

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title

[REDACTED]

First Name

[REDACTED]

Family name

[REDACTED]

Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/ Town

Penrith

I have made a reportable political donation

No

I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

Opposition to Amendment of Clause 8.2 – Sun Access in Penrith LEP 2010

Penrith City is experiencing significant growth and urban expansion, and this has been managed with commendable sensitivity to the preservation of parklands and open spaces. This balance has been achieved in accordance with Clause 8.2 of the Penrith LEP 2010, which ensures that solar access to public open spaces is maintained — a principle that is now at risk due to the proposed amendment.

Penrith Council deserves recognition for its thoughtful planning approach, which has allowed for increased residential density through multi-occupancy dwellings such as apartment buildings, while still respecting the natural environment and community amenity. This has enabled responsible development without compromising the character of the city or its connection to the Blue Mountains.

Clause 8.2 plays a critical role in protecting solar access to public spaces, which is essential for environmental sustainability, public health, and urban liveability. According to the NSW Department of Planning, solar access testing has been conducted to ensure that public open spaces retain adequate sunlight, commensurate with their function and importance within the Penrith City Centre.

The proposed amendment would facilitate the construction of significantly taller apartment blocks on key sites such as John Tipping/High Street/Union Road, as outlined in the planning proposal submitted to the NSW Planning Portal. This change risks overshadowing vital parklands and open spaces, undermining the very planning principles that have guided Penrith's growth to date.

Sunlight access is not merely an aesthetic concern — it is a cornerstone of urban design that affects thermal comfort, energy efficiency, biodiversity, and mental wellbeing. The Australasian Legal Information Institute confirms that Clause 8.2 is part of a broader framework that includes design excellence and building separation standards, all of which contribute to a cohesive and sustainable urban environment 3.

To amend Clause 8.2 in a way that permits excessive building heights would set a precedent that prioritises corporate interests over community well being. It would open the door to skyscraper-style developments that dominate the skyline, obstruct views to the Blue Mountains, and diminish the quality of life for residents.

I strongly oppose the amendment of Clause 8.2. It has served as a vital safeguard, enabling Penrith to grow responsibly while preserving sunlight access to its public spaces. Any change to this clause must be approached with extreme caution and a clear commitment to long-term community and environmental outcomes.

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title

[REDACTED]

First Name

[REDACTED]

Family name

[REDACTED]

Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/ Town

Penrith

I have made a reportable political donation

No

I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

I currently reside on Union Road, Penrith Unit 21, 79-81 Union Road, Penrith NSW 2750 to be precise and this proposed change directly affects me. What you are proposing will cast my home in darkness from the moment the sunrises to when it sets. Are you out of your minds!!!! You cannot realistically be considering this mammoth build, the quality of life will be significantly reduced and mental health will be at risk. I strongly object to the change and I will be partitioning my entire building and the buildings on either side of me to strongly object.

[REDACTED]

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title**First Name****Family name** Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email**Suburb/ Town**

Leonay

I have made a reportable political donation

No

 I agree to the Privacy statement**submission**

I wish to object to proposal to Amend Clause 8.2 (Sun Access) of the Penrith LEP 2010 - as a property owner of 83-85 union rd I believe this will impact the resale value of my properties - there should be no amendment which negatively impacts on surrounding properties but benefits new construction - no no no

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title

[REDACTED]

First Name

[REDACTED]

Family name

[REDACTED]

Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/ Town

Penrith

I have made a reportable political donation

No

I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

RE: Amend Clause 8.2 (Sun Access) of the Penrith LEP 2010

Hi there,

I have been a resident at [REDACTED] Union Road, Penrith for 17 years. My apartment is an entirely Western facing residence and therefore I am impacted by all sites referenced in the Amend Clause 8.2 (Sun Access) of the Penrith LEP 2010.

I am in support of this amendment. The parcel of Land that is referenced as affect by shadowing is un-used. In my 17 years as a resident, I have never seen a single day to which this parcel of land has been used. Its location is very noisy and exposed to the elements and is very undesirable for public use.

I believe the Amendment of Clause 8.2 to allow for the larger building developments is a positive for Penrith. This will allow for both more housing to be released and to potentially activate the Penrith CBD including more nightlife. We are a major centre, and we should be allowing for development and move the city forward.

