

NOTICE OF COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC SUPPLEMENTARY

AGENDA - B

An Ordinary Meeting of City of Parramatta Council will be held in the Cloister Function Rooms, St Patrick's Cathedral, 1 Marist Place, Parramatta on Monday, 24 May 2021 at 6.30pm.

Brett Newman
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
8	MINUTES OF THE LORD MAYOR	
8.1	Olympics Live Activation	3
9	PUBLIC FORUM	
9.1	PUBLIC FORUM: Item 17.1 - Post Exhibition - Finalisation of the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal following consideration of submissions received during the public exhibition period	5
20	CLOSED SESSION	
20.3	Report of the CEO Performance Review Panel <i>This report is confidential in accordance with section 10A (2) (a) of the Local Government Act 1993 as the report contains personnel matters concerning particular individuals.</i>	

After the conclusion of the Council Meeting, and if time permits, Councillors will be provided an opportunity to ask questions of staff

MINUTE OF THE LORD MAYOR

ITEM NUMBER	8.1
SUBJECT	Olympics Live Activation
REFERENCE	F2019/03630 - D08063001
REPORT OF	Lord Mayor, Councillor Bob Dwyer

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Lord Mayor Minute is to seek a report on the feasibility of Council hosting an Olympics Live Activation site in the Parramatta CBD.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) **That** Council officers investigate and table a report to the 28 June Council Meeting on the feasibility of City of Parramatta hosting an Olympics Live site in the Parramatta CBD.
- (b) **Further, that** this report detail costs associated with any proposed Olympics Live site activities for Council's consideration.

BACKGROUND

1. The 2020 Olympic Games are being held from 23 July to 8 August 2021 in Tokyo, Japan.
2. To celebrate the Tokyo Games in Australia, the Australian Olympic Committee (AOC) is hosting a series of Olympic Live sites to celebrate the games, support the Australian Olympic Team, promote participating in Olympic sports and activate urban communities.
3. This includes AOC hosting live sites in The Rocks, Sydney Olympic Park, Melbourne, Brisbane, Gold Coast, Perth and Adelaide.
4. In addition to these sites, the AOC is encouraging eligible sports clubs, schools, community groups and local councils to consider how they can encourage the community to experience the 'Olympic Spirit Live' through local activations.
5. These local activations could include:
 - Outdoor big screens
 - Cheering on the team
 - Having a go at Olympic sports
 - Food and drink offerings
6. Eligible organisations can also purchase an Olympics Live kit from the AOC for the purposing of creating their own Olympics Live event.
7. This minute calls for a report from Council officers to consider the feasibility of City of Parramatta hosting an Olympics Live site in the Parramatta CBD, including any associated costs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATION FOR COUNCIL

8. The staff report should include any financial implications associated with City of Parramatta hosting an Olympics Live site in the Parramatta CBD.

Lord Mayor, Councillor Bob Dwyer

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no attachments for this report.

REFERENCE MATERIAL

PUBLIC FORUM**ITEM NUMBER** 9.1**SUBJECT** PUBLIC FORUM: Item 17.1 - Post Exhibition - Finalisation of the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal following consideration of submissions received during the public exhibition period**REFERENCE** F2021/00521 - D08063576**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FORUM STATEMENTS AND STAFF RESPONSES**

