

### Attachment 3 Response to Submissions Table

*Note: This table includes all submissions that have provided a written response through the Your Say Randwick consultation page and any written submissions that were received within the exhibition period. To protect the privacy of the submissions, names and addresses have been omitted.*

Submissions	Council officer's response
I fully support changes that will allow property owners to utilize their properties in this manner should they wish to do so.	Support noted.
Are you also looking at relaxing controls for granny flats on block sizes of less than 450sqm and 12m frontage?	No. Development standards relating to 'Granny flats' or secondary dwellings are contained within the State Environmental Planning Policy Affordable Rental Housing 2009. This is a state planning policy and as such the Council has no authority to amend the policy. In addition, subdivision of the secondary dwelling from the principal dwelling is not permitted under this policy.
<p>The planning proposal will reduce the overall amenity of the Randwick city council area with increased dwellings where there's a lack of supporting infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, emergency services, roads, parking, parks, public spaces.</p> <p>The character of the area will change forever in a negative way if these changes are approved.</p>	Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a valid development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. It does not apply to new development and as a result would not cause additional impact on residential amenity and local street character.
I support minimum 400m <sup>2</sup> land size for duplex	Support noted. For example, one of proposed standards is that the area of each lot resulting from Torrens subdivision is no less than 240sqm and the minimum lot size prior to strata subdivision is 450sqm.
if there is a duplex that remains on the one strata title does this apply?	No, the intended provisions as outlined in Part 2 of the draft planning proposal states that for both strata and Torrens title subdivision only one dwelling will be situated on each lot resulting from the subdivision.

<p>I fully support the planning proposal. I think it is great that the council and NSW government finally acknowledge the fact that the old law for having min 900 or 800m2 of land to be subdivided to Torrens title/ strata is unrealistic.</p> <p>The planning proposal now is reflecting the current condition and how many people need housing around thus we need to increase supply.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I support changes being made to make the lot size smaller</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Needs to include existing developments as many families are facing intense hardship</p>	<p>Support noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) is to allow the subdivision of existing and/or approved dual occupancies in the R2 zone with a development consent issued before the 6 July 2018.</p>
<p>Include existing properties as well as new developments</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) is to allow the subdivision of existing and/or approved dual occupancies in the R2 zone with a development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. In relation to new development, the State Government's new Low Rise Medium Density Code may apply after 6 July 2018. Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development will be undertaken in preparation of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>should have been proposed long time ago</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>well needed</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>As an owner of a company title duplex in Maroubra, I hope the proposed plan become reality soon.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>I believe the proposed changes to RLEP will help our residents currently effected by bank lending criteria. The changes will allow owners of company titled dual occupancies to subdivide into lots allowing the owners to qualify for loans and secure or release funds from banks. These changes will allow ALL home owners in RCC to be considered equal and to provide for their families education, health and future financial security. The proposed RLEP changes are fair and equitable and will not increase development in RCC because the changes relate to existing built form dual occupancies that have been part of our built form for many years. The proposed RLEP changes are fair and equitable and I fully support the changes because the new NSW Low Rise Medium Density Code will allow dual occupancies to be subdivided (meeting minimum lot size requirements) with DA consent after the introduction of the new Code. The new NSW Low Rise Medium Density Code does not control existing dual occupancies. The proposed changes to the RLEP will bring existing dual occupancies and future dual occupancies into alignment and all owners will be treated fairly by banks.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>This is fantastic news for people in the community who are stuck on antiquated Company Title (duplex) provisions. They will now be able to sub-divide and get re-financing or simply be able to sell their property. This benefits me personally as we currently have an approved plan to build a duplex. This means we can put provisions in to meet the new requirements and strata or Torrens title our property ensuring our duplex is separate from our neighbours, allowing us and them the flexibility to either have a "forever home" or sell separately.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I think this is a wise move by the council, as company titles are very unattractive and hard to finance.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>The surrounding infrastructures are not planned accordingly to support such changes at this moment</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a valid development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. It does not apply to new development and as a result would not cause additional impact on residential amenity and local street character.</p>
<p>I think it is a great idea to allow the amendment and allow people to build duplexes rather than high rise units. Duplex will have less impact and stress on the infrastructure than multi story units</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Fantastic news for everyone</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>This needs to be changed for all duplexes in the future. Not just ones that are currently built</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies. Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development will be undertaken in preparation of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>To crowd already. We don't want more people living in eastern suburbs.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies. However, the Council will need to plan for future housing growth to accommodate projected population growth.</p>
<p>I want to have a fair chance to on sell my company title property in the future. At the moment we severely disadvantaged</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>The Randwick LGA is not pulling its weight in terms of development compared to other Local Government areas around Sydney. The area needs more development, not less. Therefore minimum lot sizes in Randwick should follow the State Government's Medium Housing Code, rather than applying a more restrictive code.</p>	<p>Noted. Council will soon commence a Local Housing Strategy (as required by the Eastern City District Plan) to identify areas that could support additional housing growth supported by existing and/or planned infrastructure.</p>

<p>As owners of a company title property in Matraville we desperately need our company title to change to a torrens title. As it stands we are financially crippled by a bank decisions that were changed after we made our purchase. We strongly believe existing dwellings should be allowed the opportunity to change their title. However, in regards to future development approvals we believe additional consideration is required. Thank you</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>The minimum width of 6m is just not acceptable. It should be at minimum 8m.</p>	<p>Noted. The Planning Proposal adopts the same subdivision standards (i.e minimum frontage of 6m) as those contained in the State Government's new Low Rise Medium Density Housing Code. Any future review of associated development standards will be undertaken as part of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>Schools, public transport, roads and parking are insufficient to cope with more occupants in the area. There has already been too many new dwellings approved without increase to services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a valid development consent issued before 6 July 2018. It does not apply to new development.</p>
<p>It is absolutely ESSENTIAL that our Federal Government puts in place a policy on population. Our immigration levels have become unsustainable and regardless of how it is sold to us (economic growth, increased jobs etc.etc.) our population as it is right now cannot keep pace with our infrastructure and this is leading to the biggest problem of all which is " a Rapid increase in a declining standard of living for us all"</p>	<p>Comment noted. This is outside the scope of strategic planning.</p>
<p>We believe that the minimum lot size should be 400 - 440sqm for subdivision for dual occupancy as a lot of the semi-detached homes in this area are sitting on about 221 sqm of land. We would like to have dual occupancy on our land of 446 sqm as this will enable us to have family members living next to us. Our ages are 79 and 75 and we would prefer to live at home rather than at a nursing home should circumstances allow. Dual occupancy on 446 sqm will facilitate that.</p>	<p>Noted. Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size standards for new development and applicable development standards for attached dual occupancies will be undertaken as part of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>

<p>It's important that existing duplexes are able to move to strata or Torrens. Currently there are many residents who can't sell their properties and this isn't fair or equitable</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>My husband and I purchase our first home together 4 years ago... he grew up in the area and didn't want to leave. We purchased a Duplex which is set up as a Company title due to the constraints regarding lot sizes. I am unsure why Randwick Council is the only Council in Australia who has the "rule" that blocks under 800sqm can't be sub divided?  At the time, we were banking with St George and had no problems securing finance for our property and to say we secured our property at a reduced rate is a stretch!</p> <p>The point we are struggling with, is why the constraints relating to sub division for blocks under 800sqm exist? Why is council allowing for these properties to be built, if they are concerned about over population and affordable housing?</p> <p>1) Approving for a duplex to be built is providing approval for additional people to live on the block - why does it matter to council if it's on one title or two? Financially, I'm sure Council is not being disadvantaged. Council rates are billed to each duplex separately, we have our own bins etc.</p> <p>2) The more properties available, the more affordable housing is. Give families a chance to secure a home in this great area of ours. As I'm sure you are aware, securing finance for properties under company title is no longer as easy as it once was - give everyone more of a chance to get into the market.</p> <p>We are a young couple, with two very young children and would like to invest in their future. We have (and do) work extremely hard to live where we live and are concerned that if a change isn't made to allow us to move to either a Strata or Torrens Title, all of our hard work will be in vain and our property will be extremely hard to sell when we are ready to upsize. Please provide us with the security that either a Strata title or Torrens Title can provide our family. Please vote yes to change at the council meeting this week.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Thank-you for your time	
<p>My wife and I purchase our first home together 4 years ago... he grew up in the area and didn't want to leave. We purchased a Duplex which is set up as a Company title due to the constraints regarding lot sizes. I am unsure why Randwick Council is the only Council in Australia who has the "rule" that blocks under 800sqm can't be sub divided?  At the time, we were banking with St George and had no problems securing finance for our property and to say we secured our property at a reduced rate is a stretch!</p> <p>The point we are struggling with, is why the constraints relating to sub division for blocks under 800sqm exist? Why is council allowing for these properties to be built, if they are concerned about over population and affordable housing?</p> <p>1) Approving for a duplex to be built is providing approval for additional people to live on the block - why does it matter to council if it's on one title or two? Financially, I'm sure Council is not being disadvantaged. Council rates are billed to each duplex separately, we have our own bins etc.</p> <p>2) The more properties available, the more affordable housing is. Give families a chance to secure a home in this great area of ours. As I'm sure you are aware, securing finance for properties under company title is no longer as easy as it once was - give everyone more of a chance to get into the market.</p> <p>We are a young couple, with two very young children and would like to invest in their future. We have (and do) work extremely hard to live where we live and are concerned that if a change isn't made to allow us to move to either a Strata or Torrens Title, all of our hard work will be in vain and our property will be extremely hard to sell when we are ready to upsize. Please provide us with the security that either a Strata title or Torrens Title can provide our family. Please vote yes to change at the council meeting this week.</p> <p>Thank-you for your time</p>	Support noted.