I bought my apartment back in 2008 with the expectation that we would have larger developments within the vicinity and that this would be a very high-density active area. This should not come as a surprise to surrounding residents.

I would like to see more development in our city, however if there could be more promotion for these sites focused on public transport access due to the proximity of Penrith station, this would reduce concerns on Traffic. This could also encourage Penrith to become a more walkable city.

It would be great to see the current proposed developments be successful in approval as the sites have been sitting vacant for years, which is a missed opportunity.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title

[REDACTED]

First Name

[REDACTED]

Family name

[REDACTED]

Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/ Town

Penrith.

I have made a reportable political donation

No

I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

I approve this proposal

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title**First Name****Family name**

Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email**Suburb/ Town**

PENRITH

I have made a reportable political donation

No

I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

Subject: STRONG SUPPORT for Planning Proposal PP-2024-280 + URGENT CALL for Proactive LEP Reform – 614-638 High Street & 87-93 Union Road, Penrith

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a long-term resident and property owner at 64 Union Road, Penrith, to express my full and enthusiastic support for Planning Proposal PP-2024-280, which seeks to exempt Key Sites 3 and 10 from Clause 8.2 (Sun Access) of the Penrith LEP 2010.

However, I believe this proposal represents only the beginning of what Penrith truly needs. While I strongly support this specific amendment, I urge Penrith Council to take a proactive leadership role in comprehensive LEP reform rather than being passively pushed forward by NSW State Government policies.

A Call for Bold Leadership

Penrith has fallen behind for too long in terms of urban competitiveness and economic vitality. In a global economy where cities worldwide are aggressively competing for talent, investment, and innovation, Penrith Council must lead, not follow.

I propose that Penrith Council should:

Comprehensively reform Penrith LEP 2010 with innovative incentive programs that exceed state government standards

Introduce density bonuses and development incentives that attract world-class developers and global talent

Create a competitive advantage through superior planning policies that make Penrith the preferred destination for investment

Why This Matters Now

We are blessed with an exceptional abundance of open spaces and recreational facilities across Penrith – from the magnificent Penrith Lakes to the world-class Whitewater Stadium – with even greater potential on the horizon. There is absolutely no shortage of sun-access areas in our beautiful city.

The world is moving fast, and Penrith cannot afford to be left behind. While other cities are implementing cutting-edge planning incentives to attract global talent, we must not allow outdated 2010-era regulations to constrain our potential.

A Vision for Penrith's Future

This is our moment to shine. I envision a Penrith where:

Innovative density incentives attract world-class developers

Global talent chooses Penrith as their home base

Economic prosperity flows from proactive, forward-thinking policies

Our community leads the region in urban innovation

Immediate Action Required

I strongly urge Penrith Council to:

1. Approve PP-2024-280 without delay
2. Immediately commence comprehensive LEP reform with enhanced incentive programs.
3. Engage with global planning experts to develop world-class policies
4. Position Penrith as the regional leader in progressive urban development

The future of Penrith starts with bold decisions like this one, but it requires even bolder leadership to reach our full potential. Let's not just meet state standards – let's exceed them and set new benchmarks for excellence.

Let's build a city that attracts the world's best and brightest, not just because we have to, but because we choose to lead.

Thank you for considering my submission and for your commitment to Penrith's bright future.

Yours sincerely,



Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title**First Name****Family name** Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email**Suburb/ Town**

PENRITH

I have made a reportable political donation

No

 I agree to the Privacy statement**submission**

Submission on PP-2024-280 – Revised Sun Access Control

I would like to object to the proposed changes in Clause 8.2 of Penrith Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2010, relating to sun access controls. The following summarises the reasons why.

1) Overshadowing of Surrounding Buildings

Our unit block will be adversely affected by previously proposed developments on Key Sites 3 & 10 that this proposal is the subject of. Our own unit will have significant less sunlight particularly in late morning. Other units in our block will be severely affected. Removing the limits to overshadowing of public land will result in a reduction in the quality of life currently experienced by the occupants.

