to pay for Local Infrastructure costs included in the attached PRCUTS Infrastructure Schedule (as populated, refer Appendix C); and 2. The Local Infrastructure Contribution is consistent with the current Leichhardt LEP Section 94 Contribution Plan.

10.4 VOLUNTARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (VPA) – WORKS IN KIND

The following items are offered as part of VPA (refer letter dated 26 September 2018) with Inner West Council to be deducted from the relevant State or Local Infrastructure / Section 94 contribution.

Deductions resulting from any relevant VPA could be applied as follows

Public Benefit Items

Multipurpose space to be transferred to Council = \$ 2,480,000

Upgrade of lighting to Lambert Park = \$160,000

Total Public Benefit Items / Deductions = \$ 2,640,000

Local Infrastructure / Section 94 Deductions

Public Art s = \$ 130,000

Public Open Space - \$3,600,000

Railway Land Regeneration - \$188,000

Streetscape Planting = \$50,000

Public Domain Upgrades = \$100,000

Total Local Infrastructure / S94 Deductions = \$ 4,068,000

11 OUTCOMES

- Utility services infrastructure has spare capacity to accommodate increased demand resulting from the planning proposal.
- Contributions for utility service infrastructure should not be incorporated into the IIDP as robust mechanisms to recoup infrastructure cost for utility services exist and can be applied when development consent is granted.
- Social Services (i.e. education, health) are not seeking specific contributions due to uplift.
- Localised increases in development density will not change current demand planning for social services such as health and education for the precinct.
- Section 94 contributions for the planning proposal are significantly greater than if the site remained zoned IN2 light industrial.
- Section 94 contributions under the current LEP are almost equal to local infrastructure costs defined in the infrastructure schedule.
- "Local Infrastructure" identified in the infrastructure schedule and Section 94 allocations overlap leading to doubling up of contributions for these items. Compensation for this doubling is not currently being pursued under this IIDP.

12 RECOMMENDATIONS •

- Acknowledgement that upgrades in existing infrastructure are not required to support the demand created by this specific development;
- However this report clarifies that:
 - Local infrastructure contributions are to be either the total section 94 contribution OR the local infrastructure contribution as identified in the PRCUTS schedule to avoid a doubling up of contributions on the same infrastructure items. This report recommends the higher of these 2 amounts;
 - State Infrastructure Contributions are to be made in accordance with the PRCUTS schedule and as outlined in this report; and
 - Infrastructure Contributions provides a fair, reasonable and equitable methodology to apportion infrastructure to contribute to infrastructure costs as a result of density uplift.
- The value of VPA works in kind are to be deducted from the monetary infrastructure contribution amounts.
- The consent authority should adopt the infrastructure contribution as proposed in this report and as outlined in the Draft VPA Offer associated with the subject Proposal
- The Proposal proceeds to Gateway as it satisfies the Criteria included in the PRUTS Out of Sequence Checklist.

13 APPENDIX1 PRE-LODGMET ADVICE FROM INNER WEST COUNCIL



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Contact: Leah Chiswick
Phone: 9367 5232

17 October 2018

Platino Properties
Att: Richard McLachlan
PO Box 1839
Neutral Bay NSW 2089
Sent by email to richard@platino.com.au

Dear Mr McLachlan,

RE: Pre-Planning Proposal – 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt

I refer to your application of 9 August 2018 for formal pre-planning proposal advice in relation to 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt (the site). This advice relates to the following amendments to *Leichhardt Local Environmental Plan 2013* (LLEP 2013):

- Rezone the site from IN2 Light Industrial to R3 Medium Density Residential
- Modify the FSR for the site from 1:1 to 2.4:1
- Introduce a maximum height of buildings of 30m
- Introduce a site-specific provision:
 - allowing a range of additional non-residential uses including recreation facility (indoor), office premises, business premises, light industry, industrial retail outlet, and restaurant or café;
 - requiring a minimum of 3,000 sqm of non-residential uses to be provided on the site; and
 - enabling a multi-use facility associated with Lambert Park to be provided as an FSR bonus.

Council's response (Attachment 1) outlines a number of issues with the proposal, including:

- loss of industrial land;
- workability of a mixed use development;
- prematurity of a planning proposal for the site and the requirements of the Out of Sequence Checklist, contained within the PRCUTS Implementation Plan 2016-2023, not being satisfied;
- inadequate justification for the planning controls sought;
- inconsistency with the Inner West Affordable Housing Policy; and
- lack of contribution to open space and public domain.

Furthermore, it identifies additional information that would be required if a planning proposal were to be pursued.

Council is currently undertaking a range of broader strategic planning work and studies including, but not limited to:

- Local Housing Strategy
- Local Strategic Planning Statement

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



INNER WEST COUNCIL

- Employment Lands Review
- Local Infrastructure Contributions Plan
- Integrated Transport Plan
- Comprehensive IWC LEP and DCP
- Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme
- PRCUTS precinct wide traffic modelling

This work will provide a comprehensive evidence base to inform the future strategic planning framework for the LGA, including land uses, infrastructure, public domain works, urban design and place making, community/social benefits, economic development and appropriate distribution of development uplift. A planning proposal for the subject site would be premature in relation to the completion of this broader strategic planning work, in particular the Local Housing Strategy and Employment Lands Review. The site and its future uses should be planned holistically in the context the revitalisation of Parramatta Road Corridor rather than in an ad hoc manner.

Notwithstanding, if a planning proposal is to be lodged, it should adequately address all matters raised in this correspondence. Prior to Council taking receipt of a planning proposal, a thorough review of the documentation being submitted would be undertaken. This is to ensure that an adequate level of information is being provided. This requires a meeting to be scheduled with a member of Council's Planning Operations team.

It should be noted that this response constitutes preliminary feedback and further issues may be identified during the assessment of any detailed planning proposal.

Should you have any enquiries, please contact Council's Executive Strategic Planner, Leah Chiswick on 9392 5232 (Mon, Wed and Thurs) or leah.chiswick@innerwest.nsw.gov.au.

Yours faithfully,

Colette Goodwin
Acting Planning Operations Manager

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131

**Attachment 1 – Pre-Planning Proposal Assessment
67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt**

Pre-Planning Proposal Concept

The pre-planning proposal presents a scheme for the redevelopment of the site for the purpose of a mixed use development comprising:

- 22,482 sqm of residential floor space delivering approximately 235 dwellings
- 3,000 sqm of non-residential floor space on the ground floor
- Five buildings located around the perimeter of the site ranging from three to nine storeys with a maximum height of 30 metres
- Open space of approximately 1,650sqm
- A public through site link and a secondary GreenWay connection to the Marion light rail stop
- 35 affordable rental dwellings

There are a number of fundamental concerns with the proposal as currently presented. These issues are outlined below.

