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1. Introduction

1.1 Preliminary

Architectus has been commissioned by Canterbury-Bankstown City Council (Council) to undertake an urban design review of the planning proposal of the site known as 353-355 Waterloo Road and 87 Norfolk Road, Greenacre (The Chullora Marketplace) and an indicative concept master plan prepared to support the rezoning. Following a review of the current proposal, Architectus is further engaged to undertake testing on the site towards providing recommendations for both LEP and DCP controls, of which this report provides LEP recommendations.

1.2 Structure of this report

This report provides a discussion of the site, its surroundings, planning guidelines and policies and an assessment of whether the planning proposal appropriately responds to this context. The report also discusses the planning proposal with respect to the principles of State Environmental Planning Policy 65 (SEPP65) and provides recommendations on the scale and yield that are considered to be appropriate for the subject site as a potential alternative to the proposal. Following this, Architectus’ own testing of the site is presented, concluding in recommendations for controls for the site.

1.3 The Planning Proposal

The Planning Proposal, prepared by City Plan, seeks to amend the maximum building heights for the land known as 353-355 Waterloo Road and 87 Norfolk Road, Greenacre to transform the existing standalone marketplace into a local centre which retains part of the existing shopping centre, whilst incorporating new mixed-use development with a new publicly accessible plaza.

The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Bankstown LEP 2015 (BLEP 2015) as follows:

- **Land use zoning:** No change to the current B2 Local Centre Zone. It is noted that the original Planning Proposal sought to allow residential flat buildings as an additional permitted use on the R2 zoned 87 Norfolk Road to enable alternative access arrangements. Based on this revised concept plan, it is understood the applicant is no longer seeking access from Norfolk Road. As such, the amendment to Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses under BLEP 2015 is therefore no longer required.

- **Height of buildings:** from 9 and 11m to 14 and 20m (between 2 and 6 storeys); and

- **Floor space ratio:** No change to the maximum FSR of 1:1
1.4 Methodology

The following documents were reviewed in preparation of this advice:

- Preliminary Planning Proposal, prepared by City Plan Services
- Urban Design Report including Concept Master Plan, prepared by GMU Design and Architecture (Original Submission May 2018)
- Revised Concept Master Plan, prepared by GMU Design (Revised Submission August 2018)
- Transport Review of Planning Proposal, prepared by Colston Budd Rogers & Kafes Pty Ltd
- Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2015 (Bankstown LEP 2015)
- Bankstown Development Control Plan 2015 (Bankstown DCP 2015)
- NSW Apartment Design Guide 2015
- Better Placed – An integrated design policy for the built environment of New South Wales 2017
- North East Local Area Plan, 2016.

A site visit was undertaken by the Architectus project team on Tuesday 25th of September 2018.
2. Site and context analysis

This section provides information about the urban context, site details and description of the site’s opportunities and constraints for development.

2.1 Local context

The site is located within the Canterbury-Bankstown Local Government Area (LGA), located in the suburb of Greenacre, within around 1.6km from Greenacre local centre.

The site is accessible by bus, serviced by Route M90, 941 and 913 with connections to Bankstown and Liverpool. The closest bus stop is located along Waterloo Road, immediately in front of the site. The closest station to the site is Punchbowl Station, located 4km south of the site.

The site has good road access, however has only one entry and exit point into the site, via Waterloo Road.

Figure 2 Local context map
The subject site is located along Waterloo, surrounded by two schools, low density residential and open space.
2.2 Site context

The site known as 353-355 Waterloo Road and 87 Norfolk Road, Greenacre, is situated in the northern part of Greenacre, along Waterloo Road, south of the Hume Highway. The site is bounded by Waterloo Road to the west, low density residential housing to the south, Norfolk Reserve to the east and Malek Fahd Islamic School to the north.

The site has a sloping topography from east to west, towards surrounding low density housing. Immediately south and south-east of the site is a strip of low density residential houses (zoned R2 Low Density Residential), which face onto Waterloo and Norfolk Road.

