

SUBMISSION RE SSD 8169 NORTH PARKLANDS EVENTS SITE

I wish to register my opposition to the proposed expansion of the North Parklands events.

As a resident (I reside in Ocean Shores) my opposition is as a member of a community that has had to deal with what appears as an interminable assault on my freedom and ease of life, to live within my community.

Parklands began in 2007 and became part of our background. Since then it has been a back-ground presence on a regular basis. The presence that concerns me has been the simple reality that it is a never-ending process of shifting the goal-posts. One thing is gained by the organisers and they are on to the next!

Here is the chronology;

1. The very first proposal for a one-off Splendour was put to Byron Council in 2007 for ONE three-day event with a **maximum number of patrons of 22,500**, plus 2000 staff, performers, guests, etc. Of that number, 7,500 were to be campers. **No mention was made of a year-round conference centre with accommodations, and no mention was made of a public bar.** Council approved that original proposal in 2008, but the approval was declared invalid in 2009 after a court case.
2. In 2010, Parklands then applied to become a Part 3A development (under state control) and asked for permanent approval to hold three events a year with a **maximum of 50,000 patrons** on site. Included in that was the approval for **a conference centre for 180 people and accommodations for 60 guests** to be done as "Stage 3" of the development.
 - a. The Planning Assessment Commission gave them a **five-year trial (2012-2017) with 10 festival days a year and a staged increase from 25,000 to 35,000 (Splendour) and 14,000 to 25,000 (Falls), to be accomplished over the trial period.** No event was to last longer than 4 days. Any further events after the trial were to be approved under Part 4 of the planning act, with Council to be the consent authority.
3. In March 2017, Parklands applied for an extension beyond the end of 2017, and they were granted an **extension to operation until August 2019** under the original conditions. (That was Modification 4 to the Project Approval.)
4. In December 2017, they **applied for SSD status.** Details of the proposal included **20 festival days** a year with **two 5-day festivals.**
5. **The initial proposal for a once-a-year event on land that would be a farm the rest of the year has turned into a festival precinct with the expectation that the surrounding communities will become service providers.** Parklands stated in one of the documents given to the IPC: "A larger calendar of festivals will encourage local people to start businesses that can cater to the events. The impact of this becomes greater as the number of events is increased. In short, the number of local businesses and employees

will increase as the utilisation of the NBP increases. A permanent approval is a required if the local economic benefits are to be maximised."

Certainty and security are fundamental needs in our everyday life and we are fortunate to live in a nation where these needs are met at a very high level. But Parklands is one exception to this situation, and, I contend, a fundamental reason why their submission should be denied.

Parklands has been an exercise in dealing with change on a regular basis. A lot of this has arisen as the organisers have set out to fix major problems like traffic flow, sound and environmental problems. And such adaptations are acceptable, albeit irritating, in the process of them 'getting it together'.

I can accept this change. I am even prepared to acknowledge that they have done a great job in minimising the impact of the festivals to me. I am almost unaware of their presence of late, when they have been run.

What I cannot accept is the broad sweeps that the organisers are now pushing for which are both fundamental and which will deny me as a local resident of any further control over the waking giant that is Parklands.

That issue that concerns me is the major shift in the goal-posts of making this Project the domain of a Sydney run event. This simple act immediately removes my ability to influence the environment I live in. It moves my capacity to have some say, to one of very little say.

Parklands began, as it should have, under the control of the two local shires that harbour the site. It was under the control of the two bodies who represented the residents of the area. The proposal being suggested will undermine the fundamental democratic process of control by making these two bodies into external and auxiliary voices of interest.

There are many other reasons that have been raised against the centralisation of Parklands to an event run from Sydney but to me the desired format is simple. Tyagarah and the Bluesfest have never erred from this model of local Council control. And it is testament to the viability of an event controlled within the boundaries of its residents. Events run sensitive to local needs.

I need to feel I retain the right to directly influence a Project of this dimension which sits on my doorstep. The ever-growing nature of Parklands from 'just one event a year' (the statement they began with in 2007), has haunted their aspiration ever since. Once this was established a new hope and expectation has shown itself in many ways in terms of the number of events and the size of the events. Like a genie let loose from its container the aspirations of Parklands continue to grow and, with it.

The uncertainty their ballooning aspirations poses and the ever more ambitious plans, are of grave concern to me. With the loss of the reigns to an organisation far removed from my area, and insensitive to my needs, I am deeply concerned.

As an advocate of local democracy and empowerment I recognise that I live in a society that leans further and further from this and which seems to be driven by an economic imperative rather than a more sensitive local interest. I can see the success of this proposal as a further step toward alienation and disenfranchisement of a local community.

I urge you to consider whether this Event needs to be placed under centralised control and to be removed from the relevant organisations that will best serve the communities that exist in.

I urge you to leave this Event under the controls of our local councils and recognise the both the value and importance of local democracy over centralised-authoritarianism.

