



PO Box M59 | Missenden Rd | Camperdown NSW 2050

www.bikesydney.org | ABN 95939852367

Tel +61 2 8213 2437

To:

Peter Head

The General Manager

Leichhardt Municipal Council

PO Box 45

Leichhardt NSW 2040

by email: draftlep@lmc.nsw.gov.au

28 February 2013

BIKESYDNEY'S RESPONSE TO LEICHHARDT'S DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENT PLAN (LEP) 2012

Introduction

BIKESydney is an incorporated not-for-profit community organisation.

We want to live in a city:

- Where riding a bicycle is part of everyday life
- That is vibrant, healthy, productive, creative and robust
- That values community, mobility, health, wellbeing social equity and sustainability
- Where people of all ages can make easy choices to ride a bicycle, walk and take public transport.

We advocate on behalf of our members and people who ride bicycles who live and work in the inner Sydney area. We are affiliated with Bicycle NSW.

BIKESydney encourages Leichhardt Council to take the opportunity to amend its Local Environment Plan 2012 (hereafter referred to as “the LEP”) to favour active transport - both cycling and walking. It is at these junctures that very significant community benefits can be manifest given the trickle down effects.

We congratulate Council on its proposed inclusion of sub-clause 1.2 (2) (i) which directs the LEP

“...to provide for development that reduces car dependency, increases use of public transport and encourages walking and cycling”.

With a view to prosecuting this goal, we encourage Leichhardt Council to include the following elements in the updated LEP.

Recommendations in response to the Draft Local Environmental Plan 2012

Part 2.1 - Including the zoning “Zone B4 - Mixed Use”

BIKESydney strongly urges Council to introduce zoning category “Zone B4 - Mixed Use” into Part 2.1 of the LEP which would stimulate local economic activity and increase the use of active transport, eg. by encouraging residential development to also accommodate a shop, cafe or day care centre at its ground floor.

Presently, many trips within the LGA are undertaken to local facilities (eg, shops or schools) by car because existing planning zones have enshrined the segregation of these uses from residential areas. The adoption of mixed use zoning would serve to localise these services which in turn, would reduce travel distances and critically would allow for access to them to be achieved without having to traverse major roadways - thus removing two major barriers to active transport, and in particular cycling.

Notably, the City of Sydney has included Zone B4 in its recently-revised LEP (2012), and further, states the following justification explicitly within the LEP for doing so:

“...To integrate suitable business, office, residential, retail and other development in accessible locations so as to maximise public transport patronage and encourage walking and cycling.”

(Sydney Local Environment Plan 2012 - Part 2 - Land Use Table)

Updating the Land Use Table to include Cycleways

BIKESydney recommends that the **Land Use Table** be updated to include “cycleway”, or alternatively “active transport corridor” as a use which may be “permitted with consent”. The LEP already explicitly includes “roads” for example. Doing so, would not remove Council’s opportunity to assess or reject cycleways.

Objectives of Zone RE1 should encourage public access to Foreshores

While Part 6.9 of the draft LEP addresses development in foreshore areas, the objectives expressed in the definition of Zone RE1 should also include an explicit reference to “maximising public access to the foreshore”. Public foreshore access within the LGA is presently overly restricted and indeed is being further reduced (eg, consider the reduction of public foreshore access resulting from the approval of the White Bay Cruise Passenger Terminal). Accessibility and Amenity are key themes of Council’s 2020+ Strategic Plan. Including the theme of public access to foreshores within the objectives of the Zone RE1 definition will give strong, unambiguous direction to all development of foreshore lands to necessarily include public access to the water’s edge.

The loss of public foreshore access at White Bay will significantly impact the future amenity and economic value of the local government area. Uninterrupted access to the foreshore throughout White Bay (within reach of the city) would have induced a very significant number of walking and cycling trips within and through the LGA (much as Council’s evolving the Bay Run has done).

Part 4.4A - Including Incentives that encourage Sustainable Transport

The theme of encouraging the shift to sustainable transport is writ large across all of Council’s strategic planning documents, and in the draft LEP itself (sub-clause 1.2 (2) (i)). In particular Council’s 2020+ Strategic Plan clearly seeks “...to develop integrated plans to reduce our dependence on private cars for local regular community activities and trip[s]” (Objective 2.1 of 2020+). Given that is very well established that urban planning heavily influences our mobility and transport choices, it is essential - not just desirable - that the LEP (and later, the Development Control Plan) actively encourages the shift to sustainable transport.

BIKESydney believes that Part 4.4A must enshrine incentivisation of development toward more sustainable transport options. For example, Part 4.4A could include Floor Space Ratio (FSR) incentives for reducing the amount of (on-street and off-street) car parking offered by a development. Canada Bay Council has taken steps in this direction.

Additionally, while BIKESydney is not best placed to devise the appropriate planning intervention, we envisage that incentives need to extend beyond only the offer of additional floor space. We believe that there should exist a graduated *range* of other incentives (not just

FSR allowances) to developers in order to entice also the “small” elements of progressive development (eg, common bike storage and parking areas). We urge the Council to be creative with incentives in order that it have more influence in garnering more progressive constructions. What other incentive mechanisms are available to Council?

Part 6.13 (3) (m) - Including through-site access for cyclists

With a view to aligning the LEP with Council’s commitment to cycling, we recommend that the second instance of the word “pedestrian” be deleted from sub-clause 6.13 (3) (m):

“....pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service access, circulation and **pedestrian** permeability;”

There is no reason to exclude permeability for cycling through large developments.

Dictionary

The dictionary should include definitions for the following terms so as to prevent developments delivering sub-standard constructions:

- Cycleway - notably, the LEP includes a definition for “road”;
- Permeability (pertaining to through-site access for large developments).

Also, the definition of “parking space” proposed in the draft LEP should be amended to include bicycle parking. The current definition (likely unintentionally) prejudicially and unfairly excludes provision for non-motorised transport, to the effect of excluding bicycles in particular.

Please feel free to contact us should you require any clarification or wish to discuss other matters.

Yours sincerely

David Borella
BIKESydney
President
david.borella@bikesdyney.org