The site is constrained by accessibility and topography, due to one primary entry/exit point located along Waterloo Road. To the east of the site is Norfolk Reserve, which incorporates a large natural reserve and small pocket park with an informal pedestrian connection into the back-of-house part of the shopping centre. There are well used pedestrian paths into the site from Norfolk Reserve, both from the northeast (Watergum Way) and the southeast (via the pocket park) which enter the site to servicing areas.

Figure 3 View of the entry point, looking east toward the subject site.

Figure 4 View looking south-west from car park of subject site showing interface to low density residential housing.

Figure 5 View looking north within subject site.

Figure 6 View looking north within subject site showing interface to school to the north.

Figure 7 View looking west toward Norfolk Reserve showing informal access into the site.

Figure 8 Norfolk Reserve, located immediately west of the subject site.
3. The Proposal

3.1 Introduction

The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Bankstown LEP 2015 (BLEP 2015) as follows:

- **Land use zoning:** No change to the current B2 Local Centre Zone. It is noted that the original Planning Proposal sought to allow residential flat buildings as an additional permitted use on the R2 zoned 87 Norfolk Road to enable alternative access arrangements. Based on this revised concept plan, it is understood the applicant is no longer seeking access from Norfolk Road. As such, the amendment to Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses under BLEP 2015 is therefore no longer required.

- **Height of buildings:** from 9 and 11m to 14 and 20m (between 2 and 6 storeys); and

- **Floor space ratio:** No change to the maximum FSR of 1:1

3.2 Summary of Planning Proposal

The Planning Proposal seeks to rezone the site known as 353-355 Waterloo Road and 87 Norfolk Road, Greenacre (the Chullora Marketplace), comprising an area of approximately 58,460sqm.

The Planning Proposal documentation notes that the applicant is proposing to enter into a Planning Agreement that would fund the embellishment and upgrade of the playground/accessible area of Norfolk Reserve, and install a new pedestrian crossing to the northern side of the Norfolk Road/Waterloo intersection (page 43 Planning Proposal Report, City Plan Services).

The Planning Proposal is supported by an Urban Design Report, prepared by GMU Urban Design and Architecture, submitted 13/04/2018, which demonstrates how the site could be developed under the proposed planning controls.

It is noted Council that the Planning Proposal and Urban Design Report documentation has not been updated to reflect the revised concept master plan, submitted to Council 23/07/2018. As such, it is recommended the documentation is updated to reflect the revised concept design.

3.3 Summary of the Chullora Marketplace Master Plan

The concept master plan presents a comprehensive mixed-use development, with residential apartments located above commercial and retail uses and associated parking within the podium levels. The revised master plan proposes a range of 2-6 storey buildings with retail and commercial development and car parking along the ground floor.

The revised concept master plan proposes two options for level one which includes:

- **Option 1:** Residential uses with communal open space; or

- **Option 2:** Residential uses with podium car parking

Both options result in an FSR of around 1:1, which is permissible under the Bankstown LEP 2015. The breakdown of gross floor area for each option is summarised below.

- **Option 1**
  - Residential GFA = 37,054 - 39,700sqm
  - Commercial/Retail GFA = 18,176 - 19,312sqm
  - Total GFA = 53,770sqm – 59,012sqm
- Option 2
  - Residential GFA = 35,423 - 37,953sqm
  - Commercial GFA = 18,176 - 19,312sqm
  - Total GFA = 53,569 – 57,265sqm

It is recommended that Council request the applicant to provide an accurate breakdown when submitting updated documentation to reflect the revised scheme.

The concept master plan is designed around a new internal loop road, with access from Waterloo Road. The central plaza is a good and important move, but in reality feels overwhelmed by vehicle traffic, as it is where all the cars come in and out from Waterloo Road. The loop road is unclear and does not provide a direct line of sight into the precinct.

Pedestrian and cycle through site linkages are poor and illegible. Residential address is also poor for some blocks and fails the ‘pizza delivery man test’ (in other words it would be very hard to get from the front door for some of the blocks at the rear).

