

From: PlanningAlerts <contact@planningalerts.org.au> on behalf of Pristine Ong
<pristineong@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 18 May 2018 2:06 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Comment on application SSD 17_8636

For the attention of the General Manager / Planning Manager / Planning Department

Application	SSD 17_8636
Address	Darlington Campus, Darlington, NSW
Description	The University of Sydney, Darlington Campus - Redevelopment of the Engineering Building and Engineering Link Building for various engineering and technology uses.
Name of commenter	Pristine Ong
Address of commenter	Larkin St, Camperdown
Email of commenter	pristineong@gmail.com

Comment

I question the University's request to waive development contributions under Section 94 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act. In Section 13.0 "Waiving of Section 94 Contributions" of the document submitted for assessment titled "Request for the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) – State Significant Development" (p. 29), the University justifies this request by writing that it contributes to the community by providing various communities, sporting and cultural facilities and spaces, etc. However, these are things that the University has to provide to students anyway to support student life. While I understand that the general public may access these spaces, the University effectively acts as a insular community (there are physical gates around the campus which prevents permeability), so the wider community only gets limited access or perceives that it gets only limited access even though it is a public institution.

Additionally, in 2012, the NSW Vice-Chancellors' Committee wrote a submission to the NSW Planning System review (p. 6), saying that universities should be exempt from payment development contributions because they would impact on university budgets. Given recent reports of financial misconduct by university staff and also the multi-million dollar salaries of vice-chancellors (the University of Sydney's Michael Spence earns A\$1.4 million after an increase of 56% over five years), we must question why the salary packages of University bosses are considered more important than contributions to the public.

Finally, it is questionable if sufficient consultation was undertaken for this project. 200 invitations were letterbox dropped to the surrounding community. I live in the surrounding community and did not receive this invitation, which I gather is because the engagement plan only included residents in a very small radius of the site. However, given the size of the building and the University, the catchment should have been much larger. Furthermore, the consultation report does not indicate if staff and students were consulted. Since this is a building for teaching and research, it would be an oversight if they were missed during consultation. The presentation shown during consultation made no mention of the University's seeking to waive developer contributions, which is an important bit of information for resident action groups.

Read more:

NSW Vice-chancellors' Committee (2012), Planning System Review Submission:

https://sydney.edu.au/documents/about/higher_education/2012/20120229_NSWVCC_PlanningSystemReviewSubmission.pdf

The Conversation (2018), Vice-chancellors' salaries are just a symptom of what's wrong with universities:

<https://theconversation.com/vice-chancellors-salaries-are-just-a-symptom-of-whats-wrong-with-universities-90999>

Sydney Morning Herald (2018), More than 20 Sydney Uni staff under investigation:

<https://www.smh.com.au/business/workplace/more-than-20-sydney-uni-staff-are-under-investigation-20180207-p4yzk9.html>

This comment was submitted via PlanningAlerts, a free service run by [the OpenAustralia Foundation](#) for the public good. [View this application on PlanningAlerts](#)