1. Concerns with the Pre-Planning Proposal

Loss of Industrial Land

The planning proposal needs to demonstrate consideration of the Industrial Lands Study (2014) and Leichhardt Industrial Precinct Planning (2016) both undertaken by SGS Economics and Planning.

The recommendations of the Leichhardt Industrial Precinct Planning included two options:

1. Business as usual approach
2. Policy change for key precincts

Under both options, the recommendation for the Lords Road precinct was the same, to retain the IN2 zoning and continue to protect the precinct from rezoning. The rationale for the recommendations can be summarised as follows:

- The Industrial Lands Study (2014) identified a shortage of industrial floorspace in the LGA by 2036;
- While it will not increase industrial floorspace to address the identified shortage, retention and active protection of all IN2 (Light Industrial) zoned land is the best way to ensure that there is no continual erosion of remaining stock;
- The risks associated with introducing additional uses significantly outweigh the benefits. Integrating land use types would likely generate conflicts, significantly limiting the ongoing function of the precincts concerned; and
- Introducing residential to a site could potentially result in this becoming the dominant land use, with industrial uses being pushed out.

In light of the above, concern is raised regarding the proposed loss of between 8,000sqm and 10,000sqm of industrial floorspace on the site. The loss of this floorspace, and the introduction of residential development to the site, are fundamental issues with the proposal going forward.

Furthermore, Council is currently undertaking an Employment Lands Review which will inform the preparation of an Inner West LEP. The land use future of this site should be informed by this process.

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131

The lodgement of a planning proposal for the site in advance of the completion of this work would be premature.

Economic Impact

The Draft Community & Stakeholder Engagement Consultation Report outlines that during discussions with the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE), following the decision not to support the previous planning proposal, they identified "the need to provide affordable commercial/industrial space and employment opportunities in the local area". In addition, the consultation undertaken to date identifies existing tenants who serve the local population and hence need to remain in the area but are having difficulty finding an alternative space. The planning proposal should explore how these uses could remain on the site.

The EIA states that the proposal is addressing a market gap, responding to a "distinctly modest growth of employment in knowledge-intensive industries" by providing shared work space (comprising shared desks, workshops and studio space). The report however, does not consider how the existing tenants could be accommodated within a new development on the site, nor the impact of the loss of these uses. The net economic activity considers the proposal against the residential scenario (base case), rather than the existing situation, to argue a net increase in economic activity. There is no comparison with the existing situation in terms of jobs, both direct and flow-on.

Every effort should be made to encourage the provision of large, versatile, unembellished and affordable non-residential spaces on the site, which could help support and grow the creative industries which this area and the Inner West are already known for.

A preliminary review of the EIA has raised queries relating to the selected 'catchment area' and 'analysis area'. Justification for using these areas as the basis for analysis is requested.

A peer review of the EIA, considering the methodology, analysis and assumptions, will be sought when the planning proposal is lodged.

Functionality of mixed-use development

A planning proposal would need to demonstrate the workability of the proposed non-residential space for light industrial/local service uses and how these uses could co-exist with residential development. Consideration should be given to floorspace, floor to ceiling heights, access, parking and servicing requirements and compatibility with the proposed residential component, particularly in terms of amenity. More information is also required in support of the purported flexibility and adaptability of the non-residential space.

There is no indication that an alternative scheme which separates the uses horizontally (in different buildings) has been considered.

Prematurity of a Planning Proposal

As noted above, a planning proposal for the site is considered premature in advance of the completion of broader strategic planning work, which has commenced. Furthermore, consideration against the criteria of the Out of Sequence Checklist (the Checklist) of the PRCUTS Implementation Plan 2016-2023 highlights a number of deficiencies.

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Criteria 1

| | |
|---|---|
| The planning proposal can demonstrate significant delivery or contribution towards the Strategy's Corridor wide and Precinct specific vision | The submission considers the proposal against the Strategy's Corridor-wide and Precinct Visions and the Strategy's seven land use and transport planning principles. While the adopted approach has merit, Council officers have yet to determine if the proposal as presented will achieve 'significant delivery or contribution' towards the identified visions and satisfy the Strategy's principles and Strategic Actions. |
| The planning proposal satisfies the Strategy's seven land use and transport planning principles and fulfills the relevant Strategic Actions for each Principle | The purported economic, community and environmental benefits have yet to be verified and their significance ascertained. |
| The planning proposal can demonstrate significant net community, economic and environmental benefits for the Corridor and the Precinct or Frame Area within which the site is located | The proposal includes provision of multi-purpose 'community floorspace' of 1,000sqm and notes that anticipated uses include APIA Leichhardt Football Club (500sqm); fitness studio/mixed martial arts (250sqm); dance/music/arts studio (200sqm); and café/takeaway food (50sqm). It is unclear how this proposed floorspace responds to an identified community need. |
| The planning proposal is consistent with the recommended land uses, heights, densities, open space, active transport and built form plans for the relevant Precinct or Frame Area | <p>The pre-planning proposal states that it is consistent with the relevant provisions for the Taverners Hill Precinct as outlined in the PRCUTS – Planning and Design Guidelines.</p> <p>The recommended planning controls for the site are incongruous in that the building height and density do not align with the described land use.</p> <p>In describing the recommended land use zones for the Taverners Hill Precinct, the Guidelines state that (with the exception of the western Frame Area, both sides of Parramatta Road east of Hawthorne Canal, and the eastern side of Tebbutt Street) "low density residential uses are recommended" with an R3 Medium Density zone shown "in recognition of the need to permit town houses and terrace type dwellings given the good proximity to public transport". This conflicts with the recommended building heights in the following sub-section. Figure 10.18 shows the site with a recommended height of 30m and the text states that "a 32 metre height control is...recommended for land on Lords Road that is close to the Marion Light Rail stop and other nearby facilities and services such as Kegworth</p> |

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131

| | |
|---|--|
| | Public School and Leichhardt Marketplace". There needs to be further consideration of the scale of the built form outcome for the site. This should include submission of an urban design study justifying the height and density controls sought by the proposal (refer to Urban Design comments). |
| The planning proposal demonstrably achieves outcomes aligned to the desired future character and growth projections identified in the Strategy | The approach taken to considering the planning proposal against the desired future character of the Taverners Hill precinct is appropriate, however further consideration is required by Council as to the proposal's contribution. Notwithstanding, concern is raised with regards to the impact of the proposal on achieving the desired preservation of the leafy, residential and low scale character north of Parramatta Road between Hathern Street and Lords Road. The pre-planning proposal asserts that the scheme would achieve an appropriate transition to adjacent low scale residential. This needs to be further justified (refer to Urban Design comments). |
| The planning proposal demonstrates design excellence can be achieved, consistent with councils adopted design excellence strategy or the design excellence provisions provided in the Parramatta Road Corridor Planning and Design Guidelines (Planning and Design Guidelines). | The planning proposal must adequately demonstrate that it is consistent with the design excellence provisions of the PRCUTS Planning and Design Guidelines. The pre-planning proposal submission does not include detailed consideration of the proposal with regard to these provisions. |

Criteria 2

An Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IIDP) is yet to be provided. The planning proposal will need to detail how it will contribute to various infrastructure items to realise the PRCUTS vision. The IIDP is to include a methodology for calculating the local and state infrastructure contributions.

