

CITY OF CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN

MINUTES OF THE

CANTERBURY BANKSTOWN LOCAL PLANNING PANEL ONLINE MEETING

HELD ON THURSDAY 9 SEPTEMBER AND FRIDAY 10 SEPTEMBER 2021

PANEL MEMBERS

PRESENT: Mr Anthony Hudson - Chairperson
Mr David Epstein - Expert Member
Mr Richard Thorp - Expert Member
Mr Ian Stromborg – Community Representative representing Bankstown
Mr Karl Saleh - Community Representative representing Campsie

STAFF IN

ATTENDANCE: Ms Maryann Haylock (Local Planning Panel Administration Officer)
Mr Simon Manoski (Director Planning, not present for the closed session)
Mr Brad McPherson (Manager Governance, not present for the closed session)
Mr Mitchell Noble (Manager Spatial Planning, not present for the closed session)
Ms Robyn Winn (Coordinator Governance, not present for the closed session)
Mr Camille Lattouf (Team Leader City Shaping Projects, Spatial Planning, not present for the closed session)
Mr Patrick Lebon (Coordinator Strategic Assessments, not present for the closed session))
Emma Clinton (Urban Renewal Specialist, not present for the closed session)

THE CHAIRPERSON DECLARED THE MEETING OPEN AT 6.02 PM ON THURSDAY 9 SEPTEMBER AND 2:02PM ON FRIDAY 10 SEPTEMBER.

INTRODUCTION

The Chairperson welcomed all those present and explained the functions of the Canterbury Bankstown Local Planning Panel and that the Panel would be considering the Council Officer's recommendations on the Bankstown and Campsie City Masterplans and providing advice to Council on the planning proposals along with considering all submissions received.

APOLOGIES

There were no apologies received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairperson advised that all Panel Members had submitted written Declarations of Interest returns prior to the meeting.

The Chairperson also asked the Panel if any member needed to declare a conflict of interest in any of the items on the agenda. There were no declarations of interest.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Written submissions were received for both the Bankstown and Campsie City Masterplans and tabled at the meeting.

PUBLIC ADDRESSES

The following individuals addressed the Panel on Thursday 9 September 2021:

- Sophie Cotsis MP – (Campsie)
- Charles Moses - (Campsie)
- Shane Melky on behalf of Elie Safi – (Campsie)
- Nubia Quiazua – (Campsie)
- Jenny Zhang – (Campsie)
- John Wynne – (Campsie)
- Barbara Coorey – (Campsie)
- Tony Owen representing J Group PM P/L – (Campsie)
- Miled Nasr – (Campsie)
- Christine Pape – (Campsie)
- Mark (Yue Xiong) Gu – (Campsie)
- Carol Daoud – (Campsie)
- Christopher Trimmer – (Campsie)
- David Reynolds – (Campsie)
- Simon Elias – (Campsie)
- Trevor Sinclair – (Campsie)
- Dr Shane Geha with Daniel McNamara – (Campsie)
- Terry Ashcroft - (Campsie)
- Angelo Candalepas – (Campsie)

The following individuals addressed the Panel on Friday 10 September 2021:

- Russell King of UDIA NSW, GM of Policy, Research and Government Affairs - Bankstown and Campsie)
- Jeanette Brockman – (Bankstown and Campsie)
- David Waghorn representing Joseph Touma – (Bankstown)
- Tony Owen representing Daniel McNamara - (Bankstown)
- Jason Vuong – (Campsie)
- Lachlan McInnis - Campsie
- Dan Gocher – ACCR submission – (Bankstown)
- Dick Nugent – (Bankstown)
- Will Wang – (Bankstown)
- Bing W – St Paul’s Anglican Church – (Bankstown)
- Dennis Markou – (Campsie)
- Thomas C – Bankstown Future Transit Link (Bankstown)
- Lachlan Sheehan – (Bankstown)
- Tony Sukkar – (Campsie)
- Nicholas Nasser representing Michael Nasser - Bankstown
- Louis Heath (AE Design Partnership – Campsie)
- Stephen Moore - Campsie
- Grant Mistler - Campsie

NOTES

1 Site Visit

Virtual site inspections of the areas were undertaken by the Panel due to the current Covid restrictions, prior to the public hearing.

2 Community Representatives

Mr Ian Stromborg was the Community Panel Member present for the deliberation and voting for Bankstown City Centre Planning Proposal.

Mr Karl Saleh was the Community Panel Member present for the deliberation and voting for the Campsie Town centre Planning Proposal.

