

KINGSFORD TO KENSINGTON (K2K)

AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY
INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1. OVERVIEW	6
2. GROWTH CONTRIBUTION TO FUND LOCAL AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE	6
TABLE (1) – DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL UNDER RECOMMENED CONTROLS	6
FIGURE (1) COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS APPROACH	8
TABLE (2) - FEASIBILITY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (as per HillPDA analysis)	9
3. AFFORDABLE HOUSING	9
3.2. POLICY AND STATUTORY MECHANISMS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE SYDNEY REGION	10
3.3. AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION/IMPLEMENTATION	11
4. LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES TO SUPPORT GROWTH	12
4.1. OVERVIEW	12
4.2. S94A LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS	13
TABLE (4) LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE. ESTIMATED COST AND CONTRIBUTION	13
4.3. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH	14
TABLE (5) COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISIONS IN SELECTED COUNCILS	14
4.4. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT RENEWAL WITHIN THE KINGSFORD AND KENSINGTON TOWN CENTRES	15
TABLE (7) COSTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS FOR COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE	15
5. OUTCOME OF FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS	15
TABLE (8) FEASIBILITY OUTCOMES	16
CONCLUSION	17
APPENDIX	18
TABLE (3) GREATER METROPOLITAN COUNCILS – AFFORDABLE HOUSING IMPLEMENTATION	19
TABLE (6) – ESTIMATED COST OF LOCAL AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH	32

KINGSFORD TO KENSINGTON

AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines and documents the affordable housing, local and broader community infrastructure required to support renewed growth in the Kingsford to Kensington (K2K) centres and corridor. These form integral components of strategic planning being undertaken by Randwick City Council to manage growth sustainably and to deliver livable communities.

An urban design analysis carried out by consultants to Council suggested design development controls with potential uplift from 3.0:1 (Floor Space Ratio) FSR to 4.0:1 and 5.0:1 FSR. The resulting total number of dwellings would be in the order of 4000 – 5000 dwellings with a residential uplift of some 1300 – 1450 apartments.

A feasibility analysis carried out by HillPDA for Council considered a staged approach of 3% affordable housing contribution for the first two (2) years rising to 5% contribution for the following eight (8) years of a ten (10) year development timeline.

The feasibility analysis indicates that at 3% affordable housing contribution, all sites considered within the centres are viable with the exception of Site 2 the Transit Site. At 5% affordable housing contribution, the viability of Site 3 the Infill Site and Site 4 the Opportunity Site are marginally affected.

Accordingly, the affordable housing dwellings and corresponding current (2016) market value could be achieved for the centres to support housing diversity and in particular key worker's housing affordability.

Total number of Affordable Housing	230 dwellings
Affordable Housing Contributions	\$194,062,500

A desktop review of metropolitan councils implementation of their affordable housing provisions show that they rely on adopted policies, provisions in Voluntary Planning Agreements (VPAs) and strategies. The provisions of the State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) 70 apply only to three (3) councils in the Metropolitan Sydney area, not including Randwick City Council and therefore providing no capability for Council to incorporate formalised and more certain statutory clauses in the Randwick Local

Environment Plans 2012 (RLEP). It is considered appropriate for the outcome of the evidence based analysis been undertaken to seek Randwick City Council inclusion in SEPP 70 Affordable Housing and to include applicable clauses in the RLEP for the 3% and 5% rates so that appropriate affordable housing requirements could be clearly included as conditions of development consent.

In addition to the provisions of local infrastructure as per S94 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment (EP&A) Act, this review considers it essential to provide urban improvements, amenity and community benefits within the corridor of Kingsford and Kensington town centres. Cost and contribution for these have been estimated as follows:

	COST	CONTRIBUTION
Section 94(A) at 1%	\$45,963,000	\$20,842,000
Section 94(A) at 3%	\$45,963,000	\$64,319,000
Community Infrastructure at \$475/m ²	\$39,600,000	\$41,858,781
TOTAL (at 3% at S94A)	\$85,563,000	\$106,177,000

The analysis suggests that a 3% Section 94A contribution and a community infrastructure levy of \$475/m² would deliver the contribution required. The tested feasibility by HillPDA concludes that three sites will be development feasible at the uplifted controls. The Site 2 – Transit Site will not be viable for an uplift to 5.0:1 under contribution requirements given its land value. An increase to almost 8.0:1 will have to be justified to make it viable. The relatively high land value for the site is a key contributor factor.

The evidence base analysis undertaken provide the basis for Council to seek an increase to its s94A contribution from 1% to 3% of total construction cost.

The evidence based analysis undertaken also supports a community infrastructure contribution at a rate of \$475/m² on additional residential floors space (relative to existing ones under current controls) to deliver planning development outcomes consistent with the recommended urban design analysis. In that regard, the identification costing and impact on project viability undertaken are all consistent with the recently released draft guidelines on VPA by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E). Pending the outcome of stakeholder consultation, guidelines for implementation and an appropriate clause in the Randwick LEP 2012 should be pursued including with reference to voluntary agreements.

