

Panel recommendation

Local Planning Panel advice provided pursuant to Section 2.19 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979

The Panel has considered Planning Proposal PP-2021-0001 for 569-595 High Street, Penrith (Westfield Penrith) (Lot 1 DP 1137699) and the preliminary assessment prepared by Council officers and provides the following advice:

1. The Planning Proposal is considered to have strategic merit as the envisaged development aligns with the vision of Penrith City Centre being a key employment centre in the Western Parkland City underpinned by office, retail and tourist uses, as outlined in the Western City District Plan, Penrith Local Strategic Planning Statement, Penrith Progression, East-West Corridor Interim Centres Strategy and Penrith Economic Development Strategy.
2. Despite this, the site is sensitive and assessment of the Proposal should proceed with caution to avoid prejudicing the resolution of several significant issues. Chief amongst these are flooding and stormwater management, visual impacts and views towards the west, and potential overshadowing, while design excellence is crucial for this important central and prominent site. The flooding considerations particularly warrant a narrow application of permitted uses, such that only employment and hotel uses should be subject to the additional height and floor space ratio. Other permitted uses (such as serviced apartments) are not considered suitable for additional floor space and height, despite currently being permissible.
3. The considerations for the site warrant an approach which is site-specific and only allows the additional floor space ratio and height subject to achieving certain outcomes in terms of design excellence, sustainability, and no additional overshadowing to open space to the south-east. In turn, the LEP clause(s) should be worded so they are not applicable to the site to the west (across Riley Street) nor able to be varied under Clause 4.6. In turn, this also favours wording to allow some tower location/shape flexibility, as opposed to the very narrow and specific footprint in draft controls seen by the Panel.
4. The site-specific controls should incorporate objectives which are formulated to create the foundation for the future design competition. These objectives should address the issues identified in these comments, particularly in respect of design excellence. Future buildings will be visually prominent from public open space in the immediate vicinity, from surrounding streets including potential axial vistas, and from elevated positions within the broader district.
5. The public domain upgrades should be for the entire block defined by Henry, Riley, Jane, and Station Streets. The Panel was not persuaded by the wider public benefits of the schematic proposed works, which seem to be limited to drawing pedestrians into the shopping centre, rather than wider improvements. Similarly, there are a number of adverse existing public domain elements such as long ramps in the roadways, pedestrian bridges, loading areas and inactive frontages. Any mechanisms to improve these poor public domain interfaces should be fully explored prior to gazettal, through appropriate means.
6. The Panel was not persuaded about the case to vary Development Control Plan floorplate controls at this stage, particularly for the proposed hotel. The height and floor space ratio should be calculated to facilitate buildings which would satisfy these controls. The Panel favoured some master planning controls for

the site in the DCP, particularly to address street wall heights, public domain upgrades, tower setbacks, overshadowing, sustainability and the like.

7. Subject to the receipt of an updated Traffic and Transport Report and due consideration of the above comments, the Planning Proposal be progressed through the next steps of the Gateway process.

Jason Perica (Chair) 	John Brunton 
Vanessa Howe 	