No.	Submitter / Property	Summary of Public Forum	Council Officers' Response
1.	Parramatta Leagues Club 1 Eels Place, Parramatta NSW 2150 19 May 2021 (Ref. D08059880)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledges the planning controls for the site will be reviewed as part of a Planning Investigation Area. Requests Council resolve to prepare a timeframe in which the PIAs are to be completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Public Forum statement correlates with Submission Number 245 (Number 29 of Appendix D - see page 1043 of the Business Paper). The site is part of an endorsed Planning Investigation Area so will be considered at a later stage as set out in Attachment 16 of the LPP Report (see page 1118 of the Business Paper), and discussed in the Council Report at Paragraph 115 to 117 – see page 483 of the Business Paper. The immediate priority for Council officers over the coming months will be to finalise the PLEP 2011 amendment documentation in consultation with DPIE, and also to prepare and exhibit a supporting DCP amendment and a new Section 7.12 Development Contributions Plan for the CBD. See Paragraph 127 of the Council Report on page 485 of the Business Paper. Council officers will prepare a detailed workplan for the Planning Investigation Areas as soon as possible given the above-mentioned work priorities. The Council Resolution on 24 May 2021 in relation to this report (Item 17.1) will enable officers to have a clear understanding of the future work requirements and this will be discussed with Councillors at a subsequent workshop to help determine work priorities.
2.	Resident at 70-74 Phillip Street, Parramatta 19 May 2021 (Ref. D08059881)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding that since 2016 the CBD PP has proposed to increase the FSR at this site (including Opportunity Site bonuses) to 15:1 rather than the current 6:1. Acknowledges the planning controls for the site will be reviewed as part of the Philip Street Block Study. Suggests 15:1 FSR for the site is appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A submission to the public exhibition was not received from the Resident at 70-74 Phillip Street. Review of the planning controls for the land within the Phillip Street Block is discussed at Paragraph 118 of the Council Report on page 484 of the Business Paper. Confirming the site is part of the Phillip Street Block Study which is recommended to be investigated at a later stage as set out in Row 14 of Table 3 of Attachment 16 of the LPP Report ('Changes that have merit for further investigation (via Decision Pathway 3 - Orange)'), see page 1117 of the Business Paper.
3.	Two-Dad Pty Limited "El Phoenician Site"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowner disappointed with the decision to retain the existing Local Road Reservation over the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Public Forum submission correlates with Submission Number 261 (Number 34 of Appendix D, page 1049 of the Business Paper). The specific matters relating to the Land
No.	Submitter / Property	Summary of Public Forum	Council Officers' Response
	328 Church Street, Parramatta NSW 2150 20 May 2021 (Ref. D08059876)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests Council begin discussions with landowner to develop a timeframe, mandate, or schedule to ensure pragmatic discussions to enable reasonable and feasible development at the site. States that if Council is not prepared to provide a timeframe and pathway for future redevelopment, the landowner reserves the right and opportunity to have the land acquisition lifted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reservation Acquisition (LRA) notation are already discussed there. Confirming the LRA notation on the site is a matter which will be investigated at a later stage as set out in Row 8 of Table 3 of Attachment 16 of the LPP Report ('Changes that have merit for further investigation (via Decision Pathway 3 - Orange)') - see page 1117 of the Business Paper. As the LRA notation is existing in the current Parramatta LEP 2011, its removal cannot be undertaken without a public exhibition process.
4.	Resident of Elizabeth Street 21 May 2021 (Ref. D08060726)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that the original planning controls were supported by Council studies. Disappointed with the outcome, and questions the process of the public exhibition because the majority of submissions received from residents requested the inclusion of Elizabeth Street back into the CBD PP boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Public Forum statement correlates with Submission Number 8 (Row 8 of Appendix B, see page 93 of the Business Paper). Public exhibition process was in accordance with Section 3.34(2)(c) and Schedule 1 (Clause 4) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979; and the Council officer consideration of submissions detailed in Paragraphs 23 to 31 of the Council Report (see pages 456-458 of the Business Paper). The site is part of an endorsed Planning Investigation Area so will be considered at a later stage as set out in Attachment 16 of the LPP Report (see page 1118 of the Business Paper), and discussed in the Council Report at Paragraph 115 to 117 – see page 483 of the Business Paper. The immediate priority for Council officers over the coming months will be to finalise the PLEP 2011 amendment documentation in consultation with DPIE, and also to prepare and exhibit a supporting DCP amendment and a new Section 7.12 Development Contributions Plan for the CBD. See Paragraph 127 of the Council Report on page 485 of the Business Paper. Council officers will prepare a detailed workplan for the Planning Investigation Areas as soon as possible given the above-mentioned work priorities. A Council Resolution on 24 May 2021 in relation to the CBD PP report (Item 17.1) will enable officers to have a clear understanding of the future work requirements and this will be discussed with Councillors at a subsequent workshop to help determine work priorities.