2) Inconsistent Effect on Flood Disaster Planning

Revising the sun access control will result in the increase in height of allowable building which is inconsistent with disaster planning for large flood events. The area in question is on or just above the 1% AEP and well within the PMF. It is one kilometre from the largest coastal river system in NSW. Large riverine floods are well documented for the Hawkesbury/Nepean Catchment area including the CBD area of Penrith. Flood planning for this area MUST take into consideration that flooding is likely to remain at peak levels for days, with services such as electricity, water and sewerage being unavailable for weeks. This makes Penrith City unique in the Sydney metropolitan major cities and any comparison with Parramatta or Liverpool (that can suffer from flash flooding) is not valid. While it is acceptable that some increase in density be allowed it must be consistent with self-evacuation and not allowing "shelter in place" to be the accepted method of flood preparation. Evacuation upwards in a residential tower is not acceptable. It should be remembered that some local roads in this area are already at capacity at busy times. During flood events roads will become either blocked by water or evacuating traffic.

Finally, all land within the PMF in the Penrith area must have special planning provisions to take into consideration its unique flooding situation. Density needs to be balanced with the ability to self-evacuate along designated none flooding corridors. Given this is very difficult to achieve in the CBD, only a very limited increase in housing density should be considered. Residential towers of up to 46 stories are inconsistent with this. Currently the over shadowing of public land is an effective block on large scale development of Key Sites 3 & 10 and should be retain as is.

Attached are my previous objections to proposed developments on Key Sites 3 & 10.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
30 September 2025

Submission and attachments are in uploaded file.

Submission on PP-2024-280 – Revised Sun Access Control

I would like to object to the proposed changes in Clause 8.2 of Penrith Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2010, relating to sun access controls. The following summarises the reasons why.

1) Overshadowing of Surrounding Buildings

Our unit block will be adversely affected by previously proposed developments on Key Sites 3 & 10 that this proposal is the subject of. Our own unit will have significant less sunlight particularly in late morning. Other units in our block will be severely affected. Removing the limits to overshadowing of public land will result in a reduction in the quality of life currently experienced by the occupants.

2) Inconsistent Effect on Flood Disaster Planning

Revising the sun access control will result in the increase in height of allowable building which is inconsistent with disaster planning for large flood events. The area in question is on or just above the 1% AEP and well within the PMF. It is one kilometre from the largest coastal river system in NSW. Large riverine floods are well documented for the Hawkesbury/Nepean Catchment area including the CBD area of Penrith. Flood planning for this area MUST take into consideration that flooding is likely to remain at peak levels for days, with services such as electricity, water and sewerage being unavailable for weeks. This makes Penrith City unique in the Sydney metropolitan major cities and any comparison with Parramatta or Liverpool (that can suffer from flash flooding) is not valid. While it is acceptable that some increase in density be allowed it must be consistent with self-evacuation and not allowing “shelter in place” to be the accepted method of flood preparation. Evacuation upwards in a residential tower is not acceptable. It should be remembered that some local roads in this area are already at capacity at busy times. During flood events roads will become either blocked by water or evacuating traffic.

Finally, all land within the PMF in the Penrith area must have special planning provisions to take into consideration its unique flooding situation. Density needs to be balanced with the ability to self-evacuate along designated non flooding corridors. Given this is very difficult to achieve in the CBD, only a very limited increase in housing density should be considered. Residential towers of up to 46 stories are inconsistent with this. Currently the overshadowing of public land is an effective block on large scale development of Key Sites 3 & 10 and should be retain as is.

Attached are my previous objections to proposed developments on Key Sites 3 & 10.

[REDACTED]
30 September 2025

Attachments see below.

Submission on DA20/0167 – 614-632 High Street Penrith

I would like to object to the development as outlined in the above DA on a number of grounds.

1) Development not in keeping with the local area

This area is generally built on with 5 or 6 story buildings that do not cover the entire area of the block. My understanding is that a maximum height of 24m is considered appropriate. With a podium that appears from Union Lane to be between 17.2m and 29.7m makes the building size far in excess of all other buildings in the area. With the existing buildings in Union Lane a definite tunnel effect will occur that has implications for noise and wind. The 9-story building at 83-85 Union Road should be seen as the maximum total height for the area. An adverse visual impact and amenity would occur for people living on the northern side of our property.

