

**Submission
No 140**

**INQUIRY INTO DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSPORT
ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

Name: Maria Bradley
Date Received: 28 March 2024

Dear Committee,

Thank you for the Inquiry and the opportunity to submit a submission.

I am strongly opposed to and concerned about the Transport Oriented Development (TOD) Program as well as the low and mid rise housing changes.

These plans will ultimately usurp affordable housing and replace it with expensive apartments and homes. They will remove an alarming amount of vegetation and bio diversity including street trees, wildlife corridors and backyards.

I am also confused as to why the NSW Govt is rushing to implement the TOD SEPPs by April 1st. Is this a joke on the wider community who will be directly impacted by the SEPPs?

Over riding local Councils Local Environment Plans (LEP) for a blanket, one-size-fits-all nature of the changes to create low and mid-rise housing across the Six Cities region will erode community representation and is a step backwards for our democracy.

It also means that the 8 “first-tier” precincts targeted for high growth and accelerated rezoning under the TOD Program will also be impacted by higher density well beyond the 1,200 metre radius of their transport hubs.

The proposed changes also apply to areas affected by the TOD State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP), which will effectively snap rezone areas for higher density within 400 metres of 31 metro and rail stations in order to fast-track an additional 138,000 new homes over the next 15 years.

The NSW Premier and Planning Minister are both on record citing the low density of Greater Sydney in relation to other global cities “800th least dense city” yet despite contacting their offices for the source, I have not been provided with one.

Dr Michael Grosvenor, an urban planning expert at the University of Southern Queensland, Sydney is a victim of poor statistical reporting with respect to density. Unlike comparable American cities, the Sydney region boundaries include national parks and large tracts of open space, which distorts the average and discounts the reality of very high density areas like Potts Point, Chippendale, Zetland, Darling Point and Ultimo. Dr Grosvenor also explains how Sydney is unique in having large commercial areas with high population density - for example, Parramatta - many kilometres away from its Central Business District.

It seems that creating the impression that Greater Sydney is a low density city is being used by the state government to impose additional density in areas that aren't coping already with the level of existing growth.

Successive NSW Government's have failed to create liveable suburbs. It addresses in particular ToF (p) - the capability of Greater Sydney to provide for increased residential dwelling where the existing capacity has been diminished due to the effects of climate change - by explaining how successive state governments have failed to implement effective planning controls to combat the heat island effect in many areas of Sydney.

The main problems with the one-size-fits-all proposed changes are:

- They undermine local council and Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) processes that are designed to consider the relevant factors for good, long-term strategic planning.
- They are inconsistent with district and local council strategic planning policies – including state government mandated local council housing strategies that require councils to allocate medium and high density housing in areas where it can best be accommodated.
- They are not supported by modelling showing the likely population increases on the impacted suburbs – including traffic and parking constraints, as well as the demand for essential infrastructure and services such as schools, green space and community facilities.
- They do not take into account local circumstances and local character. The changes ignore the importance of “place” to communities and will potentially result in deleterious changes to the built form in local centres and the low density residential suburbs surrounding those centres
- They completely discount public support for the importance of protecting built and natural heritage, and ignore well established, hard-fought laws and controls deliberately designed to ensure the compatibility of new development in historic and environmentally sensitive areas.
- They reduce landscaping and tree canopy requirements below state and local council targets by allowing new types of development (eg 4 to 7 storey RFBs, terraces, manor houses and dual occupancies) on smaller lot sizes with higher floorspace ratios than currently permitted.
- They do not consider environmental and natural hazard risks, including the impact of increasing population density in areas that are subject to localised flooding, bushfire and rising sea levels or home to threatened species and ecological communities. No consideration has been given, for example, to Greater Sydney's status as a biodiversity hotspot.
- They weaken standards designed to protect local amenity, eg solar access, privacy, loss of views from neighbouring properties and streetscape presentation.
- They do not require developers to deliver affordable housing. Rather, recently introduced incentives like the 20-30% height and FSR bonuses for the provision of 10-15% affordable housing will continue to apply - effectively delivering high rise by stealth in medium density areas.
- They are not supported by policies to prevent the knock down of “affordable” older housing stock with replacement luxury new builds of potentially fewer dwellings.
- They do not take into account the increase in density that has already been imposed on R2 residential zones as a result of the Affordable Housing SEPP (eg boarding houses) and the Seniors Housing SEPP.
- They impose “non-refusal standards” that will severely restrict local councils' ability to properly consider the social, economic and environmental impacts of Development Applications (DAs) - a requirement under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
- They will likely encourage even more shoddily designed and built apartment buildings.

- They provide no assurances that revenue generated by the new HPC will be directed to fund infrastructure in areas where it's needed most or delivered in a timely manner.
- They don't propose any lifting of the rate of local development contributions collected by councils to fund essential infrastructure like local community facilities, stormwater drainage, local open space and local roads Both the HPC and local infrastructure contributions are still dependent on the rate of building starts, a funding system that has contributed to significant delays in the construction of new infrastructure to support growth in new housing across Greater Sydney.

Affordable housing is being bulldozed for more expensive units , the ToDs and low mid rise plans will only make this worse. Developers aren't in the business of providing affordable housing!



Knock down a few, build one: in NSW that counts as a gain for councils' housing targets
[theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com)



Sydney councils bid to halt demolition of old housing for luxury apartments
smh.com.au

The Committee should be alarmed about the potential loss of vegetation as urban heat is a huge issue across Sydney. Wildlife corridors will be lost, habitat and feed trees removed and Sydney as a bio diversity hotspot lost.



Tree canopy in Greater Sydney, how are we doing?

I urge the Committee to reject these plans and make recommendations for affordability and liveability of our city for all, not just the wealthy.

Yes young people are leaving Sydney over affordability issues yet these plans will only make the situation worse as developers are prioritised over affordability.

The #YIMBY movement appears to be completely absent on the issue of affordability and ending urban sprawl.

Maria Bradley