No.	Submitter / Property	Summary of Public Forum	Council Officers' Response
5.	Jeanette Brokman Flooding Issues 21 May 2021 (Ref. D08061203)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raises concern that Council's Flood Risk Management Plan has been prepared based on old flood data. Notes that Council is currently preparing new flood data for the LGA, but this has yet to be finalised. Notes that the Molino Stewart Report will need to be updated once the new flood data has been prepared. Notes that the SES has not put in a submission to the CBD PP. Considers it premature for Council to finalise the CBD PP without the new flood study data or SES support. Furthermore, given Council is a potential beneficiary from the CBD upzoning, the technical flood data should be independently reviewed and exhibited for public feedback once Council's Flood Study is finalised, and before any decision by Council is made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has prepared a Flood Risk Management Plan Update and Flood Evacuation Assessment to support the CBD PP. These were both prepared by independent flood consultants, Molino Stewart, and were publicly exhibited with the CBD PP. The Flood Risk Management Plan Update, includes the following statement by Molino Stewart in the Executive Summary: <i>"This report concludes that the intensification of development in the Parramatta CBD represents a tolerable risk to life and property providing that amendments are made to the Parramatta LEP 2011 and Parramatta Development Control Plan (DCP) 2011 to better manage some of the risks of flooding to life. The review has also identified opportunities for DCP amendments to be made which could result in less development restrictions in parts of the floodplain and improved building design outcomes."</i> In response to the recommendations of the Flood Risk Management Plan prepared by Molino Stewart, the CBD PP includes a new flood risk management LEP clause 7.6L, which establishes new requirements to manage flood risk. It is noted that a new draft flood study for the wider LGA is currently being prepared. As acknowledged in the Molino Stewart Report, Council will undertake a further review of the Flood Risk Management Plan once the new flood data is available. The State Emergency Services (SES) have not made any formal submissions to date despite contact being made via the statutory requirements of the Gateway determination to invite a submission. Should the SES provide a submission after the CBD PP is endorsed by Council, Council will rely on the DPIE to address any matters arising from a late submission.

ATTACHMENTS:

1	Submission 1 - Parramatta Leagues Club	1 Page
2	Submission 2 - Peter Cundall	1 Page
3	Submission 3 - Mecone on behalf of Two-Dad Pty Ltd	1 Page
4	Submission 4 - Jody Qureshi	3 Pages
5	Submission 5 - Jeanette Brokman	3 Pages



Date: 19 May 2021

Honourable Bob Dwyer, Lord Mayor, and Councillors
City of Parramatta
PO Box 32
Parramatta
NSW 2124

**Re: Late Submission - Draft CBD Planning Proposal – Parramatta Leagues Club -
Item 17.1 Council Meeting 24 May 2021**

Dear Lord Mayor and Councillors

A summary of this submission and request is below:

Summary

1. The Council resolve to direct a timeframe in which the Planning Investigation Areas (PIAs) be complete, to community consultation stage.
2. Suggested resolution:
"Council staff shall undertake necessary work to commence public exhibition of proposed structure plans and planning control reviews within for the PIAs within 18 months of a newly-elected Council (i.e. March 2023), with a report on the proposed programme to achieve this provided to the Council prior to the end of March 2022".

As brief commentary, the Parramatta Leagues Club ("the Club") stands by its' submission that the planning controls for the block north of Eels Place and fronting O'Connell Street require and warrant review. This is warranted given the surrounding planning controls, the North Parramatta previous rezonings and the opportunities from Parramatta Light Rail.

However, the Club also understands and accepts the position and logic from Council staff that this area is to be reviewed as part of the proposed PIAs and that change at this stage may delay progress of the draft CBD Planning Proposal. However, there should be a reasonable timeframe nominated for such a review to occur. The suggestion above is provided respectfully for Council to consider.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call me on [REDACTED].

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Dimou'.

Chris Dimou
Acting CEO & Company Secretary



From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Form submission from: Public Participation at Council Meetings > Main paragraphs (previous revision)
Date: Wednesday, 19 May 2021 11:57:05 AM

***[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Stop and think before opening attachments, clicking on links or responding. ***

Submitted on Wed, 05/19/2021 - 11:56

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name: Peter Cundall

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Council Meeting Date: 24 May 2021

Item No on Agenda: 17.1

Question or Statement to Council is:

Statement: I own and live in a unit at 70-74 Phillip St. We have been on the understanding since 2016 that under the new LEP the FSR (including Opportunity Site element) would be set at 15:1 rather than the current 6:1.