The revised concept master plan also introduces community facilities including childcare to the proposal, located in the podium levels at the rear of the site. Upon re-submitting the revised concept master plan as part of the Planning Proposal submission, it is recommended the applicant undertakes a Community Needs and Social Impact Assessment to understand the current provision and demand for community facilities in Greenacre and if required, where they are best suited as part of the broader master plan.

### 3.4 Existing and proposed controls

The existing and proposed controls are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site area</td>
<td>58,460m²</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use zoning</td>
<td>B2 Local Centre</td>
<td>B2 Local Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height of buildings control</td>
<td>Part 9m and 11m</td>
<td>Part 14m and 20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum floor space ratio control</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised concept master plan – Option 2 (modelled by Architectus)
4. Assessment of proposal

A full assessment of the proposal against SEPP65, Bankstown LEP 2015 and DCP 2015 is provided in Appendix A of this document. In principle, the following core ideas of the Planning Proposal are reasonable and supportable:

- The concept of increased height in the northern portion of the site to better support the density already applicable to the site in current controls
- The idea of a central plaza should be supported as a focal location for the neighbourhood.

However, there are some concerns we have with the proposal as shown. In general, a high-density residential approach should only be accepted on a site such as this when it is demonstrated that the future centre will provide a high degree of amenity for future residents. This is not demonstrated through the current documentation including due to the following issues:

- The overall movement network through the site is not legible and clearly attractive and there is a lack of clarity as to the divisions between public, private and communal areas, including:
  - The road to the north has very little activation for its length at ground floor (including parking facing the street and the rear of Woolworths, with a tall wall to the school opposite), however appears to be public in its use (including a circulating road and some residential entries). This is a very poor streetscape outcome.
  - The road to the south and southeast also appears to have some public function however have a poor interface with residential behind and the road then cuts through the building. This creates issues which could be better handled through an alternative solution, although it is noted that generally reasonable separation is provided from neighbours.
- The central square feels overwhelmed in size and dominated by roads.
- Residential address is poor in some blocks where apartments are distant from entry locations.
- The typology of parking for retail provided predominantly below residential blocks is a concern as:
  - The parking blocks are excessively deep, appear visually overwhelming on the public realm, and the provision of parking to a public street is not accepted (See comments above)
  - There is little clarity in the proposal as to how service vehicles and major vehicular entries for the retail facility would affect residences.
  - We would need to understand the staging of the development to understand how this could be delivered as proposed
  - From the perspective of retail functionality, some parking is provided a long way from retail entries
- There is no staging plan to describe what may happen in the future when the Woolworths lease turns over.
Non-compliance with the ‘principles for local centres’ in the South District Plan. As the site is proposed as a ‘local centre’ under the plan it should be assessed against these principles. In particular the proposal includes a reduction of commercial floorspace on site. This would appear to be against the following principles in the District Plan:

- Protect or expand retail and/or commercial floor space
- Protect and expand employment opportunities.

The South District Plan identifies Chullora as a local centre based on its retail presence of which includes a supermarket with a floor space greater than 1,000 square metres.

As a key principle, local centres have an important role in providing local employment and servicing the needs of the people that live in, work in and visit the local area.

Appendix C provides a comparative analysis of other nearby local and small village centres. The analysis reveals that Chullora Market Place comprises the second largest commercial floor space offering (24,605sqm) in the North East Local Area, followed by Punchbowl Small Village (11,217sqm). Greenacre Small Village Centre is the largest retail centre in the North East Local Area with around 30,000sqm of retail and commercial floor space including a 4,000sqm Woolworths supermarket.

If a future development proposal does not maintain or replace the existing commercial GFA (24,605sqm) to ensure the protection of commercial floor space and local employment, the proposal should be supported with a comprehensive retail needs analysis which demonstrates the proposed retail development is sufficient and whether the local community or other surrounding centres are likely to be at risk or suffer net disbenefit of what is attributed to the proposed retail.