Criteria 3

While the preliminary engagement with surrounding residents and existing tenants on the site is acknowledged, further consultation is required in relation to the detailed proposal. The Consultation Report notes that engagement with a number of stakeholders, including government agencies and Kegworth Public School has not been possible.

Overall, the engagement undertaken is inadequate and there is no evidence that the requirement for an appropriate level of support or agreement has been satisfied. To satisfy Criteria 3 of the Out of Sequence Checklist, a planning proposal would need to detail:

- the nature of consultation undertaken;

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131

- stakeholders engaged, including the extent of notification areas;
- material provided to consultees; and
- evidence of stakeholder support.

Council has received correspondence (attached) from the South Haberfield Action Group outlining their opposition to the rezoning of the site and redevelopment for residential purposes. Future consultation and any planning proposal should take account of the concerns raised. This will be fundamental in obtaining the required stakeholder agreement.

The pre-planning proposal refers to further consultation being undertaken "through formal exhibition of the proposal following a Gateway decision". Consultation required by a Gateway determination is of no consequence to, and will go no way towards satisfying Criteria 3 of the Checklist.

Criteria 4

A sustainability report demonstrating how the proposal achieves or exceeds the targets of the Strategy is to accompany a planning proposal.

Criteria 5

The pre-planning proposal does not provide a thorough economic analysis to demonstrate feasibility with regard to the likely costs of infrastructure and the proposed funding arrangements available for the Precinct. This analysis should be informed by the Integrated Infrastructure Delivery Plan required under Criteria 2. A feasibility study should demonstrate the economic feasibility of the infrastructure works identified in the PRCUTS Infrastructure Schedule and how the works will be funded.

The submission makes reference to the development not being delivered until 2023. The relevance of this comment is unclear. The PRCUTS is a 30-year plan. While the Implementation Plan 2016-2023 provides the framework for the short-term delivery of the Strategy, the phasing of the Corridor's transformation beyond this time has yet to be determined. It is unreasonable to assume that land not identified for development between 2016 and 2023 will be ripe for development in 2024.

Criteria 6

Any planning proposal should be accompanied by a thorough needs assessment of the existing/future market conditions to support rezoning in the current context. As noted above, a peer review of the EIA will be undertaken should a planning proposal be lodged. This will ascertain whether the proposal adequately satisfies Criteria 6 of the Checklist.

Notwithstanding, the following preliminary concerns are raised in relation to market viability:

- The development would result in the loss of employment and urban services land which PRCUTS envisages being retained until at least 2023.
- The EIA notes that "soaring and sustained price growth in recent years is reflective of a market that is inadequately supplied". In demonstrating the market viability of the proposed residential development, sustained and significant growth in house prices should not be primarily attributed to an undersupply of housing.

Urban Design

- The submitted Urban Design Study relies on the built form controls prescribed in PRCUTS rather than demonstrating its own independent design merit. In this regard, the proposal does not provide a sound rationale for the sought FSR and height controls.

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



INNER WEST COUNCIL

- The report does not interrogate any alternative built form outcomes for the site to make its case for the preferred option.
- There are concerns regarding the relationship between the proposed building heights and surrounding context. The proposed building envelope is inconsistent with the prevailing built form character and the desired future character of the precinct.
- Any planning proposal should be supported by an analysis of the visual impact on the surrounding area. This will ensure that the height controls for the site have regard to the existing surrounding context.
- Any proposal to establish a reduced level height control needs to be accompanied by a site survey. While the site analysis provides some levels across the site, these need to be verified against a professional survey plan. Council's property records identify Lot 1 DP 550608 as being burdened by easements. The nature and extent of any affectation should be identified.
- The cross sections and elevations do not provide RLs to allow the floor to ceiling heights or maximum building heights to be determined.
- The report does not provide a basement plan/footprint to allow the extent of proposed deep soil area to be determined. There are concerns that basement car parking would limit the opportunities for on-site deep soil and tree planting.

Affordable Housing

The proposed affordable housing does not satisfy the mandatory affordable housing contribution of the Inner West Affordable Housing Policy which is 15% of gross floor area. The argument that the Inner West target is inconsistent with that of other councils lacks cogency. Any case for a housing target needs to be evidence based. While evidence for Council's target is provided in its Affordable Housing Policy, no evidence is provided for the proposed offer, relative to local need. The exclusion of moderate income households from the eligibility requirements is also an inconsistency with Council's policy.

While the proposed agreement with Bridge Housing is noted, this approach is also inconsistent with Council's Policy, which seeks ownership of these properties to enable more flexible use and respond to changing demand over time. In relation to the proposed allocation of 18 studio and 17 one bedroom apartments, it is not clear why larger apartments that would provide for families with children have been omitted. No justification for this configuration based upon housing-need data is provided. The EIA identifies that family households in the Analysis Area have increased over the 2006-2016 period, accounting for 60.3% of all households in 2016, with families with children being the dominant family cohort (47.4% of all family households).

Open Space and Public Domain

The PRCUTS Planning and Design Guidelines identify the Taverners Hill Precinct as being deficient in local open space, particularly north of Parramatta Road. Redevelopment of the site presents an opportunity to address the shortfall.

For open space to make a genuine contribution to the recreation needs of the local community, it must be appropriately located and designed. While likely to provide recreation opportunities and improved amenity for the occupants of the proposed development, the open space shown would be of little benefit to the wider community. As a minimum, the open space should have greater interface with the existing public domain.

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



The proposal states that it “provides pedestrian improvements along Lords Road between the pedestrian light rail underpass and Kegworth Primary School”. The documentation submitted does not demonstrate how the proposal will contribute to Lords Road being prioritised for pedestrians.

Community Strategic Plan

In June 2018 Council adopted a new Community Strategic Plan (CSP), *Our Inner West 2036*. Any planning proposal must address *Our Inner West 2036*, rather than the former Leichhardt Community Strategic Plan.

The CSP is guided by the principle: To work together in a way that is creative, caring and just. In the case of this proposal, creative is a key component of the principle and the Plan commits Council to the following expression:

Inner West is an environment where all forms of creativity flourish. This generates socio-economic growth and development, linking together the economy (creative industries), places (creative spaces) and people (creative talent), making a 'creative ecosystem' that reflects the relationship between creativity and place.