<p>More duplexes changes the nature of the suburb, including removal of trees and parking. We are already overcrowded, we cant park, roads are over congested, public transport is oversubscribed and the whole place is polluted. Enough.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a valid development consent issued before 6 July 2018. It will not apply to new development.</p>
<p>You allowed my duplex to be built, took all the fees, so please allow me to title it without punitive penalty.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>This will solve our problems as dual occupancy owners have been built since early 2000. Thank you</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>The provisions are currently grossly inadequate and more should be done to lower the minimum to a workable level, however council is acting poorly in pre-empting the infrastructure required. This is not an issue that has appeared all of a sudden. Poor planning for the past decade has created an issue where there shouldn't be one, and placed pressure on home and land owners.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) is to permit subdivision of existing and/or approved dual occupancies (with a valid development consent issued before 6 July 2018) in the R2 Low Density zone. Any future review of the minimum lot size controls will be undertaken in preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>The proposal would further strain our traffic congestion and quality of life in our community is already strained by the overpopulation and minimal soft green spaces. Our neighbourhood is already disgruntled by the dual occupancy that has somehow passed through council even though the block size was less than 450msq. Monster hard surfaces are already an eye sore and add more homes on the smaller blocks would be a tragedy to allow.</p>	<p>The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a valid development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. It will not apply to new development.</p>
<p>Our area is hugely overpopulated already, schools are overloaded, it's impossible getting anywhere on the road. All the beach suburbs have poor public transport options (buses only). Our development is going far too fast and far too much</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Provide the infrastructure, schools, transport first, then talk about cramming more people in.	Noted. Council's Local Housing Strategy will ensure that areas identified for future growth is supported by existing and/or planned infrastructure provision and key services.
A very good move, thank you.	Support noted.
This should be done asap	Support noted.
Do not stand in the way of people wanting to have a more comfortable life	General comment noted.
Area already overcrowded. Infrastructure can't cope with existing population now with many existing high rise already	Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies which would not cause additional impact on residential amenity and local street character. A comprehensive planning process including preparation of a Local Housing Strategy and an updated LEP will be undertaken to ensure that future growth is supported by existing and/or planned infrastructure provision and key services. See Council report for Council officer's response to the raised issues.
This is extremely important to the wellbeing of homeowners who committed to these properties prior to the lending constraints being imposed without notice. Duplexes on land between 250-350sqm offer a fantastic balance between affordability and lifestyle for young families while maintaining the street space and avoiding medium and high density housing. These duplexes are far more efficient and environmentally sustainable than standalone alternatives, housing many more people, at much higher building standards with little to no negative impacts on surrounding infrastructure, congestion and liveability.	Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.
Council should listen to the people and also conform to advice handed down by higher powers who have a far greater knowledge on the subject than combined councillors - it is the NSW Planning Department's area of expertise and our area needs this kind of housing NOT HUGE HIGH RISES.	Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.

<p>Allowed dual occupancy to subdivide is great to solve the existing financial problem for the owners. Also encouraging dual occupancy is a good way to allow population growth in the area avoiding more high buildings. So eastern suburb can still grow but keep the traditional low density style.</p> <p>Well done council!</p>	<p>Support noted. The Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>I think its a brilliant idea.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>If you allowed a dual occupancy to be built in the first place, then NOTHING will change, not the amount of occupants, not the amount of cars etc as all this was approved when you approved the dual occupancy. All that will change is it will assist with financing the purchase (hence affordability) for Australians to purchase a home.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) will permit the subdivision of existing and/or approved dual occupancies (with a valid development consent issued before the 6 July 2018) in the R2 Low Density zone. As the submission notes, it will not create additional density to what has already been approved by the Council.</p>
<p>Reading your report I wholeheartedly support the council in taking the step in the right direction to retrospectively address Company Title subdivisions and allow for Strata or Torrens title. This is an issue for a large number of Randwick residents that are under stress because of the current lending restrictions from the banks.</p> <p>We look forward to Councils assistance in resolving this long standing issue ASAP.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I think this will provide more housing options for people, especially within a certain price bracket due to the slightly smaller land the dual occupancy will sit on. Allowing more people to stay in the suburbs they love &amp; possible own a home due to affordability.</p> <p>There are currently many semis sitting on blocks of land 250+sqm per house, providing amazing homes for people in the east!!</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>

<p>I support the planning proposal as it will eliminate the current planning anomaly where some dual occupancies that are already built are forced into company title arrangements. This change will have no impact on the built environment as the subject properties are either already constructed or approved to be constructed. As such the change will have no impact on neighbourhood amenity and is a change on paper only. The planning proposal changes will not increase the number of dual occupancies already built or allowed to be built and will result in no physical changes to the built environment - as such these changes will be all but invisible to other Randwick Council Residents but will be very helpful to those trapped in unfavourable company title arrangements.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>For developments that have already been built, DA's that are underway and for any future developments the Planning Proposal should go ahead to allow for the minimum lot size of 450m2 and Torrens/strata title subdivision to occur.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Its overdue, adjacent council allows subdivision for 450sqm blocks</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>There is many duplex which are better served as in strata or Torrens title</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>This is something that should have been done by council a long time ago and I think that Duplexes are a great option for people to buy in the area.</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>

<p>I am a 29 year old school teacher with a partner and baby on the way. I would love to see this change take effect ASAP as I would like to build a duplex with my parents. This would be a great support for myself and my partner living next to my parents and to remain in the area that I was born and raised in</p>	<p>Support noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies. Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development will be undertaken in preparation of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>We would be grateful if RCC could approve and turn the proposal into law asap so that we can apply for a subdivision DA to change our current company title duplex at [REDACTED] to torrens or strata title. We have 3 young children. We wanted to refinance the property but banks rejected the application because they had decided to stop lending to company title duplexes. This issue has put our family under a lot of financial stress. We are certain that other company title duplex owners are having the same financial stress as well.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I think it's an excellent idea.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>This proposal definitely needs to go ahead. Randwick Council should be listening to the people.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>We desperately need more affordable housing, and more housing choice. Amending the lot size will allow more to be built, and smaller homes will be built. Those 2 factors (more choice and smaller sizes) will reduce prices and allow families to avoid unit living.</p>	<p>Support noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies. Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development will be undertaken in preparation of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>I think they should be changed, so more people can live in a house not an apartment. Our children are being forced out of where they grew up because single block houses are too expensive. Duplex's make sense and are much more affordable, but if banks are not lending on Company Title they cannot get a foot in the housing market in this area.</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>

Hurry it up. Very much needed to make housing affordable and the sort after areas obtainable	Support noted.
It's the right thing to do for families today and in our future	Support noted.
Allow for more development	Noted. The Council will need to plan for increased housing capacity to meet projected population growth to 2036, as part of its Local Housing Strategy. The strategy will identify areas that may support increased growth but only where it is supported by existing and/or planned local infrastructure and services.
It's long overdue that our area embrace change and allow more affordable solutions to residents	Support noted.
I think if you don't let this pass you are sending many people to financial hardship or ruin. You cannot build all those apartments and then stand against the simple change of allowing subdivision and people to get out of company title. It's so contradictory.	Support noted.
This shouldn't stil be in question. You told the people you would support and pass it.	Support noted.
I am keen for this to be passed as soon as possible as I own a duplex and want to change over to strata/ torrens	Support noted.
You have passed the duplex's to be built and have met your requirements so why would you not let them be sub divided. I can't believe this has not been done until now. This company title has effected a lot of people and should be amended as quickly as possible! You are quick to let units be built all over the local area and duplex's are a better option for young families and downsizes who still want a backyard.	Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.
I think it will improve housing accessibility and affordability in the area	Support noted.

<p>This is fair and reasonable. Conversely, objecting to this is a genuine attack on the well being of constituents.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Way overdue, Councillors should be sacked for doing nothing in converting company title properties to strata and Torrens title, using a lack of infrastructure as an excuse but approving the Meriton monster at Pagewood - corruption !</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>It has to change. Let's stop running agendas and start looking at the stats. We need more affordable housing.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>It will help eliminate the archaic Company Title.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Its a sensible idea that needs to be fast tracked</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Criminal that RCC has made homeowners comply under company title for a duplex - the additional expense is financially crippling.</p>	<p>General comment noted.</p>
<p>Needs to be done to support families stuck with company titles unable to sell their homes.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I support the planning proposal 100%. However, I am concerned that Council is taking a fundamentally contradictory and inconsistent approach by introducing a planning amendment based on the medium density code and yet seek to defer the implementation of the medium density code (and possibly seeking an exemption altogether) at the same time. I think the Council's strategy is very inconsistent and confusing to the community. The community is effectively left in limbo land after 6 July where medium density planning certainty effectively disappears.</p> <p>I believe the Council's arguments for seeking deferment of the code are flawed and lack any credible evidence. For instance, just because there may be 8000+ more potentially subdividable blocks under the new code</p>	<p>Support noted. However, in relation to Council's request to defer the commencement of the Code, the Council has sought a deferral to the commencement of the Code until such time that the Council has undertaken its Local Housing Strategy. This is to identify where best housing growth should be located and importantly be supported by infrastructure and services. The application of the low rise code will be mostly felt to the south of the city which are not as well serviced by infrastructure and services. Therefore the Council seeks to take a precautionary approach to ensure increased densities, particularly, in these areas can be supported.</p>