The proposal should also meet other place-based principles for centres under the District Plan including providing local social infrastructure (Council may have a view on what is needed here), providing good local connections and a public realm and open space focus (see comments above).
5. Built form testing

Architectus has tested four scenarios for the site as follows. These are included in Appendix A of this document:

- Scenario 1 – Mixed use master plan
- Scenario 2 – Mixed use master plan with above ground parking
- Scenario 3 – Complying master plan
- Scenario 4 – Segregated uses master plan

The master plan in Scenario 1, 2 and 4 are based on the following attributes:

- A street network that provides strong through site connectivity and legibility.
- A generous plaza located to form a significant open space at the core of this new neighbourhood.
- A careful interface to the neighbours including rear boundaries of residential to rear boundaries of R2 use, and larger floorplates closer to the large boundary wall of the SP2 use to the north.

All scenarios present 1:1 FSR overall.

Scenario 1 and 2 have the greatest retail floorspace (existing retail floorspace is retained), whereas Scenario 3 and 4 have less retail floorspace (as per existing revised proposal by the applicant).

Architectus’ preferred outcome for the site from an urban design perspective is Scenario 4. However, to allow flexibility in the mix of uses on the site, both Scenario 1 and Scenario 4 have been used as a basis for recommending revised LEP controls. The primary difference being the two scenarios is the amount of retail floorspace provided. As scenario 4 has less retail floorspace, some of the retail and residential uses have been separated on the site.

Scenario 2 was developed in part to test the impacts of introducing above ground parking on site, which creates the following key issues:

- Large podium structure appears visually bulky and limits permeability
- Interface issues with blank facade results in need for sleeving.
- Residential sleeving can make SEPP65 compliance for solar access and ventilation difficult, particularly when apartments are south facing.

Nonetheless, Scenario 2 provides a useful basis for developing guidance on above ground parking, should this be a component of a revised Planning Proposal.

Scenario 3 was developed to test the existing controls for the site which result in a low scale urban sprawl type development. This scenario has been designed with the Woolworths relocated to the west of the site (however it can also work with the Woolworths retained in its existing location). Key issues for this scenario include:

- Redevelopment of the site may not be viable at this scale
- Second level of retail may be difficult to lease in this context.
- The 2 storey + attic typology including ground floor commercial use identified in the DCP is a typical ‘high street’ typology and unlikely to be deliverable across the several blocks of such a broad site. It may be that the closest to this that would be deliverable would be live-work units.
Scenario 1 – Mixed use master plan

Scenario 2 – Mixed use master plan above ground parking

Figure 1 3D view of built form testing – Scenario 1 and 2
Scenario 3 – Complying master plan

Scenario 4 – Segregated uses master plan

Note: Scenario 4 has been modelled with the existing topography

Figure 2 3D view of built form testing – Scenario 3 and 4
6. Recommendations for controls

Based on the testing described in Chapter 5 of this document, Architectus’ preliminary recommendations for key LEP controls are as follows:

- The existing FSR of 1:1 is acceptable for the site. While this may be considered considerably below comparable ‘centres’ (e.g. Greenacre where sites are 2:1 FSR), it is a ‘gross’ density and a significant portion of this will be taken by internal roads and open space.

- **0.65:1 maximum residential FSR** on site. This could be described as an ‘area’ on the FSR map or alternatively on the Special Provisions Map. This responds to the following key considerations:
  - To ensure as far as possible that a commercial component is delivered to be consistent with the zone objectives.
  - To accord with Scenario 1 and 4 tested by Architectus.
  - By separating the FSR of different land uses, there is clear expectation set for development as to the needs for both.
  - A maximum residential FSR provides greater clarity than a minimum commercial FSR in the case that a developer believes commercial use is not viable.

- Building heights applied to the site should be 20m (six storeys) for the northern portion of the site, 14m (four storeys) for the western and eastern portions, and 11m (three storeys) should be retained for the southern portion of the site:
  - For the northern and central portion of the site this allows six storey buildings to be concentrated in the centre of the site. Six storeys is consistent with the maximum heights planned for Greenacre Centre under the North East Area Plan and is only one storey above the heights approved to the west on the ‘Eden’ site along the Hume Highway.
  - For the western and eastern portions of the site this allows four storey buildings at the edge of the site.
  - For the southern portion of the site this is consistent with the adjacent lots and removes interface issues.

