

Robert Byrne - Submission Details for Troy Williams (object)

From: Troy Williams <troy-williams@bigpond.com>
To: <robert.byrne@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 8/15/2012 8:43 PM
Subject: Submission Details for Troy Williams (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: Appendix-A-.pdf; Appendix-B-.pdf

 Department of Planning

Confidentiality Requested: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Troy Williams
Email: troy-williams@bigpond.com

Address:
94 Churchill Street

jamberoo, NSW
2533

Content:
Troy Williams objection to the Tallawarra Lands Preferred Project Report

Troy Williams object to the Tallawarra Lands project as the project doesn't adequately cater for the needs of cycling as detailed below.

* Tallawarra Lands are still challenging the funding of cycling infrastructure and without a firm and binding commitment to funding the cycling infrastructure, including the around Lake Illawarra Shared Use Path as indicated in the Wollongong Bicycle Plan, we can not support the project. see attachment "A" for the project managers response to a question on the commitment to fund cycling infrastructure.

* I am unable to understand how the developer can claim that the Shared Path are only seen as local access path, when the perimeter path is clearly part of the around Lake Illawarra Shared Use Path as indicated in the Wollongong Bicycle Plan, providing the connecting between the path provided by the LIA and the link to the south through Haywards Bay. See attachment "B" for information on the section path that should be seen as a recreational path.

* A safe Shared Path connection over the Saltwater outlet channel linking the LIA Shared Path to the developers paths has not been provided in the Preferred Project Report

IP Address: cpe-121-216-138-244.inse2.ken.bigpond.net.au - 121.216.138.244

Submission: Online Submission from Troy Williams (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=39718

Submission for Job: #3362 MP09_0131 Mixed Use Development Concept
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=3362

Site: #2051 Tallawarra Lands
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=2051

Troy Williams

E : troy-williams@bigpond.com

Powered by [AffinityLive](#): Work. Smarter.

Email correspondence with Tallawarra Lands Manager Anthony Savenkov

Hi Andrew, (email dated 31 July 2012)

I'm in the process of reviewing the latest information and see most of our concerns have been addressed. I'm however having difficulty in finding any references to our concerns in relation Environmental Assessment Report rejecting the need or justification of providing the cycling infrastructure and hope you can point me to the revised information. I am also confused in relation to the contradictory information in different documents and unclear as to the which document takes preference ie the cycling information in the Concept plan drawing in appendix "J" differs from the information in figure 29 in appendix "K"

Regards Werner

Response dated 31 July 2012

Dear Werner

Thanks for your request for clarification below.

Section 8 of the Environmental Assessment Report specifically considers development contributions. It notes that the future population of Tallawarra Lands does not itself generate the demand for a regional shared path at Tallawarra as envisaged in the Wollongong Bicycle Plan, nor a criterium circuit.

It nonetheless goes on to note (see the Column "Concept Plan Proposal") that these items, as well as significant other cycling infrastructure, is proposed by the Concept Plan. This is confirmed in various other places in the Environmental Assessment.

I've taken another look at the two drawings, and can't seem to find any contradiction. Consistent with its purpose, Figure 29 intends to show all the key cycling infrastructure on a single page. It thus provides a more detail than the Concept Plan drawing – for instance, it shows the shared use paths in the road reserve. So for that particular detail, it saves the reader having to look at the Concept Plan drawing in conjunction with the road plan and cross sectional drawings in the "Street Hierarchy" section of the Landscape plan.

Neither drawing takes precedent. They are intended to help explain each-other.

Please let me know if I've missed anything material in comparing the drawings. I trust that this satisfies your queries. Let me know if you have any further questions/comments.

Regards

Anthony Savenkov

Appendix "B" showing section of Shared Path that forms part of the AROUND LAKE ILLAWARRA SHARED PATH

The information has been overlaid on the map provided with the project preferred report