<p>does not mean they will all be subdivided at once over a short period. The subdivisions will definitely occur, but most likely at a modest pace over the next few years. As for wanting to defer the code to make sure we have adequate infrastructure in place, one can have a field day with this argument! This has not stopped large scale apartment complexes being constructed in the area - look at Pagewood Green and High Rise Harry's 3000 new apartments - where were the infrastructure concerns when this project was approved?</p> <p>As a local resident and father of a young family, I am sharply disappointed that the Council is opposing the medium density code - no building code will ever be perfect and satisfy everyone - but for what it tries to achieve, this is a good code that really makes an attempt to address housing supply and affordability. How can Council oppose a code that only permits two story dwellings and at density levels already permitted under the local LEP? All the code really allows is residents with larger blocks of land to do more with these blocks - such as building duplexes for their kids and in-laws. There is also a design framework within the code to ensure that new duplexes and townhouses are built to a high standard.</p> <p>By opposing a code with such modest objectives and with such feeble arguments, the Council seems to be acting opportunistically and failing in its key responsibility to serve the local community. The Council has had two years to consider the code and get its own housing strategy in order - it simply isn't fair on the local community to oppose it now and throw medium density planning into another long period of uncertainty and limbo.</p>	
<p>It's good to see Randwick Council responding so positively to community needs. However, I was very concerned to learn that Council is seeking deferment of the medium density code. This seems quite contradictory. Why have a planning amendment based on a code that Council is seeking to defer or gain an exemption from? I believe the Council should embrace the new code which only permits two story dual occupancies. By opposing the code only weeks before the implementation date, the Council risks losing the trust and confidence of the local community.</p>	<p>Support noted. However, in relation to Council's request to defer the commencement of the Code, the Council has sought a deferral to the commencement of the Code until such time that the Council has undertaken its Local Housing Strategy. This is to identify where best housing growth should be located and importantly be supported by infrastructure and services.</p>

<p>Duplex better in many ways.</p> <p>Units and large developments are the real issue. Places more pressure on infrastructure.</p> <p>Duplex upgrades steer scrape and removes old asbestos homes.</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>I believe if council has approved the existing DA approvals for duplex's I think they should be able to sub divide as a Torres or Strata title.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I 100% support this. High rises are a much bigger issue than council allowing subdivision of smaller sized blocks! Why would council be against this when the state is supportive? Come on Randwick, at the very least, we need to get this through for the people already locked into company title with existing duplexes already built.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>About time and great to support constituents of Randwick council that have been significantly impacted by the banks withdrawal of company title lending.</p> <p>We are living in large duplexes approved by the council and should have equal rights to Torrens or strata title.</p> <p>The sooner the better.</p> <p>Many Thanks</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>You do a right thing!</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>We are already having terrible problems with parking in residential areas. This change will have a serious and devastating effect. There is nothing worse than coming home after a busy day and not finding a parking spot close to home because there are so many new driveways. Nevermind the ridiculous traffic that already exists where there was none only 10 years ago before all the highrises. The light rail is already inadequate before it has even started. The new parking lots are an insufficient joke and the overall program certainly will not be able to handle the increased traffic load.</p> <p>Backyards and greenery are vital for suppressing stress and anxiety and promoting relaxing and privacy. To say there is no negative affect on our environment and our lives is absurd and irresponsible. This will destroy the sought after residential living.</p>	<p>The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. It does not apply to new development.</p>
<p>There should be no issue with approving this change for existing and approved developments as there will be no impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Company title should NOT exist</p>	<p>Noted. Company title legislation is governed by Commonwealth legislation and is outside the scope of local government.</p>
<p>I support the planning proposal as it will eliminate the current planning anomaly where some dual occupancies that are already built are forced into archane company title arrangements. This change will have no impact on the built environment as the subject properties are either already constructed or approved to be constructed. As such the change will have no impact on neighbourhood amenity and is a change on paper only. The planning proposal changes will not increase the number of dual occupancies already built or allowed to be built and will result in no physical changes to the built environment - as such these changes will be all but invisible to other Randwick Council Residents but will be very helpful to those trapped in unfavourable company title arrangements.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>Need to keep Company Title problems from rearing its ugly head again and by correcting the RLEP this will address this family destroying archaic problem.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>How can a supposedly progressive Council not change its LEP to support our children and grandchildren to be able to afford a home in the area they grew up in and to be close by to support their aging parents. By changing the LEP to allow duplex's to be built on blocks under 800m2 and not be locked into Company Title allows them to do so.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Yes I definitely support the Planning Proposal. It should be amended without further delay.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Council are seriously reducing the quality of life of residents in Randwick Council. Pockets of low density living within reasonable proximity to the city should be preserved. Yes, as local homeowners, we may miss out on accessing higher prices for our house on sale, but the lifestyle of the Southern end of the Eastern suburbs one which used to be the norm in Australia. It should be respected and preserved. Council already allows over development of the Anzac Parade corridor. Enough, let's preserve the lifestyle residents have chosen.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. It does not apply to new development.</p>
<p>Please get on with it. You have massive developments going up all over the place, including Eastgardens &amp; the Randwick Inglis stables, and you are worried about these subdivision. Sydneys population is heading toward 8 million over the next 25 years. People want to live somewhere near the CBD. As the English writer 'Samuel Johnson' said, "Nothing will ever be attempted, if all possible objections must first be overcome".</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>This is a very sensible amendment to fix prior Randwick City Council poor planning rules. The creation of Torrens or Strata titles for current Company title duplexes will see absolutely no negative impact on Randwick City as all of these premises are already built or have already</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

been approved to be built. At present there are families who are suffering severe financial hardship and cannot sell their home to alleviate this hardship. Please do not delay this process any further.

I have resided within the LGA my whole life (51 years) and this is the first time I have ever written to council on any issue.

In 2016 I purchased a three bedroom duplex in the suburb of Chifley. I then resided in this property with my wife and two children.

In 2017 I commenced a renovation of a property in Maroubra with the plan to sell the Chifley property to pay for the renovation and move into the Maroubra property with my family. During this time I was made aware that banks and financial institutions had stopped lending towards purchases of duplex properties in the Randwick Council LGA. I had recently retired 'Hurt on Duty' after a 30 plus year career with the NSW Police Force and had used all of my retirement lump sum towards the renovation costs. This has now left me in a position that I am unable to sell the Chifley property as no-one can obtain finance for a Randwick LGA Company Title duplex. I am now left holding two properties with significant mortgages without the ability to sell the Chifley property. This has caused myself and my family significant stress and I am aware that there are other examples in the LGA of stress and financial hardship due to your planning controls on duplex zoning.

As stated, I have been a police officer for over 30 years and during that time I have seen the result of families dealing with financial hardship which on occasions has contributed to persons taking their own life. I would hate to hear of any person committing suicide as a result of this issue and your council subsequently being called to account before a tribunal such as the NSW Coroners Court. Once again I implore you to expedite change to your planning laws to reduce this financial stress being applied to your rate payers who own company title duplexes.

<p>Currently our family is suffering undue financial hardship due to the zoning for our Duplex being Company Title and the banks will not lend money on this title. Torrens or Strata Title changes are sensible and will not have any negative impact on Randwick City as all of these duplexes have already been approved for sub-division</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Currently our family is suffering undue financial hardship due to the zoning for our Duplex being Company Title and the banks will not lend money on this title. Torrens or Strata Title changes are sensible and will not have any negative impact on Randwick City as all of these duplexes have already been approved for sub-division</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>It should go ahead</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I support the planning proposal as it will eliminate the current planning anomaly where some dual occupancies that are already built are forced into company title arrangements. This change will have no impact on the built environment as the subject properties are either already constructed or approved to be constructed. As such the change will have no impact on neighbourhood amenity and is a change on paper only. The planning proposal changes will not increase the number of dual occupancies already built or allowed to be built and will result in no physical changes to the built environment - as such these changes will be all but invisible to other Randwick Council Residents but will be very helpful to those trapped in unfavourable company title arrangements.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Allow company titleholder to be subdivide to torrent titles</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>Not only should the lot size be in line with the state laws current Company Title lots should immediately be entitled to apply for Torrens or Strata Title and fix the archaic title Randwick Council has forced onto residents.</p>	<p>Support noted. Only once the proposed amendment is finalised can the proponent then apply to the Council through a development application for Torrens and/or strata subdivision of the subject property.</p>
<p>This will be a welcome result for families caught in the tightening of bank finance. I thank Council for their support and understanding on this matter.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Currently, it is possible to construct a dual-occupancy dwelling on a block size of 600 sq metres on the proviso that it is registered as Company Title. Under the proposed legislation, the owners of an identical dual-occupancy dwelling would be able to subdivide the property and register the titles under the Torrens system.</p> <p>This would give an owner complete autonomy with respect to his/her individual property and remove the ability of the owner of adjoining property to affect the quality of life of the neighbour.</p> <p>Company Title was introduced 100 years ago to cater for the ownership of apartments in the blocks of flats that were constructed in the 1920s and 1930s. It is now obsolete.</p> <p>Replacement of the current Company Title registration will allow the owners greater access to a wide range of mortgage lenders instead of being restricted to the 4 major banks at present.</p> <p>The ability to subdivide smaller blocks will bring those new dual-occupancy dwellings in line with the hundreds of existing Victorian terraces and semis that are, quite possibly, constructed on smaller blocks than those proposed under the new legislation.</p> <p>I currently live in a terraced property in the middle of South Coogee. The terrace was constructed in 2012. The block size is 219sqm and the floor space ratio is 90%. This high-density building is situated in the middle of</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development will be undertaken in preparation of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>

