

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DPIE PDPS Camellia-Rosehill Place Strategy Mailbox](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Submission to NSW DoPIE - CamelliaRosehill
Date: Thursday, 24 February 2022 1:37:54 PM
Attachments: [Submission to NSW DoPIE - CamelliaRosehill.docx](#)

To Manager, Camellia Rosehill Place Strategy Team

The attached submission is lodged on behalf of [REDACTED] of Northmead. Please acknowledge receipt.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CONSULTING SERVICES IN URBAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SUBMISSION to NSW DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

CAMELLIA - ROSEHILL PLACE STRATEGY

28 February 2022

Introduction

On 11 October 2021 I lodged a submission on the September 2021 Place Strategy Directions Paper for Camellia Rosehill. The submission was lodged on behalf of [REDACTED] longtime Parramatta resident and ex-Councillor. It offered comments on the Five Directions and made several considered suggestions for action based on a thorough assessment of the Directions Paper and on the results of two intensive field inspections of the precinct on foot and by car. The submission was in direct response to the Department's invitation to "have your say" on p.3 of the Directions Paper.

In December the Department released the Draft Camellia-Rosehill Place Strategy. According to a statement on p.6 of the Strategy report, the Department drew on "extensive community and stakeholder consultation" in its work on the Strategy. We have read the Consultation Report of December 2021 and are generally supportive of its findings. However, this present document seeks to draw the Department's further attention to several matters which were included in Mt Bennett's submission but which, in our view, demand further attention/official consideration beyond what was offered in the Consultation Report.

Key issues of concern

1. Dedicated development authority

In Mr Bennett's original submission it was strongly argued that if an "integrated and holistic" approach to the management and implementation of the project is to be achieved, a dedicated redevelopment authority bringing "whole of government" resources will be

necessary. On page 12 of the Consultation Report this recommendation is not discussed *and no reasons are offered for its apparent rejection*. The Report merely states that the “the project team will continue to work with stakeholders to determine appropriate governance structures and mechanisms to put the place strategy into action.”

In response, it is now submitted that before final management decisions are taken it will be in the public interest for the Department to offer a thorough explanation of its apparent rejection of the suggested management model.

It is further submitted that in the event that “alternative governance structures” are identified, they should be made public and offered for public debate. The future of Camellia-Rosehill is too important to be left in the hands of what seems likely to become a “business as usual” model in which existing agency silos continue to play their separate games and the wider community gets the usual token invitations to “have its say” at carefully orchestrated points in the process.

If the CR project is to become a ‘world class’ example of its kind, it will require an imaginative and innovative management model, to be adopted *before* crucial decisions on infrastructure and environmental clean-up (for example) are made.

In the interests of good planning and responsible ‘place-making’ consistent with DoPIE policy the Department is requested to formally respond to the above submissions.

2. CBD growth strategies

As was argued in [REDACTED] previous submission, it is again submitted that the CR project offers an opportunity for a serious re-appraisal of the current Parramatta CBD expansion plans as they affect North Paramatta. The 2007 strategy which saw the river as the northern limit of high-rise high density CBD development has been abandoned, along with congruent DCP objectives which were cited in the previous submission. A reappraisal would enable a thorough and objective comparison of the currently proposed north-south CBD growth corridor with an east-west corridor terminating at CR. The evidence suggests that this option lay behind earlier infrastructure decisions and private development projects.

It is therefore a matter of continuing concern that there is no reference to the east-west CBD growth option in the Consultation Report. It is submitted that the Department’s failure to discuss or even acknowledge the option is unacceptable for a public agency devoted to the cause of good planning.

If there are good and sound reasons for rejecting the east-west option they should be placed on the public record. That has yet to be done, and the Department’s response is now formally requested.

3. Celebrating Country

The findings of the Consultation Report regarding Country are fully supported. However, the report does not refer directly to the comment in the earlier submission that Indigenous participation must go beyond tokenistic expressions of ‘welcome to Country’ and ‘healing and restoring’. An example was offered: gifting or otherwise making available to our First

Peoples a selected site within CR, with the future of that site being determined by their representatives in the true spirit of healing and restoring.

That suggestion, made in good faith, found no reference in the Consultation Report. Why ? An explanation is now sought.

4. Riparian buffer zone

The creation of a riverside buffer is obviously strongly supported in submissions. In the present context, the Department is urged to increase the minimum width from 40m to at least 60m . There needs to be flexibility to enable the actual buffer boundary to be determined on site, having regard to the precise location of mangrove stands, drainage lines, soil quality and the like. Posterity will benefit from a more generous width to enable a wide variety of recreational and infrastructure projects into the longer term. *The proposed 40m is unacceptable.*

5. Social /affordable housing

Regrettably there was virtually no discussion of social housing in the Directions Paper. Without any supporting data the Consultation Report identifies a minimum 5% affordable housing. It is submitted that 5% as a minimum target for affordable housing is irresponsible and grossly inadequate. At a time when housing affordability is becoming a daily headline issue nationally, Camellia Rosehill offers a rare opportunity for official generosity on this important aspect of social policy. A minimum in the range of 10-15 % is suggested.

Conclusion and Request for feedback

The Department is respectfully requested to respond to the requests and issues raised in this present submission, given that they relate to strategic elements in the plans for Camellia Rosehill as they are further refined and detailed.

.....

28 February 2022