In summary, the following contribution scheme is necessary and appropriate to deliver the recommended urban design outcomes.

- S94A (local infrastructure): 3% of total construction costs.
- Affordable Housing levy initially 3% in the first 2 years progressing to 5% (thereafter) of total residential yield. Randwick City Council to pursue its evidence based submission to government for it to be incorporated in SEPP 70 and enable it to impose the levy by way of conditions of development consent.
- Community Infrastructure contribution of \$475/m² to apply on the additional floor space. A Community Infrastructure Contribution scheme should be introduced within Randwick LEP 2012 supported by appropriate guidelines.

1. OVERVIEW

The planning framework for the Kingsford and Kensington Centres does not reflect emerging development and renewal constraints, pressure and opportunities. The CBD to the South East Light Rail, currently under construction, offers challenges and opportunities for growth as the proximity and access to public transport will attract residential, commercial and associated development hence change the overall urban setting of the area.

Randwick City Council has appropriately embarked on a strategic planning initiative for the centres to proactively manage growth and achieve a long-term vision commensurate with community benefits, (as distinct from the less preferred reliance on a site by site rezoning process). An urban design competition was conducted following an early public participatory issue identification to reflect local community's preference for the area. At the core of the strategy and the associated winning design competition are proposed new planning controls and more importantly the community related facilities and infrastructure essential to deliver livable communities, sustainable public domains.

This report deals with the scope and cost of local infrastructure, community facilities and infrastructure and affordable housing, and required development contribution by development proponents, to support and manage anticipated growth. The report complements (and refers to) comprehensive feasibility analysis undertaken by HillPDA for Council.

2. GROWTH CONTRIBUTION TO FUND LOCAL AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

The draft planning strategy proposes new planning controls for the Kingsford and Kensington town centres with the following outcomes.

TABLE (1) – DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL UNDER RECOMMENED CONTROLS


	CURRENT (DWELLINGS)	PROPOSED (DWELLINGS)	UPLIFTS (DWELLING)	COMMERCIAL UPLIFT
Kensington	1329	1855	526	6257 (GFA) m ²)
Kingsford	2002	2772	770	18615m ²)
TOTAL (average dwelling GFA 80m ²)	3331	4627	1296	24872

To support the proposed new densities and uplift in yield for residential development in particular, the following infrastructure and community facilities are considered essential:

- a) **Affordable Housing**, consistent with state and local government policies and practices and in particular to support the employment and economic performance of the nearby Randwick Education and Health Education Centre.
- b) **Local Infrastructure** that are directly related to development, based on the nexus and proportionality principles of s94 of the EP&A Act.
- c) **Community Infrastructure and Facilities** essential to deliver the livable and greening strategic outcomes of the K2K renewal, particularly as recommended by the design competition and early community participatory process.

The diagram (figure 1) broadly outlines the process and analysis undertaken to test the financial development and feasibility implications from various contribution sources to deliver the integrated renewal strategy outcome.

FIGURE (1) COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS APPROACH



The analysis undertaken by HillPDA adopts the project Internal Rate of Return (IRR) as the primary indicator of Performance. The indicator(s) adopted are consistent with recognised practice.

TABLE (2) - FEASIBILITY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (as per HillPDA analysis)

PERFORMANCE	PROJECT IRR 18%	DEVELOPMENT MARGIN
Feasible	>18%	>25%
Marginally feasibility	16% - 18%	20% - 25%
Not feasible	<16%	<20%

The approach adopted and the approach in its integration into decision making recognise good practice, including those advocated in DP&E recently released draft guidelines on the VPA, in that:

- They are based on an integrated strategic approach.
- They are based on evidence based information and analysis, including in particular testing for financial performance and impacts on feasibility of development.
- They reflect early community input into the plan which will be transparently published in draft for input submissions by all stakeholders, community and development proponents prior to finalisation.

Four identified sites in the Kensington and Kingsford South East Light Rail line corridor were tested for development feasibility to achieve the recommended urban design outcomes of 4.0:1 and 5.0:1 FSR.

Site 1: Gateway Site – 31,33,35,37,39 and 41 Anzac Parade Kensington
 Site 2: Transit Site – 111 – 125 Anzac Parade and 112 Todman Avenue, Kensington
 Site 3: Infill Site – 372 – 388 Anzac Parade, Kingsford
 Site 4: Opportunity Site – 391 – 395 and 397 – 397A Anzac Parade

3. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

3.1. OVERVIEW

Planning for affordable housing particularly for medium income key workers are key objectives for the state government housing and growth renewal planning strategies. The centres of Kingsford and Kensington are in proximity to the Randwick Education and Health Strategic Centre which includes institutions of state and national significance. Almost half of the Randwick local government area jobs are provided for by this strategic centre.

Growth within the two centres provides an important opportunity to plan for the delivery of affordable housing as an integral component of increasing housing diversity and to strengthen the economic employment performance of the Education and Health Strategic Centre.