<p>South Coogee and was allowed because of the original zoning of the land. There is, obviously, hypocrisy between the development of land previously owned by a government body that provides for lot sizes of 219 sq metres to be subdivided and registered under the Torrens system (and allows for 90% FSR) and the existing requirement that requires a block of 750 sq metres to be registered as a Company Title if it is to be used for a dual-occupancy. Not to mention the hypocrisy of the hundreds of existing Victorian terraces and semis on blocks that are less than 200 sq metres.</p> <p>Randwick Council announced that “at a meeting on Tuesday 17 April 2018, Council resolved to amend its planning controls to permit existing and approved dual occupancy properties to subdivide down to 225sqm”. As a result, there would be numerous purchasers who, in good faith, registered their blocks in individual names. In the event that Company Title registration is still required by Council, those purchasers will be required to pay Stamp Duty a second time to have the land transferred to a company. On a purchase of \$2,400,000, that would result in a second Stamp Duty payment of approximately \$125,000. This, obviously, will cause an unfair and crippling financial imposition on those people who relied on Council’s publicity releases regarding its plan allow smaller subdivision.</p> <p>Finally, if Council is concerned with housing density, the obvious solution is to set a minimum lot size of, say, 600 square metres, that would be eligible for subdivision.</p> <p>This would be little different from the existing development plans with the only difference being the registration of the dual-occupancy dwellings under the Torrens system instead of Company Title.</p>	
<p>The primary control for what type of dwelling can be built on a lot should be the Development Control Plan (DCP). I support the current minimum lot size requirement (450sqm) for dual occupancy or possibly a small reduction to 400 sqm. However, subdivision should be aligned to the minimum lot size requirement per the DCP. In other words, I support that there is no or minimal change to the current DCP. However, I do support reducing the minimum lot size for subdivision to be in line with the DCP - if the DCP allows a dual occupancy, then you should be allowed to</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development and applicable development standards for attached dual occupancies will be undertaken in preparation of Council’s Local Housing Strategy.</p>

<p>subdivide allowing for Strata or Torrens title to be applied to each dwelling.</p>	
<p>As lenders will now no longer lend money to people wishing to purchase a company title property, this effectively traps company title property owners as they cannot sell. This is extremely stressful for families whose circumstances may have changed and they need to sell their company title property</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>I would like to ask Council to consider adding an important clarification to the proposed LEP changes. My husband and I own an attached dual occupancy (duplexes) that would qualify for strata title subdivision under the proposed LEP changes. However, the property we have is very old and we have been planning to build new duplexes on the same land. It is not clear to me how the proposed LEP changes would accommodate this scenario. The proposed planning amendment needs to clarify that attached dual occupancies which qualify for Strata/Torrens title under the LEP changes can also be built new with Strata/Torrens title if the owners need to do this. Otherwise we will have a rather curious situation where owners won't be able to build new over a pre-existing structure once they are given strata title on the old property! Nor should owners be forced to dissolve one strata plan (which is a costly and lengthy process) and reapply for another strata plan for a new build of a pre-existing structure - owners should only be required to go through one strata application process if they are intending to replace old duplexes for new.</p>	<p>The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies. Subdivision applications for any new dual occupancy development which does not have a development consent issued by 6 July 2018, will be subject to the current LEP minimum subdivision lot size provisions (i.e. 400sqm for R2 zone). Any future review of the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development and applicable development standards for attached dual occupancies will be undertaken in preparation of Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>To the General Manager Randwick City Council</p> <p>PLANNING PROPOSAL: MINIMUM SUBDIVISION LOT SIZE</p> <p>I support the Planning Proposal to amend the minimum subdivision provisions in the Randwick Local Environmental Plan 2012.</p> <p>I am a resident of Randwick City Council with a young family. We live in a duplex in Little Bay. Purchasing a duplex (dual occupancy) was one of the few affordable options we had to remain living in the local area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

I am in support of any amendment to the LEP that would enable properties on which a Dual occupancy has been developed to subdivide a Torrens Title, thereby eliminating the necessity of a Company Title for many of the duplex/dual occupancies in the LGA.

A number of financial institutions have indicated they will no longer be financing loans for properties on a company title. As a result many current and prospective owners of these properties will be find it more difficult to buy and sell in Randwick City Council.

As you will know the current LEP specifies the minimum lot size for an application/approval for subdivision. This minimum lot size requirement is in excess of a large majority of dual occupancies built in the local area. Development of these dual occupancies have been approved by Randwick City Council. Due to the limitations of the LEP, with respect to subdivision, many owners have had no choice but to create a company title to manage financing the properties, particularly were two unrelated parties live side by side.

If we are to maintain a diverse and vibrant community Randwick City Council must change it's development guidelines to effectively respond to a changing and more restrictive lending environment in addition to a sharp acceleration in property prices over recent years.

Kind Regards



This will allow long term family members to be able to stay in the areas they grew up in and relieve pressure caused by company tittles shortfalls in financing dual occupancies.

Support noted.

<p>I agree with all the points on the Planning Proposal. A very welcomed and much needed change.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>The planning proposal will lead to increasing population in the Randwick area with consequent increase in traffic congestion, loss of amenity, loss of the local character, typified by Federation to 1930s housing. The increasing urban density and consequent traffic creating a microclimate along the so called "main roads" exposing people who walk along the roads or cycle to increased air pollution. The health effects of traffic related air pollution are well known and include increases in the incidence of lung cancer and asthma. The population of Clovelly alone has doubled in 20 years and is likely to double again in less than 10 years. I note that the On 16 January 2018, the Department released Planning System Circular PS 18-001 respecting and enhancing local character in the planning system, however this proposal will act to destroy local character.</p>	<p>To clarify, the proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies. It applies retrospectively. In relation to the referenced planning circular, this circular is to be considered in preparation of Council's Local Housing Strategy and Local Strategic Planning Statement.</p>
<p>Why not you build high rises everywhere I'd much prefer medium density housing in my areas &amp; I don't like in a duplex or own one it just makes sense.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>LONG OVERDUE! More homes with yards for families rather than units!!!</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity.</p>
<p>Council should permit owners of dual occupancy properties to have same rights as other owners in Australia</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Council does not have the right to force properties to convert their property to company title.</p>	<p>Company title legislation is governend by Commonwealth legislation which is outside the scope of local government.</p>

<p>I am an owner and occupier of a duplex property. I have gone through undue stress and unnecessary expense clearly caused by the archaic rules of the outdated LEP. The current rules are outdated and are not in keeping with the Australia wide policies by other councils. This new rule will establish a consistent approach to these type of approved dual occupancies and will have no effect on the amenities of the local area as the structures are already existing. In fact, Randwick Council will benefit from their ability to apply a new rate structure. This money can be used to serve the broader Randwick Council community in many positive ways.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I am born and raised in the Randwick area. I want the option of affordable housing when it comes time to buy a home.</p>	<p>General comment noted. The provision of affordable housing is essential to maintain the socio-economic functions of a city and will be a key consideration in the Council's Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>I believe council should approve all company title duplex to become Torrens titled</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) is to permit subdivision of existing and/or approved dual occupancies in the R2 zone with development consent in accordance with relevant subdivision standards. For example, one of proposed standards is that the area of each lot resulting from Torrens subdivision is no less than 240sqm and the minimum lot size prior to strata subdivision is 450sqm.</p>
<p>I agree to the proposal as we are one of the families effected as we are in a Company Title residence. We purchased our property over 12 years ago when there was no issue of banks lending on Company Title properties. We are now in a position as are so many other families that unless this Planning Proposal is approved we will find it near impossible to sell or borrow money against our property as the banks no longer see our homes as assets. I am very much for this change and the sooner the better for all the affected families in our area.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>As the owner-occupying of a company title property, I am quite concerned with the changes in financing company title properties. Owners are being penalised significantly by the increased restrictions imposed by the banks. This unfair situation has dire financial consequences. For example, my neighbour just lost \$250,000 in selling his property, just because of absurd lending restrictions.</p> <p>The combination of high prices and banks asking for greater deposits (40% deposit, I believe) makes the selling of our properties a financial penalty. Thus, when our circumstances change (e.g., death, divorce, increase in the family) not only we get the stress of the change but also become worse off in financial terms.</p> <p>While the banks penalise owners of company title dual occupancy premises, also the Randwick City Council is responsible for our situation. The Randwick City Council created the problem in the first place allowing the Company Title to exist and then locking us in. When I bought my property I was coming from Canberra and had no idea of the restrictions and significance of owning a Company Title home; now we are not able to convert the title and moving to a similar non-company title property would cost me too much money. This circumstance is just wrong.</p> <p>Finally, I appreciate the Randwick City Council initiative and consultation; it recognises a situation that needs addressing. I sincerely hope the current Councillors vote for a change and rectify this unjust situation.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Extremely disappointed that Randwick Council, after hearing all their effected residents speak out at local forums, now want to delay the changes to the smaller block size. Why do we have to tolerate such incompetent management. These councillors may be well meaning, but clearly are not up to the task of running such an important issue as this which is clearly hurting so many people. From the meetings I have attended there is no good reason not to make the change so why in the world would OUR council now seek to delay. Can each councillor please give their reasons so we, the voters, can see who thinks what and who should stay in council next election.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has sought a deferral to the commencement of the Code until such time that the Council has undertaken its Local Housing Strategy to identify where best housing growth should be located and importantly be supported by infrastructure and services. The application of the low rise code will be mostly felt to the south of the city which are not as well serviced by infrastructure and services. Therefore the Council seeks to take a precautionary approach to ensure increased densities, particularly, in these areas can be supported.</p>

