Item 3.

Post Exhibition - Housing for All Discussion Paper

File No: X132804

Summary

As experienced internationally, Australian cities are in the grip of a housing affordability crisis for low- to medium-income earners. It's not a new crisis, but is a complex and deepening one, driven by a combination of short- to medium-term economic pressures and long-term structural problems, including sustained undersupply of affordable homes, tax and policy settings, flat or falling construction productivity, rising costs and population growth pressures. More well-priced housing is needed for our growing population, including social and affordable rental housing for low-to moderate-income households.

The City of Sydney (the City) local area has grown rapidly in the last 20 years. Since June 2004 over 46,000 private dwellings have been built in the local area, making us one of the fastest growing local government areas in NSW. More than 11,000 new non-private dwellings (dwellings with shared facilities) have also been built in this period, including student and co-living housing.

Our growth has been expertly planned in consultation with the community, achieving a high level of amenity and liveability supported by public transport, walking and bike connections, high-quality public domain, well-positioned open space and world-class community facilities.

On 1 August 2026, the NSW Government released the Sydney Plan, a new region plan for Greater Sydney. The plan identifies significant growth in Sydney over the next 20 years – particularly in established areas like the City of Sydney.

The Sydney Plan establishes a 5-year housing target for all Sydney councils, with 18,900 dwellings to be delivered in the City of Sydney council area by 2029 — one of the highest targets in the region. It also requires councils to maintain 30 years of feasible housing capacity in its planning controls at all times. To meet both the 5-year target and the 30-year feasible capacity requirement, the Sydney Plan directs the City to undertake additional planning for further housing growth.

On 1 July 2026, the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces issued an updated "Statement of Expectations Order". The Order is considered when the Minister is exercising powers to appoint a planning administrator for a council and includes new expectations relating to updating planning statements, maintaining feasible housing capacity and reviewing industrial lands.

The City is best placed to work with community, industry, community housing providers, peak bodies, the finance sector and landowners to meet our housing needs and guide the city's development. This has been repeatedly demonstrated in the delivery of high-quality high-density urban renewal in places like the 2.78sqkm Green Square Urban Renewal Area, the Ashmore Estate, Erskineville and most recently Ultimo/Pyrmont.

The Housing for All discussion paper (discussion paper) was prepared to guide a conversation with the community, housing providers, industry, peak bodies and government about where and how we can plan for more housing in the local area. The intent of the discussion paper was to initiate the process of long-term strategic planning for housing. It sought feedback to 3 important questions about housing:

- Where and how can we plan for more homes? We asked for ideas on places that could be suitable for more well-located homes.

- What should the NSW Government do to support more homes? We asked for feedback on the NSW Government developing public land and continuing to deliver better transport, including metro and light rail extensions to high density communities as road space for more drivers is challenging.

- How can housing better meet the diverse needs of our community? We asked for ideas about the different types of housing we need for our diverse community, so that housing is available for people from a mix of cultural backgrounds, income levels, household types, lifestyles and stages of life.

The discussion paper was placed on public exhibition for an extended period between Tuesday 7 April 2026 to Friday 19 June 2026. In total over 1,680 distinct responses were received. A detailed summary of feedback is provided in the Housing for All Engagement Report at Attachment A.

About 65% of the feedback received supported additional housing, acknowledging the need for it to accommodate a growing population and improve housing choice. While views differed on the scale, location and form of future growth, feedback generally focused less on whether additional housing should be provided and more on where and how it should be delivered and what infrastructure was needed to support it. However, some responses objected to additional housing growth due to concerns about overdevelopment, loss of amenity and insufficient infrastructure.

The accompanying Housing for All discussion paper- Interim implementation plan (interim plan) at Attachment B sets out the short term (zero to 2 years) to medium term (3 to 5 years) planning and advocacy actions the City could take to address significant housing supply, affordability and diversity concerns raised in response to the discussion paper. It will supplement the City's current strategies and plans related to housing.

The NSW Government is expected to direct councils to updated local strategic planning statements (LSPS) and local housing strategies in 2027. The future LSPS and local housing strategy will incorporate the actions in the interim plan and respond to the NSW Government's Sydney Plan.

Recommendation

It is resolved that Council:

(A) note the issues raised in public consultation on the Housing for All discussion paper (the discussion paper), as provided in the Housing for All discussion paper - Engagement Report, shown at Attachment A to the subject report

(B) endorse the Housing for All discussion paper - Interim implementation plan (the interim implementation plan), shown at Attachment B to the subject report

(C) note the matters raised in the Housing for All discussion paper - Engagement report which will inform further local strategic planning to address housing supply, affordability and diversity concerns in the local area. This may include, but is not limited to, the preparation of any local strategic planning statement and associated local housing strategy in accordance with any direction or instruction of the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces

(D) note the Interim Implementation Plan will be incorporated into the future update of the City of Sydney Local Strategic Planning Statement and associated City of Sydney Local Housing Strategy.

Attachments

Attachment A. Housing for All discussion paper - Engagement report

Attachment B. Housing for All discussion paper - Interim implementation plan

Attachment C. Resolution of Council – 23 March 2026

Background

The discussion paper guided a conversation about housing in the local area

1. The discussion paper was prepared to guide a conversation with the community, housing providers, industry, peak bodies and government about where and how we can plan for more housing in the local area. It sought responses to 3 important questions about housing:

    (a) Where and how can we plan for more homes?

    (b) What should the NSW Government do to support more homes?

    (c) How can housing better meet the diverse needs of our community?