The delivery of affordable housing is consistent with the following state and local strategies and policies:

- A Plan for Growing Sydney (Action 2.3.1) requires councils to provide affordable housing in response to local demand.
- The recently released draft District Plans by the Greater Sydney Commission advocates for affordable housing targets of 5% - 10% (depending on feasibility).
- Randwick City Council Affordable Housing Strategy and Action Plan (2008 – 2018) contains objectives and advocates for the provision of mixed housing dwellings including affordable housing. The 2011–12 review of the Randwick Education and Health Strategic Centre identifies the need to ensure the provisions of affordable housing for key workers to sustain its economic performance.
- Randwick City Council VPA specifically includes affordable housing in the negotiations of VPAs.

3.2. POLICY AND STATUTORY MECHANISMS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE SYDNEY REGION

Table (3) in the appendix, represents the outcome of a desktop review of Affordable Housing Policy, strategy and statutory provisions in various councils in the Greater Sydney Region. The NSW Planning System provides for a number of mechanisms for local councils to secure affordable housing as part of growth renewals particularly those associated with uplift increase in densities. In summary those mechanisms are by way of:

- Affordable housing local strategies, objectives in planning instruments, Development Control Plans (DCP) and as part of Housing Strategies and/or policies.
- Specific reference for VPAs to include considerations/make requirements for the provisions of affordable housing as a target or as agreed with developers.
- Statutory provisions in the LEP for inclusionary zoning, expressed as a target/quantum for affordable housing as part of development proposals (in land or contribution) subject to meeting the requirements of SEPP 70 - Affordable Housing. To date only three (3) local government areas are

listed under SEPP 70, namely Sydney, Willoughby and Leichhardt (now part of Inner West) and hence can benefit from these provisions.

As indicated in the table the following provisions are adopted by the councils in the Greater Sydney Region, by descending order:

- Strategies or broad policy documents/statements
- Policies on VPAs that provide for such agreements can include contributions for affordable housing.
- Provisions in the LEP and/or DCP that encourage a mix of dwelling types.
- Aims in LEPs to facilitate/encourage affordable housing.
- Explicit clauses in the LEP that offer higher floor space if the development include a proportion of affordable housing, specified in reliance on SEPP 70 and clause 74F of the EP&A Act.

Randwick City Council has provisions as part of its Affordable Housing Strategy and Action Plan (2008 – 2009) as well as under its adopted VPA policy, to facilitate affordable housing contributions for the K2K centres and corridor. However, there is no certain statutory mechanism enabling Council to require affordable housing as a condition of development consent.

The Minister for Planning is currently considering a comprehensive submission from Council for it to be included under SEPP 70 Affordable Housing and hence enabling Council to use the contribution capabilities under S94F of the EP&A Act and specific Affordable Housing clause under its LEP. This is considered the most certain, transparent mechanism particularly when supported by strategic evidence based and feasibility analysis as is the current case.

3.3. AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION/IMPLEMENTATION

Based on development feasibility analysis, a two-staged approach for an affordable housing contribution regime was considered, to enable market supply adjustments. This approach would commence at 3% of total supply (first two (2) years) and increasing to a maximum of 5% of total supply (for following three (3) years).

The results of the feasibility analysis undertaken by HillPDA indicate that the affordable housing levy regime:

- will not adversely impact Site 1 the Gateway Site
- will leave a marginal viability impact on Site 3 the Infill Site and Site 4 the Opportunity Site at a 5% affordable housing contribution levy (16% project IRR and 22% - 27% development margin)

- development of Site 2 the Transit Site, would not be viable at the recommended revised planning controls of FSRs ranging from 4:3 to 5:1.

This will provide a total of some 200 – 230 affordable housing dwellings based on 5000 dwellings development potential in the centres. The market value for affordable housing dwellings (2016 dollars), approximates \$190,000,000. This is a justifiable contribution to support uplift growth and broadly economic and housing mix and diversity.

To implement the relevant provisions, it is appropriate for council to amend/adjust its affordable housing strategies and policies (including those that relate to the VPA outcomes) to reflect this outcome. At the earliest opportunity and subject to the Minister for Planning’s decision for inclusion of Randwick Council in the SEPP 70, a specific clause should be inserted in Randwick LEP to reflect the rate of contributions commensurate with any uplift approved and to be applied as a condition of development consent.

4. LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES TO SUPPORT GROWTH

4.1. OVERVIEW

The renewal growth of the corridor must fundamentally provide for:

- local infrastructure directly and proportionally attributable to the increased density;
- the provision of community and urban enhancement facilities so as to secure a liveable community outcome.

Community feedback received by Council as part of the Urban Design Competition highlights the need for the renewal corridor to provide adequate accessible open spaces, green corridors and landscaped linkages, improved public domain and allocating places for the community to gather and connect, for innovation and public events. The winning design of the K2K competition provides important community enhancement facilities as an integral part of delivering increased densities. These include, for example water sensitive urban design facilities such as raingardens, garden beds; multi-purpose community and innovation centres and several green links and urban improvements.