<p>This has been promised by council to the community who were represented very strongly in the Community Forum earlier this year. It would alleviate hardship for those wishing to call on equity in their homes and provide some much needed medium density housing in the area. The current DA process requires at least 50% open space which is much more preferable than the 90% in the new MDHC and the CDC. We need more family homes for our kids not just high-rise.... This is way overdue!!!!</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>This is necessary as the infrastructure is already failing</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I believe it is fair to support this amendment to the RLEP because it will align other property in the Randwick LGA with the same financial services available. That is, banks will allow funds to be secured by a title deed not a share certificate as is now the case for company title properties.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Infrastructure will not be able to support increased number of dwellings. There will be negative impact to residence and the nature.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies which would not cause additional impact on residential amenity and local street character. A comprehensive planning process including preparation of a Local Housing Strategy and an updated LEP will be undertaken to ensure that future growth is supported by existing and/or planned infrastructure provision and key services.</p>
<p>The block size of 450sqm is too small for dual occupancy and will negatively impact on our area with increased congestion.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies which would not cause additional impact on residential amenity and local street character. The issues raised will be considered when Council reviews the minimum subdivision lot size controls for new development in preparation of the Local Housing Strategy. See Council report for Council officer's response.</p>

<p>Times are changing. It's no longer reasonable for individual private dwellings to use so much land, or for governments to unreasonably constrain homeowners from making the most of their land. I picture a future in which a significant minority of houses in Randwick have a granny flat; it's the perfect solution for relieving housing stress with low impact on streetscapes or community culture. Allowing dual occupancies on smaller lots (225sqm +) is a great use of land, increasing density without height, keeping families together, and addressing the affordability crisis for both buyers and renters.</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>Dear Council, Council's move to amend these planning controls has been a great move which will bring more housing choice to the municipality as well as providing relief for the many owners who have been caught up with banking restrictions for such properties. I believe there should be more discussion for duplex / dual occupancy housing in the city of Randwick. In the future if we can reduce the lot sizes to even smaller blocks, we might make owning an actual house with a small yard in the East a possible dream for more people.</p> <p>Sincerely [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Dear Sirs

I strongly object dual occupancy title in single house zone.

I am , [REDACTED] , Live at [REDACTED] . At 2017 I bought blank land at Prince Henry of Little Bay and built a single torren house then moved in 2010 . But , the neighbor No 4 just started construction since 2018 , which means I have bear the invasion of the rats and insects to me for 8 years , more worse things is the more than 12 months site construction turned up many many dust and noise have seriously affected my family's heath ( such as cough and poor sleep ) till today .

When I bought land and was told by Landcom that every lot in this area have to build single torren house with a Style design approved by Council and finish construction in 3 years otherwise the Landcom/ Council will enforce to sell the land ,which codition also wrote in our "sale contract' . But actually , some lands not only build in 3 years ( still have few of blank lands sleep there) but also receive the Max Benefit which build Dual Occupancy house and continue to create pollution , because they will bring more cars and more family members.

I just ask where is the fair? How is Council doing , it seems People who follow up the roles receiving hurts and people who break up the roles got benefit !!!

Thanks your concern.

King regards

[REDACTED]

Noted. The submission raises concern regarding development within Prince Henry, Little Bay. A detailed master plan applies to these lands which are zoned R1 General Residential. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies in the R2 Low Density Residential zone, and therefore will not apply to the R1 zoned land within Prince Henry.

<p>Council should not back date. people built with full disclosure and would have known what they were doing according to the laws at the time. if laws change then they usually change at the time of change and do not make it retroactive. most people would be happy or should be happy with what they have or they wouldn t have done it in the first place. any one unhappy may have not got good advice from their solicitors at the time. the fault may lie with them. sue the solicitors. my answer is no to amending local environment plan 2012.</p>	<p>Noted. See Council report for Council officer's response to the raised issues.</p>
<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I received a letter regarding the public exhibition of planning proposal for the above mentioned matter.</p> <p>I wanted to advise that I wholeheartedly support this change. Sometimes logic is lost in matters that are hotly debated, and this change is logical for the times. To do anything else would be reckless.</p> <p>Best</p> <p></p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I wish to fully support the proposed changes, they are excellent and welcome.</p> <p></p> <p>Sent on the run from </p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

I am writing as a lifelong resident in relation to the proposed changes to the LEP for the purpose of subdivision to Dual occupancy developments.

I attach for your information prior submission made to Council in April both directly and via my Architect Fernando Banales of Arkhaus. I also participated in the community consultation process re this matter undertaken by Council.

As outlined in the attached submission made to Council previously the reason that we are undertaking a dual occupancy development is for our special needs child and to assist my children to stay in the area in which they grew up.

The proposed changes as they stand will put my family in a state of extended limbo. I also know that I am not the only ratepayer to be in this difficult position. We will also not have the same rights as those who have had DA's approved prior to 6 July 2018 being the relevant date for councils cut-off date for the Torrens allowance to Dual Occupancy.

In attempting to properly deal with this matter since late 2017 we have found ourselves having to amend our approach a number of times based on Randwick Council's changing position being:

1. We commenced work in preparing to lodge a DA after it being widely publicised that Council will review its position, which it subsequently did but on very narrow basis;
2. After being advised by Council that the medium density code ("CDC") will be approved, including noting the very limited DA relief, we stopped the DA process and then commenced work on completing a CDC development application;
3. Now I understand that Council has changed its position by seeking deferment of the CDC, again we have determined to stop the CDC process and recommence the process to lodge a DA, as we feel that we have no choice. This lodgement will occur in the next 2 weeks.

I would suggest that a common sense way to deal with this matter is that if the deferral of the CDC is accepted by the NSW Planning Department or there is a delay in the publication, that council will also amend the

Concerns regarding changing planning policy directions are noted. The intention of Council's planning proposal is to assist those existing households under financial hardship due to banks tightening lending criteria to attached dual occupancies under company title. Any future review of Council's minimum subdivision lot size controls and associated dual occupancy development standards will be undertaken as part of the Local Housing Strategy. In addition, the Council are yet to receive a response from the Minister for Planning to its request to defer the commencement of the Code. So until such time that the Council receives a response and/or direction to the commencement of the Code, the Code is to commence on 6 July 2018.

gateway approval for DA's to reflect this i.e. to for any DA's approved prior to 6 July 2019 and not those only from 6 July 2018.

Could you also pass this email to the Elena Sliogeris in the Strategic Planning Department as I understand that the Strategic Planning Department is dealing with this matter.

Please feel free to call me directly should you wish to discuss the matter in further detail.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir,  
This has reference with our receipt of your letter F2017 /00530 dated 29 May 2018.  
Our dual occupancy site at [REDACTED] got approved DA No: [REDACTED] on 30 June 2015. The dual occupancy building is now still under construction and will be completed soon.  
We are so happy to hear news that a Planning Proposal to permit Torrens Title subdivision of attached dual occupancy premises on lot of 450 sqm or greater which have a valid development consent issued prior to 6 July 2018 is on processing for approval.  
This LEP amendment will be of much help for us in selling the dual occupancy property (under separate Torrens Title) in due course which means will also save us from financial catastrophe or heavy loss due to hard selling under company title.  
Through this letter we would also like to register our dual occupancy site at [REDACTED] for Torrens Title subdivision.  
Kindly further advise should there are other terms and conditions we have to fulfil in order to obtain the Torrens Title subdivision.  
We thank you for your kind attention.

Support noted. A development application will still need to be lodged to the Council for subdivision approval, should the proposed LEP amendment (planning proposal) be finalised. This means that only once the proposed LEP amendment has been legally made, can a development application be lodged for any proposed subdivision of the subject attached dual occupancies.

<p>Yours sincerely  </p>	
<p>Re: RLEP 2012 changes to Torrens title sub-division for Dual Occupancy development</p> <p>To: Strategic planning department (Elena Sliogeris)</p> <p>As also discussed in brief with Elena, I write in regards to the proposed changes to the LEP for the purpose of subdivision to Dual occupancy developments.</p> <p>Our aim was to open dialogue regarding the change-over from councils cut-off date for the Torrens allowance to Dual Occupancy (July 6th, 2018) which allows the opportunity to then utilise the new medium density code.</p> <p>I am aware that councils seeks to defer the use of the medium density code which I believe leaves a time gap if the deferral of the CDC gets deferred by the planning department. I am also aware that the planning department is currently still undertaking running amendments to the code.</p> <p>I would suggest that, if the deferral is accepted by the planning department or there is a delay in the publication, that council will also amend the gateway approval date to reflect this. If this does not take place we remain in the same situation which we are trying to remedy.</p> <p>Please feel free to call me directly should you wish to discuss the matter in further detail.</p>	<p>Noted. As outlined, the intention of Council's planning proposal is to assist those existing households under financial hardship due to banks tightening lending criteria to attached dual occupancies under company title. Any future review of Council's minimum subdivision lot size controls and associated dual occupancy development standards will be undertaken as part of the Local Housing Strategy. In addition, the Council are yet to receive a response from the Minister for Planning to its request to defer the commencement of the Code. So until such time that the Council receives a response and/or direction to the commencement of the Code, the Code is to commence on 6 July 2018.</p>

Good Morning,

I understand council is seeking submissions on reducing the minimum lot size in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone.

As a resident of Kensington, I reject the submission.

The Kensington, Kingsford residential area (which has not been ruined by 1960's/70's apartment blocks), is dominated by Federation and Californian Bungalow dwellings.

The change in minimum lot size will encourage developers to knock down these dwellings and replace with townhouses, which are not in keeping with the street scape and will detrimentally impact neighbouring property values.

Furthermore I simply find it wrong that, as reported by the Southern Courier (5th December 2017), the reason Randwick Council is considering this is because they wish "to help duplex owners sell their properties" (<https://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/newslocal/southern-courier/randwick-council-to-review-lot-sizes-to-help-duplex-owners-sell-their-properties/news-story/a2afb833e2f33b9909a9e8e771ef7c90>) . Such owners represents a minor number of residents and council should focus on what is best for the majority.