2) Area not suitable for high-density residential building

This development is on a floodplain of a river with a huge catchment area that is being affected by Climate Change. The proposed development is effectively being built on or just above the 1 in 100 flood level and well within the PMF. I find it odd that the Environmental Effect document indicates it is not in a flood prone area yet tries to justify the use of above ground parking due to “site constraints including flood impact” (page 54). This seems to confirm my belief that Penrith CBD should not be seen to be in the same category of urban area as places such as Strathfield, Parramatta, Liverpool or even Blacktown. The Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley is considered to have the “Highest flood risk in NSW” (Resilient Valley, Resilient Communities - Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Risk Management Strategy). Unlike Parramatta and Liverpool, which are also in a flood prone area, the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley is the largest coastal catchment in NSW with a total area of 21,400 sq. km. At this stage the NSW Government is still considering increasing the height of Warragamba Dam as a flood mitigation measure. No decision on this has been made and is subject to intense community protests opposing the raising of the dam wall. I believe the likelihood of it occurring is low. The recent high rain event in February 2020 resulted in an increase in the storage capacity from 42% to 70% within one week. This is equivalent to 567,560 ML within a catchment area of 9050 sq. km. It is now at 83.7% or an increase of 854,259 ML since 7 February. Studies are needed about what would happen if the dam was full when the February rain event occurred. I suspect that the result in Penrith would be catastrophic, particularly if the emergency spillway at the Dam was activated. It is generally now accepted that, due to climate change, the likelihood of high rain events similar as to what happened in February is very high.

The Flood Impact Assessment only recommendations if a flood occurs are that the elevators are not use as the power may go off, people can move up to the mezzanine level or level one and then “shelter-in-place” in the communal areas on Level 4. This is not acceptable as the building may be surrounded by flood waters for an extended period of time and people will need to evacuate the building.

No high-density developments should be approved in the Penrith CBD area.

3) Inadequate Noise Report

This report seems to not take into consideration the adverse effects of car and truck movements along Union Lane. There is already considerable number of service vehicles using Union Lane. There are a number of residential units from our block and next door that have balconies and windows on Union Lane. This must be addressed. I suggest that should any development go ahead on this site the entrance not be on Union Lane and all vehicle to enter and exit on the new link road on the western side of the building. The report also seems to be a cut and paste with reference to “Parramatta and Mallet Street” in Table 1 page 7. It also seems unusual that the noise graphs show a higher noise levels in the evening between 8pm and 12pm.

4) Inadequate parking and adverse traffic impact on local area

As indicated previously Penrith should not be considered a typical urban area. The Penrith City Council area has a very high semi-rural component and is on the very edge of the Sydney metropolitan area. The use and need for a car is very high, even short trips away from the area around the train line are difficult without one. There is a high level of second car households. The parking provisions in this development is inadequate. A minimum of one parking space per 1- and 2-bedroom units and two parking spaces for 3- bedroom units should be allowed. There is no on street parking in the immediate area. Only very limited parking is available on Union Road which is already very heavily utilised. It is common that Union Road backs up from Station Road through to Mulgoa Road with Worth Street and High Street also blocked. This regularly happens in the busy times of the year particularly at the weekend with people trying to access Westfield. I also have not established what provision has been made to allow orderly evacuation of cars in the event of a local emergency or flood event (how long it would take and evacuation route?).

The Traffic and Parking Assessment report does not seem to address that the vehicle entry and exit point is direct across Union Lane from the entry and exit points for both our building and 83-85 Union Road. There is also parking allowed at the rear of 83-85 Union Road of garbage collection, moving vans and delivery vehicles. It is also the

practise of the waste removal trucks to park behind our building. This would seriously impact the entry and exit from the proposed development. As I have said previously move and entry and exit to the new link road. The report also surveyed traffic movements on Thursday 13 February 2020 which would be a typically quite day. Weekends can see the area completely chocked with traffic.

The inclusion of serviced apartments in the development introduces an issue regarding temporary parking to access the lobby/reception area on the south eastern corner. Undoubtably cars will park for a short period on Union Lane to go into the reception area. This is likely to affect the vehicle exit and entrance to our block and needs to be addressed. The movement of the reception area to the new link road side of the building would allow a specifically designed stopping bay when done in conjunction with the relocation of the entry and exit point.

