

Angela Hynes, A/Manager Place and Infrastructure, Central (GPOP)
Central River City and Western Parkland City
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Via email: angela.hynes@planning.nsw.gov.au

Your Reference	PP-2021-5178
Our Reference	RZ/5/2016
Contact	Paul Kennedy
Telephone	9806 5093
Email	pkennedy@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au

27 January 2022

Dear Ms Hynes

RE: Site-specific Planning Proposal: 24 and 26 – 30 Parkes Street and 114 – 116 Harris Street, Harris Park (Department Ref: PP_2021_5178)

I refer to your letter of 8 December 2021 inviting Council's comments on a review sought by the proponent for the Gateway determination and also your email of 23 December 2021 extending the deadline for making comments to 26 January 2022.

It is acknowledged that the site-specific PP is relying on controls in the draft Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal that are currently being assessed by the Department and therefore yet to be finalised. Notwithstanding this Council officers generally support the proponent's grounds for review for the following reasons:

- The Planning Proposal is generally consistent with relevant Section 9.1 Ministerial Directions.
- The Planning Proposal from information provided by the proponent should be able to achieve a substantial degree of compliance with ADG solar access requirements and that in any case solar access will be difficult to fully achieve in the Parramatta CBD context.
- The final urban design outcome for the Planning Proposal is ultimately considered acceptable, although it is acknowledged the outcome includes compromises, particularly relating to building setbacks. Furthermore, whilst there are a number of detailed urban design matters still to be agreed, it is considered that these can be resolved at the stage of preparing a Development Control Plan for the site.
- The Planning Proposal is considered to be accompanied by adequate information to support the progression of the proposal.
- There is a justified need for the Planning Proposal.

Direction 2.3 Heritage Conservation

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with Direction 2.3. It is acknowledged that the area of Experiment Farm protected under the CBD Planning Proposal does not coincide with the boundary of the item in the State Heritage Register and with the curtilage of the item in Parramatta LEP 2011. Nevertheless, Experiment Farm is protected to the extent recommended by heritage consultants Hector Abrahams and adopted by Council in the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal provisions.

Council officers are satisfied from the latest reference designs that development can comply with the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal for solar access to Experiment Farm. Further refinement and detail can be provided during the design excellence process and later at the Development Application stage to ensure compliance with these controls is achieved.

Contact us:

council@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au | 02 9806 5050
[@cityofparramatta](mailto:cityofparramatta) | PO Box 32, Parramatta, NSW 2124
ABN 49 907 174 773 | cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au

Direction 4.3 flooding

The Planning Proposal is considered to be capable of being consistent with Direction 4.3 subject to compliance with the CBD Planning Proposal controls – particularly relating to safe refuge. It is noted that Council's Senior Catchment and Development Engineer has concluded that the site is generally suitable for residential development from a flood risk perspective.

Direction 6.3 Site Specific Provisions

The Planning Proposal is considered to be consistent with Direction 6.3. In particular, Council has provided sufficient justification to exempt the sites from compliance with the FSR sliding scale. Acceptable urban design outcomes can be achieved if the sites develop separately and consequently amalgamation should not be required in this case. Therefore, it is reasonable to exempt the sites from FSR sliding scale compliance.

SEPP 65 Design Quality of Residential Flat Buildings

It is noted from the proponent's conclusion of an ADG analysis that the three proposed towers of the development should be able to achieve at least 70% solar access. Council would need to review the ADG analysis to confirm this assertion. However, generally in an urban context particularly in the Parramatta CBD with FSRs of 10:1 and greater, it will be difficult to fully meet ADG solar requirements.

In the report of 16 June 2021 to the Local Planning Panel (LPP) it was stated that the final urban design outcome includes compromises which Council officers consider are not ideal but are ultimately acceptable. It was noted that compromises include the 3 m tower setbacks to the east and west side boundaries for 24 Parkes Street and the 6 m tower setbacks to the west boundary for 26 – 30 Parkes Street and 114 – 116 Harris Street. It was further stated that whilst a number of matters are still to be clarified and agreed upon, Council officers are comfortable that these detailed matters can be resolved at the DCP stage.

Information supporting the progression of the Planning Proposal

There is general agreement with the proponent's grounds for review being,

- It is not necessary to undertake urban design modelling to demonstrate built form under the sliding scale as it has been established that the underlying purpose of the sliding scale to encourage amalgamation would not result in the best urban form. The results of Council staff testing of amalgamation options are long, bulky buildings that dominate the streetscape inconsistent with Council's policy direction for tall slender towers in the Parramatta CBD.
- Also, as shown by the proponent the difference in GFA across three sites between sliding scale and non-sliding scale provisions (as drafted in the CBD PP) is only approximately 4500 m² that may only result in a slight variation to tower height and will not greatly affect urban form outcomes and impacts (including privacy and noise).
- In addition, there is considered to be an adequate commentary on the impact on the Experiment Farm State Heritage item. It is noted that a detailed Statement of Heritage Impact on Experiment Farm prepared by the proponent was forwarded to the Department.

Justification of need for proposed Planning Proposal

The Planning Proposal is considered to justify the need for the proposed amendment. Redevelopment of the sites without amalgamation and exemption from sliding scale will result in acceptable urban design and planning outcomes

Should you have any queries, please contact Paul Kennedy, Project Officer Land Use at the details listed at the beginning of this letter.

Regards,



Robert Cologna
Group Manager Strategic Land Use Planning