Regards,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies (with a valid development consent issued before 6 July 2018) in the R2 Low Density zone. It will not reduce the minimum lot size for new development. Any future review of the minimum lot size and associated development standards for attached dual occupancy will be undertaken as part of Council's Local Housing Strategy.

<p>Dear Mr. Bright,</p> <p>I'm writing to express my support for the planning proposal to permit the strata or Torrens title subdivision of attached dual occupancy premises on lots of 450sqm or greater.</p> <p>I'm the owner of two duplexes and currently it's very difficult for me to sell either duplex as buyers find it hard to obtain loans from banks for company title properties. Otherwise the only alternative is to sell both duplexes in one go but this prove more difficult as most buyers can't afford to buy two duplexes at once.</p> <p>Also such amendment will specially benefit retirees so that they could sell one duplex to fund their retirement instead of relying on tax payer funded government pensions.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that Randwick council could pass the proposal.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your consideration!</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>██████████ ██████████</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I disagree entirely with the council lowering the lot size to 450 square metre's. We have far to much development in the Randwick council area. Just getting to and from Kingsford from Little Bay is a nightmare in the morning and early evening due to the over development of Prince Henry Hospital at Little Bay.</p> <p>What we do need is less unit development, better roads and more infrastructure and green areas for the adults and children already paying rates in the council area.</p> <p>██████████████████ ██████████████████ ██████████</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a valid development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. It does not apply to new development and as a result would not cause additional impact on residential amenity and local street character.</p>

<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>████████████████████</p> <p>Our Torren's title land is lot: ██████████ and the land is 9.5m wide and 50.29 long. That is 477.7 square meters with rear lane access.</p> <p>Three years ago, we built a council approved detached granny flat at the rear of the property on Victoria Lane.</p> <p>Our query is that as the owners of two detached dwellings on the same lot, would we become eligible for subdivision under the proposed Minimum Lot Size amendment please?</p> <p>Or does the amendment cover attached dwellings only?</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>████████████████████</p>	<p>The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) applies only to attached dual occupancy. Subdivision of a 'granny flat' and/or secondary dwelling is prohibited under cl.24 of the State Environmental Planning Policy Affordable Rental Housing 2009. This is a state planning policy and as such the Council has no authority to amend the policy.</p>
<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Re: New Low Rise Medium Density Code</p> <p>I refer to the State Government's introduction, on 6th July, 2018, of a new Low Rise Medium Density Code ("the Code") and to your proposed request for a deferment to the introduction of the Code and provide the following information:-</p> <p>a) On 6th April, 2018, my ex-wife and I exchanged contracts for the purchase of a property of 753sqm in Malabar to be used to construct a dual occupancy as residences for us.</p> <p>b) As the result of a Business Paper dated 17th April, 2018, a copy of which is attached, that was released by Randwick City Council, we amended the name of the purchaser of the property from the company that was initially required to build a dual-occupancy to joint names in anticipation of the Council's published support for the adoption of the Code.</p>	<p>Concerns regarding changing planning policy directions are noted. The intention of Council's planning proposal is to assist those existing households under financial hardship due to banks tightening lending criteria to attached dual occupancies under company title. Any future review of Council's minimum subdivision lot size controls and associated dual occupancy development standards will be undertaken as part of the Local Housing Strategy. In addition, the Council are yet to receive a response from the Minister for Planning to its request to defer the commencement of the Code. So until such time that the Council receives a response and/or direction to the commencement of the Code, the Code is to commence on 6 July 2018.</p>

c) On 2nd May, 2018, we paid Stamp Duty of \$117,510 in respect of the purchase.

d) I learned, on 23rd May, 2018, that Randwick City Council had resolved to approach the Hon. Anthony Roberts, MP, to seek a deferment of the introduction of the Code.

As a result of the change in the Council's support for the Code and, from a conversation that I had with an officer from the Council's Town Planning department, I have been advised that, in order to proceed with the planned construction of a new home, we will be required to transfer the property to the original company that my ex-wife and I initially incorporated to purchase the property.

This will necessarily require the payment of Stamp Duty, on an ad valorem basis, and cost another \$117,510. This will result in an unfair financial burden and an unnecessary expense in the construction of a new home for my ex-wife and me.

The alternative, according to the Council's Town Planner, is to wait for Council to complete its review of the current planning laws which may commence in the near future and could take up to 3 years.

a) I am currently 64 years of age and, together with my ex-wife who is 61, we have placed our entire savings into purchasing our land at a cost of \$2.4m.

b) We changed the title registration of the property on the basis of Council's indication that it supported the Code.

c) The area of our land is 753sqm which will result in 2 properties of 376.Ssqm each. This is just 23.Ssqm below Council's current minimum lot

size for subdivision. Obviously, this is far in excess of 225sqm proposed in the new Low Rise Medium Density Code.

d) My ex-wife and I are now faced with either paying an additional sum of \$117,510 to amend the title of the property and register a company as the proprietor or to wait for up to 3 years for the Council to complete its review of planning laws to begin our building process.

If we have to wait 3 years to begin building, we will end up paying an extra \$201,800 in rent and I will be commencing to build at a time in my life when I was anticipating retiring and enjoying my home instead of being involved in its construction. This, of course, does not take into account the holding cost of having our purchase price of \$2.4m tied up in a block of land instead of earning approximately \$70,000 per annum in interest.

e) By requiring my ex-wife and I to register and construct dual occupancy homes for us under the company title system, Randwick City Council is requiring us to utilise a registration system that was introduced some 100 years ago to cope with the ownership, by individuals, of single flats in the buildings that started to proliferate in Sydney in the 1920s.

This effectively contradicts Council's published desire to allow the owners of existing dwellings to apply for strata subdivision of Torrens title subdivision whilst committing new developments to the Company Title system which Council has acknowledged results in "financial pressure and stress" and "are increasingly difficult to sell after banks tightened lending practices on company title".

The Council is causing financial pressure and stress to my ex-wife and me as a result of its desire to now delay the introduction of your Government's code.

My ex-wife and I are just 2 of the many people who have been left in limbo by the abrupt about-face by the Randwick City Council and it is respectfully requested that consider your request to the New South Wales Government to defer the introduction the new Low Rise Medium Density Code.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

██████████

General Manager  
Randwick City Council

Dear Sir

On 17 April 2018, Council resolved to;

- a) amend the provisions under RLEP 2012 in relation to the minimum subdivision lot size and attached dual occupancy in the R2 Low Density Residential zone that was approved prior to 6 July 2018 to be subdivided in accordance with the relevant standards contained in the Low Rise Medium Density Code.
- b) Prepare a draft planning proposal to be forwarded to the Greater Sydney Commission or its delegate requesting 'Gateway Determination' under section 3.34 of the EPA Act 1979
- c) Following 'Gateway Determination', exhibit the draft Planning Proposal in accordance with the conditions of the gateway determination and bring

The Gateway determination was issued on the planning proposal as submitted to the DPE. This includes all the intended provisions as listed under Part 2 'Explanation of provisions' of the planning proposal.

back a report to Council detailing the results of the community consultation for consideration by Council

Based in terms of the Councils resolution, the Gateway Determination has granted "to amend the minimum subdivision lot size for attached dual occupancy development approved prior to July 2018 in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone". However, the Gateway Determination has not included the second part of Councils resolution; "to be subdivided in accordance with the relevant standards contained in the Low Rise Medium Density Code".

The Gateway Determination determined the amendment to the RLEP 2012 should proceed subject to several conditions including;

1. (a) include mapping showing which properties with existing and approved attached dual occupancies that may be affected by this planning proposal.

(b) include an explanation of how land owners will need to prove that they have development consent for their dual occupancy development to then obtain subdivision approval as sought by the proposal.

The Gateway Determination did not determine that the amendment to the RLEP 2012 should proceed with a condition that attached dual occupancies are to be subdivided in accordance with the relevant standards contained in the Low Rise Medium Density Code (LRMDC).

In terms of Councils draft Planning Proposal; Introduction: the intent of, and the justification to amend the RLEP 2012 was instigated in response to concerns raised by some members of the community that the lending restrictions placed by banks on attached dual occupancies under company title is placing financial hardship on the owners of these properties.

This reference is to the title of the Gateway determination only. As mentioned above, the Gateway determination has been issued on the planning proposal as submitted to the DPE including Part 2 'Explanation of provisions' which adopts the subdivision provisions of the Code. Further information on the Gateway process can be viewed on the DPE website.

The draft Planning Proposal identified there are 137 attached dual occupancies under company title schemes.

RCC Planning Proposal (May 2018), Section D, Q10; The planning proposal applies to existing attached dual occupancy development approved before 6 July 2018... It aims to enable subdivision of the attached dual occupancy which currently exists under company title.

The Gateway Determination allows Council to amend the minimum subdivision lot size for attached dual occupancy development approved prior to 6 July 2018 in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone. Implementation of the Gateway Determination will allow all owners of the identified 137 existing dual occupancies under company title approved prior to 6 July 2018 to be able to subdivide their properties and remove the property ownership from being under company title.

Council sought legal advice for a new local provision to amend the Minimum Subdivision Lot Size Provisions in the RLEP 2012. The legal advice provided is based on the planning provisions contained in the LRMDC for attached dual occupancies. Council drafted provisions in the draft Planning Proposal based on the legal advice received.

The legal advice provided to the Council does not appear to be in accordance with the conditions of the Gateway Determination.

The legal advice also recommended that Clause 4.6 of RLEP 2012 does not apply and should not be included.

In the draft Planning Proposal, Council has indicated that they will rejected this part of the legal advice, stating; clause 4.6 should still apply.

The LRMDC has new planning controls that were not in place at the time consents were made for the identified 137 existing attached dual occupancies under company title. In some cases, the new planning

Noted.