2. Council resolved to exhibit the discussion paper on 23 March 2026 (Attachment C). The discussion paper and associated council report are available at: https://city.sydney/j48

The NSW Government recently released the Sydney Plan to guide planning across the region

3. The NSW Government released the Sydney Plan in August 2026; a new region plan to guide greater Sydney's growth. It sets out a regional approach to deliver on 7 statewide priorities for land use planning, including Aboriginal Outcomes, Housed, Prosperous, Connected, Resilient, Liveable, and Coordinated.

4. The Sydney Plan mandates 5-year housing targets for all Sydney councils. The City of Sydney is obligated to deliver 18,900 dwellings by 2029 — one of the highest targets. The Sydney Plan also requires all Sydney councils to maintain 30 years of feasible housing capacity in its planning controls at all times.

5. To meet both the 5-year target and the 30-year feasible capacity requirement, the Sydney Plan directs the City to undertake additional planning for further housing growth as follows.

    (a) Short term:

        (i) rezone areas identified in the discussion paper

        (ii) rezone Pyrmont/Ultimo supported by Wentworth Park open space

        (iii) investigate Newtown and Erskineville high-density opportunities (collaboration with Inner West Council).

    (b) Further short term investigations:

        (i) Paddington (between Oxford Street and Moore Park Road) and the area around the Entertainment Quarter

        (ii) heritage conservation areas of Surry Hills, Darlinghurst and Potts Point-Elizabeth Bay.

(c) Medium-longer term investigations:

(i) around the Surry Hills light rail station subject to infrastructure capacity and consultation with government agencies

(ii) consider the evolution of locally significant industrial land within the council area that could be transitioned to mixed-use opportunities.

6. On 1 July 2026, the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces issued an updated "Statement of Expectations Order". The Order is considered when the Minister is exercising powers to appoint a planning administrator for a council and includes new expectations relating to updating planning statements, maintain feasible housing capacity and reviewing industrial lands.

The discussion paper was publicly exhibited for an extended period

7. The discussion paper was placed on public exhibition for an extended period between Tuesday 7 April 2026 to Friday 19 June 2026. Engagement activities included:

(a) a Sydney Your Say project page with the opportunity to provide feedback via an interactive online map, online survey and/or email submission

(b) letters sent to all residents in the council area, property owners affected by any of the 10 ideas and NSW Government agencies notifying them of the public exhibition

(c) 2 evening public forums hosted by the Lord Mayor at:

(i) Lower Town Hall – Wednesday 29 April 2026

(ii) Green Square Public School and Community Spaces – Thursday 30 April 2026

(d) briefings to the City's Advisory Panels including the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Panel, Multicultural Advisory Panel, Housing for All Advisory Panel and Design Advisory Panel

(e) presentations and opportunity to speak with a planning officer about the discussion paper at the Lord Mayor's social housing forums held in Glebe, Waterloo, Woolloomooloo and Erskineville

(f) briefings to industry, community action groups and NSW Government agencies.

8. The consultation was also promoted through social media (Facebook, Instagram and LinkedIn), the Sydney Your Say e-newsletter, Sydney City News and community centre newsletters.

We heard from 865 people and organisations with their ideas about housing

9. In total, 1,685 responses were made to the public exhibition, including:

    (a) 232 email submissions

    (b) 261 online survey responses

    (c) 656 online interactive map comments (from 179 respondents)

    (d) 536 comments made at the 2 public forums (from 193 attendees).

10. An extended summary of the feedback is in the Housing for all - Engagement report (engagement report) at Attachment A.

People acknowledge the need for more housing

11. Responses acknowledged the need for additional housing to accommodate a growing population and improve housing choice, with housing affordability a significant issue. Feedback focused on where and how housing should be delivered and what infrastructure was needed to support it with different views on the scale and location.

12. Community, residents and community action groups had mixed views on the scale and location of housing growth, but generally supported well-planned housing that delivers community benefit, including more social and affordable rental housing. Key concerns focused on the impacts of increased density on existing communities, particularly infrastructure capacity, heritage and local character, open space and residential amenity.

13. Industry stakeholders supported increasing housing supply and development opportunities. Feedback called for more flexible planning controls, streamlined approvals and greater housing diversity. The main concern was development feasibility, with construction costs, financing, contributions and planning requirements identified as potential barriers to delivery.

14. Peak bodies focused on how the broader housing system could work better. This included improving housing affordability and outcomes for renters, ensuring transport and community infrastructure keeps pace with housing growth, and making sure planning supports the delivery of new housing.

Six overarching themes emerged from the feedback

The planning system and decision-making

15. The feedback included:

    (a) support for collaboration between the City, the NSW Government, infrastructure providers and landowners to identify and deliver housing opportunities

    (b) concerns about State-led and ad hoc planning that could reduce the City's role in planning decisions, limit community participation or bypass established planning controls

    (c) support from industry for faster planning decisions, clearer planning controls and planning requirements that do not compromise project feasibility

(d) different views on the role of the NSW Government and the appropriate level of planning intervention

(e) importance of meaningful community engagement and clear justification for planning changes

(f) questions about whether planning changes alone would secure housing delivery, given construction costs, financing and workforce availability.

