

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au on behalf of Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment
<noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 28 April 2021 4:54 PM
To: PDPS DRDE Design and Places SEPP Mailbox
Cc: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Subject: Webform submission from: Design and Place State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)

Submitted on Wed, 28/04/2021 - 16:53

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Submission

28/Apr/2021

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Design and Place State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)

To Whom it May Concern,

I object to the Planning Policy listed above.

I would like to submit my comments regarding the above planning Proposal.

As a resident of Parramatta City Council Area, we have been the recipients of many Disastrous Planning strategies implemented by several organisation including the Planning Dept, The Central City planning authority (and its various predecessors) and the Parramatta City Council. All these groups are faceless public servants with NO monitoring of performance with NO penalties for their generally inept and visionless performance of their roles. This strategy appears to continuing the same direction and leading to the same result

The one's that have had to live with the penalties for this activity is the LOCAL community.

Having read the primary document and other information, it nothing less than a social engineering strategy, inflected upon the residents and the community. It would appear to be an overreach by the Minister and the department mandarins.

It is difficult to understand in who's interest these changes are for the benefit off. It appears to generally help the Developers, Builders and the various authorities regulating or providing so call expert advice that manage the build form of our city.

The very many changes are a highly risky undertaking, by proposing such a comprehensive upheaval (based upon experience gained over time). There are so many inter-related changes proposed I think the end results have not been thought through or modelled.

Has anyone actually Modelled in detail the impact of the proposed strategy (please advise)! So that we can consider if this is the Society and Community we want. If it has been why has it not been made available to the Public?

A key issue with this planning strategy given its complexity and radical changes is the lack of discussion with the general community and the relatively short time allowed for consideration and to provide a detailed comprehensive submission. It should be Paused to allow the above actions be undertaken.

I could detail numerous points raised within this strategy other than the general comments above however I will list a few key concerns:

- It would appear that the community input into an individual development at the several levels of strategies is virtually eliminated.
- What capacity of individuals and groups to object is not detailed and mandated. What about the in balance in this process, where a developer can expense any costs involved as does the various Government authorities whilst the objector runs the risk of catastrophic costs.
- The role of local Governments role and powers appears to be minimised (but is unstated) an also what about the Planning panels?
- The documents fail to indicate and document what is the communities payback for the uplift in property higher utilisation. There is nothing to show how the community can afford to provide the increased demand for additional facilities resulting from the mandated planning changes. It is critical as the general community should not be forced to fund the developers impact of their development.
- It would appear that there is a diminishment of local residents oversight of these strategies and there implementation is removed and to be replaced by non residents, not accountable public servants with minimal accountable or impact from their decisions.
- The heritage coverage is very poor, displaying the lack of experience or comprehension regarding its significance and important to te general community showing the development of our cultural heritage. Ever the reference to Aboriginal heritage topics and land uses gives the impression of tokenism. For example in Parramatta we have a complex mix of significant heritage structures and Streetscapes being dominated by significant developments. Heritage needs to be protected by a gradual sloping envelope between different land uses. Nothing in this document offers a solution to this matter other than a winner take All result for benefit of the developer.
- I have concerns about the suggestion about removing parking spaces with high rise units and Commercial developments. Either this is a very naïve understanding of the issue or is designed for the developers and builders at the expense of the Community and residents. Particularly is the suggestion of removing parking from the units area and allowing the aggregation, management and possible trading in these spaces will have enormous on-going detrimental impact particularly of those less well off.
- The section regarding the amount of sun-light that an individual access to has no regards to the over-shadowing and wind tunnels created will have upon adjoining properties. Again North Parramatta is a example to this lack of a comprehensive view and its impact is enshrined into any legislation.

Hope this has been of assistance.

Regards,



I agree to the above statement

Yes