

**Submission
No 154**

**INQUIRY INTO GREATER SYDNEY PARKLANDS TRUST
BILL 2021**

Name: Ms Linda Bergin OAM

Date Received: 16 January 2022

Submission REVISED

Select Committee on the Greater Sydney Parklands Trust Bill 2021

parklands@parliament.nsw.gov.au

Sunday, January 16, 2022

Dear Chair and Committee Members,

Business Hub development within Western Sydney Parklands

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission.

The Western Sydney Parklands (WSP) is by far the largest area presently administered by Greater Sydney Parklands (GSP), and the GSP Trust Bill appears to be closely modelled on WSP Trust Act.

According to my calculations, the WSPT has already exceeded its limit of 2% for business hubs by 10% and is investigating even more hubs despite this.

The goal of 2% for business hubs was first mentioned in the WSPT Plan of Management (POM) 2020, written in 2010, even though the table below (from the WSPT POM 2030 written in 2018) indicates the 2% hubs are a goal of the 2030 POM.

Note there was also a supplementary POM 2014 not shown in this table.

I have attached the previous POMs to my submission as they do not appear on the WSPT website.

Table 4
Financial Sustainability and Economic Development: past, current and future

2010	2018	2030
No implementation of Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD)	Commenced integrating ESD into new Parklands developments	Carbon neutral through industry leading ESD
Limited tourism facilities within the Parklands	Provided 25 ha for tourism facilities	Continue to expand tourism facilities within the Parklands
Minimal contribution to Western Sydney economy	Creation of over 1,300 direct and indirect jobs	Significant contribution to the Western Sydney economy through direct and indirect jobs Investment and innovation opportunities through initiatives such as environmental services and tourism
Trust's capacity to develop the Parklands limited by available funding	Income generation increased with 1.2% of the Parklands leased for WSPT Business Hubs	Achieve a sustainable business model by establishing WSPT Business Hubs with income-generating leases on up to 2% of the Parklands
Around 900,000 annual visitors to partners' venues in the Parklands	2.2 million annual visitors to partners' venues in the Parklands	More than 3.5 million annual visitors to partners' venues in the Parklands
Ongoing dialogue with infrastructure utility providers and Trust on proposed new infrastructure	Ongoing dialogue on new infrastructure impacts	Ongoing management to allow appropriate new infrastructure, while minimising impacts on the Parklands Ongoing dialogue with service agencies on management of infrastructure within the Parklands.
Limited data available on Parklands assets	Developed and implemented an Asset Management System	Comprehensive long-term asset renewal program in place

PLAN OF MANAGEMENT 2030

WSPT has a business hub page on their website however it is not fully informative because it does not include the size of the hubs.

<https://www.westernsydneyparklands.com.au/about-us/our-organisation/business/business-hubs/>

I have researched the approved DAs to obtain the business hub site sizes, available on Department of Planning portal, State Significant Development.

Business hubs

complete, underway - hectares

- Horsley Drive Business Park 21
- Horsley Drive Business Park stage 2 16.5
- Eastern Creek Business Hub 19 (est)¹
- Bringelly Road 21
- Fifteenth Avenue 4.36
- Light Horse Interchange 34.39² (including surrounding infrastructure)

Total 116.26 hectares or 2.2% of 5,280 ha (total park boundaries)

Under investigation

- Pike's Lane (Wallgrove Precinct)
- Horsley West (Horsley Precinct)
- Wallgrove Rd (Cecil Park North Precinct)
- Leppington (Bringelly Precinct)

In addition, there are many tourism hubs completed, underway, under investigation or noted on the POM. The long-term outcome for tourism hubs is 264 hectares, which is around double the land permitted for business hubs.

Tourism hubs

completed, underway – hectares (note only 2 of many listed here)

- Zoo 16
- Bungarribee 7

Under investigation

¹ Of the total site area of 34 hectares, around 15 hectares on the eastern site is designated conservation and includes 2 stormwater detention basins

² The WSPT website states 29.5 hectare <https://www.westernsydneyparklands.com.au/about-us/our-organisation/business/business-hubs/> This is understated because it omits lot 8, 2.151 hectares (stormwater management system) and new roads of 2.881 hectares.

- Pike's Lane (Wallgrove Precinct)

POM dots

- Prospect Recreation Precinct (2)
- Cecil Park Precinct
- Bringelly Precinct

It should be noted that the apparent continuation of the plan for 2% business hubs precedes the Covid pandemic. Has the WSPT plans to lessen this, or to freeze any further hubs now that parkland is in far greater demand?

Also, the number of park users would have increased enormously since 2010, when the business hubs were first announced, including increased demand due to the pandemic.

One also might consider whether a better calculation for 2% would be to omit lands not available to WSPT. The following areas, even though within its boundaries, are not vested in WSPT, not legally controlled by them, and are not capable of changed land use:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|----------------|------------------|
| • Prospect Reservoir | 755 | WaterNSW | (not accessible) |
| • Prospect Reserve | 325 | National Parks | (not accessible) |
| • Kemps Creek Reserve | 200 | National Parks | (not accessible) |
| • Western Sydney Regional Park | 580 | National Parks | |

Removing these areas leaves 3,420 hectares AT MOST where WSPT can develop business hubs ($116/3,420 = 3.4\%$), but this would be largely understated as it does not include already developed lands.

Present and proposed hubs should be related to green space remaining that is not protected otherwise, not the entire 5,280 hectares in the park boundaries.

WSPT is the model for the proposed GSP Trust. I do not think it is a good model as there are no constraints on development. There are numerous other problems with the Bill which many others will make submissions about.

I would suggest to the Committee that the Bill in its present form should be rejected.

Yours truly,

Linda Bergin OAM