Infrastructure

16. The feedback included:

(a) the importance of timely infrastructure investment to support growth and stronger commitments from the NSW Government to coordinate housing delivery with transport, schools, hospitals and other essential infrastructure

(b) public transport was the most frequently raised issue, with respondents calling for improved metro, light rail and bus services, and better transport connections

(c) the importance of additional parks and recreation facilities, wider footpaths, separated cycleways, community facilities and upgrades to utilities and essential services

(d) concern about whether existing services and facilities (public transport, open space, community facilities, education and health) had the capacity to accommodate population growth and that upgrades were required before new housing

(e) industry stakeholders noted additional housing can support the case for future investment and should not necessarily be delayed pending the delivery of major infrastructure.

Overdevelopment

17. Feedback included:

(a) different views on the scale, density and form of new housing

(b) support for additional density in appropriate locations

(c) views that neighbourhood character, amenity and liveability should be protected and development should respond to the local context

(d) support was strongest for additional housing in centres, public transport corridors and larger redevelopment sites

(e) concern about increased density, taller buildings, traffic, parking and pressure on local infrastructure.

Design quality

18. Feedback included:

    (a) support for well-designed, liveable homes, including natural light, cross ventilation, privacy, sound insulation, storage, accessibility and a mix of housing types

    (b) support for active street frontages, mixed-use development and larger apartments that can accommodate families and other larger households

    (c) desire for sustainable and climate-responsive design including rooftop gardens, tree planting, communal green space, solar panels and water-sensitive design as well as adaptation of existing buildings rather than demolition

    (d) concern about poor construction quality and apartment design, loss of trees and development that does not respond to its context.

Heritage and local character

19. Feedback included:

    (a) the importance of protecting heritage and local character while accommodating additional housing

    (b) support for additional housing that responds sensitively to surroundings

    (c) support for restoration and adaptive reuse of warehouses, commercial buildings and former industrial sites, particularly in established neighbourhoods

    (d) the importance of maintaining active high streets and human-scaled streets

    (e) concerns about the loss of heritage buildings and streetscapes, increased height and density, and development out of scale with its surroundings.

Environment

20. Feedback included:

    (a) strong support for housing that protects and enhances the natural environment, including increasing tree canopy, protecting mature trees, expanding green space (including rooftop gardens, community gardens, green corridors and deep soil) and improving resilience to urban heat, flooding and other climate-related impacts

    (b) improving the quality of streets and public spaces with wider footpaths, more trees, improved walking and cycling connections, safer streets and the renewal of major transport corridors

    (c) additional housing was often supported where it contributes to healthier, more walkable and attractive neighbourhoods

    (d) concern about the loss of tree canopy, green space and environmental amenity including vegetation and biodiversity loss, urban heat, flooding, noise, air pollution, waste and wind.

Responding to the feedback

21. It is proposed the City take the following action in response to the issues raised:

    (a) apply the planning principles, set out in the discussion paper, when preparing housing related draft policies, planning proposals and submissions to other levels of government for Council's consideration

    (b) consult and respond to the community and other stakeholders when planning for housing

    (c) proactively engage with NSW Government infrastructure providers when preparing planning proposals to ensure state and regional infrastructure keeps pace with growth

    (d) prepare a new contributions plan to replace the City of Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2015, to ensure housing growth is supported by new and improved local infrastructure.

The response to our 10 ideas for more housing was generally very positive

22. The discussion paper explored 10 ideas where we could investigate planning changes to provide more opportunities for homes.

23. Feedback on the ideas was captured through the survey, which asked whether people supported the idea, and other written responses, which included emails, online map comments and forum feedback.

Ultimo and Pyrmont

24. In October 2025, Council resolved to investigate additional sites in Ultimo and Pyrmont for more housing in response to previous feedback and the NSW Government's commitment to return Wentworth Park to public open space. The majority of responses supported the Ultimo/Pyrmont idea as shown in Table 1.

    Table 1: Ultimo / Pyrmont: table of support

Survey (254)	**Other responses (61)**
• 67% supported • 15% did not support • 18% were unsure	• 77% supported • 15% did not support • 8% were unsure

25. Feedback included:

    (a) strong support for a place-based approach to work with existing development and natural features to accommodate growth, where opportunities for additional housing are considered as part of broader planning for the area

    (b) the western side of Harris Street presents an opportunity for residential renewal with underutilised sites capable of accommodating additional housing and public domain improvements

(c) additional housing should be supported by improvements to public space, tree canopy, walking and cycling infrastructure

(d) concerns about overdevelopment and increased traffic and on-street parking pressures.

26. In response to the feedback, recent requests by landowners and the previous resolution of Council, a planning proposal has been prepared for Council's consideration.

Connecting Green Square

27. The discussion paper identified the "North Green Square" precinct for rezoning to increase heights and densities for a mix of light industrial, retail, commercial and residential uses. The precinct has the potential to connect Green Square Town Centre and Waterloo. The majority of responses supported this idea supported as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Connecting Green Square: table of support

Survey (253)	**Other responses (95)**
• 68% supported • 12% did not support • 20% were unsure	• 72% supported • 9% did not support • 19% were unsure

28. Feedback included:

(a) Green Square generally is well supported by infrastructure, services and open space and is a suitable place for more housing

(b) the area is an opportunity to provide better quality and diversity of retail and services for Green Square, including entertainment and cultural uses and better dining and shopping experiences

(c) the opportunity to introduce more connections between Waterloo and Green Square for pedestrians and cyclists

(d) concerns the area is already dense, there will be amenity impacts to existing dwellings, and the new housing will not provide good residential amenity, particularly along busy roads.

29. In response, it is proposed that a planning proposal incorporating the feedback will be prepared for Council's consideration.