Traffic and Transport

- Prior to any rezoning commencing, the PRCUTS Implementation Plan requires completion of a precinct-wide traffic study and supporting modelling which considers the recommended land uses and densities, as well as future Westconnex conditions, and identifies the necessary road improvements and upgrades required to be delivered as part of any proposed renewal in the Precinct. The above mentioned study is being undertaken in collaboration with the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) and its completion is not anticipated until the end of March 2019. It is unlikely that a planning proposal could be supported prior to the completion of this study.
- Concern is raised regarding the increased use of Davies Lane and the possibility that vehicles associated with the new dwellings fronting Davies Lane may try to park (even temporarily) in Davies Lane, severely restricting access to the rear garages of properties fronting Davies Street. This is further exacerbated by the internal road exiting onto Davies Lane.
- While the active transport link through Lambert Park is discussed, there is no formal commitment to this from either party. This connection is unlikely to be achieved unless Lambert Park is reconfigured.
- Application of a green/home-based travel plan will assist in reducing private car dependency, particularly at a site with proximity to both light rail and buses, however current spare capacity/occupancy levels on the network is uncertain (the applicant's assessment and Council's assessment seem to differ).
- The proposed access road is located in close proximity to the 90 degree road bend which may result in unsafe conditions for vehicles turning right into the site.
- “Scenario 3” indicates Level of Service F at the Marion/Foster intersection for 2028, however no assessment of the public transport impacts (either delay due to the LoS F, or the increased population) on spare public transport capacity by 2028.
- The current proposal will generate additional pedestrian traffic in Davies Lane. To ensure pedestrian safety, provision of a 1.5m wide footpath will need to be considered. This would require the dedication of land along the length of Davies Lane.

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131

- To enable vehicles to exit Davies Lane in a forward direction, a "Y" turning head may be required at the northern end of the lane.
- The traffic report states that the assessment is for "63-73 Lords Road, Leichhardt". However, the study area should be "63-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt".
- The survey date and raw data have not been provided for the "Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volume" for the intersections along Foster Street and Tebbutt Street (presented in Figure 2.8).
- The traffic report (Table 6.1) notes that the traffic generation of the existing development is estimated using the RMS guide. An overall rate of 1 trip per 100sqm was applied to all light industrial type uses which result in a higher generation rate for 'warehouse and storage' use. The RMS guide specifies that 0.5 trips per 100sqm for warehouses and 1 trip per 100sqm for factories. Traffic generation rates should be revised in accordance with the RMS guide.
- An overall rate of 1.69 trip per 100sqm was applied to all office/community space type uses. The RMS guide specifies 1.6 trips (AM peak) and 1.2 trips (PM peak) per 100sqm for offices. Traffic generation rates should be revised in accordance with the RMS guide.
- Notwithstanding the overall reduction in the peak traffic generation identified, the most critical times for the location are during school pick-up and set down. As such, the likely traffic movements at these times should be demonstrated (through surveys of similar developments in the inner west).
- The existing traffic surveys were undertaken in 2013. The relevance of the data should be justified, and evidence presented of the business occupancy in the precinct during the survey.
- The traffic report used RMS (TDT2013/04) Sydney Average traffic generation rate for high density residential flat dwellings of just 0.19 peak vtpm per unit. The surveys used to derive this rate include those from St Leonards and Chatswood, which have very different traffic generation rates than the inner west. The traffic generation rates shall be amended to use a rate of 0.3 peak vtpm per unit which is derived from the RMS survey data, excluding St Leonards and Chatswood.
- Both Figure 6.1 and Figure 6.2 show the PM peak hour traffic volume generated from the study area. AM peak is not presented.
- Further clarification is required regarding traffic distribution at the Lords Road/Foster Street intersection.
- Concern is raised regarding the potential for additional right turn movements at the Foster/Tebbutt Street/Kegworth Street intersection, particularly during school peak period.
- The ability to comply with the car parking requirements of Leichhardt DCP 2013 should be demonstrated.
- Section 7: Intersection Capacity Analysis
 - Clarify the growth rate that was used in the analysis
 - SIDRA calibration and validation report to be provided for review

2. Additional Information

Site-specific Development Control Plan provisions

A planning proposal of the nature outlined would need to be accompanied by site-specific DCP provisions to be incorporated into Leichhardt DCP 2013. This would constitute a Complex DCP amendment under Council's Fees and Charges and as such a fee of \$35,000 would be payable at lodgement (in addition to the \$100,000 Complex LEP Amendment fee).

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



INNER WEST COUNCIL

Social Impact Statement

A Social Impact Statement is required to be prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the former Leichhardt Council. This approach to identifying social impacts (positive and negative), strategies and mitigation measures is the established mechanism for ensuring the balanced assessment of a proposal.

The Social Impact Assessment should take account of the Leichhardt Community and Cultural Plan 2011-2021 which identifies this site as being a component of the Iron Cove Arts, Culture and Recreation Corridor, containing significant creative sector employment lands, recreation lands, and community infrastructure.

Flood Study

The site is identified as a Flood Control Lot and as such a flood study must be submitted with a planning proposal. The study must establish the flood planning level, the probable maximum flood level and the hazard category. The study should be informed by an updated Flood Certificate obtained from Council. Without a flood study, consistency with Ministerial Direction 4.3 cannot be determined.

An overland flowpath must be maintained along the western boundary of the site. The existing flood waters pass from Parramatta Road, through George and Upwards Streets and on to Beeson Street. As the waters cannot pass the rail embankment, the flood waters travel alongside the embankment to Marion Street where it then has access to Hawthorne Canal. This flowpath will need to be maintained as part of any proposal to ensure that flooding of other properties in Lords Road or Kegworth Street is not exacerbated.

Heritage Impact Study

A Heritage Impact Study must accompany a planning proposal for the site. The study should consider the impact of the proposal on nearby heritage items, including the former house located within Lambert Park and Kegworth Primary School.

Contamination

While the pre-planning proposal states that an updated contamination assessment will be prepared to support the planning proposal, it is pertinent to note that in addition to a preliminary investigation, a detailed investigation may be necessary to adequately satisfy the requirements of SEPP 55 and demonstrate that the land can be remediated to make it suitable for the intended use.

Acid Sulfate Soil Study

The site is identified as having a probability of containing acid sulfate soils. Accordingly, an Acid Sulfate Soils Study must accompany a planning proposal for the site.

Voluntary Planning Agreement

Council will be seeking 50% of any uplift in value facilitated by amendment of the planning controls for the site, to be secured through a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA). A VPA offer is to be submitted with a planning proposal and is to contribute towards meeting local infrastructure/service demands.

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131



Note: A new fee structure for planning proposals and DCP amendments was adopted by Council on 24 July 2018. In addition to allowing for the recovery of costs associated with additional studies and peer reviews, it also stipulates that the costs of referring planning proposals to the Inner West Planning Panel and Architectural Excellence Panel are to be borne by proponents.

