



Meeting Minutes

Housing for All Local Democracy Group

19 June 2025

Level 6 Meeting Room, Ashfield Service Centre

Meeting commenced at 6:05PM and concluded at 7:43 PM.

Attendees

Community members	Council officers	Councillors
Aniruddha Nadkarni	Simone Plummer	Nil
Eddie Ma	Daniel East	
Elayn James	Jennifer Gavin	
Gianluca Dragone	Jyn Kim	
Justin Simon (online)		
Reagan Ward (online)		
Ryan Harris		
Yolanda Gil		

Chairperson

Elayn James

Acknowledgement of Country

Elayn James

Apologies and membership changes

Apologies – Rishi Krishnan, Suzanna Mannering

Disclosures of conflicts of interest

Nil

Endorse previous meeting minutes

Endorsed minutes of 5 June 2025.



Discussion Items

Agenda Item	Discussion summary and Agenda item outcome/action (as required)
-------------	---

2	Members confirmed previous minutes of 5 June 2025.
---	--

3	Our Fairer Future Plan – Housing for All LGD Submission
---	--

Council staff collated members' feedback on *Our Fairer Future Plan* collected during the previous LDG meeting on 5 June 2025. Refer to *Appendix 1 – OFFP Workshop Collated Comments*. At this meeting, members reviewed the collated feedback to refine and form a consensus for submission as a collective response from the LDG, as follows:

Opening Comments

What do you strongly support?

- The place based urban design approach as compared to the TOD and LMRH.
- Including a vision and desired future character to guide development.
- Taking a hubs and spines approach rather than just a circle.
- Built form guidance that maintains amenity.
- Encouraging use of faith-based land holdings.
- Identifying opportunities for new public open space and other community infrastructure.
- Improved nightlife if done right.

What are key issues or concerns?

- Need more than 2% affordable housing in perpetuity.
- Managing transition from high to medium and low density.

INNER WEST

Topics where consensus not reached:

- Planning mechanisms – key sites and incentives supported but benefit developers who are already getting uplift.
- Heritage – health check review is good, but heritage continues to constraint opportunities.
- Development on main streets – supported but impacts identified – amenity and need for public realm improvements.
- Distribution – too focussed on specific locations.
- Uplift too much (should aim for 5-6 storey) versus not enough
- More infrastructure will be needed – larger parks and green corridors.
- Car parking – general support on reduced rates but should recognise the needs of diverse demographics.

Housing Investigation Areas

Q1. What positive outcomes do you think the draft master plans will bring to the community?

The following are supported:

- Increased housing.
- Increased not-for-profit (affordable) housing – noting all opportunities should be taken to achieve greater than 2% – how could this be increased?
- More walkable and connected neighbourhoods – noting need more buses, accessibility and amenities.
- Boost to local economy.
- More vibrant town centres – noting centres need diversity to be vibrant and some locations need more attention than others – such as Norton Street Leichhardt.
- New social and recreational infrastructure proposed including libraries, parks, active recreation, plazas, community facilities – acknowledging more will continue to be needed and it will take time.

Q2. Are there other positive outcomes?

- Nil



Q3 and Q4. What concerns, if any, do you have about the draft master plans?

- *Impact on local character* – street setbacks important in maintaining character.
- *Increased traffic congestion* – these will need to be well managed.
- *Lack of open space* – more open space needed for active and passive recreation.
- *Environmental impacts* – no concerns.
- *Property values and rates* – leaving it to the market may not result in affordability.
- *Pressure on infrastructure* – more childcare centres and sports facilities needed and some libraries require updating.
- Take up may be too slow to meet supply needs.
- Policy positions may impact financing.

Q5 and Q6. What would make the proposal better?

- More green and public spaces.
- Enhanced commitment to active transport.
- Detail on cycleway design and delivery.
- Heritage controls should only apply to affected land not nearby properties.
- More opportunities exist – for example Wardell Road which is a popular route between the train station and village.
- Utilisation of council owned land for social and affordable housing.

Q7. Are there any unintended consequences?

- Key sites that deliver community benefit may be avoided due to extra hurdles.

Residential Review

Q. Has the residential review accurately translated the existing controls for your property?

- Yes and no further comments.



General amendments

Q1. Do you agree with the proposed general amendments to allow affordable housing on faith-based land?

- Generally supported
- Other comments:
 - Heritage will impact ability to use.
 - Clarify 'any purpose' statement in this proposed clause. This is very open ended.

Q2. Do you agree with the proposed general amendments to minimise loss of existing residential dwellings?

- Agree while noting the ADG requires larger dwelling sizes than older apartment blocks so in some cases may be unavoidable.

Q3. Do you agree with the proposed general amendments to harmonise minimum lot size for subdivision?

- Agree.

Q4. Do you agree with the proposed general amendments to increase the minimum lot size for dual occupancies in Haberfield?

- Undecided. Mixed views of opportunity versus retaining character.

Q5. Do you agree with the proposed general amendments to introduce a Special Entertainment Precinct in Ashfield?

- Agree.

Incentives

Q. What are your thoughts on the three proposed incentives?

- *What are the positives* - Supported.

INNER WEST

- *Do you have any concerns* – A view shared by some was that site amalgamation over incentivises and does not capture enough community benefit and may result in losing fine grain character.
- *Are there unintended consequences* – Nil
- *What would make it better* – Development controls retain fine grain character.

Permissibility changes

Q. What are your thoughts on the proposed changes to permissibility?

- *What are the positives* - Supported
- *Do you have any concerns* – Nil
- *Are there any unintended consequences* – Nil
- *What would make it better* – Nil

Car parking rates

Q. What are your thoughts on the proposed car parking rates?

- *What are the positives* – Generally supported.
- *Do you have any concerns* – Need to consider diversity of community who may rely on private vehicles.
- *Are there any unintended consequences* – Nil
- *What would make it better* – Nil

Affordable housing

Q. What are your thoughts on the proposed 2% affordable housing requirements?

- *What are the positives* – Supported
- *Do you have any concerns* – Need for higher % and often in least desirable location of development therefore lacking amenity.
- *Are there any unintended consequences* – Nil



- *What would make it better* – Nil

Dwelling mix

Q. What are your thoughts on the proposed dwelling mix?

- *What are the positives* – Supported.
- *Do you have any concerns* – Ranges need to be more concise.
- *Are there any unintended consequences* – Nil
- *What would make it better* – Mixed views as there is too much emphasis on smaller units. Need to enhance three bedrooms + to accommodate families and diverse housing groups.

Key sites and land reservation acquisitions

Q. What are your thoughts on the using these planning mechanisms to achieve community benefits?

- *What are the positives* – Supported
- *Do you have any concerns* – Nil
- *Are there any unintended consequences* – See previous comments
- *What would make it better* – Nil

As above, the refined feedback was finalised and recorded in this minutes during the meeting as a group submission. Members requested a one-page summary of the refined feedback.

4	Next meetings	18 September 2025 – Outcome of Community engagement for <i>Our Fairer Future Plan</i>
5	AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Combined LDG Workshop on 26 June



- Policy Challenge Question: How can Council provide our diverse community with more housing in well located, appropriate areas?

Next meeting

6:00 PM, 18 September 2025