Prince Alfred Park edges

30. The Prince Alfred Park edges precinct is to the east and south of Prince Alfred Park. It includes the mixed-use streets of Cleveland Street, Buckingham Street and Elizabeth Street and the Australia Post site on Cleveland Street. The discussion paper identified the area as having potential for more housing and jobs given its excellent access to public transport, open space and local amenity. Support for this idea varied depending on the type of response as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Prince Alfred Park edges: table of support

Survey (250)	**Other responses (69)**
• 50% supported • 24% did not support • 26% were unsure	• 83% supported • 4% did not support • 13% were unsure

31. Feeback included:

(a) the area is well suited for additional housing because of its proximity to Central Station and other transport links, Prince Alfred Park, local services and amenities

(b) the Australia Post site on Cleveland Street is underutilised and if sensitively designed can provide for housing and local services that transition to the surrounding area

(c) additional housing should protect park amenity, acknowledge heritage, retain local businesses and creative industries, provide affordable rental housing, consider traffic impacts, support greening and high-quality design

(d) consider opportunities to expand the precinct boundary

(e) concerns additional density would result in overdevelopment, overshadowing, loss of park and residential amenity, increase traffic and parking pressures and ignore heritage and local character.

32. In response, it is proposed that a planning proposal incorporating the feedback will be prepared for Council's consideration.

33. The planning proposal will exclude the Australia Post site on Cleveland Street as it was declared State Significant Development by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces on 31 July 2026. The City will make a submission to the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) when it is exhibited.

Renewing the Supa Centa site

34. The discussion paper identified the Supa-Centa site on South Dowling Street in Moore Park for potential rezoning to allow for residential uses to capitalise on the new public parkland being delivered at Moore Park. It was proposed the current retail and services be retained on the site, but that additional capacity be created for residential towers above the existing structure. The most responses supported this idea as shown in table 4.

Table 4: Supa Centa: table of support

Survey (253)	**Other responses (58)**
• 74% supported • 12% did not support • 14% were unsure	• 91% supported • 5% did not support • 4% were unsure

35. However, the Supa Centa site was declared State Significant Development by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces on 7 July 2026. The proposal is for 5 residential towers on the site of 15-25 stories with an estimated 870 dwellings.

36. The City will not prepare a planning proposal to rezone the site given the current SSD process, but it will make a submission to the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) when it is exhibited.

Renewing Broadway: UTS to Glebe Point Road

37. In the discussion paper, the “Broadway precinct”, stretching from Parramatta Road to the southern edge of Wentworth Park, was proposed for more housing to capitalise on the future expansion of Wentworth Park and potential light rail on Parramatta Road. Most responses supported this idea as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Renewing Broadway: table of support

Survey (254)	**Other responses (87)**
• 74% supported • 11% did not support • 15% were unsure	• 83% supported • 3% did not support • 14% were unsure

38. Feedback included:

(a) this is a good place for different types of housing, including affordable housing and student housing as it is close to the university, transport, jobs, shops and entertainment

(b) heritage is important in this area but needs to be balanced with meeting housing need

(c) connections in and through the area need to be planned, particularly those between Broadway, Wentworth Park and the Sydney Fish Market

(d) the Broadway Shopping Centre is an opportunity for renewal and more housing, particularly the car park

(e) concerns that additional housing would contribute to overdevelopment, increase pressure on limited open space and local roads, and affect the distinctive character of the area

(f) concerns raised about the unpleasant feel and the unsafe and aggressive traffic environment at the Parramatta Road end of the precinct which should be addressed before more housing

(g) light rail was seen as an opportunity for wholesale renewal of Parramatta Road and a reallocation of space away from private vehicles to public transport and a more walkable and bike friendly environment.

39. In response, it is proposed that a planning proposal which addresses the feedback will be prepared for Council's consideration.

Renewing underused sites along Parramatta Road

40. The discussion paper proposed rezoning 14 sites in Forest Lodge currently used for light industrial, commercial and office uses for a mix of housing and employment uses. Most responses supported this idea as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Renewing underused sites along Parramatta Road: table of support

Survey (254)	**Other responses (74)**
• 87% supported • 4% did not support • 9% were unsure	• 91% supported • 3% did not support • 6% were unsure

41. Feedback included:

(a) the area is suitable for student housing, people needing access to the hospital, essential workers and social and affordable rental housing

(b) the need to renew the precinct with shops and services that meet community needs while acknowledging heritage and creating a more inviting, local high street

(c) better connections to open space and increased greening are needed to improve amenity

(d) new development should address noise and pollution from Parramatta Road

(e) concerns additional density impacting on existing residences and increased traffic and parking pressure with some preferring upgrades to existing buildings rather than redevelopment.

42. In response, it is proposed that a planning proposal addressing the feedback will be prepared for Council's consideration.

More life (and living) on our high streets

43. The discussion paper explored opportunities for more housing on high streets across the local area through shop-top housing, additions to existing buildings and mixed-use development. Support for this idea varied depending on the type of response as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: More life on our high streets: table of support

Survey (248)	**Other responses (123)**
• 43% supported • 31% did not support • 26% were unsure	• 67% supported • 22% did not support • 11% were unsure

44. Feedback included:

(a) support for more housing on high streets, given their access to shops, services and public transport and the potential for more residents to support local businesses and street activity

(b) feedback favoured a place-specific approach rather than a one-size-fits-all approach, recognising that some high streets have greater capacity for additional housing and that growth should be accompanied by public domain and greening improvements

(c) support was generally conditional on development responding to local character and heritage, retaining fine-grain shopfronts and commercial activity, maintaining an appropriate scale and delivering high quality public domain outcomes

(d) concerns focused on development scale and impacts on local character and amenity, including heritage loss, traffic and parking pressures, infrastructure capacity, sunlight and privacy, and potential conflicts with existing high street activities.