Customer Service Centres

Petersham | P (02) 9335 2222 | E council@marrickville.nsw.gov.au | 2-14 Fisher Street, Petersham NSW 2049

Leichhardt | P (02) 9367 9222 | E leichhardt@lmc.nsw.gov.au | 7-15 Wetherill Street Leichhardt NSW 2040

Ashfield | P (02) 9716 1800 | E info@ashfield.nsw.gov.au | 260 Liverpool Road Ashfield NSW 2131

From:

Sent: Saturday, 6 October 2018 9:31:01 AM

To: Inner West Council

Subject: Haberfield residents against Lords Road rezoning

Dear Mr Hart,

Haberfield residents are alarmed that Platino Properties is again trying to get the 67 Lords Road site rezoned to high-rise residential uses.

We had a meeting last week as the South Haberfield Action Group, and released the attached statement.

We urge Council to continue opposing the rezoning, and support our call for genuine consultation over the future of this important community resource.

Convenor

This email has been scanned by Symantec Email Security cloud service on behalf of Inner West Council.

South Haberfield Residents Statement

The owners of our local industrial site, at 67-73 Lords Road, Leichhardt (Platino Properties), is preparing a new bid to rezone the site for high-rise residential development. It is only 12 months since the last bid to rezone this land to residential was rejected by the Regional Planning Panel.

Platino Properties has been carrying out a sham consultation before resubmitting its plans. They want to argue that their redevelopment should be given priority so it can occur out-of-sequence before 2023. Their consultants have met some Leichhardt residents, who repeated their objections to the proposed scheme. But they did not talk to local Haberfield residents, not even those who addressed the Regional Planning Panel which rejected the proposed rezoning. They put on a planning display at the Haberfield library, but did not leaflet or inform most of the Haberfield houses directly affected.

The 'consultation' is a sham to justify a redevelopment almost as large as that rejected.

We object to the proposal for rezoning and intensive residential development of this site because:

1. The site with its diverse employment uses provides local services to the community including cultural and recreation services. This area has already lost much of its industrial lands, but a community is more than just dwellings.
2. The development is grossly out-of-scale with the surrounding community.
3. The increased residential population will put additional strain on local services such as the school and light rail
4. The development will increase traffic and congestion around the school, pedestrian routes and bike paths.
5. Residents in Haberfield will suffer a loss of privacy and sunlight, with likely effects on their property value.
6. The proposal has not taken into account that Haberfield is a heritage conservation area, subject to height restrictions which should apply to developments adjoining the conservation area.

We call upon our Local, State and Federal Government representatives to reject the redevelopment schema for the Lords Roads Industrial Lands.

We call on Platino Properties to meet representatives of the local community including the South Haberfield Action Group and the Lords Road Precinct Residents Committee to negotiate an acceptable consultative planning process.

14 APPENDIX 2 CORRESPONDENCE FROM TFNSW

Our Ref: 00606506

Mr Jack Prail
jack@platino.com.au

Dear Mr Prail

Thank you for your correspondence to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure about capacity on the Inner West Light Rail. I have been asked to respond to you.

I note your comments and appreciate the reasons that prompted you to write.

As you are aware, the Inner West Light Rail is very popular with customers. You may be assured Transport for NSW regularly reviews patronage, demand and anticipated growth for additional light rail services. I am advised that since July 2015, 185 additional services have been added for peak and inter-peak periods and Saturdays.

You may be interested to know, the Inner West Light Rail between Central and Dulwich Hill will receive an extra 35 services from August 2018. The increased frequency of services will assist in reducing crowding and wait times for customers during peak periods when it is needed most.

I understand that Mr Terry Brown, Director of Rail Services Contracts at Transport for NSW contacted you on 3 August 2018. He informed you that your queries about rapid bus and Parramatta road upgrades were referred to the Land Use Planning & Development area. I also understand that a meeting was arranged for 17 August 2018 with Mr Billy Yung, Senior Transport Planner, and Mr Mark Ozinga, Principal Manager of Land Use Planning & Development, to discuss your queries.

Thank you for taking the time to write.

Yours sincerely



22/8/2018

Terry McSweeney
Principal Manager, Ministerial & Government Services
Customer Relations & Government Services



Mr Jack Prail
Assistant Development Manager
Platino Property Pty Ltd
Suite 11, 20 Young Street
NEUTRAL BAY NSW 2089

Dear Mr Prail

Planning Proposal for 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt

Thank you for your email dated 17 August 2018 inviting Transport for NSW (TfNSW) to provide pre-Gateway comment on the subject proposal. It is noted from our meeting on 17 August 2018 that the subject proposal is under consideration by Inner West Council in respect to it proceeding to the Department of Planning & Environment for a Gateway determination.

TfNSW has liaised with Roads & Maritime Services on the proposal. However, the contents of this letter do not necessarily reflect a formal position from Roads & Maritime Services, and it is recommended that you consult separately with them.

The documents attached to the above email have been reviewed and the following comments are provided for your consideration:

Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS)

The subject Planning Proposal is within the Parramatta Road Corridor and is therefore subject to the policy objectives and directions outlined in the PRCUTS. Your attention is drawn to the relevant Section 117 local planning directions published on the Department of Planning & Environment website.

The subject site is located within the Taverners Hill Precinct of PRCUTS and ideally the subject proposal should be prepared following the preparation of a traffic study for that precinct, which is required under the Implementation Plan for PRCUTS. Road and other infrastructure upgrades are preliminarily identified in the Infrastructure Schedule for PRCUTS and the precinct-wide traffic study would establish further details in relation to those upgrades.

It is noted that the subject proposal has addressed the "out of sequence" criteria, but this is a matter primarily for Council's consideration. TfNSW is of the view that Council as the planning authority should consider the subject proposal on the basis of demonstrating compliance with the Section 117 Direction regarding:

- Consistency between the planning controls proposed in the subject proposal and the recommendations of the PRCUTS in accordance with the "out-of-sequence" checklist criteria;

- Adequacy of existing transport infrastructure to accommodate the additional demand generated by the subject proposal; and
- Identify suitable funding mechanism towards the regional infrastructure identified in the Implementation Plan of PRCUTS on an equitable basis as required by the relevant authority.

In this regard it is noted that the proposed planning controls (Zoning, Maximum building height and FSR) are consistent with the recommendations of the PRCUTS. It is also considered that the location of the subject site is within reasonable walking distance of existing light rail and bus services. Nevertheless it is essential for Council to resolve an approach to how the PRCUTS requirement for completion of the aforesaid precinct traffic study prior to any rezoning will be addressed. The subject proposal has included a list of infrastructure items which could be delivered (through SIC or VPA commitment) to support the proposed development. Council should further establish the details to inform a draft planning agreement that form part of the planning proposal, should it proceed to Gateway.

