

# What does the Liberal party have in mind for my suburb?

## TOWN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES Development Control Plan. (DCP for SHOPPING CENTRES)

For some time now, Auburn Council has been considering its 'vision' for our Town and Neighbourhood Centres (the shopping centres). In early December, Auburn's Liberal councillors submitted a proposal with significant changes to the recommendations put forward by the Council town planners. While RAGAA is not necessarily happy with several of the town planners' proposals, we feel that much of the submission put forward by the Liberals would NOT be supported by the Auburn community.

### The more contentious Liberal proposals are discussed below:

Note that each letter-number combination (eg. D3.6) represents a clause in the Town and Neighbourhood Centres DCP.

**The Main change: Floor Space Ratio for Neighbourhood centres 3(a)** (Neighbourhood centres are small shopping centres, such as at Wellington Rd/Cumberland Rd, Auburn).

**(D3.6) Council's town planners' proposed a maximum Floor Space Ratio of 1:1.**

..... **The Liberals' want a Floor Space Ratio of 1.3:1.**

### SO WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

Floor space ratios are used to control the density of buildings (*ie. Their size and bulk*). A higher number (*ie increasing from 1 to 1.3*) means allowing more floor space for the same sized block of land (*ie more storeys, more ground area coverage, or both!*). That's right: The Liberal councillors want to give developers the right to fill their blocks with bulkier, taller buildings than can be allowed at this present time.

### JUST HOW HIGH DO THEY WANT TO GO? Heights in Town centres 3(a) (D3.7)

Council's town planners currently recommend a 4 storey height limit for **Berala** town centre. The Liberal councillors are asking for 6 storeys. Similarly, in **Lidcombe**, Council's town planners are recommending a 5 storey limit for purely commercial buildings or 6 storeys for mixed commercial/residential buildings in the shopping centre. The Liberals want a maximum of 8 storeys or 25metres from natural ground to eaves (for commercial buildings) and an 8 storey height limit for mixed commercial/residential buildings.

**The Liberal councillors have given no justification for this increase.**

### BUT HOW LARGE OR SMALL WILL THESE FLATS BE?

**WILL THEY BE A COMFORTABLE SIZE FOR PEOPLE TO LIVE IN OR WILL THEY BE 'BUTTER BOXES?'**

| D4.9 Dwelling size (in square metres) | Proposed by staff | Proposed by Liberal |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Studio                                | 38.5              | 38                  |
| 1 bedroom                             | 65                | 50                  |
| 2 bedroom                             | 85                | 75                  |
| 3 bedroom                             | 115               | 95                  |
| 4 bedroom                             | 130               | 115                 |

These sizes suggested by the Liberal Councillors are in accordance with the minimum requirements for affordable housing stipulated in the NSW Government's Residential Flat Design Code, but Auburn Council adopted larger sized units at the suggestion of the real estate agents on the last council, who said that larger units were much more suitable and comfortable for people to live in. There is no reason why council cannot require better for our residents than the bare minimum.

**Note also** that the Liberal councillors' proposed changes fly in the face of promises made during their election campaign: Liberal advertisement: Auburn Review 24/3/2004 Paragraph 8.....

**'approvals were given without careful consideration of the aesthetic appeal OR THE COMFORT OF LIVING THAT OUR RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS SHOULD OFFER'**

**'AND ARE THEY BUILDING UNITS FOR THE 'INVESTMENT MARKET' OR FOR THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE AREA? WE SEEM TO HAVE LARGER FAMILIES THAN MANY OTHER AREAS'**

**Dwelling Mix** (D4.91) Council's town planners proposed that in developments containing 4 or more dwellings, not more than 60% of dwellings should have the same number of bedrooms. The Liberal councillors do not want this section included. They say '...let market forces determine'.

**Adequate mix of apartment types** is something that Cr Victor Korabelnikoff (RAGAA) has been fighting for since his election in March, 2004. Auburn's Draft Social Plan indicators show that Auburn has larger families than the Sydney average. Since 2001, and up to November, 2004, Council has only approved one 4 bedroom unit in the town centres, and only 22% of all units approved by Auburn Council in this time period were 3 bedroom (Note that the Auburn Central development houses a large number of three bedroom units. If it is excluded from this calculation, the percentage of 3 bedroom units approved by Auburn Council since 2001 is a mere 13.61%). The vast majority of units approved (68%, or 76.8% if Auburn Central is excluded) have been 2 bedroom. We believe that 2 bedroom units are more common because they are what investors want to buy, rather than what the existing and emerging community require. Also, as the free-standing housing stock diminishes, we are losing many 3 bedroom dwellings. This reduction in choice for families who require more than 2 bedrooms forces up the price of three bedroom and larger dwellings, for homebuyers and for renters.

