#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Thursday, July 15, 2021 11:17:53 AM **Last Modified:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 12:55:50 PM

Time Spent: 01:37:56

IP Address: 123.243.196.130

Page 1

Q1

Contact Details

Name Sean Macken

Organisation Committee for Sydney

Post Code (Organisation) 2000

Email Address sean@seanmacken.com.au

Q2

Submissions may be made public (including full name, organisation name and postcode only). You can choose to publish your submission anonymously (using your postcode only). Please select from the options below:

My submission can be made public (with my full name, organisation name and postcode published)

Q3

What has been your experience with the 'retain and manage' industrial land policy?

The 'retain and manage" policy is is being used by Council's as an excuse to stop planning for employment lands. They see it as a directive for no change at all and not just as a reason to reject Planning Proposals. Considerations of changes to FSR or height limits in IN Zones are not being considered. Its a plan to not plan and is having some perverse outcomes and in some cases some poor planning outcomes.

It is leaving many employment areas with increasingly dated controls.

It is also a one size fits all approach which does not reflect unique circumstances, local considerations or the strategic needs of the metropolis.

We note that the policy does not seem to apply to Government owned employment land.

Q4

What has been your experience with the 'review and manage' industrial land policy?

٠

Q5

What suggestions would you make for industrial lands policy in the next Greater Sydney Region Plan?

The principle that these lands should be protected from residential and retail uses is both sound and supported. However the 'protect and retain' policy is a blunt planning tool and fails to reflect local circumstances, strategic need or changes in industry.

A more nuanced and thoughtful policy should be considered.

Under some circumstances there should be consideration of changing the zoning but only after proper consideration and only after detailed study and planning.

The loss of employment lands to residential should not be a result of a developer or landowner led Planning Proposal, and a higher policy threshold is needed to ensure important lands are not lost unnecessarily.

Policy should also be directed to ensuring we get more out of our employment lands. These are a precious places yet our controls are very dated and reflect 1980's thinking about use and activities. The standard instrument changes being considered by DPIE are a good start.

Q6

Are there particular locations in Greater Sydney that are most appropriate to transition to alternative uses? Why?

The interface between some of the IN zoned lands and out Health/Education precincts should be reviewed to ensure they are compatible with each other. For example, the land constrained Camperdown ED/Med cluster is not supported by the adjacent industrial zone in the Inner West LGA.

The Committee is consulting with our members for other examples.

Q7

What are your views on rezoning industrial and urban services land (IN1; IN2, B7; B5) to permit residential uses or general retail activity?

We are not supportive of rezoning these lands to residential or retail, unless there is an overwhelming strategic need to do so.

Under some unique circumstances consideration could be given to temporary uses, such as build to rent, allowing these lands to return to their primary purpose in the future.

Q8

Are you aware of any new types of industrial or urban services uses occurring in industrial areas in Greater Sydney?

The dramatic increase in land values for employment lands in Sydney in recent years reflects a significant shift in industry and logistics activity as well as market sentiment. There is also a trend for industries to want to collocate activities onto a single site with ancillary office, retail and administration activities of a company being adjacent to the company's industrial or logistics activity.

We note that many advanced manufacturers are moving out of IN Zones into the better located and higher amenity B Zones.

Q9

From your organisation's perspective, what would be the most productive way to manage industrial lands? What are the opportunities to make industrial areas more productive?

The current IN Zone is out dated and reflects out dated ideas about how these lands should operate and where they should be located. It's no accident that many precincts in Sydney sit empty or underutilised while land values in other precincts are rising rapidly. Our planning system is not delivering what industry and the community need.

Many of our industrial areas could be made more productive if the range of permissible uses was widened and if some of the density restrictions were removed. Most LEP controls have not been changed in decades. For example many still mandate FSR's of less than 1:1. We seem to have a set and forget approach to these places rather then actively planning for them.

If employment lands are scarce it makes little sense to restrict the density or diversity of activities allowed in them. We should do the opposite, and increase their yield and economic output. We should support them with active and contemporary strategic planning.

Q10

From your organisation's perspective, what are major barriers to the operation of industrial lands? Are there any opportunities to improve their operational use?

Our spatial plans need to be supported with an economic plan. We have strategies in place to support and grow a range or industries in Sydney - Fin tech, Higher Ed, Finance, Medical research, IT, etc. - but we haven't had a plan for manufacturing in 40 years. Notwithstanding it contributing 10% to the cities economic output.

We also invest little into understanding or supporting urban logistics, leaving this to individual companies to sort out.

The pandemic has brought this deficiency into stark relief.

Each precinct should be supported with a proper plan or strategy. A plan which encourages industrial and economic agglomeration and specialisation.

We have on one hand a very prescriptive and complex regulatory regime to employment lands and on the other a laissez faire approach to curation. Great cities don't happen by chance. They happen when our plans are complemented by actions.

Q11

Please provide any further comments below

The Committee is currently considering publishing a Paper outlining the views of our Members and expanding on these ideas in more detail.

Q12

Respondent skipped this question

Would you like to attach a document?