It is also mentioned that the development does not rely on the building of the new link road. The new link road MUST be mandated if this proposal is approved in any form. With any increase in traffic on Union Lane an issue with the alignment will cause serious issues if two way. The kink just east of the development causes visibility problems heading east and will particularly affect the exit of large vehicles from the development as they will need to swing onto opposite side of the road.

5) Overshadowing of Surrounding Building

A report indicates that our building will be in shade for an unacceptable period of time. The documentation provided indicates that 18 of 31 residential units in our block would not get a minimum of 2 hours sunlight particularly when the proposed Toga development is taken into consideration. I do note that the documentation provided does not take into consideration of the proposed increase in scale of the Toga development. This I not acceptable.

6) No Provision for Electric Vehicles

I have not identified any provision in these plans for the charging of electric vehicles. This is important to plan that a high proportion of cars will need to be charged. Issues such as provision of adequate electrical capacity and suitable parking whilst the cars are being charged. I suspect that ventilation and fire consideration will need to be addressed. I also would expect that solar power and storage batteries be install or at least provision be made.

7) The COVID-19 Crisis

At this point we are still in the middle of the COVID-19 crisis. This is likely to continue for many months possibly years and will have on going repercussions. It is highly likely that we will need to make alterations to the way we live. Social distancing will possibly be the norm forever. Certainly, there will be ongoing permanent changes. On the front page of the Sydney Morning Herald on 8 May 2020 an article by Angus Thompson (urban affairs reporter) quotes the Planning and Public Spaces Minister Rob Stokes as saying: "Our future precincts, parks and public spaces need to be designed to enable better social distancing, with wider footpaths, segregated cycleways and more linear parks, to meet the increased demand for these precious public spaces." I believe this will extend to residential building particular high-density residential developments. More lifts, larger lobbies, more room in shops, cafes and restaurants are all likely. This proposal needs to be revised to meet any new requirements. It will take some time to develop these new guidelines so no approval for this development should be given at this time.

8 May 2020

Submission to LEC2021/355201 on DA20/0167 – 614-632 High Street Penrith

I have participated in submitting objections to the proposed development at both the initial lodgement of the DA in May 2020 and at the Planning Panel stage in April 2021.

My previous objections have been based on the following:

- 1) Development not in keeping with the local area**
- 2) Area not suitable for high-density residential building**
- 3) Inadequate Noise Report**
- 4) Inadequate parking and adverse traffic impact on local area**
- 5) No Provision for Electric Vehicles**
- 6) The COVID-19 Crisis**

All these objections are still very much valid and to my knowledge not been addresses and rectified. Copies of my previous submissions are attached. This includes a summary of my submission to the Panning Panel held on 26 April 2021.

I would like to emphasis that a “Shelter in Place” is not in anyway suitable for use in a major riverine flood event. In the previous 3 years we have had significant flooding and as I write this submission the river is still in flood and the media have called the recent/current event as Sydney having “Dodged a bullet”. The event could have been much worse had the east coast low crossed the coast closer to Sydney. The evidence that this type of weather event is becoming more common (potential yearly) is strong.

I also note that the proposed Toga development (DA20/0148 LEC2021/126870) has been rejected by the Land and Environment Court. I feel reasons for this rejection are largely applicable to this development. I am surprised that the applicant is proceeding with the court action. Perhaps a new DA with a development more in keeping with the local area and site limitations should be submitted.

Finally, the front page of the Sydney Morning Herald today (4-Mar-22) has the following heading “Living on floodplain must end: relief boss”. Penrith CBD, including the proposed development, is on the Nepean River floodplain and development must be limited. This article strengthens the case that a high density 46-story residential building should not be allowed.

4 March 2022

Attachments (to email):

Submission to DA20/0167

Submission to Sydney Western City Planning Panel (26-Apr-21)

Submission on DA20/0148 – 87-93 Union Road Penrith

I would like to object to the development as outlined in the above DA on a number of grounds.

1) Development not in keeping with the local area

This area is generally built on with 5 or 6 story buildings that do not cover the entire area of the block. My understanding is that a maximum height of 24m is considered appropriate. With a podium that appears to be nearly 18m this would make the building size far in excess of all other buildings in the area. This includes the 9-story building at 83-85 Union Road. This building should be seen as the maximum height for the area. An adverse visual impact would occur for people living on the western side of our property.