**AND WHAT ABOUT THE SHORTAGE OF PARKING IN THE SHOPPING CENTRES? WON'T MORE FLATS MEAN MORE CARS ON THE STREETS..**

| D6.1 | Car parking | Proposed by staff | Proposed by Liberal(min) |
|------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
|      | Studio      | 0.5 car spaces    | 0.5 car spaces           |
|      | 1 bed       | 1                 | 1                        |
|      | 2 bed       | 1                 | 1                        |
|      | 3 bed       | 1.5               | 1                        |
|      | 4 bed       | 1.5               | 2                        |

This Liberal councillors' proposal is interesting because they ran a strong campaign for the council election in 2004 **complaining about the shortage of parking in the town centres**, yet they are now proposing to reduce residential parking requirements. Refer: Auburn review 10/3/2004 pge 6 Lib. Advertisement, para.8. If insufficient parking is provided, car owners from the units will park their cars on the streets, taking away spaces from shoppers. (For example, look at Cr Oueik's block of flats at the corner of Samuel Street/Water Street, Lidcombe most days, and see how many people park on the street).

## AND WHAT ABOUT THE GARDENS?

### HOW DOES COUNCIL ENSURE THAT THEY ARE LOOKED AFTER?

D9.11 Council's town planners proposed that "A bond shall be provided to Council for landscaping. This is refundable in 2 years, providing the landscaping meets the required standard." The Liberal councillors proposed, instead, to limit the time to 6 months. The bond was introduced to stop developers from putting in landscaping, and then not caring for it. The Liberal's proposal would increase the likelihood that trees and shrubs, often planted in order to satisfy council's requirements to provide privacy to neighbours, will not get properly established and may die.

### BUT THE AREA LOOKS UNTIDY...THERE IS ALWAYS RUBBISH ON THE STREETS, PARTICULARLY WHERE THERE ARE MANY UNITS. AND ALL THOSE GARBAGE BINS!!!!!!

Internal parking areas shall be designed to allow access by garbage trucks to Council's satisfaction (D10.2 ) The Liberal councillors want to delete this clause, and say that it is 'unrealistic'. (*This has already been introduced at 23 - 27 Amy St, Regents Park, and will be provided at the building currently under construction at the corner of Rawson St and Northumberland Rd, Auburn.*)

The purpose of this clause is to stop the abundance of garbage bins that we are seeing now on the streets on garbage collection days (and often for several days afterwards) from large unit complexes. Some residential flat buildings house over 100 units (eg. Swete St, Lidcombe). Rows of bins are placed out on the kerbside on collection day in front of these buildings. Auburn Council is investigating the possibility of using a smaller garbage truck to access the basements of these buildings, so that garbage from multiple units can be collected from within the basement, and away from the street.

Refer: Liberal ad Review 17/3/2004 pg 7 Pictures... 'how could you possibly live next to this?' What, then is the Liberal vision for Auburn... hundreds of bins lining Auburn Road. This will do wonders for the image of the area!!!!!!!!!!!!

### BUT WHAT ABOUT THE ELDERLY OR THOSE WHO ARE DISABLED?

#### Adaptable housing (D11.3)

|                        | <b>Proposed</b>   | <b>Liberal</b>    |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| For every 5 – 10 units | 1 adaptable unit  | 0 adaptable units |
| For every 11 –20 units | 2 adaptable units | 1 adaptable unit  |
| For every 21 –30 units | 3 adaptable units | 2 adaptable units |
| etc                    |                   |                   |

Adaptable housing is required to provide for an ageing population and for those who may suffer, now or in the future, from some form of mobility restriction. It requires of the developer such things as wider doorways, to allow for possible wheelchair circulation, lower steps into showers, possibly lower kitchen bench-tops. These units do not have to have all the resources built into them, such as shower rails, but they need to be designed to allow for future use by the disabled or the elderly without major structural changes.

*Council has an obligation to look after ALL its residents, both for now and into the future. This means both the able-bodied and the less able-bodied.*

*The more that people are able to 'age in place', the less disruptive it is to their lives.*

**The mainstay of much of the Liberal advertising was their concern for the well being of the elderly. Refer: Review 10/3/2004 Pg 6**

## **We at RAGAA value your feedback.**

The community must speak up for what it wants, as the voting history of the current council has been disappointing.

**It is time to have your say.**

### ***What can you do?***

*Ring, write or email your councillors Our contact details are located on our website at [www.ragaa.org](http://www.ragaa.org) or visit the council website at [www.auburn.nsw.gov.au](http://www.auburn.nsw.gov.au) and go to 'about your council' and then 'your representatives'*

*You can also write a letter to the Editor of the Auburn Review Pictorial,  
Letters to the Editor, The Review, PO Box 110, Auburn. NSW 1835.  
or email him at [review@torchpublishing.com.au](mailto:review@torchpublishing.com.au)*