Two mechanisms are available for the funding and realisation of those elements:

- Section 94A contribution under the provisions of the EP&A Act.
- Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) to be adopted as part of council policy and LEP provisions.

The implementation of these provisions are essential to the delivery of a sustainable K2K urban renewal outcome.

4.2. S94A LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS

S94A under the EP&A Act is a flat levy imposed on new development based on the contribution value of and approved development. The levy contribution is to be allocated toward the cost of providing additional demand on local services and infrastructure that are directly attributable to the approved development. The tests in applying the levy are: there must be a nexus between the additional infrastructure and services needs and the contribution to be paid; the amount of contribution must be proportional to the added infrastructure required; and transparent governance arrangements must apply.

Randwick City Council, as with the majority of other local government areas, applies a 1% rate of construction cost. This rate can only be varied by the Minister for Planning based on a viable evidence based submission from council.

Other rates currently applicable beyond 1% include:

- Newcastle City Centre – 2%
- Parramatta CBD – 3%
- Burwood Town Centre – 4%

It is noted that the provisions of S94A do not apply to affordable housing. A Section 94A Development Contribution Plan (DCP), 2015, Randwick City Council, provides for the current list of local infrastructure towards which the 1% levy contribution is to be made.

Randwick Council officers have developed a draft schedule of infrastructure and public domain improvements needed for the additional development anticipated in the K2K centres/corridor (see table (6) in the appendix). The following table summarises the cost implications.

TABLE (4) LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE. ESTIMATED COST AND CONTRIBUTION

COST	CONTRIBUTION	
	S94A at 1%	S94A at 3%
\$45,563,000	\$20,842,850	\$64,319,464

4.3. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH

Section 93F of the EP&A Act establishes a statutory based system where council can negotiate with a developer for the provision community benefits by way of VPAs. Unlike contributions levied under S94A of the EP&A Act, this section is specific that no nexus is necessary between a provision in the VPA and the object of expenditure of any money required to be paid by the provision.

In NSW, VPAs are typically entered into in connection with the preparation of planning proposals for the primary purpose of securing a proportion of the increased land value for the community benefit arising from a change in planning rules.

The public purpose for which development contributions under VPAs can be applied are deliberately broad and can be applied to new capital or recurrent expenditure items including environmental and community related enhancement initiatives. Contributions to be in the form of money, the dedication of land free of cost, or any other material public benefit, including works.

A number of councils in the Sydney Region have used VPAs particularly at the strategic level to implement a value share contribution towards community related facilities and infrastructure to support increased amenities and growth and deliver livable sustainable communities and outcomes. Examples of such schemes in selected councils are as per Table below.

TABLE (5) COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISIONS IN SELECTED COUNCILS

COUNCIL	RATE AND MECHANISM
City of Sydney	\$475/m ² levied on additional floor space (incentive scheme) through the development process. Relies on a clause in the LEP – Clause 6.14 – Community Infrastructure floor space at Green Square and implemented by way of Planning Agreement.
Leichhardt (now part of Inner West Council)	A VPA policy for 50% of value uplift.
North Sydney	No specific rate – VPA policy for community infrastructure provision on a case by case basis at the rezoning proposals stage.
Ryde Council (Macquarie Park)	\$250/m ² – Clause 6.9 development in Macquarie Park Corridor provides relevant incentive provisions.

Parramatta City Council (Draft under consideration/review)	Phase 1 – 20% of land value uplift (\$120/m ²) Phase 2 – 50% of land value uplift (375/m ²) like by clause in LEP and Planning Agreement.
---	--

4.4. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT RENEWAL WITHIN THE KINGSFORD AND KENSINGTON TOWN CENTRES

The NSW Department of Planning and Environment recently issued a draft guideline on VPAs which should be used to guide the application of a contribution for community related infrastructure.

Table (6) in the appendix lists the relevant infrastructure and community facilities and associated costs attributable to the centres/corridor growth and renewal. Consistent with the Department’s draft guidelines, the items listed have been developed as the result (and as an integral part) of the strategic planning exercise for the centres, including the outcome of the Urban Design Competition, as well as consideration of public submission during the early stage of the planning process.

For contribution and feasibility testing of \$475/m² applicable to additional floor space was used by HillPDA as a benchmark based on the comparable Green Square contribution. Table (7) below summarises the cost and contribution to implement the scheme based on that assumption. The table indicates that the total contribution based on that levy is appropriate to meet the required cost.

TABLE (7) COSTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS FOR COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

	COST	CONTRIBUTION (based on \$475/m ²)
Kingsford	\$18,100,000	\$24,873,826
Kensington	\$21,500,00	\$16,984,955
TOTAL	\$39,600,00	\$41,858,781

5. OUTCOME OF FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

HillPDA conducted detailed feasibility analysis using the following contributions assumptions:

- Section 94A: 3% of development construction cost
- Affordable Housing: 3% of total new dwellings (first 2 years); 5% of total new dwellings

- Community Infrastructure: \$475/m² on the residential uplift floor space.