Site Specific DCP

It is noted the Preliminary Planning Proposal indicates that a site specific Development Control Plan (DCP) will be prepared. TfNSW is of the view that the DCP should include requirements for traffic and transport facilities and maximum car parking provision consistent with the rates outlined in the PRCUTS.

Comments are also provided on the Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment Report included in **Tab A**.

For further information or clarification regarding this matter, please contact Billy Yung, Senior Transport Planner at Billy.Yung@transport.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



6/9/2018

Mark Ozinga

**Principal Manager, Land Use Planning and Development
Freight, Strategy and Planning**

CD18/07546

**Tab A – Comments on Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment Report prepared by
The Transport Planning Partnership dated 9 August 2018**

The following comments are provided on the subject report:

- Table 6.1 of the report summarises the tenancy breakdown of the existing development. It is assumed that the tenancy are grouped into similar use for the applying relevant trip generation rate;
- Clarification is required for trip generation rate applied to Gymnasium. The adopted rate is meant for evening peak hour trip generation as recommended in the *Guide to Traffic Generating Developments*;
- Clarification is also required for having tenancy of academic function (i.e. Art School, Pottery classes, Kung Fu Classes) under Office/Community Space. The adopted trip rate should be justified;
- A traffic generation survey had been conducted in 2013 and it is recommended that an updated survey should be conducted to inform any changes to the existing traffic condition.
- The traffic assessment should take into account of the future traffic condition after the full completion of the proposed development (i.e. 10 years background traffic growth + proposed development).
- TfNSW supports the promotion of sustainable modes of travel including buses, walking and cycling, that tend to reduce car dependency. The proposal, including the traffic report, contains limited information in regard to each of these forms of transport to and within the area affected by the proposal. Provision of active transport linkages has been identified in the vicinity of the subject site under the PRCUTS and therefore the proposal should demonstrate, to the greatest extent possible, that the aims and objectives of the State Government policies in regard to this matter is supported.
- It is appreciated that the report provided an outline of demand management initiatives (refers to Section 7.5). However, it is requested that this section should be further elaborated with details of the proposed measures. In particular,
 - More details should be provided on how to *create high quality pedestrian/shared environments and cycling facilities to encourage cycling and walking*. It is noted that the subject site is within reasonable walking distance to the two light rail stops via Greenway and possible improvement to this linkage could be investigated as part of this proposal.
 - The green travel measures suggest *provision of reduced car parking within the site to limit availability of car parking spaces to reduce car ownership*. However, it is noted that a higher rate exceeding the recommendation of the PRCUTS is proposed in Section 5.1.4.
 - The post occupation program of on-going monitoring and evaluation will be important with initiatives reviewed and refresh as appropriate to achieve modal targets. The measures suggested in the Green Travel Plan initiatives should include a successor travel plan coordinator to be nominated following the initial period stipulated by the consent authority to ensure the travel plan remains active in the future.

George Revay

Subject: FW: Transport NSW Leichhardt Light Rail Services
Attachments: image004.jpg; image001.jpg; image004.jpg

From: Sangar, Para [mailto:Para.Sangar@transport.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 9 July 2018 2:53 PM
To: Jack Prail <jack@platino.com.au>
Cc: Ozinga, Mark <Mark.Ozinga@transport.nsw.gov.au>; Brown, Terry <Terry.Brown@transport.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: RE: Leichhardt Light Rail Services

Hi Jack

As discussed this morning, TfNSW would constantly review the patronage for the inner west light rail services and would increase the services if required.

Should you have any further queries, please contact me.

Regards

Para

Para Sangar
Senior Transport Planner
Freight, Strategy and Planning

Transport for NSW

T 0466 024 892
241 O'Riordan Street, Mascot NSW 2020



SENSITIVE: NSW GOVERNMENT

From: Jack Prail [mailto:jack@platino.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 9 July 2018 2:49 PM
To: Sangar, Para
Cc: Paula Mottek; George Revay
Subject: RE: Leichhardt Light Rail Services

Dear Para,

Thanks again for speaking with me this morning.

RE: Leichhardt Light Rail Services

I refer to the above matter and to our previous correspondence with you.

Platino Properties is currently preparing a planning proposal to rezone land within 250m of the Marion Street light rail station at 67-73 Lords Road, Leichhardt, in accordance with the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy.

One of the requirements of the planning proposal is that an "Out of Sequence Checklist" is completed to demonstrate that, among other things, appropriate services are available to accommodate the future development of the site to provide for residential apartments.

As part of the checklist, we are seeking confirmation from Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) to the effect that:

- the Marion Street light rail will be capable of servicing the rise in passengers generated by a 230-unit apartment development; or

- that additional cars could be added to the light rail system if required.

For this purpose, can you please confirm that TfNSW undertakes annual monitoring of the light rail capacity, and is able to re-evaluate the services needed to satisfy demand, increasing the number of cars where necessary?

I thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Sincerely,

Regards,

Jack Prail

Assistant Development Manager

M: 0420 677 405

D: 02 8968 1934

E: jack@platino.com.au

A: Suite 11, 20 Young St, Neutral Bay, NSW, 2089

W: www.platino.com.au

Platino Properties Pty Ltd warrants that it is an agent authorised to commission work and make representations on behalf of the owner of the property referred to in this email.?? Platino Properties Pty Ltd, as the agent of the owner of the property is not liable for any loss suffered by the recipient of this email resulting from the actions of the owner of the property or from the communication contained within this email.?? This email is a privileged

15 APPENDIX 3 CORRESPONDENCE WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Richard McLachlan

From: Richard McLachlan
Sent: Thursday, 4 October 2018 11:33 AM
To: 'david.a.mitchell@industry.nsw.gov.au'
Cc: George Revay
Subject: GR-DM.Dol.Lords.4-10-18
Attachments: GR.Dol.Lords.4-10-18.pdf; Social Impact Assessment Cred.pdf

Dear Sir
Pls see letter and report attached.
We look forward to your earliest response.
Regards

Richard McLachlan
COO and Director New Business

M: 0408 675 973
D: 02 8968 1937
E: richard@platino.com.au
A: Suite 11, 20 Young St, Neutral Bay, NSW, 2089
W: www.platino.com.au



Platino Properties Pty Ltd warrants that it is an agent authorised to commission work and make representations on behalf of the owner of the property referred to in this email. Platino Properties Pty Ltd, as the agent of the owner of the property is not liable for any loss suffered by the recipient of this email resulting from the actions of the owner of the property or from the communication contained within this email. This email is a privileged communication for the use of the intended recipients only. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately.



PLATINO
PROPERTIES

4 October 2018

NSW Minister for Industry
MLC Centre
19 Martin Place
Sydney NSW 2000

By Email david.a.mitchell@industry.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sir

Platino Properties is currently preparing a planning proposal to seek to rezone land and construct approximately 235 dwellings at 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt, in accordance with the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS). The site is within the Inner West LGA.