2) Area not suitable for high-density residential building

This development is on a floodplain of a river with a huge catchment area that is being affected by Climate Change. It is effectively being built on or just above the 1 in 100 flood level and well within the PMF. Penrith CBD should not be seen to be in the same category of urban area as places such as Strathfield, Parramatta, Liverpool or even Blacktown. The Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley is considered to have the “Highest flood risk in NSW” (Resilient Valley, Resilient Communities - Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Flood Risk Management Strategy). Unlike Parramatta and Liverpool, which are also in a flood prone area, the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley is the largest coastal catchment in NSW with a total area of 21,400 sq. km. At this stage the NSW Government is still considering increasing the height of Warragamba Dam as a flood mitigation measure. No decision on this has been made and is subject to intense community protests opposing the raising of the dam wall. I believe the likelihood of it occurring is low. The recent high rain event in February 2020 resulted in an increase in the storage capacity from 42% to 70% within one week. This is equivalent to 567,560 ML within a catchment area of 9050 sq. km. It is now at 83.7% or an increase of 854,259 ML since 7 February. Further studies are needed about similar increase happening if the dam was full. I suspect that the result in Penrith would be catastrophic, particularly if the emergency spillway at the Dam was activated. It is generally now accepted that, due to climate change, the likelihood of high rain events similar as to what happened in February is very high. No high-density developments should be approved in the Penrith CBD area.

3) Inadequate parking and adverse traffic impact on local area

As indicated previously Penrith should not be considered a typical urban area. The Penrith City Council area has a very high semi-rural area and is on the very edge of the Sydney metropolitan area. The use and need for a car is very high, even short trips away from the area around the train line are difficult without one. There is a high level of second car household. The parking provisions in this development is inadequate. A minimum of one parking space per 1- and 2-bedroom units and two parking spaces for 3- bedroom units. Due to the surrounding area there is no on street parking in the immediate area. Only very limited parking is available on Union Road which is already very heavily utilised. It is already very common that Union Road already backs up from Station Road through to Mulgoa Road with Worth Street and High Street also blocked. This regularly happens in the busy times of the year particularly at the weekend with people trying to access Westfield. I also have not established what provision has been made to allow orderly evacuation of cars in the event of a local emergency of flood event (how long it would take and evacuation route?).

4) No Provision for Electric Vehicles

I have not identified any provision in these plans for the charging of electric vehicles. This is important to plan that a high proportion of cars will need to be charged. Issues such as provision of adequate electrical capacity and suitable parking whilst the cars are being charged. I suspect that ventilation and fire consideration will need to be addressed. I also would expect that solar power and storage batteries be install or at least provision be made.

Submission to LEC 2021/126870 on DA20/0148 – 87-93 Union Road Penrith

I have participated in submitting objections to the proposed development at both the initial lodgement of the DA in March 2020 and at the Planning Panel stage in April 2021. Over that time, I have developed an opinion that this development is not only unsuitable for the area but will potentially result in loss of life in major flood event.

1) Shelter in Place

It has become obvious that they developers are relying on a “shelter in place” strategy during extreme flooding as it is highly unlikely that the entire building could be evacuated in the required time. The developer supplied Flood Impact Assessment Part 1 (4.3 Flood Planning Controls for PMF page 24) states ‘*Sensitive uses, where occupants may be less able to evacuate in an emergency may need to be elevated above the PMF.*’ Consequently this requires the evacuation to higher levels during a flood event for impacted residents. This strategy is not one that is recommended by the NSW SES. (See SES letter to Great Lakes Council attached.) SES only seems to tolerate it in areas that have already been developed in “flash flood” areas such as Parramatta. I am not aware of any suggestion that this would be the case for new high-rise developments in riverine flood areas. The Nepean River is widely regarded as being subject to riverine flooding. Riverine flooding is very different to flash flooding as it will last for an extended period of time. In Penrith it is likely that if the proposed development is seriously affected by flooding services such as electricity supply and sewerage will be compromised and not potentially not available for weeks (not hours or days). The local sewerage works and major electrical substation are all subject to inundation in a huge flood event. See: <https://www.ses.nsw.gov.au/hawkesbury-nepean-floods/> .