By reference to the benchmark feasibility financial performance in Table (2) the following results were obtained.

TABLE (8) FEASIBILITY OUTCOMES

SITES	IRR	DEVELOPMENT MARGIN
Gateway Site	22% - 23%	41% - 44%
Transit Site	5% - 6%	(0.11% - 1.75%)
Infill Site	16% - 17%	27% - 29%
Opportunity Site	16% - 17%	22% - 24%

The feasibility analysis was undertaken for development potential with the planning controls recommended by the selected Urban Design Competition. The analysis demonstrates that Site 1 the Gateway Site, Site 3 the Infill Site and Site 4 the Opportunity Site, are development feasible at the total contributions quantum, including for affordable housing, at FSRs ranging from 3.6:1 to 5.1:1.

Development at Site 2 the Transit Site, would not be financially feasible up to an FSR of 5.1:1 mainly due to the applicable land value of the site.

CONCLUSION

The South East Light Rail line will result in changes to the urban setting of the Kingsford and Kensington centres and linking corridor. Randwick City Council's undertaking of an integrated strategic planning is the most appropriate action to plan for sustainable growth, livable communities, support infrastructure and community facilities.

An urban design analysis recommended uplift development controls for the centres from 3.0:1 FSR to 4.0:1 and 5.0:1 FSR and as importantly a range of community facilities and public domain improvements. Feasibility analysis were comprehensively undertaken that concluded an appropriate contribution regime consisting of: 3% section 94A; \$475/m² on additional floor space for community infrastructure, and; an affordable housing regime of initially 3% of total dwellings progressing to 5%.

This report examines the work undertaken and available implementation mechanisms, and concludes that:

- i. To plan and realise the recommended urban design uplift planning controls, the scope and range of local and community infrastructure indicated in the report are appropriate and recommended. The provision of affordable housing is consistent with State and Local government policies and certainly justifiable for this area.
- ii. The contribution regime costing and design have been evidence based feasibility tested and is justifiable to meet the necessary costings and should proceed to stakeholder and community consultation and implementation as applicable.
- iii. An implementation strategy should be pursued as follows:
 - Council to seek an increase in its S94A local infrastructure contributions from 1% to 3%, based on the available feasibility evidence
 - A Community Infrastructure levy of \$475/m² on additional floor space be the subject of public and stakeholder's consultation and as applicable incorporated to Council VPA policies, guidelines and the Randwick LEP 2012.
 - Substantial evidence exists to justify the inclusion of Randwick Council in SEPP 70 so that the recommended Affordable Housing regime (3% to 5%) be statutory implemented by way of conditions on development consent.

APPENDIX

TABLE (3) GREATER METROPOLITAN COUNCILS – AFFORDABLE HOUSING IMPLEMENTATION

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Canterbury-Bankstown Council	N/A	Canterbury LEP – N/A Bankstown LEP – N/A	N/A	N/A	Canterbury VPA – sets out that AH not provided under AH SEPP will be considered a 'public benefit' in the negotiation of a VPA
Inner West Council	Leichardt LGA identified under SEPP as needing affordable housing. SEPP sets out the 'affordable housing principles' to apply when including a condition of consent under S94F of the Act	Leichardt LEP - N/A Ashfield LEP (CI4.3A) – for RFBs & mixed use developments in the Ashfield town centre 7m additional height permitted if affordable rental housing is provided on site Marrickville LEP- N/A	Leichardt Housing Strategy 2011 – guides retention & development of AH (LGA wide) Marrickville Urban Strategy 2007 – identified need for AH Strategy	UG NSW – Bays Precinct: White bay Power Station, early planning "housing diversity" flagged UG NSW – Bays Precinct: Rozelle Rail yards, early planning potential for "affordable housing" flagged Leichardt – Allen Street Leichardt VPA – monetary contribution to be partly used by council in the provision of AH Leichardt – Terry Street Rozelle VPA - monetary contribution to be partly used by council in the provision of AH Marrickville – Urban Strategy 2007 identifies potential AH sites – civic centre site at Petersham and former Marrickville Hospital site.	Leichardt VPA Policy includes achieving the provision of AH Ashfield Urban Planning Strategy includes a number of directions & actions relating to AH Marrickville Affordable Housing Strategy – recommends the use of VPAs in conjunction with FSR bonuses Marrickville VPA Policy includes achieving the provision of AH Marrickville DCP requires Social Impact Assessments for some DAs, partly to consider loss or gains re AH