Our proposed height control is based on a number slightly above the following which we consider minimums for best practice:

- 3.5m ground floor (or 4.5m for large format retail)
- 3.1m x 4 for L1-L4

It is understood that lift over run (approx. 1.6m) can be in addition to the maximum building height as architectural roof features (Clause 5.6 in the LEP).

Preliminary recommendations for LEP maps are shown below.
Figure 9  Proposed land use zoning
Site outlined in red
Adapted from Bankstown LEP 2015, Sheet LZN_004

Figure 10  Proposed maximum height
Site outlined in red
Adapted from Bankstown LEP 2015, Sheet HOB_004
Figure 11  Proposed floor space ratio
Site outlined in red
Adapted from Bankstown LEP 2015, Sheet FSR_004
7. Appendix A – Assessment of proposal

7.1 SEPP65 Design Quality of Residential Apartments

The proposal has been assessed against the nine Design Quality Principles of SEPP65, being context, built form and scale, density, sustainability, landscape, amenity, safety, housing diversity and social interaction, and aesthetics. The following section provides commentary on the proposal’s performance against the principles and makes recommendations to improve the built form outcome.

Principle 1. Context

The site is located along Waterloo Road, which runs in a north-south direction, connecting to the local centre of Greenacre (approximately 1.6km south of the subject site). The site’s immediate adjacencies include single detached, low density residential housing to the immediate west and south, a nature reserve ‘Norfolk Reserve’ to the east and the Malek Fahd Islamic School to the north. At present, there are two vehicular connections into the site via Waterloo Road. Pedestrian connectivity is poor, with some informal connections from Norfolk Reserve to the back-of-house area of the shopping centre.

The site presents strategic merit for some uplift, being identified as a local centre within the South District Plan. Greenacre local centre is similarly noted as a local centre in the South District Plan and has been earmarked for development up to 6-storeys in the North East Local Area Plan. The site is not considered as a centre of the same level as Greenacre in this plan, however already includes controls which allow for some significant residential density. The site at present doesn’t provide the high degree of residential amenity that you would normally associate with a centre attracting a substantial number of apartments, however it does have the potential to provide this amenity and local centre function as through redevelopment.

Whilst the proposed concept plan aligns with the objectives of the B2 Local Centre, it is important for the proposal to demonstrate that the future centre will provide a high degree of amenity for future residents.

Principle 2. Built form and scale

Parts of the proposal are well suited to the site. The concept of increased height in the northern portion of the site is supported, with heights proposed up to 6-storeys.

A general 2-storey street wall height is proposed along the new internal road, with heights proposed up to 3 and 6 storeys above. A 3-storey street wall height with upper level setback is proposed for buildings in the south. In consideration of low density residential properties to the south, this is not ideal. It is recommended a townhouse typology is applied, that is consistent with the existing maximum LEP height (11m) to ensure properties to the south are protected from overshadowing and overlooking.

Principle 3. Density
The density proposed is between 2 and 6 storey massing, which is equivalent to a total gross floor area of up to 59,000sqm or an estimated FSR of 1:1. Whilst a high density residential approach seems appropriate for a site of this size, it will be important for the site to retain and protect its commercial presence, particularly being located in a B2 Local Centre zone.

Principle 4. Sustainability

The proposed layout indicates that due to orientation and massing, the proposal will be able to facilitate an acceptable level of natural ventilation and solar compliance. However, it still needs to be demonstrated that solar compliance is possible given the site’s topography and ability to affect neighbours to the south.

Solar access to the new proposed open space should also be prioritised to ensure sun access is retained during key hours of the day.

Architectus are satisfied that an appropriate level of sustainability measures can be achieved in future development and design stages on the site.

Principle 5. Landscape

The concept of the central plaza/open space is supported, but feels overwhelmed as it is located where all the cars come in and out.

The divisions between public and private open space are also not clear and overall movement network throughout the site is confusing. There is a lack of clarity as to what is considered public and what is private/communal open space including:

- The road to the north has very little activation for its length at ground floor (including parking facing the street and the rear of Woolworths, with a tall wall to the school opposite), however appears to be public in its use (including a circulating road and some residential entries). This is a very poor streetscape outcome.

