

**Helen Mulcahy - Fw: Section 75W Application to modify Major Project - Lewisham Estate MP08 - 0195 - 78/90 Old Canterbury Rd, Lewisham.**

---

**From:** "JCV - Vince" <jcv@itconnect.net.au>  
**To:** <Helen.Mulcahy@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 4/22/2013 2:58 PM  
**Subject:** Fw: Section 75W Application to modify Major Project - Lewisham Estate MP08 - 0195 - 78/90 Old Canterbury Rd, Lewisham.  
**Attachments:** Attachment 1 - 12.3.pdf; Attachment 4 Owen's design for 120 OCRd.pdf; Attachment 2 - Photomontage 3.pdf; Attachment 3 - Swept paths analysis.pdf

---

Dear Ms Mulcahy  
 please find attached my late submission.

**Subject:** Section 75W Application to modify Major Project - Lewisham Estate MP08 - 0195 - 78/90 Old Canterbury Rd, Lewisham.

Dear Ms Mulcahy,

**Re: Section 75W Application to modify Major Project – Lewisham Estate MP08 – 0195 – 78/90 Old Canterbury Rd, Lewisham.**

My family own and live at Nos 2, 4 & 6 William Street Lewisham and I also operate a business in Longport St, Lewisham. We are very long-term residents.

I am writing to you because I'm deeply concerned about matters relating to the proposed modifications to the PAC approved concept plan of which I received no notification.

Indeed the only notification I received was a letter dated March 27, 2013 from Marrickville Council advising me that a DA had been lodged by the developer and that I had an opportunity to respond to that by May 3, 2013. I've therefore had little time to view changes requested but I notice in the first instance that:-

- The developer's intention to close off Brown Street (previously the entrance/exit to the development) is supported. And yet a proposed footbridge from the eastern side of Brown Street over Longport St - on a piece of land that adjoins my mother's house - to a rail embankment on the northern side of Longport St to provide access to Lewisham heavy rail station still remains open and on the table. This is simply absurd and the Department should categorically rule out this option once and for all.
- Even more concerning to my family and fellow residents is the lack of accuracy in documentation submitted with the Section 75W application. I refer to amended concept plan 1a Annexure 1- 12.3 – Subject Site Masterplan (Rev C) dated November 9, 2012 – where road widening on the cnr of Old Canterbury Rd and Longport St is still proposed in the documentation – see yellow circle notation – where a resident's cottage with a resident still residing there – appears to have been 'disappeared' in the plan submitted? In addition, a proposed signalised crossing – rejected on previous occasions – remains in this plan. ATTACHMENT 1 – Subject Site Masterplan..
- Photomontage 3 (from the DA application before Council) seems only to heighten the view that the existing residences located on the cnr of OCRd and Longport Street are being

hidden from 3<sup>rd</sup> party scrutiny on documentation provided to the DOPI as note how the trees in this image obscure the number, low-rise character and location of the existing residences - that will soon be 'towered over' by the imposing heights of proposed flat buildings.  
ATTACHMENT 2 – Photomontage 3 from DA.

- The long ramp along the western boundary of the development as pointed out in the Transport for NSW submission is a very poor option in our view and a roundabout at a light rail stop if Hudson Street becoming the only entrance to the car park is unacceptable. The ramp will adversely affect the ground floor units of Block A & B and Hudson St will need to carry more traffic meaning more traffic flow, in turn through the roundabout, affecting access and safety of those wanting to use the light rail.
- The swept paths analysis – Annexure 3 – appendix B - rather than providing reassurance of this as a sensible option tends to suggest instead a recipe for chaos and confusion.  
ATTACHMENT 3 – Swept paths analysis – from Traffix.

A high quality pedestrian path/shared zone through to any public space/footpath is needed. For example, a narrow path running north/south from the light rail through to Brown Street will prove to be next to useless as a connection to the light rail for residents accessing the light rail stop from the northern end of the development.

Connectivity to the light rail as well as the wider connectivity/permeability through to the proposed open space in the Mills development should be enhanced not ignored.

**Considering the number of people who will be living in an urban island surrounded by three busy roads there needs to be much improved permeability between the two development sites to avoid the shape, look and feel of a 'mini walled city of Kowloon' precinct.**

Unfortunately, the facades of the buildings themselves are dull and uninteresting, box-like and monotonous. This will be a large, crowded development in what will be a very dense McGill Street precinct book-ended well to the south of the proposed Meriton development by an already approved design for 120A and 120B Old Canterbury Road by the same architect that is starkly incongruous and wildly at odds with the context of the existing area. ATTACHMENT 4 –Tony Owen design for 120A & 120B OCR cnr McGill Street..

There remains only a small window of opportunity left to get the best possible outcome for this development, and for the future residents and the existing communities that will be living with this development for years into the future. Design and planning excellence remain the only opportunity to improve what is shaping up now in this modification proposal to be a very disappointing and poorly planned development outcome.

**In summary: -**

**The design excellence guidelines must not be deleted from the PAC approval – nor should the Department of Planning change any of the conditions set by the PAC. These are after all only minor incremental conditions with little economic costs imposed by the PAC most likely in an attempt to make a poorly conceived concept plan into a somewhat better concept planned outcome. All of those conditions should stand.**

After all, the Department cannot have it both ways. It cannot continue to assert publicly,

individually and collectively in its own forums that the community must accept the need right now and into the future for dramatic increases in density (in otherwise low-density residential areas) when in turn the department signs off on insensitive half-baked proposals that are guaranteed to simply alienate and divide communities even further than occurred during the appalling subverted Part 3A legislative period.

Yours sincerely

Vincent Scaturro