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Northern Beaches Council	N/A	Manly – N/A Pittwater – N/A Warringah LEP – N/A	Pittwater Strategic Plan 2020 has initiative of “investigate affordable housing initiatives and progress accessory dwellings”	N/A	<p>Pittwater DCP includes social objective: “promote the provision of accessible, diverse and affordable housing options to cater for the changing housing needs of the community” with most locality planning criteria referring to the need for more “compact and affordable housing”</p> <p>Manly S94 Plan – “Council continues to explore opportunities for the provision of AH... Plan does not recoup any loss of affordable housing however negotiations take place with developers of sites which lead to loss of affordable housing with a view to them making a contribution to not for profit housing schemes.</p>
Central Coast Council	N/A	Gosford LEP (Cl 7.7) if AH provided at 85–93 Karalta Road, Erina additional height (13.75m if AH, 11m without) & FSR (1:1 if AH, 0.85:1 without)		N/A	<p>Wyong Settlement Strategy 2013 strategic directions include: “Complete and implement the Affordable Housing Study, and investigate opportunities for Council to use planning powers to encourage affordable housing and Establish a policy that requires major development that may threaten the supply of housing choice and affordable housing to undertake a social impact assessment. “</p>

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
City of Parramatta Council	N/A	N/A		UG NSW – Sydney Metro North West Urban Transformation Projects – preliminary planning, housing diversity flagged (Draft for consultation) Camellia Land Use and Infrastructure Strategy – AH included in the high level 'vision' for the precinct	Affordable Housing Policy 2009 - aims to protect existing AH and to facilitate new AH. Includes an aspirational target of 6018 AH dwellings by 2025. Delivery tools include planning incentives, Council projects & demonstration projects. DAs submitted under AH SEPP 2009 for infill or boarding house developments require a Social Impact Assessment VPA policy specifically includes AH as public benefit in the determining of VPAs
Cumberland Council	N/A	Holroyd – N/A Auburn N/A		SOPA Residential Developments – 3% AH	Holroyd – Social Impact Assessments required for larger scale residential development and/or when there is a loss of affordable housing
Georges River Council		Hurstville – N/A			Georges River VPA Policy specifically includes AH as public benefit in the determining of VPAs
The Hills Shire Council	N/A	Ni/A	Residential Direction 2008 – Objective: “Promote a range of housing that is affordable to households of varying financial capacity.” Actions comprise promoting greater dwelling mix and monitoring of affordability.	UG NSW – Sydney Metro North West Urban Transformation Projects – preliminary planning, housing diversity flagged	Hills 2026 Community Strategic Direction includes aim of “planning for sustainable, adaptable and affordable housing options”

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Blacktown City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>UG NSW – Sydney Metro North West Urban Transformation Projects – preliminary planning, housing diversity flagged</p> <p>Numerous sites where AH has been delivered via VPAs or conditions of approval including:</p> <p>Forest Glade, Parklea (greater density via smaller lots sizes and reduced setbacks of subdivision in exchange for 13 of the 164 lots to be AH.)</p> <p>Rouse Hill Town Centre – dedication of land via VPA with State government Bunya Estate, Bungarrabee (Doonside) – approved under Affordable Housing SEPP 2009</p>	
Bayside Council	N/A	Botany - N/A Kogarah – N/A			<p>Botany: VPA for a planning proposal at 11-13 Lord Street, Botany. Rezoned from B7 – Business Park to B4 – Mixed Use;” amended height from the max of 22m to a max of 23.5m; and amended the FSR for the site to be increased from 1:1 to 2:1. Total contribution of \$9 million included the “purchase of units within a development for AH.”</p>
Burwood Council	N/A	N/A			VPA Policy specifically includes AH as public benefit in the determining of VPAs

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Camden Council	N/A	N/A	Camden Residential Strategy 2008 recommended "Council further promote, in appropriate locations, alternative and affordable housing forms " and investigate alternative methods, for the provision of alternative and affordable housing.		
Campbelltown City Council	N/A	N/A	Draft Residential Development Strategy 2014 recommends "Support affordable "entry price" housing"		<p>Campbelltown Local Planning Strategy 2014 includes following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouragement of a range of housing types in the fulfilment of existing and future housing needs • Protection of the amount and general distribution of housing at an affordable price level for a range of market groups/segments • Facilitation of local housing projects in response to local specific needs • Encouragement of housing options for the aged, persons with disabilities and low incomes, around existing support facilities.

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
City of Canada Bay Council	N/A	N/A			<p>VPA Policy specifically includes AH as public benefit in the determining of VPAs</p> <p>Affordable Housing Policy (updated April 2016) “supports the production of AH stock; whether through inclusionary zoning, voluntary planning agreements or working with developers to encourage appropriately designed AH, aims to provide increased flexibility for a diverse range of housing types and sizes for varying stages of life...achieve this by updating the LEP and DCP following detailed community engagement and analysis in order to understand needs undertakes the role of advocacy, and where possible, undertake mitigation to reduce further loss to affordable housing stock”</p> <p>Council passed a motion at its April 7 2016 meeting to be authorised under SEPP 70 to collect section 94F contributions for AH.</p>
Hawkesbury City Council	N/A	N/A			
The Council of the Shire of Hornsby	N/A	N/A		UG NSW – Sydney Metro North West Urban Transformation Projects – preliminary planning, housing diversity flagged	VPA Policy specifically includes AH as public benefit in the determining of VPAs