We now learn that this element has been removed pending the outcome of a Block Study, apparently as a result of submissions by the National Trust and the owner of 60 Phillip St.

Council may be interested to note the following:

- Our block contains the bulk of the land between George Khattar Lane and the public right of way leading to the Elizabeth St footbridge
- The property is old, built in 1983 and would be considered an eyesore to some.
- It is one of the gateway properties being one of the first properties seen by visitors stepping off the ferry and is next to the area in the park that Council uses for numerous events for various communities.
- Since the draft LEP was released we have had 8 formal development approaches for the collective sale of the site.
- All of these offers have been predicated on a 15: 1 FSR.
- There is a direct correlation between land prices and sales/rental rates of residential/commercial floor plates. The lower the FSR the lower the value of the land.
- Because owners expectations after 8 offers are now baked in and there is almost no turnover of units (the last transfer occurred as a result of a deceased estate) the likelihood of 75% owners agreeing to sell for a rate based on 6:1 is nil. I can say that with certainty given I have been coordinating the possible collective sale.
- This may be a point of indifference to Council although it means you are foregoing higher rates and urban renewal on a line of buildings that were all (with 1 exception) built in the 1980's.
- We note also the apparently favourable treatment of other owners on Phillip Street outside the block study.

We seek a speedy execution of the Block Study confirming the previously recommended 15:1 FST and height limits.

I am happy to provide further information if required.



20 May 21

[REDACTED]
Group Manager City Planning
City of Parramatta Council
PO Box 32
Parramatta NSW 2150

To whom it may concern,

RE: Response to Community Engagement Report on behalf of the landowners of 328 Church St, Parramatta in relation to the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal (F2020/02641)

I write on behalf of Two-Dad Pty Limited, the owner of 328 Church Street, Parramatta, to respond to City of Parramatta Council regarding the retention of the compulsory acquisition clause as proposed for a laneway through the subject site as discussed within the Community Engagement Report – Appendix D under the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal (PP_2017_COPAR_002_01).

We acknowledge the Council officer recommendation for Item 34 that:

'The amendment to the CBD PP requested namely the removal of the LRA notation that currently applies to the site is not supported, however Council should undertake further investigations into financial implication and planning opportunities under Decision Pathway 3 – Merit for further investigation'.

The landowner is disappointed with this decision for the reasons specified in the previous submissions, namely that the affectation continues to sterilise the entirety of the site and causes hardship for the landowner. Whilst we maintain that the current PP provides an opportunity for the land acquisition to be rightfully abandoned, the amber light pathway of further investigation should occur immediately to alleviate ongoing planning constraints.

Given these concerns, it is requested that Council begin discussions with the landowner immediately to develop a timeframe, mandate or schedule to ensure pragmatic discussions and a clearly identified planning process is formulated to allow a reasonable and feasible development for the site. If council is not prepared to provide a timeframe and pathway for future redevelopment, our client reserves the right and opportunity to have the land acquisition lifted.

If you would like any further clarification on these matters, please do not hesitate to contact me at [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely

Adam Coburn
NSW State Director

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Elizabeth Street CBD Planning Proposal
Date: Friday, 21 May 2021 8:46:14 AM

From: jody qureshi [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 20 May 2021 11:04 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Elizabeth Street CBD Planning Proposal

***[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Stop and think before opening attachments, clicking on links or responding. ***

Good morning Lord Mayer, Councillors and whoever else it may concern,

I am writing in response to the report that is being submitted to council to consider around the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal.

The report will recommend council adopts the CBD Planning Proposal in its current form after consideration of the public exhibition.

I am not sure if the councillors have had a chance to read through the public submissions but I and many other residents who this directly affects have read through them. There were a lot of submissions that objected to this planning proposal in its current form. This was due to the areas that had suddenly been moved in September 2019 because of a councillor who was not satisfied with all the reports that had been undertaken since 2015 and believed we needed additional studies. Even though majority of councillors voted to keep these areas in the proposal, this was simply lost due to the fact a couple of councillors were absent on the meeting.

