

4 March 2014

To: peter.mcmanus@planning.nsw.gov.au

Cc: david.gibson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Peter,

University of Sydney's Campus Improvement Program 2014-2020 State Significant Development (SSD 6123)

While you were on leave, RAIDD was informed by David Gibson that the Department of Planning would accept submissions in regard to this application for a short time after the closing date of 28 February 2014.

I am writing now to object to the University of Sydney's Campus Improvement Program 2014-2020 State Significant Development (SSD 6123).

The University of Sydney has not complied with the Director General's Requirements which were requested from the Department of Planning in September 2013.

In the Director-General's Requirements documents there is a requirement which says "During the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), consultation must be undertaken with the relevant Commonwealth Government, State or local authorities, service providers, community groups and affected landowners. In particular you must consult with: ...RAIDD – Residents Acting In Darlington's Defence."

In the EIS itself at Section 10.2 it states "'The University has been engaging with the local community throughout 2013 on the Darlington Campus Abercrombie Redevelopment Project. This has resulted in meetings with key stakeholders and local community with the University providing regular communication regarding the development of the Business School, the Abercrombie Student Accommodation project and the Darlington Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Strategy. Details of these community stakeholders can be found at Appendix N."

Section 10.2 then goes on to state "Through this engagement the University has been able to identify the major issues of importance to the community in relation to the operations of the University". However, at no stage in this engagement was there any mention by the University representatives present that they were trying "to identify the major issues of importance to the community in relation to the operations of the University" nor was there any mention of the Campus Improvement Program (CIP). The engagement was specifically about the development of the Business School, the Abercrombie Student Accommodation project and the Darlington Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Strategy.

Section 10.2 of the EIS then goes on to say "These issues have all been considered and provided for in the development of the CIP through the following inclusions detailed in **Table 11**". Table 11 then has 2 columns: one headed "Issue Raised" which lists the things the University has identified as issues for the community (without having checked these with the community); and one headed "CIP Response" which is presumably how the University will address those issues, which it itself has identified, in the CIP.

This table is included to address another requirement laid down by the Director-General that "The EIS must describe the consultation process and the issues raised, and identify where the design of the development has been amended in response to these issues. Where amendments have not been made to address an issue, a short explanation should be provided."

Clearly, the intention of Section 10.2 of the EIS is to convince the Department that the University has complied with the Director-General's Requirements and has consulted with RAIDD in regard to the preparation of the EIS. However, no such consultation has ever taken place.

When members of RAIDD wrote to the Vice-Chancellor to complain about their names being listed in the CIS as having been consulted when they had not, the Vice-Chancellor replied quoting the first paragraph of Section 10.2 and saying "There is no suggestion that these community stakeholders were being consulted about the CIP in this reference".

Clearly, the Vice-Chancellor agrees with us that the local community has not been consulted in the preparation of the EIS and that the University has therefore not met the condition of the Director-General's Requirements which directed the University to consult with RAIDD (amongst others) in the preparation of the EIS.

Because of this I submit that this Development Application should not be considered by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. The University should be instructed to abide by the Director-General's Requirements and consult properly with the local community, taking into account any issues raised and showing the changes made to address each issue, before resubmitting a new State Significant Development Application to the Department.

Regards,
Peter Nixon
52 Lander Street
Darlington NSW 2008