

Level 5
478 George Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000
p. 0447755799
09.11.2016
giovanni@planninglab.com.au

NSW Department of Planning & Environment
320 Pitt Street,
Sydney NSW
2000

November 11, 2016

Dear Sir / Madam,

UPDATED SUBMISSION WITH RESPECT TO SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK MASTER PLAN 2030 ON BEHALF OF THE HOMEBUSH PARTNERSHIP, 5 PARKVIEW DRIVE SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK (4 Pages)


I refer to the exhibition of the draft Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030 (2016) including draft amendments to the State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Precincts) 2005 which are on exhibition until 15 November 2016. This submission is made on behalf of the long-term leaseholders of sites 62A and 62B shown in Attachment 1.

It is understood that the Sydney Olympic Park Master Plan 2030 is to be interpreted as the development control plan for all new development at Sydney Olympic Park.


In comparison to Sydney Olympic Park Masterplan 2010, the revised masterplan has significant detrimental impacts upon the long-term leasehold property interests at 5 Parkview Drive, Sydney Olympic Park and the grounds for objection to the draft are itemised below:

1. SOPA states that the purpose of Masterplan 2030 includes to *“provide a comprehensive approach to the long-term development of Sydney Olympic Park, ensure Sydney Olympic Park continues to evolve into an active, vibrant town within metropolitan Sydney and to encourage development of Sydney Olympic Park that responds to its context, and which contributes to the quality of the built environment, future character and cultural significance of the Park”*.
2. However, to the contrary the revised 2016 Masterplan in comparison to the 2010 Masterplan, further isolates the subject industrial site and discourages development of the site by removing the possibility of residential development from the subject site, which is presently expressly permitted under the 2010 Masterplan.
3. The site is currently lawfully used for industrial purposes including bonded hazardous chemical storage facilities, which are also clearly inconsistent with the Masterplan. Planning controls for the subject site should be configured to encourage (rather than discourage) the renewal of such sites particularly given that residential tower developments are planned adjacent.
4. The Masterplan envisages significant development surrounding the subject sites, permitting densities as high as 5.5:1 and tower forms as high as 30 storeys to the east the subject site (on SOPA controlled sites).

5. The subject site, having a relatively unique unobstructed northern orientation, should capitalize upon this aspect, and be identified for residential development of comparable scale and intensity to nearby sites (30 storeys and 5.5:1)



6. Residential development is currently permitted on the subject site in the area referred to as site 62B. Despite the permissibility of residential development at present, this revised Masterplan will prohibit all residential development on site 62B if it proceeds.
7. The proposed designation of the site for expressly commercial purposes is in our view, contrary to State Government Planning policies, the Metropolitan Strategy 2015, which has identified the valuable contribution made by mixed use development on urban renewal sites and far more appropriate than a land use control which precludes residential development and isolates existing industrial sites.
8. The proposed Masterplan is contrary to Ministerial Directions under Section 117 of the EPA Act, 1979. Specifically Direction 3.1 prescribes that a planning authority shall not prepare a planning instrument which will reduce the permissible residential density of land.
9. In this case, the Masterplan 2010 currently permits residential development for at least half of the site's developable floor space ratio, and the intended Masterplan will prohibit residential development entirely, in breach of the Ministerial Direction.
10. The proposed exclusion of future residential development on the subject site is unreasonable given the current Masterplan allows for residential development, and future residential development is permitted on all adjacent sites to the south and east of the site.



11. The Planning Proposal is not required by the State Government in order to comply with State Directions or its' policy framework. To the contrary, the proposal is inconsistent with s117 Directions and broader strategies;
12. It is not necessary, reasonable nor appropriate to prohibit residential development on the site. Rather, the compatibility of residential use on the land can be addressed by building design and well considered site planning.
13. Residential development of the site would be well connected to planned residential areas immediately to the east and south of the subject site, world class public amenities and residential services.
14. Adequate and large areas of industrial and business zoned land currently exist in the Sydney Olympic Park precinct and in the West Central District subregion and will be protected in the future.
15. The land has been master planned for mixed uses since 2010 and the landowners have acted in good faith and invested in the precinct in good faith in the expectation that their investments could be developed in accordance with the existing and long established zoning.

Recommendation: It is recommended that as a 'symmetrical book-end' to the neighbouring sites (being sites 2a and 2b bounded by Parkview Drive, Murray Rose Avenue and Australia Avenue to the west), the subject site should also be shown on the Masterplan as being suitable for 30 storey tower forms, with an equivalent FSR of 5.5:1 and residential development being reinstated as a permitted land use on the subject site.

Yours sincerely

Giovanni Cirillo
Director, Planning Lab

Attachment 1

Figure 5.38 Parkview Precinct Site Boundaries Plan