As outlined above, the Gateway determination was issued on the planning proposal as submitted to the DPE. If any of the intended provisions was inconsistent with the DPE in their assessment of the planning proposal, it would have been a condition on the Gateway determination to remove and/or amend the local provision.

In addition, Council officers have recommended that cl.4.6 should apply given that there may be circumstances (eg. due to particular/unique site constraints) where variation to the LEP provisions could be appropriately sought. As such, this will form part of the merit based assessment.

controls of the LRMD C will not allow subdivision of these properties. In these circumstances, implementation of the new planning controls contained in the LRMD C will breach the intent of, and the justification to amend the RLEP 2012 and will not be in a accordance with the conditions of the Gateway Determination.

An example of the above is [REDACTED] for the construction of a single story attached dual occupancy, approved 13 January 2013.

The LRMD C will apply from 6 July 2018 for all new applicable development applications.

Dual occupancy developments approved prior to 6 July 2018, have or will met Councils existing planning provisions imposed by the development and consent conditions.

The new planning provisions in the LRMD C should not be retrospectively applied to the existing identified 137 dual occupancy developments constructed over the past 15 years or so.

A further issue is; the identified 137 existing dual occupancy property owners did not have an opportunity to comply with the new provisions of LRMD C at the time they lodged their development applications.

It should also be noted that Council is in the process of deferring the adoption of the provisions of the LRMD C.

The Gateway Determination allows Council to amend the minimum subdivision lot size for attached dual occupancy development approved prior to 6 July 2018 in the Low Density Residential Zone.

The current minimum lot size for construction of an attached dual occupancy is not less than 450m<sup>2</sup>.

The planning proposal adopts the subdivision standards of the Code only. The other standards contained in the Code in relation to the development of an attached dual occupancy development will not apply retrospectively. The subdivision standards as proposed in the planning proposal are considered appropriate to be applied to those existing and/or approved dual occupancy approved prior to 6 July 2018.

<p>The provisions in the draft Planning Proposal for inclusion in the RLEP 2012 for the subdivision of the identified 137 existing attached dual occupancy developments should be amended to be in accordance with the planning provisions applicable at the time of the lodgement of the development application.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>██████████</p>	
<p>Councillor Lindsay Shurey</p> <p>Mayor of Randwick</p> <p>My Dear Mayor</p> <p>My wife ██████████ and I have lived at ██████████ since 1967. Our three children were raised here. Our children and grandchildren (nine) live either in Maroubra, Randwick or adjacent suburbs.</p> <p>I thank Council for their recent media releases together with attending fact sheets in respect to land rezoning and lot sizes and Council's invitation to have our say.</p> <p>By accepting this offer I assume local councils still have some authority in the legislating for, the processing of, and the enforcement thereof, of zoning restrictions and minimum lot sizes.</p> <p>If Councils have been effectively sidelined in these matters then it is quite unfair to survey the population seeking their opinion on matters the Council knows they cannot enact nor enforce.</p> <p>Council have already been advised by a State Planning Authority that their district must absorb a further forty per centum increase in population over Council's published preferred option. If Council believe the reduction in lot</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) only applies to existing and/or approved dual occupancies with a valid development consent issued before the 6 July 2018. It does not apply to new development and as a result would not cause additional impact on residential amenity and local street character. This is on the basis that a precautionary approach is needed with regards to new development until such time the Council has undertaken its local housing strategy. Similarly to Canterbury/ Bankstown and Ryde Councils, the Council has requested a deferment to the commencement of the Code but is yet to receive a response to its request.</p>

sizes is a reasonable method of absorbing the allotted forty per centum supply capacity then have the courage to place such proposal before your community.

Prior to the view expressed in your media release of 23 May 2018 Council appeared to favour the easing of restrictions of land sizes in low and medium density zones. Reference your lauding of the State Government new legislation on land size restrictions (media release 11 April 2018).

If such was the case then Council should be indebted to the citizens of the Ryde and Canterbury Bankstown municipalities who had the foresight and commitment to agitate against the unseemly accelerated development being imposed on them by the unhealthy nexus between property developers and politicians. Thankfully such citizens reaction gives Council the "get out option" and should be immediately taken up.

How is Council's apparent previous policy of the reduction in building sizes conducive to the expressed desire to properly consider the issue of increasing densities across our suburbs?

One cannot and should not expect Council to have the wit/authority to solve the increasing density problems in Sydney. Such problems arise from the mass immigration of wealthy migrants policy by the Federal Government. Like all Ponzi schemes it relies on growth and more growth regardless of the longterm effect of such a flawed policy.

What one may ask of the local government is that they do not compromise their limited planning rights to facilitate a policy which is, and will continue to have, an enormous detrimental effect on current citizens and their quality of life. Neither of the major parties will even consider questioning the current immigration programme let alone change same, so the citizens must act through the level of government closest to their daily lives, viz their Local Council. The low and medium density zone restrictions act as

district boundary buffers against high rise over development and must be maintained irrespective of other Governments pressure.

Incidentally, Council's previous expressed concern for the financial hardship of dual occupancy dwellers caused by the lending practices of banks seems utterly wrong. If there has been a surge in company titled properties then this is more likely to be that land so titled does not have to comply with Council's zoning requirements rather than the lending policies of the "dreaded banks"

One other matter of concern is, in planning issues, people of authority seem to seamlessly transfer from, and then back to, the various bodies involved in the whole process. By this transmogrification the person who initially reviews a proposal may well end up approving same. Does Council see a possible conflict of interest problem here?

In summary, Council should use what powers it has to sustain our village type of living; the last thing we require is a watering down of existing restrictions on land zonings and minimum lot sizes. Any concessions will only establish the groundwork for the creation of a "Hong Kong style of living fostered by the insatiable desires of property developers.

Yours Sincerely

██████████

Families need houses with outdoor spaces instead of units. The potential to increase the housing stock for local families, at the more affordable end of the spectrum, is a positive outcome.

Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.

<p>This is much better than large unit blocks like the new Pagewood Green at Eastgardens, which are high density and create traffic and parking issues in the area.</p>	
<p>Planning Proposal to permit Torrens Title subdivision of attached Dual Occupancy premises on lots of 450 sqm or greater which have a valid development consent issued prior to 6 July 2018 will be of much help for developer in selling the dual occupancy property in due course which means will also save developer from financial catastrophe or heavy loss due to hard selling under company title.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>"I fully support the proposed changes to the LEP. I cannot understand why council is trying to defer the state legislation on medium density whilst at the same time fully supporting high density in the Kingsford and Kensington areas. Sydney is full of semis and terraces which make far more sense than the new Meriton skyline that is making us look more like Hong Kong and they will no doubt be the. Slums of the future. "</p>	<p>Support noted. However, in relation to Council's request to defer the commencement of the Code, the Council has sought a deferral to the commencement of the Code until such time that the Council has undertaken its Local Housing Strategy. This is to identify where best housing growth should be located and importantly be supported by infrastructure and services. The application of the low rise code will be mostly felt to the south of the city which are not as well serviced by infrastructure and services. Therefore the Council seeks to take a precautionary approach to ensure increased densities, particularly, in these areas can be supported.</p>
<p>We also support the sub division of 450 square metre plots with council approved detached dwellings on the land, i.e. main house + granny flat. As we have done with council approval on our 477.7 square metres of land.</p>	<p>The proposed LEP amendment (Planning Proposal) applies only to attached dual occupancy. Subdivision of a 'granny flat' and/or secondary dwelling is prohibited under cl.24 of the State Environmental Planning Policy Affordable Rental Housing 2009. This is a state planning policy and as such the Council has no authority to amend the policy.</p>
<p>Allowing duplexes makes good sense for communities. It supports downsizing for seniors and up-sizing for those with families. It's a sound</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>

<p>way to have flexible housing options in a community whilst allowing people to stay in a community.</p>	
<p>I would ask the council that this should apply to all existing company title duplexes or duplexes currently under construction. As the minimum lot sizes for strata is 450sqm and Torrens 480sqm I would ask that there should be at least a tolerance of 5% in sqm if the lot in question deviates by at least 5% from the lot sizes for subdivision. Where a lot is a corner block with a 2 street frontage, and the frontage for each duplex exceeds 6m on each street these particular lots should be approved for a Torrens title subdivision as they look like normal houses and their own sewer and stormwater connection.</p>	<p>Noted. It is recommended that in forwarding the Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning and Environment for finalisation, the Council clarify to the Department that Clause 4.6 of the RLEP 2012 should apply as there may be circumstances (e.g. due to particular/unique site constraints) where variation to the LEP provisions could be appropriately sought.</p>
<p>More home and less apartments.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>I agree. We do not have enough homes for families, way too many apartment blocks. When our kids grow up they can live close to us so we can help them.</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>Allows more homes for families, increases density to allow for the efficient introduction of mass transport.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This will be considered in preparation of a Local Housing Strategy to ensure that future growth is supported by existing and/or planned infrastructure provision and key services.</p>
<p>The amendment is an important step forward but also progressive. A positive yes outcome will contribute to low density housing in the area without the burden of high rise development. The change will reduce the burden currently experienced by many residents.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>I support the planning proposal as it will eliminate the current planning anomaly where some dual occupancies that are already built are forced into archaic company title arrangements. This change will have no impact on the built environment as the subject properties are either already constructed or approved to be constructed. As such the change will have</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>no impact on neighbourhood amenity and is a change on paper only. The planning proposal changes will not increase the number of dual occupancies already built or allowed to be built and will result in no physical changes to the built environment - as such these changes will be all but invisible to other Randwick Council Residents but will be very helpful to those trapped in unfavourable company title arrangements.</p>	
<p>I am a Company Title duplex owner with a wife and 2 young children suffering financial stress due to banks no longer lending for Company Title properties. There are many other residents with similar circumstances.</p> <p>I fully support the proposal to allow existing duplexes already built zoned R2 Residential to be permitted to be subdivided by amending Randwick Council LEP. Thank you for this change bringing Randwick Council into line with other surrounding councils.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>The General Manager  Randwick City Council  30 Frances Street  RANDWICK NSW 2031</p> <p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>PLANNING PROPOSAL: MINIMUM SUBDIVISION LOT SIZE</p> <p>We are writing in support of Council's Planning Proposal to amend minimum subdivision provisions. We believe this is a very important process, as the planning controls need to be amended to permit owners of company title dual occupancy premises to subdivide into strata or Torrens title.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p> <p>Support for inclusion of Clause 4.6 noted. It is recommended that in forwarding the Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning and Environment for finalisation, the Council clarify to the Department that Clause 4.6 of the RLEP 2012 should apply as there may be circumstances (e.g. due to particular/unique site constraints) where variation to the LEP provisions could be appropriately sought.</p>

We are the owners of a dual occupancy property with company title, at the above address. The other property owned by the relevant company, [REDACTED], at which our neighbour, [REDACTED], reside.

