

and Use Planning Harmonisation **Discussion Paper**



Following Council boundary changes in May 2016, different planning controls apply to different parts of the Parramatta Council Local Government Area (LGA). Council is working to create a single consolidated set of controls that will apply to the whole LGA. This process could result in changes to the current planning controls applying to certain areas, such as what types of development are allowed and changes to car parking and tree protection controls.

In January 2019, Council asked the community what should be included in a consolidated set of planning controls. Council's Land Use Discussion Paper (exhibited from 21 January to 4 March 2019) outlined suggestions for the planning policies and controls that will form the basis of a new LGA-wide Local Environment Plan (LEP) and Development Control Plan (DCP).

Here's what you told us:

Across the many topics raised in the Discussion Paper, the majority of community feedback was on dual occupancy development, and in particular the issue of where in low density areas dual occupancies should be permitted.

A breakdown o one issue.



(301 submissions, 68% of submissions) Other dual occupancy issues (201 submissions, 13% of submission

Medium density and high density residential zones



(66 submissions, 14% of submissions)





(62 submissions, 13% of submission



(47 submissions, 10% of submissions)



(34 submissions, 7% of submission



(26 submissions % of submission



Feedback on prohibiting dual occupancies in certain parts of the Council area 301 submissions were rece allowed. Of these:



e out of 301 submission eferred Option 1 to ohibit dual occupancial low density ighbourhoods in the rmer Hornsby Council data the Hills Council eas, plus some additiourts of Oatlands and inston Hills.



areas, to al occupanci ntified in us in parts of Dundas, Epping and

A small number of submissions recommended prohibition areas be extended to other parts of the LGA including Ermington, Dundas Valley, Oatlands and Melrose Parl ons people gave for supporting or not supporting



65%

.er
... Most c
... poported thi
unted to see du
cies allowed in
und Carlingford,
rirly in areas that
t of the former
Council area,
all occupanc'
prohibits





Did not indicate a clear preference for a particul



- Dual occupancies were incompatible with character of low density areas.
 Dual occupancies would create traffic and parking congestion, particularly in narrow streets.
- Dual occupancies would contribute to overdevelopment in the council area and put a strain on infrastructure.
- Concern about loss of trees and gardens
 Low density areas had poor access to public
 transport.
- dback received on other issues

Amongst those in **support** of dual occupancy

- The suggested prohibition areas are and inconsistently applied.
 Dual occupancies will contribute to housing choice and affordability in the council area.
 Prohibition will reduce property value.
 There is already medium density housing
- me submissions made suggestions for how dual cupancy prohibition areas could be defined, such based on proximity to transport and services, pography, street-widths and opportunities for using renewal.

There was mixed feedback on some DCP controls suggested in the Discussion Paper, including those relating to housing design, car and bicycle parking, and tree protection.

There was overful support for most LEP-related policy suggestions, including minimum lot size provisions for dual occupancies and prohibiting places of public worship and indoor recreation facilities within the R2 Low Density Residential zone. as not a majority of support for the following policy sugge

H)

47%

46%

41%

 $(\mathbf{\hat{h}})$ 37% 27%

cing restrictions on the form and division of dual occupancies in subdivision of dual occupa heritage conservation area supported by 48% of subm (156 submissions received)

Increasing the minimum subdivision lot size to 550sqm in residential zones in the former Holroyd and Hornsby areas was supported by 47% of submissions. (35 submissions received)

Prohibiting tourist and visitor accommodation in industrial zor (IN1) was supported by 41% of submissions.

(17 submissions received)

Restricting dual occupancy development to attached forms was supported by 37% of submissions. (95 submission received)

Prohibiting function centres and registered clubs in industrial zones (IN1) was supported by 27% of submissions.
(15 submissions received)

Who participated?

Numerous channels were activated to reach as many community members as possible, to notify them of the opportunity to have their say on Land Use Harmonisation and direct them to Council's engagement, portal or to email the project team to provide feedback.

Communications and engagement activities included, letters and emails to landowners, LGA wide newspaper advertising in four English and three community language newspapers, circulating a media release, activating various social media networks (Facebook, Linkedin, Twitter) and creating email campaigns for distribution to various databases, Council's corporate website was also utilized Council officers less distributed fluxer and uatabases. Council's corporate website was also utilised. Council officers also distributed flyers and postcards and managed a number of community drop in sessions.

1.6 MILLION
people on average saw the opportunity to provide
feedback – multiple channels used to promote the
project including letters, advertising, social media,
community drop-in sessions 535 sions were received (464 uniqu

317 via Council's engagement portal and 218 email and letter submissions

Individual residents: 472 submissions
 Resident groups: 5 submissions
 Landowners (not resident in the LGA): 35 submissions
 Government agencies: 11 submissions

- 35 submissions
 Government agencies: 11 submissions
 Neighbouring councils: 2 submissions
 Other: 12 submissions
 Businesses: 7 submissions
 General public not resident in LGA:
 3 submissions

- 250

112

Project Timeline:

w of submissions and work to prepare draft LEP and DCP Subject to Council's endorsement of the draft LEP, Council submits planning proposal for the new LEP to the Department of Planning, Industry & Environment (DPIE) for review and Gateway Determination



Consideration of feedback on Discussi Paper and recommendations for the draft LEP by the Local Planning Panel and then Council

Anticipated public exhibition of draft LEP planning proposal and draft DCP (subject to Gateway Determination from DPIE).

Expected finalisation and adoption of plans