- The road(s) to the south and southeast that also appear to have some public function however have a poor interface with residential behind and the road then cuts through the building. These appear to be creating issues which could be better handled through an alternative solution. Although it is noted that generally reasonable separation is provided from neighbours.

These connections should be prioritised and resolved through new DCP controls.

Whilst setbacks provided in the original concept master plan are generally supported, it is unclear whether the revised proposal will retain these setbacks as per the original master plan. As such, a revised urban design report incorporating the revised scheme is requested.

Principle 6. Amenity

Residential address is poor in some blocks, where some residences, particularly at the rear, are distant from entry locations. Floorplate.

Principle 7. Safety

The proposal raises questions of safety and security with its proposed residential uses and how the place will function outside trading hours of the shopping centre. As outlined above, overall movement network and connectivity throughout the site is poor and does not provide a direct line of sight throughout the precinct.

Principle 8. Housing diversity and social interaction
Architectus is satisfied that an appropriate apartment mix can be achieved in future development and design stages on the site.

Moreover, whilst community uses are supported on site, it is recommended a Community Needs and Social Impact Assessment is undertaken to determine the demand for social infrastructure and facilities in the area and if suitable, where they are best located on site. A potential location may be co-located the new public open/plaza space.

**Principle 9. Aesthetics**

Apartment typologies are not supported in the south of the site. More attention should be given to the surrounding interfaces of the site including the school to the north and surrounding low density properties to the south and south-east. It would be preferred if townhouse typologies are provided to the south to allow for an appropriate transition to single storey properties to the south. Similarly, residential development is not supported along the northern interface to the school.

### 7.2 Bankstown Local Environmental Plan 2015 (BLEP 2015)

The planning proposal has been assessed against the provisions of the BLEP 2015.

#### Land use zoning

![Figure 10 Land zoning map](source: Bankstown LEP 2015)

The site is mostly zoned B2 Local Centre, with the exception of one allotment zoned R2 Low Density Residential. Residential flat buildings are permissible with consent within the B2 Local Centre zone, along with commercial premises, community facilities and shop top housing. The objectives of the zone are to provide a range of retail, business, entertainment and community uses that serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit the local area, as well as to provide for certain residential uses that are compatible with the mix of uses in the local centre.

The land uses surrounding the site include R2 Low Density Residential land to the south and south-east, the school zoned SP2 Infrastructure to the north Norfolk Reserve to the west.

The planning proposal seeks to enable development shown in the concept plan, including community facilities, residential flat buildings and shop top housing which are permissible uses (with consent) in the B2 Local Centre Zone. As such, the planning proposal does not seek to alter the existing B2 Local Centre zone of the shopping centre.
and will only seek to rezone No.353 Waterloo Road from R2 Low Density Residential to B2 Local Centre.

It is noted that the original Planning Proposal sought to allow residential flat buildings as an additional permitted use on the R2 Low Density Residential zoned land at 87 Norfolk Road to enable alternative access arrangements. Based on this revised concept plan, it is understood the applicant is no longer seeking access from Norfolk Road. As such, the amendment to Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses under BLEP 2015 is therefore no longer required.

**Floor space ratio**

![Figure 11 Floor space ratio](source: Bankstown LEP 2015)

The subject site has a maximum floor space ratio of 1:1. Sites to the south and east have a maximum floor space ratio of 0.5:1. The school to the north and nature reserve to the west is not subject to a maximum FSR.

The revised concept master plan achieves an estimated FSR of 1.1. It is recommended the applicant submit a breakdown of gross floor area to calculate the anticipated FSR for the site.

**Height of buildings**
The subject site has a maximum building height of part 11m and 9m for the single R2 zoned allotment.

The Planning Proposal seeks to allow for a range up to 20m, set back from a 14m height buffer from Waterloo road and the surrounding low density residential properties to the south.

Heritage

The site is identified as an archaeological heritage item.