45. Feedback varied across different locations. Glebe Point Road generated the strongest support for further investigation, followed by Oxford Street. Respondents also identified opportunities for renewal along Botany Road and King Street, while raising concerns about changes to Crown Street and Erskineville Road.

46. In response, the City will undertake further detailed investigations into high streets to identify which high streets have the opportunity to accommodate additional housing and provide local retail and services. This work would be reported to Council prior to proceeding with any planning proposals.

Mid-rise living in Beaconsfield

47. The discussion paper identified Beaconsfield as a potential location for more mid-rise housing because it is close to public transport, employment, shops, community facilities and parks. Support for this idea varied depending on across the type of response as shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Mid-rise living in Beaconsfield: table of support

Survey (249)	**Other responses (127)**
• 50% supported • 27% did not support • 23% were unsure	• 29% supported • 36% did not support • 35% were unsure

48. Feedback included:

(a) the area is well located given its access to public transport, jobs and services, with some favouring broader or more flexible planning controls rather than focusing on selected sites

(b) concerns focused on the scale of development and impacts on Beaconsfield's heritage and village character, including increased building heights, loss of fine-grain streetscapes and potential site amalgamation

(c) traffic, parking and infrastructure capacity were significant concerns, including pressure on local roads, public transport, parks, schools, stormwater, sewer and community facilities

(d) residential amenity was also a concern, including overshadowing, loss of sunlight and privacy and increased noise, with some respondents preferring additional housing to be directed to surrounding renewal areas

(e) support was generally conditional on carefully managed growth, including low- to medium-rise development, protection of heritage and fine-grain character, higher densities on larger sites with fewer heritage constraints, and infrastructure keeping pace with growth.

49. In response, it is not proposed to investigate substantial planning changes for Beaconsfield at this time, but we will still process planning proposals when submitted.

Gentle density on laneways

50. The discussion paper explored opportunities for additional compact, high amenity housing on laneways in existing residential areas. This is based on the small houses that already existing on narrow streets in the local area and that we already allow garages with upper levels on laneways. The majority of responses supported the idea as shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Gentle density on laneways: table of support

Survey (248)	**Other responses (115)**
• 51% supported • 24% did not support • 25% were unsure	• 70% supported • 13% did not support • 17% were unsure

51. Feedback included:

(a) small lot housing along laneways is seen as a low-impact way to provide more housing choice, with smaller homes generally preferred to larger apartment developments and a way to protect heritage streets

(b) underused or neglected laneways that felt unsafe were seen as an opportunity for new housing and more activity, while improving the character, greening and affordability of these spaces

(c) support was generally conditional on good design and protecting the amenity of existing and new homes, including access to sunlight, privacy, ventilation and open space, as well as retaining trees, deep soil and heritage character

(d) careful management of laneways would be needed to support additional housing, particularly traffic, parking, waste collection and access, with respondents also seeking more greening along laneways

(e) concerns focused on laneways becoming overcrowded and losing their existing character and function, including impacts on privacy, greenery, parking and access, increased pressure on infrastructure and local streets and whether the approach would deliver meaningful additional housing

(f) in Erskineville and Alexandria, concerns focused on impacts to heritage, local character, privacy, sunlight and amenity, with Erskineville respondents also pointing to substantial housing growth already occurring in the area

(g) in Glebe, concerns focused on existing density and the loss of backyards and laneways valued for greenery, wildlife and wellbeing, although the Glebe Society expressed cautious support where amenity, access, waste, traffic and safety issues could be addressed.

52. In response, the City will undertake further investigations to precedents, design guidance and opportunities for small lot housing and report this work to Council for further community consultation prior to the preparation of any planning control changes integrated with any future greening strategies.

Park-side living for more people to enjoy

53. The discussion paper identified park edges as good locations for additional housing as they provided high levels of amenity to residents and made use of existing community infrastructure. Most responses supported this idea as shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Parkside living: table of support

Survey (251)	**Other responses (92)**
• 63% supported • 20% did not support • 17% were unsure	• 71% supported • 14% did not support • 15% were unsure

54. Feedback included:

(a) support for more housing near parks as it provided more people with access to green space, particularly in areas well served by public transport, shops, schools and community facilities

(b) more activity and amenity around parks are a potential benefit, including the opportunity for more shops, cafes and improved park facilities

(c) support was generally conditional on protecting park amenity, including retaining mature trees and green space and limiting overshadowing of parks, public spaces and surrounding homes

(d) growth should be supported by high-quality design and improvements to infrastructure and connections, including parks, public transport, walking and cycling, with further investigation of local impacts before planning changes are considered

(e) concerns focused on potential impacts on the openness, character and recreational value of parks, and increased pressure on park capacity, roads, parking and community infrastructure, with some respondents preferring housing growth elsewhere

(f) location-specific feedback included:

(i) protecting Redfern Park’s amenity, sunlight and mature trees

(ii) general support for further investigation around Wentworth Park provided its amenity, sunlight and recreational use were maintained

(iii) concern the areas surrounding Sydney Park, Erskineville Oval, Harry Noble Reserve and Alexandria Park had already experienced significant housing growth, and that further housing should consider park amenity, recreational use and capacity.

55. In response, it is proposed to undertake further investigations into park-edge locations to understand where and how additional housing may be provided and report this work to Council for further community consultation prior to the preparation of any planning control changes.