A GENERAL COMMENTS

- (1) The Panel is considering two masterplans / planning proposals. The Bankstown City Centre Masterplan/Planning Proposal ('the BPP') and the Campsie Town Centre Masterplan/Planning Proposal ('the CPP' and together 'the PPs').
- (2) There are a number of matters to note from the outset about the Panel's consideration of the PPs as follows:
 - (a) The State Government has directed that local planning panels provide advice to the Council about major planning proposals. The Panel's role therefore is to consider the proposed recommendations and determine what advice will be given to the Council about the PPs. The Council will determine whether PPs are sent to the Department to seek a gateway determination.
 - (b) The Panel acknowledges the extensive work that has taken place in preparing the PPs which are clearly necessary and critical for the future of the Bankstown city centre and the Campsie town centre. There are many good ideas and opportunities articulated in the PPs and the local communities should benefit from the growth and development of these areas in future.
 - (c) It follows that the Panel generally supports the proposed changes in both PPs.
 - (d) The Panel has been advised that
 - (i) the PPs do not make any changes to existing heritage items or heritage conservation areas and will not create any new heritage items or heritage conservation areas as these matters will be the subject of a separate and whole council area planning proposal, and
 - (ii) State Government Authorities (education, health and transport) have been consulted and are aware of the extent of proposed population changes to the two centres envisaged from the PPs and these Authorities will again be formally consulted at the public exhibition stage.
- (3) It is acknowledged that the proposed changes arise out of and are consistent with the Greater Sydney Commission's and the Council's strategic planning for Campsie and Bankstown as set out in the sections 1.4 "Setting the Scene" in the master plans.
- (4) The Panel also notes the engagement activities that took place prior to the public notification of the draft masterplans in March- June 2021 as set out in schedule 'A' below.
- (5) The Panel heard references to various ICAC inquires. The Panel is of the view that these references are not relevant to the Panels consideration of the PPs.

B CAMPSIE PP

- (6) However, despite the above the panel would like to see an improved public response (whether positive or negative) to the CPPs so the Panel recommends that before any gateway determination there be further public involvement as part of the early engagement of the CPP including the changes to what was previously notified this year.
- (7) The reasons for this are:
- (a) The report notes that there were 42 survey contributors to the draft CPP 43% (18 people) said 'Hits the mark'; 21% (9) 'don't like it' and 36% (15) said 'needs work'. This means only 18 residents were in favour and 24 residents were not in support.
 - (b) Even taking into account any usual low public response, this response (whether positive or negative) from the public about a plan proposing such major changes appears to be too small which means the consultation may not have been very successful. Further, of the submissions received a lot were not in support which again may suggest that the many attempts by Council to engage the community produced very limited enthusiasm. Perhaps it was due to the Pandemic, or possibly some factor such as trust or fear in Government Authority, but the result indicates that very few residents at this time are in favour of the new Town Centre.
 - (c) The proposed changes to Campsie's short and long term development are extensive, a lot of which is in a fairly confined area a large part of which is longstanding lower density residential.
 - (d) The changes proposed in the CPP (and in the BPP) are technical and complicated and may not be easily understood by the public (this is not a criticism only a fact of planning).
 - (e) Some additional information could be obtained to test and explain some of the assumptions and projected impacts (see below).
 - (f) This extra material will assist in engaging with the community and ensuring that there has been full community consultation in the long term of the project.
 - (g) The current Covid situation especially in Canterbury- Bankstown is a real and live distraction for achieving community engagement in council strategic planning, which ordinarily can be a difficult exercise.
 - (h) Following from (g) above there was only a small period of time for the community to respond to the Panel's agenda.
- (8) In summary the Panel is concerned that it cannot confidently conclude that the public and more specifically the existing Campsie landowners and occupants, have or should have a sufficient understanding of the proposed development changes in the CPP. The opportunity for further consultation should be seen as a positive step towards achieving even greater community engagement and ownership and thereby more confidence in the relevance and efficacy of the CPP.
- (9) As noted above the Panel considers it is worth making a further attempt to 'engage the community' before gateway.
- (10) This could be more by illustration than by words including the preparation of a scale model. The suggestion is to have a combination of physical models (at a scale of 1: 500) of parts of Campsie together with digital 3D modelling. Such models would give a genuine impression of all of the various changes that would permit cross reference to other parts of Campsie that are not included in the model. This would assist in understanding the "Intensification Strategy Map" which is fundamental to the CPP.