Lot size

The land is not subject to a minimum lot size requirement under Clause 4.1 of BLEP 2015.
8. Appendix B – Scenario testing
Appendix B

Existing Proposal

This shows the existing revised proposal (Option 2) from the applicant (modelled by Architectus)
Scenario 1 - Mixed use

This scenario illustrates Architectus’ preferred master plan for the site with mixed use buildings. It retains the existing retail floorspace for the site.

The master plan is based on the following structuring principles:

Land use
- Ground floor retail in Building A, B and C. Large floorplates are concentrated in Building A close to large boundary wall to the north. Existing Woolworths can be retained through staging process if required.
- Potential for community use in Building D
- Sleeved ground residential along Waterloo Road and new shared path providing passive surveillance to streets.
- Residential apartments on podiums of Building A, B and C with good street addresses for all lobbies.
- Terraces to the south of the site provide a good interface to neighbouring low scale residential.

Access, movement and public domain
- Street network that provides strong through site connectivity and legibility includes a new high street as the focus for active retail and a shared path connecting the two existing pedestrian entries to the site to the west.
- A clear structured plaza around a new significant open space forms the core of the new neighbourhood
- Main service access off Waterloo Road tucked away to the north of the site.
- Basement carparking with some convenience shopping on street car parking provided. This assumes one basement level beneath Building A and two basement levels beneath Buildings B and C.

Scenario 1 achieves an FSR of 1:1 with a maximum height of 6 storeys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>GBA</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
<th>Total GFA</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55,661</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A Ground | 14,457 | 1 | 12,289 |
| Mid      | 4,801  | 2 | 7,202  |
| Upper    | 3,600  | 1 | 2,700  |
| B Ground | 6,762  | 1 | 5,747  |
| Mid      | 3,569  | 2 | 5,354  |
| Upper    | 2,401  | 1 | 1,801  |
| C Ground | 4,697  | 1 | 3,992  |
| Terraces | 1,226  | 2 | 1,639  |
| Mid      | 2,008  | 2 | 3,012  |
| Upper    | 1,600  | 1 | 1,200  |
| D Ground | 957    | 2 | 1,628  |
| E Terraces | 2,122 | 2 | 3,183  |

Scenario 1 - Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>GBA</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
<th>Total GFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Below</td>
<td>16,263</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Below</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Below</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No. of retail spaces: 860 (as per existing) at 36sqm/p space = 30,960sqm
No. of resi spaces: 327 (1 space per dwelling) at 42sqm/p space = 13,734sqm

Scenario A - Preferred master plan

Schedule

| Commercial total | 23,656 | 0.41 |
| Residential total | 32,005 | 0.56 |
Scenario 2 - Mixed use with above ground parking

This scenario illustrates a similar master plan to Scenario 1, however it includes above ground parking.

The primary differences in this scenario are:
- Building A includes ground floor retail with two floors of above ground parking sleeved with residential and residential atop the podium.
- In addition to this, one level of basement car parking is assumed beneath Building B and C as well as some convenience shopping on street parking.

As per Scenario 1, Scenario 2 also achieves an FSR of 1:1 with a maximum height of 6 storeys, however Scenario 1 is preferred, as Scenario 2 demonstrates some of the key issues associated with above ground parking, such as:
- Large podium structure appears visually bulky and limits permeability.
- Interface issues associated with blank facade resulting in need for sleeving.
- Residential sleeving can make SEPP65 compliance for solar access and cross ventilation difficult, particularly when apartments are south facing.

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario B - Parking</th>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>GBA</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
<th>Total GBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Above</td>
<td>16,253</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Below</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Below</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Ground</td>
<td>16,253</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Terraces</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No. of retail spaces: 860 (as per existing) at 36sqm/p space = 30,960sqm
No. of resi spaces 320 (1 space per dwelling) at 42sqm/p space = 13,400sqm

### Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>GBA</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
<th>Total GBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,656</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>GBA</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
<th>Total GBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32,733</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 3 - Complying

This scenario illustrates a master plan which complies with existing controls. It includes a two storey stand alone retail building and 2 storeys with attic work and live terraces.
Scenario 4 - Segregated uses

This scenario illustrates Architectus preferred master plan with some segregated uses and includes reduced retail GFA (as per revised Planning Proposal).