The community agreed more action was required by the NSW Government to support housing growth

56. The discussion paper asked what the NSW Government should do to support the delivery of more housing, specifically:

(a) what the NSW Government should do on their own land to provide more housing and

(b) about the potential of extending light rail along Parramatta Road and light rail and metro to Green Square to unlock housing opportunities.

NSW Government-owned land

57. A majority of responses about developing NSW Government land for more housing were in support of the idea.

58. A common theme in responses was that the renewal of NSW Government owned land provides an opportunity to create great places to live and work, while increasing the supply of market, social and affordable housing. Feedback also encouraged the City to continue advocating for the NSW Government to take a more active role in delivering housing on its own land.

59. Feedback also included:

(a) a strong expectation that redevelopment be supported by appropriate infrastructure and deliver high-quality places, including well-designed buildings, trees, open space and community facilities

(b) suggestions that the NSW Government retain ownership of public land and housing, including social, affordable and market housing, to provide ongoing community benefit and generate revenue to support future housing and infrastructure delivery

(c) calls for greater transparency around the delivery of housing on NSW Government sites, including clearer timelines

(d) concerns that the identified sites should continue to support broader public purposes and should not be relied on too heavily to meet future housing needs.

60. The Newtown Tram Sheds was frequently identified as an opportunity with some supporting mixed-use development (housing, community space and greenery) while others preferred open space, local services or community uses. Feedback also highlighted the potential for adaptive reuse that retains the site's heritage significance.

61. In response, it is proposed the Council continue to advocate for direct NSW Government action to increase housing supply on government-owned land, including advocating that the NSW Government fast track the delivery of housing on land that is already planned, including:

    (a) rail sidings next to Prince Alfred Park

    (b) Regent Street Sidings, Central Station

    (c) Paint Shop, North Eveleigh

    (d) Clothing Store, North Eveleigh

    (e) East of Redfern Station on Gibbons St, Redfern.

Social housing estates

62. There was significant feedback about the potential redevelopment of social housing estates. In addition to the broader engagement program, the discussion paper was presented to residents at the Lord Mayor's regular social housing forums in Glebe, Waterloo, Woolloomooloo and Erskineville. Across the engagement, there was broad recognition that renewal could provide additional social housing to help meet local need. However, concerns focused on:

    (a) maintaining and increasing social housing rather than replacing it with market housing

    (b) minimising displacement and protecting the housing security, support networks and community connections of existing residents

    (c) ensuring residents are involved in planning and have opportunities to remain in, or return to, their community following redevelopment

    (d) exploring refurbishment and renovation before demolition, while protecting existing open space, community facilities and social infrastructure.

63. The Erskineville Estate attracted particularly strong interest. There was a strong view that redevelopment of the Estate, or other parts of Erskineville, should not be considered by the NSW Government because:

    (a) the Estate was seen as an important part of the local community, with concerns that redevelopment would disrupt established social connections and neighbourhood identity

    (b) of the potential displacement of residents and the loss of housing security for existing tenants

    (c) it would place further pressure on infrastructure and impact heritage and neighbourhood character.

64. While opposition to renewal was the dominant view, a smaller number of responses supported additional housing on the Estate to help meet the demand for social housing.

65. The City is not taking any action to redevelop the Erskineville Estate. Any future action would depend on the NSW Government deciding to pursue renewal of the site.

66. The feedback received about the redevelopment of housing estates will be referred to the NSW Government for their consideration. It will be used to inform the City's advocacy in the event the NSW Government proposes renewal or redevelopment of social housing estates in the local area.

67. The City will continue to advocate to the NSW Government that, where a social housing estate is proposed for renewal, it:

    (a) stays in public ownership

    (b) delivers more social and affordable housing, as a priority over market housing, so as to meet our 15% target

    (c) is planned in collaboration with existing residents

    (d) does not result in a reduction of existing public open space or recreational / community facilities

    (e) first explores sustainable renovation of existing housing to minimise disruption to the existing residents, limits the need for relocations and retains community connections.

Light rail and metro to support more housing

68. Responses showed strong support for light rail and metro to support more housing. Feedback included:

    (a) current public transport was considered inadequate for existing and future growth, particularly in Zetland, Rosebery and Beaconsfield. Respondents highlighted poor access to rail and Metro stations, reliance on overcrowded bus services and pressure on Green Square Station, with Rosebery described as a particular transport gap.

    (b) light rail or metro was strongly supported to improve connectivity and support further housing growth, particularly through Green Square, Zetland and Rosebery. Feedback showed better transport could reduce car dependence, support higher-density housing and create opportunities for safer, more walkable streets.

    (c) housing growth should be coordinated with transport and other infrastructure investment. Feedback called for feasibility studies, funding commitments and delivery timeframes for more transport before rezonings or greater housing targets.

69. There was a mix of views about metro or light rail supporting more density in Green Square and Rosebery. Feedback indicated that improved transport is needed to support already planned housing, while other feedback argued it could unlock additional housing capacity.

70. There was strong support for the delivery of light rail along Parramatta Road to support housing in the Broadway precinct and other sites further west of the local area. Feedback included:

    (a) a response from ALTRAC that a new light rail line along Broadway and Parramatta Road could conservatively facilitate over 70,000 new homes between Central and Burwood under existing planning rules, including 20,000 new homes within the local area

    (b) strong support for light rail on Broadway and improvement of Parramatta Road to calm traffic, improve connections, reallocate road space for pedestrians and cyclists, plant more trees and improving traffic sequencing to prioritise pedestrians

    (c) concerns that Parramatta Road (and Broadway) was traffic clogged, unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists and was an ugly and unwelcoming gateway to the CBD.