The PRCUTS Implementation Plan supports delivery of a maximum 47,000sqm of residential GFA and a minimum of 35,000sqm of commercial GFA by 2023 within the Taverners Hill Precinct.

Whilst the Lords Road site is outside the area envisaged for Stage 1 2016-2023 release under the PRCUTS – Implementation Plan, an Economic Impact Assessment has been prepared which demonstrates that take up has been slow in the precinct. It is considered that the redevelopment of the site would not result in growth within the precinct exceeding that anticipated under the Implementation Plan to 2023. As set out in the PRCUTS a planning proposal can be lodged even if the site is not within the stage one area, subject to the completion of a satisfactory checklist that notes that services and other infrastructure are available.

Notwithstanding, one of the requirements of the PRCUTS is that the proponent consult the government stakeholders with respect to the availability of services to accommodate potential future demand from the development's estimated 447 future residents.

For this purpose, can you please confirm, from the perspective of the NSW Dept of Industry, that there is adequate capacity within local services and infrastructure to meet the demand generated by the anticipated population under the PRCUTS to 2023? For further information we have also attached our Social Infrastructure assessment which further details the proposal.

I thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours Sincerely

George Revay
Director

Suite 11, 20 Young Street,
Neutral Bay, NSW, 2089
Phone (02) 8968 1900
properties@platino.com.au

www.platino.com.au
ACN: 002 388 856

Richard McLachlan

From: Richard McLachlan
Sent: Thursday, 4 October 2018 11:45 AM
To: 'slhd-esu@health.nsw.gov.au'
Cc: George Revay
Subject: GR-TA.SAHS.Lords Rd.4-10-18
Attachments: GR.DoH.LAHS.Lords.4-10-18.pdf; Social Impact Assessment Cred.pdf

Dear Dr Anderson,

Pls see letter and report attached.
We look forward to your response.

Regards

Richard McLachlan
COO and Director New Business

M: 0408 675 973
D: 02 8968 1937
E: richard@platino.com.au
A: Suite 11, 20 Young St, Neutral Bay, NSW, 2089
W: www.platino.com.au



Platino Properties Pty Ltd warrants that it is an agent authorised to commission work and make representations on behalf of the owner of the property referred to in this email. Platino Properties Pty Ltd, as the agent of the owner of the property is not liable for any loss suffered by the recipient of this email resulting from the actions of the owner of the property or from the communication contained within this email. This email is a privileged communication for the use of the intended recipients only. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately.



**PLATINO
PROPERTIES**

4 October 2018

Chief Executive Officer
Sydney Local Health District
83 Missenden Road
CAMPERDOWN NSW 2050

Attention Dr Teresa Anderson
By Email slhd-esu@health.nsw.gov.au

Dear Dr Anderson

Platino Properties is currently preparing a planning proposal to seek to rezone land and construct approximately 235 dwellings at 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt, in accordance with the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS). The site is within the Inner West LGA, and the Sydney Local Health District.

The PRCUTS Implementation Plan supports delivery of a maximum 47,000sqm of residential GFA and a minimum of 35,000sqm of commercial GFA by 2023 within the Taverners Hill Precinct.

Whilst the Lords Road site is outside the area envisaged for Stage 1 2016-2023 release under the PRCUTS – Implementation Plan, an Economic Impact Assessment has been prepared which demonstrates that take up has been slow in the precinct. It is considered that the redevelopment of the site would not result in growth within the precinct exceeding that anticipated under the Implementation Plan to 2023. As set out in the PRCUTS a planning proposal can be lodged even if the site is not within the stage one area, subject to the completion of a satisfactory checklist that notes that services and other infrastructure are available.

Notwithstanding, one of the requirements of the PRCUTS is that the proponent consult the government stakeholders with respect to the availability of services to accommodate potential future demand from the development's estimated 447 future residents.

For this purpose, can you please confirm, from the perspective of the NSW Dept of Health, that there is adequate capacity within local health services and infrastructure to meet the demand generated by the anticipated population under the PRCUTS to 2023? For further information we have also attached our Social Infrastructure assessment which further details the proposal.

I thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours Sincerely

George Revay
Director

Suite 11, 20 Young Street,
Neutral Bay, NSW, 2089
Phone (02) 8968 1900
properties@platino.com.au

www.platino.com.au
ACN: 002 388 856

Richard McLachlan

From: Richard McLachlan
Sent: Thursday, 4 October 2018 12:40 PM
To: 'katie.joyner@det.nsw.edu.au'
Cc: George Revay
Subject: RM-KJ.NSW.Education.Lords Rd.4-10-18
Attachments: GR.DoE.KJ.Lords.4-10-18.pdf

Dear Ms Joyner,

Pls see letter and report attached.
We look forward to your response.

Regards

Richard McLachlan
COO and Director New Business

M: 0408 675 973
D: 02 8968 1937
E: richard@platino.com.au
A: Suite 11, 20 Young St, Neutral Bay, NSW, 2089
W: www.platino.com.au



Platino Properties Pty Ltd warrants that it is an agent authorised to commission work and make representations on behalf of the owner of the property referred to in this email. Platino Properties Pty Ltd, as the agent of the owner of the property is not liable for any loss suffered by the recipient of this email resulting from the actions of the owner of the property or from the communication contained within this email. This email is a privileged communication for the use of the intended recipients only. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately.



PLATINO
PROPERTIES

4 October 2018

NSW Department of Education
33 Bridge St
Sydney NSW 2000

Attention Ms Katie Joyner
By Email katie.joyner@det.nsw.edu.au

Dear Ms Joyner

Platino Properties is currently preparing a planning proposal to seek to rezone land and construct approximately 235 dwellings at 67-75 Lords Road, Leichhardt, in accordance with the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS). The site is within the Sydney Metropolitan School district, and in the Inner West LGA.

The PRCUTS Implementation Plan supports delivery of a maximum 47,000sqm of residential GFA and a minimum of 35,000sqm of commercial GFA by 2023 within the Taverners Hill Precinct.

Whilst the Lords Road site is outside the area envisaged for Stage 1 2016-2023 release under the PRCUTS – Implementation Plan, an Economic Impact Assessment has been prepared which demonstrates that take up has been slow in the precinct. It is considered that the redevelopment of the site would not result in growth within the precinct exceeding that anticipated under the Implementation Plan to 2023. Further, as set out in the PRCUTS a planning proposal can be lodged even if the site is not within the Stage 1 area, subject to the completion of a satisfactory checklist that notes that appropriate services and other infrastructure are available.

Therefore, we seek to consult the Department of Education with respect to the availability of education services to accommodate potential future demand generated by the development's estimated 17 school age residents. We note that as per the table below there are approx 20 schools currently operating within 2km of the site, with a current school population of 4904 students.