The master plan is based on the following structuring principles:

Land use
- Separated retail in Building A with opportunity for large floorplates concentrated along large boundary wall to north. Potential for community use on Level 1 of Building A.
- Building D includes mixed uses with ground retail and residential atop the podium.
- Residential apartments to ground in Building B and C with height decreased to eastern boundary to provide appropriate interface with adjacent endangered bushland.
- Terraces to the south of the site provide a good interface to neighbouring low scale residential.

Access, movement and public domain
- Street network that provides strong through site connectivity and legibility includes a new high street as the focus for active retail and roads and generous footpaths connecting the two existing pedestrian entries to the site to the west.
- A clear structured plaza around a new significant open space forms the core of the new neighbourhood.
- Main service access off Waterloo Road tucked away to the north of the site.
- Basement carparking with some convenience shopping on street car parking provided.

Scenario 4 achieves an FSR of 1:1 with a maximum height of 6 storeys and is the preferred scenario for the site from an urban design perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>GSA</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
<th>Total GSA</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57,048</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lower</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Ground</td>
<td>12,895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Ground</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Ground</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Ground</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E terraces</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial total</td>
<td>19,718</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential total</td>
<td>37,330</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solar testing (Scenario 1)

9am 21 June
10am 21 June
11am 21 June
12pm 21 June
1pm 21 June
2pm 21 June
3pm 21 June
Solar testing (Scenario 4)
## 9. Appendix C – Comparison centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Village/Precinct</th>
<th>Commercial capacity</th>
<th>Built form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenacre Small Village Centre</strong></td>
<td>- Largest retail centre in North East Local Area</td>
<td>- Existing built form is mostly low rise 2-3 storey shop top housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 30,000sqm$^1$ of retail and commercial floor space including a 4,000m$^2$ Woolworths supermarket</td>
<td>- The North East LAP identifies opportunities for medium high-rise development around 4-6 storeys with a FSR of 2:1-2.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2% vacancy rate</td>
<td>- In 2014, there were 1,241 residential dwellings in Greenacre Small Village Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proximity to Bankstown CBD and Chullora Marketplace limits the role and expansion opportunities</td>
<td>- The North East LAP forecasts a likely net dwelling yield of an additional 2,139 dwellings by 2031 (Total dwellings by 2031 = 3,380).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punchbowl Small Village Centre (Station)</strong></td>
<td>- 11,217sqm$^2$ of retail and commercial floor space</td>
<td>- Existing built form is mostly low rise 2-3 storey shop top housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 11% vacancy rate</td>
<td>- The North East LAP identifies opportunities for medium high-rise development up to 8-storeys with a FSR of 3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Punchbowl Small Village Centre forms part of the Sydenham to Bankstown Urban Renewal Corridor earmarking the centre for a place of shopping and commuting.</td>
<td>- In 2014, there were 817 dwellings in Punchbowl Small Village Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The announcement of the Sydney Metro provides a catalyst for housing growth along the corridor.</td>
<td>- The North East LAP forecasts a likely net dwelling yield of an additional 1,770 dwellings by 2031 (Total dwellings by 2031 = 2,587).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chullora Marketplace Precinct</strong></td>
<td>- 24,605sqm$^3$ of commercial GFA</td>
<td>- The North East LAP recommends maintaining the low-density character of the Chullora Marketplace including its small-scale commercial nature that is compatible with the surrounding low density neighbourhood. It is proposed to retain the B2 Local Centre Zoning and amend the height limit from 2 storeys + attic to 3 storeys across the neighbourhood centre zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^1$ North East Local Area Plan (Bankstown City Council, April 2016)

$^2$ North East Local Area Plan (Bankstown City Council, April 2016)

$^3$ Applicants Planning Proposal (City Plan, May 2018)
Image above showing Precincts in the North East Local Area Plan
Image above showing Indicative Height Distribution in Greenacre Small Village Centre
Image above showing Indicative Height Distribution in Punchbowl Small Village Centre