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Fairfield City Council	N/A	Fairfield LEP 1994 (relates only to Bonnyrigg Town Centre) includes objective (CL 28H(0)): "to allow development that incorporates a variety of housing, increasing housing choice and flexibility, to accommodate a range of income groups and encourage social diversity"	Draft Residential Development Strategy 2009 recommends for study areas of * Fairfield – "Priority location for affordable housing developments, integrated with new development" * Canley Heights "Encourage integrated affordable housing developments" * Villawood - "ensure affordable housing integrates with other housing stock and provide mixed income development"		Fairfield Citywide DCP 2013 objectives of residential areas include creating "greater availability of affordable accommodation". Fairfield City Centre DCP includes objective of "providing for residential development which is affordable, provides a suitable range of housing options that meet the needs of all parts of the community, and retains a high standard of design"
Ku-ring-gai Council	N/A	N/A			
Liverpool City Council	N/A	N/A			DCP – Social Impact Statement or full Assessment required for DAs for or changes to affordable housing.
The Council of the Municipality of Hunters Hill	N/A	N/A			

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Lane Cove Municipal Council	N/A	N/A		<p>504 Pacific Highway and 95 Nicholson Street, St Leonards VPA with draft planning proposal – rezoning from B3 to B4 and increase in height from 72 to 138m VPA includes contribution for affordable/key worker housing.</p> <p>472 & 486 Pacific Highway, St Leonards VPA with draft planning proposal – rezoning from B3 to B4 and increase in height from 65 to 115m (in part) VPA includes contribution for affordable/key worker housing.</p> <p>500 Pacific Highway, St Leonards VPA with draft planning proposal – rezoning from B3 to B4 and increase in height from 65 to 115m (in part) VPA includes contribution for affordable/key worker housing.</p>	
Mosman Municipal Council	N/A	N/A			

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
North Sydney Council	N/A	N/A			<p>North Sydney DCP - where a loss of AH occurs "applicant will be required to pay a monetary contribution for the replacement of AH"</p> <p>North Sydney DCP - North Sydney Bus Depot site Area Character Statement AH is a "public benefit priority" for the site.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Strategy 2015 – includes following strategies "Council considers the provision of affordable housing as a key public benefit when undertaking local planning studies." And "Council will utilise Voluntary Planning Agreements in conjunction with site specific Planning Proposals to facilitate the provision of affordable housing. "</p> <p>Section 94 plan requires contribution be paid for the loss of AH.</p>
Shellharbour City Council	N/A	N/A			<p>Shellharbour DCP requires DAs for subdivisions and medium density residential include SIAs addressing "housing diversity and opportunities for affordable housing"</p>

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Penrith City Council	N/A	Penrith LEP 2010 R4 High Density Zone includes objective of "To encourage the provision of affordable housing"	Draft Penrith Urban Strategy 2009 includes action of "Incorporate in key strategic centres an affordable housing target of 3% by 2030. Utilise the Penrith LEP or DCP to facilitate the provision of affordable housing requirements throughout the Penrith LGA. This does not mean that all future development proposals within Local Centres to provide 3% of dwellings within a development for affordable housing. Such an indicator seeks development to contribute to the overall city- wide target by 2030, utilising a range of means and methods of contribution. Any future large scale development within new urban release areas should continue to provide for a minimum of 3% affordable housing."		<p>Penrith City Centre Vision Action 10: "Encourage increased residential densities within the city centre and in key locations adjoining the city, and investigate affordable housing opportunities."</p> <p>Penrith DCP 2014 requires concept plans to be submitted for precincts such as Caddens, Glenmore Park and the Penrith Health and Education Precinct to satisfy the objective of "To provide for a range of housing types that should include an affordable housing component"</p>

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Randwick City Council	N/A	<p>Randwick LEP 2012: All residential zones include the objective “to encourage housing affordability”</p> <p>Sites >10,000sqm require a site specific DCP to be prepared where “housing mixes and tenure choices, including affordable and adaptable housing” are provided for (Cl 6.12)</p>	Randwick City Plan 2013 – “encourage diverse, adaptable and affordable housing through “the local planning process and planning agreement policies, we negotiate for ownership of affordable units on completion of housing developments”	Newmarket Green DCP (site in suburb of Randwick) requires any concept plan to include key worker and student housing including AH	<p>VPA policy specifically includes AH in the negotiation of VPAs</p> <p>Affordable Housing Strategy & Action Plan, 2008 – 2018 requires council staff to discuss with developers with projects for “larger scale multi unit residential developments, to consider a contribution towards AH units.”</p> <p>Social Impact Assessment Policy requires specific consideration of AH</p>
Council of the City of Ryde	N/A	N/A		UG NSW- Lachlan’s Line, North Ryde includes “an affordable housing offering (96 apartments) which must be purchased by a community housing provider, or a private developer in a joint venture or similar partnership arrangement with a community housing provider” EOI closed July 2016	Ryde DCP 2014 – Ryde Town Centre Precinct “Residential development (with the exception of Precincts 9, 10, and 11 as identified on the Ryde LEP 2014): is to provide a variety of housing (including affordable housing) to accommodate a range of income groups and increase housing choice”