We agree with amendment to allow subdivision of attached dual occupancy development in the R2 zone, already with development consent and issued prior to 6 July, in accordance with the relevant subdivision standards contained in Part 6 of the State Government's Low Rise Medium Density Housing Code (Code).

We believe that dual occupancies of the kind outlined in the Planning Proposal and in the Code are a suitable low impact form of development within the Randwick local government area. This complements and enhances the investment made by the State government in the new light rail development. Dual occupancies have both strategic and local merit in the Randwick local government area.

The merit based approach suggested under the planning proposal is the appropriate approach, as it will allow some minor variation to be considered, should it be necessary. As the dual occupancies were not constructed under the Code, the criteria and provisions of that Code were not known. Therefore, the dual occupancies could not be designed and constructed to meet that Code. We firmly agree with Council that Clause 4.6 provisions should apply. If it were necessary for Council to limit the variations, then it could be +/- 10 per cent of the standards with the Code.

The suggested time frame for completion of the LEP is stated as being 9 months. We believe that this process could be reasonably shortened to 6 months.

We applaud Council's response to this issue and look forward to a successful resolution of it.

Yours faithfully

██████████

SUBDIVISION LOT SIZE FOR ATTACHED DUAL OCCUPANCY DWELLING

Reference is made to the planning proposal to amend the minimum subdivision provisions in the Randwick Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012 for the proposed dwelling house at the subject address.

This submission endorses Council's planning proposal which seeks to permit strata title and Torrens title subdivision of existing and approved dual occupancies.

The subject site at ██████████ contains an approved dual occupancy under ██████████. It should be noted that an existing DA remains under assessment for the strata subdivision of the approved and constructed dual occupancies under ██████████.

Both lots are in excess of 305sqm which are significantly (125sqm) above the minimum lot size requirement for strata subdivided dual occupancies, that being 180sqm.

It is noted that the planning proposal excludes battle axe subdivision dual occupancies.

It is also noted that the State Government's Low Rise Medium Density Housing Code does not apply to battle axe allotments as it requires that each lot shall have a minimum frontage of 6-metres to a public road.

Support noted. Comments in relation to specific development applications underassessment and/or undetermined cannot be provided. The points raised in the submission describes a site specific situation which may be considered as part of a merit based assessment.

It is requested that the planning proposal be amended to permit strata subdivision of existing approved or erected dual occupancies on battle axe allotments.

It is not suggested that the planning proposal encourage new battle axe subdivisions as part of the planning proposal.

It is considered that the proposed strata subdivision of the approved and erected battle axe dual occupancy would be reasonable for the following reasons:

1. The lot sizes are well above the minimum lot size required for strata subdivision (being 125sqm above the 180sqm lot requirement at ground level).
2. The dwellings have already been erected and therefore, there will be no discernible visual difference between the un-subdivided and subdivided allotments.
3. The proposed dwellings would not operate any differently or cause any different amenity impacts as a result of the proposed subdivision. Council's approval of the dual occupancies endorsed the design and amenity of the dual occupancies which confirms that the lot sizes will maintain a suitable level of amenity.
4. The dwellings can operate and function in an orderly manner, despite the limited frontage to [REDACTED], through the use of easements for services and access. Such easements do not affect the proposed strata subdivision.
5. The proposed strata subdivision will not alter the approved density, height or intensity of use.

6. The site is unusual being part of a larger original allotment [REDACTED] whereby a large child care centre was proposed, but subsequently refused. Subsequent development applications were approved to resubdivide the site into smaller allotments including the Torrens title subdivision at [REDACTED], noting that both lots were below the minimum allotment size under the LEP and minimum frontage requirement under DCP 2013. It is therefore considered that the proposal represents an unusual circumstance which would not readily apply to other properties throughout the Municipality. The proposal would therefore not be responsible for setting an undesirable precedent.

7. It is also noted that Council have approved the subdivision of two other battle axe dwellings [REDACTED] - Torrens title and [REDACTED] under [REDACTED]. It is noted from the following aerial photographs that both developments were approved with one dwelling behind another and that the rear dwelling did not have a 6-metre frontage to the public road, as they rely on approximately 3-metre wide driveway access only.

8. It is reiterated that this submission does not seek a request that the planning proposal should be amended to include new battle axe proposals, but rather only existing battle axe dual occupancy arrangements. We have carried out a detailed investigation of the Municipality and it is considered that the proposed amendment to the planning proposal would not apply to a significant number of allotments. The proposal would thereby not alter the character of the area as existing nor the desired future character that will be achieved by the suite of LEP and DCP controls.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal will achieve an orderly and economic use of land and will retain the low-density environment. The proposed subdivision will not result in any adverse impacts to the amenity of the adjoining properties or the character of the locality.

<p>If you require any additional information, or clarification of any of the above points, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned on ( [REDACTED] )</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
<p>This will give more people the opportunity to easily subdivide &amp; provide an increased supply for people &amp; families waiting to live in the east. I do however believe that the land size should be a minimum of 600sqm and above to ensure there isn't a total oversupply given the numbers Randwick council have provided or effect on our streets scapes.</p>	<p>Support noted. Comment raised in relation to the minimum lot size control will be considered when Council reviews its development standards for new development (including minimum lot size) as part of the preparation of an updated LEP, informed by the Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>This option provides affordable housing to those who wish to stay in the area. Rules are already in effect regarding the development of attached dual occupancy dwellings, these restrictions do not necessarily need to change, however the subdivision of these is essential. I would much prefer to see duplex housing than high rise unit blocks with no provision for amenity / parking, public transport, schools, health care services that we are starting to see in the area.</p>	<p>Support noted. Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>
<p>If possible to allow 450m2 lots to be torrens title subdivided. This will remove alot of confusion given the very similiar land sizes required for subdivison. Otherwise to ensure all 450m2 lot are able to be strata title subdivided (the 180m2 strata area for ground level is not clear as a requirement and should not be limited to ground floor dwelling space). No dwelling that is one one title or company title should miss out on being able to be subdivided given the consequences.</p>	<p>Noted. The planning proposal intends to permit the strata subdivision of lots that are 450sqm and greater and Torrens subdivision of lots that are 480sqm and greater. The reference to 180sqm is the minimum strata area at ground level.</p>
<p>Allow 450m2 lots to be torrens title subdivided given the difference of 480m2 vs 450m2 is minimal. If above cannot be granted then ensure the minimum 180m2 strata area be removed given each lot size must be</p>	<p>Noted. It is not recommended that Torrens title be permissible on lots smaller than what the Code permits. In relation to strata subdivision, the intended provision is to</p>

<p>minimum 225m2 lot size. Otherwise 180m2 apply to both ground floor areas per 450m2 lot, in other words 90m2 ground floor area including garage, patios etc per 225m2 lot.</p>	<p>ensure that the strata area at ground level must be at least 180sqm.</p>
<p>I agree with new proposal for minimum subdivision lot size for attached dual occupancy development of 450sqm.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Hi,</p> <p>I welcome the proposed change to minimum lot sizes and the permission of Strata or Torrens Title subdivision of existing dual occupancies and development approvals yet to be built.</p> <p>I am a mortgage broker and for sixteen years I have been arranging finance for family and friends who have bought and/or built company title duplexes in the area.</p> <p>In recent times, I have seen incredible stress endured by many of these owners due to lending changes. Unfortunately funding has dried up which has left people feeling like prisoners in their own home and have also left people with DA approvals in extremely tough financial positions.</p> <p>To allow existing dual occupancies and DA approved dual occupancies to apply for Strata or Torrens Title subdivision would be a life changing positive result for these people.</p> <p>Currently, lenders don't like the fact that they hold a Share Certificate as security and not a Certificate of Title (Title Deed). Therefore owners struggle to sell and buyers struggle to buy.</p> <p>I believe that moving forward any applications after the 6th July 2018 should also qualify for a Strata or Torrens Title to come in line with every other council in the country. Dual Occupancies are an affordable Eastern Suburbs property option. They are a good option for young families as well as retirees looking to downsize. It also provides an option for our ageing population to live securely within close proximity to their family.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Council recognises that dual occupancy development is an important contributor to housing diversity. This will be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Housing Strategy.</p>

Traffic issues would be minimal and streetscapes would be enhanced by new properties replacing in many cases, old run down homes. Most duplexes have a garage and/or off street parking which reduces the impact of on-street parking. The block sizes in most cases are bigger than your traditional semi-detached homes and duplexes are more appealing due to being low rise than high rise buildings popping up throughout a suburb.

I'm willing to discuss this matter further if required.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]