For this purpose, can you please confirm, from the perspective of the NSW Dept of Education, that there is adequate capacity within local Education services and infrastructure to meet the demand generated by the anticipated population under the PRCUTS? For further information we have also attached our Social Impact Assessment which further details the proposal, and an extract from this report is below, detailing the many schools near the site.

I thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours Sincerely

George Revay
Director

Suite 11, 20 Young Street,
Neutral Bay, NSW, 2089
Phone (02) 8968 1900
properties@platino.com.au

www.platino.com.au
ACN: 002 388 856

Table - Primary and secondary schools

(source: myschool.edu.au)

| | Level | Name | Type | Enrolment 2017 | Enrolment 2016 | Enrolment 2015 | Distance from site |
|---------------|-----------|---|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | 1 Primary | Kegworth Public School | Government | 329 | 318 | 308 | <100m |
| 2. | Special | Eileen O'Connor Catholic College | Non-government | 39 | 20 | NA | 788m |
| 3. | Special | The John Berne School | Non-government | 38 | 37 | 60 | 822m |
| 4. | Secondary | Fort Street High School | Government | 927 | 941 | 941 | 823m |
| 5. | Primary | St Joan of Arc Primary School | Non-government | | | | 1.1kms |
| 6. | Secondary | Christian Brothers Lewisham | Non-government | 1352 | 1359 | 1376 | 1.23km |
| 7. | Primary | Leichhardt Public School | Government | 735 | 705 | 674 | 1.25km |
| 8. | Secondary | Sydney Secondary College Leichhardt Campus | Government | 945 | 893 | 849 | 1.43km |
| 9. | Primary | Taverners Hill Public School | Government | 86 | N/A | N/A | 1.45kms |
| 10. | Primary | Lewisham Public School | Government | 193 | 179 | 150 | 1.7kms |
| 11. | Primary | St Vincent's Primary | Non-Government | 275 | 302 | 314 | 1.8km |
| 12. | Secondary | Bethlehem College | Non-Government | 695 | 730 | 726 | 1.9km |
| 13. | Secondary | De La Salle College | Non-Government | 528 | 548 | 551 | 1.9km |
| 14. | Primary | Stanmore Public School | Government | 664 | 644 | 617 | 1.9kms |
| 15. | Secondary | Newington College Incl Wyvern Prep | Non-government | 2036 | 2036 | 1989 | 1.9kms |
| 16. | Combined | Trinity Grammar School | Non-government | 2084 | 2012 | 2030 | 1.96km |
| 17. | Secondary | Dulwich Hill High School of Visual Arts and Design | Government | 784 | 700 | 675 | 1.95km |
| 18. | Primary | Summer Hill Public School | Government | 807 | 824 | 830 | 2.00km |
| 19. | Primary | Dobroyd Point Public School | Government | 240 | 254 | 260 | 2.00km |
| 20. | Primary | Orange Grove Public School | Government | 428 | 381 | 345 | 2.00km |
| TOTAL: | | | | 4904 | 4748 | 4694 | |



Sydney Catholic Schools

25 September 2018

Mr George Revay
Director
Platino Properties
20 Young Street
Neutral Bay NSW 2089

Dear Richard

School Demand, Sydney Inner West region

Sydney Catholic Schools ("SCS") manages and operates over 152 schools in Sydney, with eleven schools in the area surrounding the proposed Lords Road proposal.

We understand that Platino is seeking a rezoning on a site in Lords Road Leichhardt, which will propose 235 new dwellings. Sydney Catholic Schools operates 11 schools in the area surrounding the Lords Rd proposal. These are.

| School Name | Suburb | Enrolments |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Eileen O' Connor Special needs School | Lewisham | 75 |
| St Joan of Arc Primary | Haberfield | 350 |
| St Vincents Primary | Ashfield | 312 |
| St Fiacres Primary | Leichhardt | 123 |
| St Columba's Primary | Leichhardt | 156 |
| St Patricks Primary | Summer Hill | 166 |
| St Michael's Primary | Stanmore | 134 |
| St Brigids Primary | Marrickville | 385 |
| Bethlehem College | Ashfield | 742 |
| De La Salle College | Ashfield | 541 |
| Casmir College | Marrickville | 701 |
| | | 3574 |

38 Renwick Street Leichhardt NSW 2040 · Ph (02) 9569 6111
PO Box 217 Leichhardt NSW 2040

www.sydcatholicschools.nsw.edu.au

SYDNEY CATHOLIC SCHOOLS LIMITED ACN 619 137 343
AS TRUSTEE FOR THE SYDNEY CATHOLIC SCHOOLS TRUST ABN 26 158 447 082



As a low fee system of schools Sydney Catholic Schools in the Inner West of Sydney has over the recent years experienced a decline in the school aged population, due to the lack of affordable housing in the region for families with limited incomes.

Opportunities to provide families with affordable housing in the Inner West are a welcomed initiative.

Yours Sincerely



Glenn McLachlan
Director of System Stewardship
Sydney Catholic Schools



16 APPENDIX 4 SECTION 94 CONTRIBUTION CALCULATIONS

S94 Developer Contributions

Proposed Multi-unit Residential (235 units)

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation | \$ 4,531,505.00 |
| Part 2 - Community Facilities & Services | \$ 692,545.00 |
| Part 3 - Transport & Access | \$ 214,202.97 |
| | |
| Total | \$ 5,438,252.97 |
| Cost per Unit | \$ 23,141.50 |
| Cost per m2 | \$ 240.01 |

Proposed Employment Generating Development (3000m2)

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation | \$ 50,248.71 |
| Part 2 - Community Facilities & Services | \$ 231,560.89 |
| Part 3 - Transport & Access | \$ 122,528.40 |
| | |
| Total | \$ 404,338.01 |
| Cost per m2 | \$ 134.78 |

Proposed Contribution (Total)

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation | \$ 4,581,753.71 |
| Part 2 - Community Facilities & Services | \$ 924,105.89 |
| Part 3 - Transport & Access | \$ 336,731.37 |

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Total Contribution | \$ 5,842,590.97 |
|---------------------------|------------------------|

Existing Older Style Industrial Building (Avg)

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Part 1 - Open Space and Recreation | \$ 90,095.03 |
| Part 2 - Community Facilities & Services | \$ 46,223.87 |
| Part 3 - Transport & Access | \$ 798,796.88 |
| | |
| Total | \$ 935,115.78 |
| Cost per m2 | \$ 87.47 |
| Cost per 100m2 | \$ 8,746.76 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Total Deduction | \$ 935,115.78 |
|------------------------|----------------------|

Total Section 94 Contribution \$ 4,907,475.19

17 APPENDIX 5 PRCUTS INFRASTRUCTURE CALCULATIONS

[illegible]