- (11) The models would show the proposed changes in height and form and be located in a readily accessible place close to the centre of Campsie (or if that proves too difficult, located at Council premises in Bankstown at the Library or perhaps at Council offices).
- (12) The intent is that it would be available for a period of at least six weeks when there are no (or substantially less) Covid 19 restrictions in operation, and that the community be given the opportunity to have sessions with translators in attendance in addition to council officers. Ideally, there would be sessions arranged in concert with community language groups, with some written material and the ability to respond (all in the selected language of the day).
- (13) Further, the commercial blocks that are already the subject of proposals could be included - even as 'provided' by the proponents.
- (14) The masterplan has a very large number of moves, directions and ideas which means it is quite daunting to comprehend and respond. As part of the next notification questions to the public could be simplified.
- (15) For example based on an assumed or better understanding of the CPP the type of questions could be:
- (a) Does the community support the idea of the Intensification
 - i. within walking distance of the Metro Station? (400m)
 - ii. within walking distance of key open spaces?
 - (b) Does the community support low intensification of areas between town centre and the river and the hospital?
 - (c) Does the community support no intensification - maintain existing built form controls in special character and low density areas?
- (16) Another suggestion could be the engagement of a specialist community consultation expert firm to help co-ordinate this further public consultation.
- (17) The Panel heard from a number of affected residents from the Dryden Street acquisition proposals. They were opposed to the acquisition by the Council. The Panel notes Council's advice that while these sites are to be included on the acquisition map the Council did not have current plans to compulsorily acquire the sites and were planning to seek to acquire the sites as they came up for sale in the future.
- (18) The Panel is of the view that this approach is too uncertain for both the land owners and for the public in realising the future open space benefit to be obtained from acquiring the sites.
- (19) Other avenues to explore with future development may include the use of setbacks and footpath widening to provide more localised open space with trees, play areas for kids, casual seating and meeting spaces etc. Perhaps the existing small park at the south end of Dryden Street could be upgraded as well. The above to form part of any existing or future public domain plan for the area.

- (20) The Panel also supports a focus on upgrading and improving the currently available parks and open spaces - Tasker Park, Cooks River and its banks, Carrington SQ and ANZAC Park as well as Lofts Gardens. Perhaps Lofts Gardens can be increased in size beyond what is shown already in the CPP.
- (21) While the existing parks may support residents from other areas, any improvements to these parks as well as proposed extensions to the open space network such as the upgrading of the Cooks River foreshore and banks are supported by the Panel (noting also that the proposed Cooks River activation comes as a result of introduction of apartment buildings up to 8 storeys in height).
- (22) The Panel also notes in relation to open space that new development standards under the ADG require more open space, both private and communal, than what exists in older apartment blocks. Therefore as the population increases and new RFB's are built, the amount of open space within each development (and within the public domain if the above strategies were adopted) should be more than what one would find in existing residential unit blocks (noting that many of the older RFBs do not even have private balconies).
- (23) The Panel also assumes that there will be appropriate provisions in the DCP to promote and require site and immediate public areas tree planting and general landscaping enhancement.

C THE B6 ZONED "HOSPITAL" AREA

- (24) The Panel heard a number of submissions from owners in this area. In summary the submitters did not support the proposed B6 zone and requested that the existing zoning remain in place.
- (25) The objective of providing an area incidental to and in support of the hospital is clearly an appropriate objective if the assumption is made that the hospital is to remain and continue to be an integral part of NSW Health's plans for the future.
- (26) While the Panel has noted that NSW Health has been consulted about this area the Panel's concern is that there is insufficient community confidence about the future of the hospital.
- (27) The Panel suggests that Council request clear written confirmation from NSW Health about the future plans for the hospital including some time line and commitment to funding so that this letter could be part of any further public exhibitions both as suggested by the Panel and as part of the future post gateway public exhibition. If this cannot be provided by NSW Health then this zoning may need to be reconsidered.
- (28) In relation to comments about Council rates changing, the Panel has been informed that any current residential rates would only change if the residential use changes to a commercial use because rates are based on actual usage not proposed usage.

D BANKSTOWN PP

- (29) The Panel is of the view that the Bankstown PP could proceed forward subject to the recommendations and the Panels comments below about Specific Sites and the public domain.
- (30) The BPP should include a more detailed study of the public domain, built form and building interface associated with the 2 north south streets, Chapel Road and Restwell Street, The Appian Way. This should be prepared for the purposes of informing the DCP.

E SPECIFIC SITES for the PPs

- (31) The Panel heard from representatives for a number of specific sites most of which requested changes to FSR / height to increase the development potential of the sites.
- (32) The Panel notes the advice from the Council officers that some of the submissions included new suggestions and reasons for proposed changes to the PPs for some of these sites.
- (33) The Panel is not in a position to specifically and properly analyse each of the site proposals in the strategic context of the PPs.
- (34) However, the Panel suggests, and the council officers have agreed, that all of these submissions be closely reviewed in conjunction with the owners to determine if there is any scope to make changes to the proposed controls for the specific sites.
- (35) The Panel agrees with the Anglican Church site (BPP) being redeveloped.