71. In addition, ALTRAC stated that the existing L1 Light Rail Line has the potential to support significant housing growth in Pyrmont and Glebe, however, it is currently operating at capacity. It suggested further investment in rail systems, rolling stock and civil infrastructure to accommodate additional population and housing growth.

72. This feedback is consistent with advocacy actions contained in Sustainable Sydney 2030-2050: Continuing the Vision, and the City's Access Strategy and Action Plan. Under these plans the City advocates for better transport to Green Square and Zetland, a light rail connection between Green Square and the city centre, and light rail along Broadway and Parramatta Road. The City will continue to advocate for these initiatives and feedback received will be referred to the NSW Government.

There was strong support for greater housing diversity

73. The discussion paper explored the housing we need for our diverse community, so that housing is available for people of all cultural backgrounds, income levels, household formation, lifestyles and stages of life. There was strong support for prioritising housing diversity in our local area.

Affordable housing

74. Feedback highlighted the importance of genuinely affordable housing, with rents linked to household income, and permanent affordable rental housing. There was support for increasing supply through new development, rezonings, NSW Government land and partnerships with community housing providers. Respondents emphasised the need for secure, well-designed homes close to jobs, public transport and essential services. Some responses, particularly from industry, cautioned that affordable housing requirements could affect development feasibility.

75. In response, the City will:

    (a) continue to use all its available levers to deliver more affordable housing in the local area, including:

        (i) using its planning controls, such as requiring affordable housing contributions where a site is developed

        (ii) where superfluous to need, selling City owned land at a significant discount to not-for-profit organisations to support the delivery of affordable and diverse housing

        (iii) providing grants from the Affordable and Diverse Housing Fund to eligible applicants who support and deliver affordable and diverse housing in the City of Sydney area.

    (b) advocate to the NSW Government to:

        (i) ensure planning uplift achieved under the Housing Delivery Authority makes appropriate and commensurate contribution to affordable housing in accordance with the City's affordable housing program

        (ii) develop a monetary contribution approach where on-site affordable housing provision is impractical or unfeasible

        (iii) review NSW Government affordable housing policies to facilitate the delivery of affordable housing in perpetuity, rented at an income-based rent.

Social housing

76. There was strong support to increase the supply of social housing and retaining social housing in public ownership. Renewal of social housing should increase public housing, avoid displacement of residents and allow residents to return. There was also support for integrating social housing across neighbourhoods to create mixed-income communities. Respondents emphasised the need for well-designed and well-managed homes close to public transport, jobs and services. Some raised concerns about social housing that is poorly maintained or lacks appropriate support services.

77. in response, the City will continue to advocate for more action and a comprehensive plan for the increase of social housing in our local area, in accordance with our current LSPS and local housing strategy.

Housing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

78. The Discussion addressed the impact of the ongoing loss and redevelopment of social housing estates on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in our local area, and that more social and affordable housing is needed for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander households. Further, it is essential this housing is owned and managed by Aboriginal community-controlled organisations.

79. Responses supported increasing access to housing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, with Aboriginal involvement and control over its design, delivery and management. There was also support for housing near community-controlled services and established communities, particularly in Redfern and Waterloo. Some responses preferred affordable rental housing to be allocated based on need rather than targeted to specific cohorts.

80. In response, the City will work with Aboriginal landowners and housing providers to support opportunities for new housing on Aboriginal-owned land and strategically build capacity to develop and deliver housing projects.

Naturally occurring low-cost market housing

81. The discussion paper talks about the impact of losing traditional boarding houses and other low-cost housing and the exclusion on non-private housing from the NSW Government's housing targets.

82. Responses supported retaining older apartments, lower-cost dwellings and traditional boarding houses, with concerns about their loss and resident displacement when redeveloped. Responses identified a role for Council in retaining lower-cost housing and reviewing planning requirements, while maintaining appropriate safety and quality standards.

83. In response, the City will continue to advocate to the NSW Government to strengthen provisions that support the retention of low-rental housing, including traditional boarding houses, and improve outcomes for residents displaced by their closure or redevelopment.

Housing for renters

84. The discussion paper highlights growing pressures on renters, including rising rents, low vacancy rates and limited housing security, in an area where two thirds of households rent. It raises concerns about the impact of short-term rental accommodation on the availability of homes for long-term residents.

85. Responses supported increasing rental supply and improving affordability, security and housing quality, including through longer leases and stronger renter protections. Build-to-rent was generally supported to increase supply and security, although some questioned its affordability. Some also cautioned that further rental regulation could discourage investment and reduce supply.

86. Short term rental accommodation (STRA) was one of the most frequently discussed housing issues. Opposition to further STRA restrictions from property owners substantially outweighed support.

87. Many considered STRA was not a major driver of housing pressures and highlighted its role in providing flexible accommodation and supporting the local economy. Around one-third of those opposing further restrictions specifically focused on protecting STRA in principal places of residence. Others supported more stringent controls to protect long-term rental supply, while some preferred better enforcement of existing controls and targeted regulation of commercial operators.

88. In response, the City will continue to:

    (a) advocate for stronger renters' rights, fairer rental laws, more secure and pet-friendly tenancies and better quality and energy-efficient homes as outlined in our social sustainability policy and action plan

    (b) advocate to the NSW Government:

        (i) to publicly release the outcomes of its 2024 review of the short-term rental accommodation framework and any supporting evidence used to inform policy decisions

        (ii) for a STRA regulatory framework that recognises the differing impacts of principal places of residence, hosted accommodation and commercial STRA operations and prioritises long term rental opportunities

        (iii) to strengthen their monitoring, compliance and enforcement of the existing STRA regulatory framework.

