

Sub. Count	Sub Ref	Attachments?	Objection	Support	Other	Key Issues	Proponents response
1	SUB-13482	Y	Y			<p>1. Overshadowing of surrounding residential buildings</p> <p>2. Flood planning</p>	<p>1. Overshadowing to neighbouring residential buildings will form a matter for consideration in future DAs on Key Sites 3 & 10. The PP simply seeks to rectify an inconsistency in the Penrith LEP, whereby Key Sites 3 & 10 are unable to achieve their anticipated uplift as a result of the blanket sun access controls in Clause 8.2.</p> <p>2. Flooding considerations will be addressed as part of future detailed DAs, in accordance with relevant local flood planning controls.</p>
2	SUB-13151	N	Y			<p>1. Loss of solar access to public open space</p> <p>2. Obstruction of views to the Blue Mountains</p>	<p>1. Penrith City Centre and its immediate surrounds benefit from a high-quality green / public open space network, including access to natural waterbodies and large regional parks. Solar access to key public open spaces is protected by the Sun Access provisions of Part 8 of the LEP, which balance the need to develop identified key sites while protecting amenity. It is notable that, when first published in 2015, the Sun Access provisions of Part 8 of the LEP sought to protect specified public open spaces within the City Centre from additional overshadowing while enabling increased densities on selected key sites.</p> <p>The public open space which will be affected by future development on Key Sites 3 and 10 is located immediately to the south of Key Site 3. It is an unnamed open space, roughly triangular in form, and comprises residual land which was created following the establishment of Mulgoa Road and the resultant extension of Union Road in the c.1970s-80s. It is not a formally planned public open space but, rather, is an 'island' land parcel which, aside from a row of trees along the western alignment, does not exhibit any significant landscape qualities. Notably, only part of this space (the northern portion) is zoned RE1 Public Recreation, while the southern portion is zoned R4 High Density Residential – suggesting that, from a land use perspective, the open space demonstrates little amenity for either active or passive recreation uses. It has been demonstrated through the refused DAs for Key Sites 3 and 10, as well as through this Planning Proposal, that overshadowing to this open space is necessary to allow for the orderly and economic development of the key sites consistent with the densities anticipated by Clause 8.7 of the LEP.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the overshadowing studies accompanying this Planning Proposal demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The public open space to the south of the site will be partially overshadowed between 9.30am-10.30am in mid-winter, - The worst-case overshadowing to the public open space to the south of the site will occur between 10.30am-12.30pm in mid-winter, and - The public open space to the south of the site will be largely free from overshadowing after 12.30pm in mid-winter. <p>Future DAs for Key Sites 3 & 10 will address overshadowing to this public open space in detail.</p> <p>2. The incentive FSR controls of Part 8 of the LEP are currently in force for identified Key Sites within the Penrith City Centre, signalling anticipated increases to development densities in line with Penrith City Council's broader strategic objectives for the City Centre.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that implementation of these incentive FSRs on the 13 identified Key Sites will result in the alteration of some broader district views to the Blue Mountains. Changes to these views have been previously addressed by Penrith City Council during the finalisation of the Part 8 incentive FSR provisions. This Planning Proposal intends, simply, to rectify an inconsistency between the incentive FSR provisions and the Sun Access controls in Clause 8.2. It is highlighted that this Planning Proposal does not seek to adjust or increase the maximum incentive FSR which is permitted on Key Sites 3 & 10 of 6:1 under Clause 8.7(4) of the Penrith LEP 2010.</p>
3	SUB-13157	N	Y			<p>1. Overshadowing of surrounding residential buildings</p> <p>2. Negative impacts on quality of life</p>	<p>1. Overshadowing to neighbouring residential buildings will form a matter for consideration in future DAs on Key Sites 3 & 10. The PP simply seeks to rectify an inconsistency in the Penrith LEP, whereby Key Sites 3 & 10 are unable to achieve their anticipated uplift as a result of the blanket sun access controls in Clause 8.2.</p> <p>2. A suite of State- and local-level strategic planning policies recognise Penrith City Centre as a key location to accommodate the anticipated future growth of Greater Western Sydney. A number of land use policies are in place at the State and local levels to ensure that the future growth of Penrith City Centre will not negatively affect the quality of life for current and future residents and workers.</p>
4	SUB-13173	N	Y			Negative impacts on property prices	Property prices are not a matter for consideration under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> .
5	SUB-13174	N		Y		Positive impacts on the Penrith CBD, including increased vibrancy and housing choice	The applicants acknowledge this submission.
6	SUB-13201	N		Y		No specific matters raised.	The applicants acknowledge this submission.
7	SUB-13204	N		Y		Positive impacts on the Penrith LGA, including increased economic activity / investment and building the city of the future. This submission also acknowledges that the Penrith LGA benefits from a significant public open space network.	The applicants acknowledge this submission.