The residents of Elizabeth Street Parramatta are very disappointed with the outcome of this public exhibition. There were many submissions to have Elizabeth Street included in the CBD Planning Proposal in addition to many other submissions regarding the other deferred areas. An estimate would be that the majority of submissions were from residence, property developers etc. who were against these areas being pending for further investigation.

It is extremely disappointing to see that regardless of the large number of submissions that were sent in that these were completely overlooked and ignored.

Council including the LPP department were all well aware prior to the public exhibition that Elizabeth Street wanted to be included in the upcoming public exhibition and there was a lot of evidence sent in to support why we felt we should be included including councils own reports. Were told we will get to have our say at public exhibition. This was done only to be told that Elizabeth Street is not part of the CBD and will be left for further investigation. What was the point of a public exhibition? It is meant to consider what the public says.

There was a lot of evidence sent in to show that most of Elizabeth Street, excluding the units directly on the river were never raised as being an issue for an FSR of 6:1 in any reports done, including the Urbis Study in 2015, overshadowing reports etc.

As you can appreciate these decisions made have an impact directly on residents. While we appreciate that studies need to be done in order to protect heritage it is a little confusing when there have been multiple studies done over the years since 2015 that have never suggested for most parts of Elizabeth Street to have lower building heights.

When councillor Bradley made the suggestion to have Elizabeth Street removed for further studies, Councillor Bradley was then sent an email around this. It was rather surprising to know that Councillor Bradley had no idea where Elizabeth Street was situated or why it was removed initially.

Based on all of the studies that council have undertaken since 2015 including the Urbis Study Elizabeth Street was never recommended lower building heights. It seems Elizabeth Street was removed simply because of the All Saints Church however council have not considered the fact that all of the studies and reports completed have provisions in place to protect the church.

I am requesting on behalf of Elizabeth Street that council please consider the studies that have already been completed and consider adding Elizabeth Street back in. This street is separate from the North Parramatta area, we are located on the other side of Victoria road across the road from the new Powerhouse and within walking distance to every major attraction in Parramatta and are completely separate from the North Parramatta Heritage area.

Please review this before it is too late. Why do we need another study which could potentially take years to complete to tell us what years have studies that council have conducted have already told us?

It is unfair to say that including Elizabeth Street would mean another public exhibition or that if they add one area in they need to all areas back in.

Elizabeth Street is in a different situation to the other areas, the other areas had conflicting reports dating back to 2015. All studies done to date by council on Elizabeth Street have no conflicting information in their reports and already have provisions in place to protect the church, there are no studies that have suggested Elizabeth Street should have lower buildings in most of the blocks.

We have simply been asking for council to review these reports since this street was first removed, but our feedback has always been pushed to the side and here we are.

Please consider this before endorsing the CBD Planning Proposal without Elizabeth Street.

Thanks for taking the time to read this and hoping for a positive outcome in the meeting on the 24th.

Kind regards

Jo

Long term resident of Elizabeth Street.

Written Presentation to Council**Item 17.1 Post Exhibition - Finalisation of the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal following consideration of submissions received during the public exhibition period**

Despite the Report to Council being more than 700 pages, the report fails to adequately address key concerns relating to the flood management plans.

Background Information

In December 2017 an Option Deed between the City of Parramatta Council (Council) and the Minister for Arts acting for the state government (State Government) was signed. The Deed related to a number of land parcels that subsequently amalgamated to form the Powerhouse Parramatta site on Phillip Street.

Shortly thereafter the [Johnstaff report](#) to the NSW cabinet dated 8 January 2018 indicates the negotiations between Council and the State Government assumed a guaranteed FSR of 15:1. It is assumed that the FSR was intended to correspond to the City's Planning Proposal. Potentially this enables a building height to more than 200 metres for the site which is indicated in Council's CBD Planning Proposal.

Subsequently in April 2019 following the last state election, the site was transferred from Council to the State Government for \$140 million consideration. Notably, while the approved [plans for the Powerhouse Parramatta](#) have not realised the potential FSR or height, this could subsequently change given the site is still considered as a potential 'Opportunity Site' as indicated in the Review of Opportunities Sites' report dated October 2019 – refer [page 52](#).