Better apartment living

89. Responses recognised apartments as an important part of city living, supporting walkable neighbourhoods and access to services and amenities. Responses said apartments should be well-designed, adaptable and sustainable providing good light, privacy, acoustics, storage and access to open space. There was support for more affordable, family-sized apartments and better communal spaces. Some responses raised concerns about building quality, maintenance and strata management, with many calling for stronger standards, regulation and oversight.

90. In response, the City will continue to:

    (a) monitor its planning controls, and where appropriate adjust them, to ensure that apartments are meeting the needs of the growing community

    (b) advocate to the NSW Government to ensure state planning policies and planning controls deliver well-designed, adaptable and sustainable apartment buildings.

Housing for people who need more support

91. Appropriate housing is needed for older people, crisis and emergency accommodation, people who are experiencing homelessness and people with a disability. The discussion paper talked about feasibility challenges, limited government funding, land availability and value and complexity in delivery.

92. Responses supported a range of housing models to meet different needs, with a focus on integrating housing with health, care and support services. Some responses identified a need for more crisis and transitional housing, particularly for people experiencing homelessness or escaping domestic and family violence.

93. There was also support for more accessible and adaptable housing that enables older people and people with disability to remain in their communities as their needs change. Feedback also sought greater support to connect people with need to available accessible housing, noting there was no obvious visibility in the market of this housing type.

94. In response, the City will:

    (a) continue to advocate for increased and improved supported housing, including on NSW Government sites, and for the retention and improvement of existing supported housing

    (b) continue its work with government and service providers to prevent homelessness, reduce rough sleeping and connect people experiencing or at risk of homelessness with appropriate housing, services and support, as outlined in our social sustainability policy and homelessness action plan

    (c) advocate to the NSW Government to establish a publicly accessible platform for the identification of dwellings constructed to meet accessible design standards, including those approved as adaptable apartments, to enable visibility of suitable housing for people who require it.

Alternative housing models

95. Alternative housing models and tenures may better address individual or community needs. The discussion paper identified lack of funding, complex legal structures, feasibility challenges, land availability and lack of know-how as challenges to delivering alternative housing models.

96. Responses supported greater diversity in housing types, tenure and delivery models, and encouraged the City to investigate and advocate for alternative approaches. Cooperative housing, particularly shared and limited-equity models, received specific support, including calls for the City to help facilitate or pilot these approaches. Responses also emphasised that alternative models should complement, rather than replace, social, affordable rental, supported and crisis housing.

97. In response, the City will continue to support alternative approaches to housing delivery through the Affordable and Diverse Housing Fund.

An updated local strategic planning statement and local housing strategy will be prepared following NSW Government direction

98. In 2027, the NSW Government is expected to direct councils to update their LSPS and local housing strategy. The LSPS and local housing strategy will be required to align with the NSW Government's strategic plans, including the recently released State Plan and Sydney Plan.

An interim plan has been prepared to set short to medium term planning actions on housing

99. The Housing for All Interim Implementation Plan (interim plan), shown at Attachment B, consolidates the short term (0 – 2 years) to medium term (3 – 5 years) planning and advocacy actions the City will take to address significant housing supply, affordability and diversity issues raised in response to the discussion paper.

100. It will guide staff in progressing the identified actions, with progress reported to Council at key milestones. It will also inform the preparation of the City’s next Local Strategic Planning Statement.

101. The interim plan supplements, does not replace or repeat, the City's current strategies, plans and programs that already support housing, including, but not limited to:

    (a) Sustainable Sydney 2030–2050: Continuing the vision

    (b) City Plan 2036: City of Sydney Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) and Housing for All: City of Sydney Local Housing Strategy

    (c) Access strategy and action plan: Continuing the vision

    (d) Environmental strategy 2025–2030

    (e) Inclusion (disability) action plan 2025–2029

    (f) A city for all: homelessness action plan

    (g) A city for all: towards a socially just and resilient Sydney

    (h) Affordable and diverse housing fund

    (i) City of Sydney Affordable Housing Program.

Key implications

Risks

102. The discussion paper provided an opportunity to test new planning approaches with stakeholders. Seeking feedback through the discussion paper was within the risk appetite for reputation and image, as consultation with the community ahead of significant change is encouraged in accordance with 'Our approach to engaging the community'.

103. The engagement report and the interim plan align with the City's minimal tolerance for non-compliance with legal or regulatory requirements. They will support the timely preparation of the local strategic planning statement, and any supporting local housing strategy, when further direction is provided by the NSW Government about the required form and content.

Financial implications

104. While developer contributions and potential additional rate revenue may support new local infrastructure as well as the maintenance of existing assets and increased service demands, they recover only a portion of Council's actual costs and often with a significant time lag.

105. The additional infrastructure and service costs required to support potential further housing growth are not yet incorporated into the City's long-term financial plan, although will be considered in the City's review of developer contribution plans.

106. There may be increased planning consultancy requirements due to the Minister's updated Statement of Expectations Order, and additional work due to the release of the Sydney Plan and Local Strategic Planning Statement requirements.

Relevant legislation

107. Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

GRAHAM JAHN AM

Chief Planner / Executive Director City Planning, Development and Transport

Tamara Bruckshaw, Manager Green Square and Major Projects