F MISCELLANEOUS

- (36) The Panel agrees that a draft DCP and s7.11 contributions plan be exhibited with the PPS post gateway.
- (37) The Panel agrees that the studies referred to in the Council officers' recommendations be carried out as suggested.

G RECOMMENDATIONS /ADVICE TO COUNCIL

(1) CAMPSIE PP

- (a) Council carry out discussions with specific site landowners that addressed the Panel to review issues raised.
- (b) Council request further written confirmation from the State Government about Canterbury Hospital (as referred to in paragraph 27 above).
- (c) Council engage in a further public notification / exhibition for the Campsie PP prior to sending the CPP to the Department for a gateway determination as referred to in discussion above.
- (d) Completion of the following studies prior to submission for Gateway:
 - i. Independent Flood Review, to confirm consistency with Section 9.1 Direction 4.3 – Flooding;
 - ii. Land Use Safety Study, to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are considered (if any) in relation to high pressure pipelines located alongside the Cooks River;
 - iii. Preliminary Contamination Assessment, to confirm consistency with Section 9.1 Direction 2.6 – Remediation of Contaminated Land.
- (e) Council prepares a Development Control Plan to implement the Master Plan that is exhibited concurrently (together with relevant contributions plan) with the Planning Proposal.
- (f) Council integrates existing Planning Proposals set out in this report into the Campsie Town Centre Master Plan.

(2) BANKSTOWN PP

- (a) Council prepares and submits a Planning Proposal to amend the draft Canterbury Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2021 for Gateway that implements the Bankstown City Centre Master Plan, subject to:
 - (i) carrying out discussions with specific site landowners that addressed the Panel to review issues raised,
 - (ii) preparation of draft LEP Amendment maps to include with the Planning Proposal, and
 - (iii) implementation of the following studies prior to submission for Gateway:
 - Independent Flood Review, to confirm consistency with Section 9.1 Direction 4.3 – Flooding;
 - Preliminary Contamination Assessment, to confirm consistency with Section 9.1 Direction 2.6 – Remediation of Contaminated Land.
- (b) Council prepares a Development Control Plan to implement the Master Plan that is exhibited concurrently (together with the relevant contributions plan) with the Planning Proposal.

SCHEDULE "A"

Chronology of engagement activities undertaken prior to March 2021

The table below provides a chronology of engagement activities prior to notification of the full draft Master Plan in March 2021. It is noted that engagement begun with the community before drafting of the Master Plan to ensure maximum community input and feedback was received to inform the Master Planning process.

Date	Activity	Intent
July to August 2020	Community survey	Online surveys for the community to inform Council of their vision and priorities for Campsie and Bankstown.
July to September 2020	Targeted engagement with workers and students in the Bankstown and Campsie centres	This was advertised on Council's website, and by directly reaching out to educational institutes in both centres and the business community.
July 2020 to date (September 2021)	Call an expert service	This service has been advertised on Council's engagement website, and has allowed the community to call the Strategic Planning Officers responsible for the Master Plan directly. This has included access to non-English speaking staff when requested. This option commenced in July and has not been turned off. Many of the speakers that presented over the last two days have called this service multiple times.
October to November 2020	Interactive mapping	An online tool was published allowing the community to present issues, opportunities and ideas to the Master Planning team about both centres using a map. This tool was advertised via Council's social media channels and via posters at both stations.
April 2020 to present	Government agency engagement	See overview below.
July to September 2020	Early landowner engagement	Letters were sent out to landowners in each study area to give them the opportunity to provide ideas and responses for the Master Plans based on the directions of the adopted Local Strategic Planning Statement. This process occurred before the Master Plan drafting had commenced, providing the opportunity for ideas and concerns to be considered in the drafting process. In addition, planning proposal applicants were met with multiple times through this process (with a probity referee) to provide opportunities to discuss their specific proposals and submissions through this process.

January to April 2021	Targeted property industry engagement	Whilst developing the 'big moves' of the Master Plan, the Master Planning team presented to industry forums hosted by property industry groups such as the Urban Taskforce and tested propositions such as building electrification, reduced parking rates and the incentive scheme for uplift.
July to November 2020	Targeted Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community engagement	Through the analysis and early drafting phase of the Master Plan, ongoing engagement through a number of in-person workshops, was undertaken with Council's ATSI Committee representatives. This was to ensure that Aboriginal Culture and Heritage was considered in the foundations of the Master Plan, and to provide direction for improved recognition of Aboriginal culture and heritage in Bankstown and Campsie.

The meeting closed on Thursday 9 September at 7:30pm and Friday 10 September at 3:50pm.