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Council of the City of Sydney	<p>City of Sydney and South Sydney identified under SEPP as needing "affordable housing"</p> <p>SEPP sets out the 'affordable housing principles' to apply when including a condition of consent under S94F of the Act</p>	<p>Affordable Housing Levy Contribution applied to Green Square, 'southern employment lands' (Alexandria area) & Ultimo-Pyrmont (CI 7.13)</p> <p>Density & Height bonuses – 87 Bay St Glebe (CI 6.23 & 6.24)</p> <p>Residential permissible in the B7 Business Park zone if affordable housing is to be provided (CI 7.13A)</p> <p>SLEP (Harold Park) Floor space bonus when AH provided</p>		UG NSW - Central to Eveleigh – early stages of planning. "Housing diversity" being explored in partnership with FaCS.	
Waverley Council	N/A	N/A	Waverley AH Program (WAHP)- provides rental apartments at reduced rents.	N/A	<p>Planning Agreement Policy - 10% of all agreement contributions need to comprise a monetary contribution to Waverley's Affordable Housing Program fund.</p> <p>Waverley DCP 2012 requires that some DAs (at Councils discretion) to prepare a "plan of management" that includes consideration of 'social and economic effects of the development on the community, including the loss of affordable housing'</p>

LGA	SEPP 70	LEP PROVISIONS	HOUSING STRATEGY	'URBAN GROWTH' RENEWAL & OTHER KNOWN SITES WITH AH REQUIRED/PROVIDED	OTHER POLICIES & STRATEGIES (DCPS, VPAS ETC.)
Willoughby City Council	<p>LGA identified under SEPP as needing “affordable housing”</p> <p>SEPP sets out the ‘affordable housing principles’ to apply when including a condition of consent under S94F of the Act</p>	<p>Floor Space Bonus – floor space of building used for AH not included in max FSR (CI 4.4 2A(b))</p> <p>Numerous specific sites in Chatswood, Artarmon, St Leonards, Northbridge & Willoughby known as “Area 3 sites” 4% contribution for/as AH is to be provided as part of any redevelopment (CI 6.8)</p>	Willoughby City Strategy (2013) “plan for housing choice” and “facilitate, advocate and provide for affordable housing”.		Willoughby DCP (Part G4.2) expands on LEP AH provisions.

TABLE (6) – ESTIMATED COST OF LOCAL AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH

	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE	LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE
Kensington	\$20,900,000	\$28,818,000
Kingsford	\$19,100,000	\$16,745,000
Total	\$40,000,000	\$45,563,000
Grand Total	\$85,563,000	

*to the nearest \$

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

KENSINGTON

Public art/sculpture	\$1,100,000
Bicycle networks	\$1,000,000
Todman Avenue Cycle Way	\$3,000,000
Green links	\$1,500,000
Multi-purpose community centre and exhibition centre	\$1,600,000
Innovation centre	\$3,000,000
Cycle sharing facility	\$300,000
Upgrades including water sensitive Urban Design	\$3,000,000
Pneumatic waste collection	\$6,400,000
TOTAL	\$20,900,000

KINGSFORD

Public art/sculpture	\$ 1,000,000
Community facility	\$1,200,000
Bicycle Network Improvements	\$400,000
Kensington Park	\$1,600,000
Innovation centres	\$1,500,000
Underground bicycle storage facility	\$2,500,000
Cycle sharing facility	\$300,000
Upgrades incorporating water sensitive Urban Design	\$3,000,000
Pneumatic waste collection	\$7,600,000
TOTAL	\$19,100,000

LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE

KINGSFORD

Improvements to Council owned carpark in Middle Lane/Meeks St	\$1,000,000
Improvements to Council owned carpark in Houston Lane	\$1,000,000
Anzac pde / Gardeners Rd / Rainbow St intersection (Kingsford Junction)	\$1,200,000
Wallace St public realm (adjoining Souths Juniors)	\$2,385,000
Anzac Pde footpaths and intersections	\$1,540,000
Undergrounding of overhead power lines	\$2,000,000
Multifunctional poles/smart poles	\$1,120,000
Southern Cross Close	\$300,000
Other public realm works and upgrades	\$2,000,000
Local road improvements and upgrades	\$3,500,000
Other Laneways	\$700,000
TOTAL	\$16,745,000

KENSINGTON

Bowral St footpath widening	\$528,000
Duke St public domain	\$600,000
Council car park upgrade Addison St/Anzac Pde	\$1,200,000
Anzac Pde footpaths and intersections	\$4,165,000
Undergrounding of overhead power lines	\$2,625,000
Future open space acquisition (general)	\$12,000,000

Multifunctional poles/smart poles	\$1,200,000
Other public realm works and upgrades	\$2,500,000
Footpath widening along Todman Ave and Kensington Public School	\$1,000,000
Improvements and Upgrades	\$3,000,000
TOTAL	\$28,818,000