Further to this The Flood Impact Assessment Part 1 (4.4 Site Access and evacuation page 24) talks of a flood being “*evacuation would not be possible and shelter in place would be suitable given the short time of inundation during such events.*” However, the MANAGING FLOOD RISK THROUGH PLANNING OPPORTUNITIES prepared for the Hawkesbury-Nepean Floodplain Management Steering Committee (2006) (copy included) clearly indicated on page 11 that “*the Hawkesbury-Nepean flooding has been described as exhibiting a combination of the worst characteristics of riverine flooding (depth and extent), and the worst characteristics of flash flooding (rapid rise of floodwaters and limited warning time)*”. In addition on page 40 “*it states Evacuation is essential for Hawkesbury-Nepean flood islands where all the land lies below the PMF*”. When you move to a higher level within a building to avoid a flood it is the same as moving to a “flood island”.

The above strongly supports my belief that a “Shelter in Place” strategy for high rise developments is not suitable and all developments below the PMF must be able to be evacuated at short notice and move to above the PMF.

This has implications for all other proposed high-rise developments in the Penrith CBD area.

2) Reluctance to have underground car parking

The reluctance to provide the necessary carparking underground seems to be very much driven by cost. This was evident during the Planning Panel held on 26 April 2021. This cost

seems to be due to the specialised civil engineering required for a low water table due to the proximity to the Nepean River (after all it is on the flood plain). This should obviously be seen as one of the limitations of the site and results in the development density being capped by the amount of carpark spaces that can be housed underground as per usual PCC requirements for the area. To overcome this the development relies on having multiple levels of carparking above ground level. This results in a block structure that is unacceptable and out of character to the local area. I strongly oppose any onsite parking above ground level.

3) Required Alteration to Local Roads

The inability of the developers to come to terms with Penrith Council and the developers of the adjoining property DA20/0167 with regards to the local road improvements particularly the intersection onto High Street is a major concern. No development in this area should be approved without an agreement to improve access along Union Lane and onto both High Street and Union Road.

I have also attached copies of my previous submissions. The attached submission to the Planning Panel is my pre-prepared notes and follows closely my oral presentation.

While most Penrith residents agree that this area will be developed the scale of this development is inappropriate and must be rejected.

By email: 26 April 2021

Attachments

Item-1D-Planning-Proposal-For-Flood-Prone-Land-DCP-Amendments – Great Lakes Council Strategic Meeting 12 May 2015 (SES Letter)

Submission to DA20/0148

Submission to Sydney Western City Planning Panel (26-Apr-21)

MANAGING FLOOD RISK THROUGH PLANNING OPPORTUNITES, Hawkesbury-Nepean Floodplain Management Steering Committee, Parramatta, June 2006 ISBN 0 7347 5650 X

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title**First Name****Family name** Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email**Suburb/ Town**

Penrith

I have made a reportable political donation

No

 I agree to the Privacy statement**submission**

REF PP-2024-280

This is a submission against the proposal to exempt the key sites from the Penrith Local Environment Plan (LEP) 2010.

This proposal is a shocking attempt to overrule all the democratic processes that were involved in this long-running saga, culminating in a failed challenge in the Land and Environment Court.

Had the developers REALLY wanted to contribute to housing supply they would have built units in accordance with the Penrith LEP, just like all the other recent housing developments in the surrounding neighbourhood of Union St, Vista St, De Vilnits Parade and John Tipping Grove.

This proposal would not only damage the neighbourhood it would set an unwarranted precedent for other developments, fundamentally altering the intention of the Penrith LEP. Citing other councils' LEPs is completely irrelevant as they refer to their local areas, not one nestled in the floodplains of the Nepean River with views to the foothills of the Blue Mountains, a World Heritage area.

Pretending that this development is appropriate is risible, given that it did not achieve State Significant Development status. The developers also now sneeringly refer to the open space to be overshadowed as "insignificant". Their disdain is breathtaking, as is their contempt for open space shadowing and the Penrith LEP. This is what happens when you are motivated by pure greed.

Having tried and failed to bulldoze the Penrith LEP, the developers now appeal to unelected panel members to do the bulldozing for them!

Such unconscionable arrogance should not be rewarded.

Regards



Documents

Action summary