Molino Stewart Report

Notably, [Molino Stewart's DRAFT Flood Management Report](#) (MS DRAFT Report) provides advice to Council in response to its Planning Proposal. This includes assumptions in relation to the risk assessment, and flood management including evacuation in place strategy which is considered a more viable solution, given the [option](#) of a horizontal evacuation was considered too costly and had some inherent challenges.

Moreover the report which has undergone a number of iterations is particularly important given the inherent risks from flood waters to the 'Powerhouse Parramatta' site and the report's significance supporting the City's CBD Planning Proposal. Notably, the October 2019 report states:

'At the time of writing, Council was in the process of finalising a new flood study to cover the Upper and Lower Parramatta River floodplains within the LGA. It is understood that this new Flood Study will produce significantly more detailed and accurate data for the assessment of flood risks within the LGA. However, it is currently anticipated to be completed in 2020, with an updated floodplain risk management study and plan likely to be completed following that. Therefore this plan update was required to bring the original Plans in line with the new regulatory framework, land use and planning instruments in the interim. It is recommended that this study is reviewed once the new data from this Flood Study has been received'

While the MS DRAFT report indicates the risks can be managed in terms of an evacuation in place strategy for residential and commercial towers, in evidence to a Parliamentary Inquiry last year, Steven Molino indicated the risks to life, given the estimated number of visitors, which is estimated ~ 2 million visitors a year.

Significantly, the DRAFT Report has not been finalised given Council's Parramatta's River Flood Study (Study) was not completed last year as anticipated. Notably [Item 12.3 - Attachment 1](#) in the current Report to Council confirms the Study is still being progressed:

The Study 'is behind schedule'. Moreover the comment notes that the Study 'is progressed with the Final Flood Model and Reports. Internal and external stakeholder reviews have been completed. Consultant are currently finalising modelling work to address the stakeholder and peer-review comments before council and peer final review. Community consultation materials are being prepared. Progressing with internal councillors workshop and public exhibition and community consultation phases of this project later in Financial Year 21/22'.

In the interim, MS DRAFT Report indicates the report relies on data and management plans that pertain to 2005. Given however the frequency of big weather events has significantly increased, and with it, it is assumed the potential risks, the completion of Council's Flood Study is particularly important. These concerns were previously noted in the media by the SES. Notably too Water NSW has indicated concerns about 2005 data.

Furthermore, the Department of Planning's [conditional Gateway Determination](#) in December 2018 indicated further consideration was necessary in relation to the 'Flood Prone Land'. To this end, MS DRAFT Report is pending the outcome of Council's Flood Study.

Feedback from the SES

Council's report states that the Environment, Energy and Science Group, a State Government Agency highlighted *'all matters regarding flood evacuation, community education and awareness of the need to shelter in place are the primary responsibility of the NSW SES and its endorsement is considered essential.* The report also states *'that feedback from the State Emergency Services (SES) did not make any formal submissions to date despite contact being sought. The report also states that 'should the SES provide a submission after the CBD PP is endorsed by Council, Council will rely on the DPIE to address any matters arising from a late submission'.*

Given however the flood management risk, and previous feedback in the media from the SES, this should follow before any decision by Council is made.

Conclusion

The Planning Proposal will have significant ramifications for the City of Parramatta's future.

While no doubt Council is keen to finalise the Planning Proposal, a key aspect for consideration is the risk assessment for properties on the flood plain and inherent flood management plans. This is particularly important given the frequency of big weather events in recent years, and the inherent risks.

Notably the MS DRAFT Report has not been finalised. Consequently, it's premature to finalise the City's Planning Proposal without Council's Study data and its public exhibition.

Moreover, while Council's report (page 451) states that *'It is intended that these plans [i.e. Flood Management Plan] will be in place prior to the DPIE finalising the Council endorsed CBD PP'*, the public exhibition was progressed in the absence of Council's Flood Study being concluded, and MS DRAFT Report being finalised as part of the exhibition process.

Furthermore, given Council is a potential beneficiary from the CBD upzoning, the technical data should be independently reviewed and exhibited for public feedback once Council's Study is finalised, and before any decision by Council is made. This has not been addressed in the Report to Council.

Jeanette Brokman

May 2021