



11 Grosvenor Crescent
Summer Hill
NSW, 2130
Ph 02 9799 8164
Email: edney2@optusnet.com.au

January 6, 2011

To: Director Metropolitan projects
c/- Amy Watson, contact officer

Re: Application No: MP08_0195, 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd, Lewisham

Dear Ms Watson,

I am not opposed to higher density living close to transport and the city. Such developments are required to save arable land on the city fringes and to minimise pollution. However, I would like to raise the following objections regarding the Environmental Assessment for the above concept plan.

First and foremost, the development of 524 units with a floor to space ratio of 3.5:1 is a gross overdevelopment of the site and double that proposed in the local master plan by Marrickville Council. In addition, it is not in keeping with the Council's urban strategy (2007) which proposes Lewisham as a Neighbourhood Centre – a much lower density in terms of retail and residential space.

Such over development would ruin the amenity of the local area in several ways:

1. Increased traffic congestion: the local roads are already choked during peak hour and will not be able to cope with the additional traffic from the residents as well as the proposed retail outlets in the development. Being close to public transport does not guarantee people will use it and it is not always practical or convenient for certain destinations including work.

2. Building height: I do not think the development should be higher than 3-6 stories. Most buildings in the area are only 1-2 stories high. A nine story building would be the highest in the area, above council regulations, and set a precedent for future developers.

– 2 –

January 6, 2011

3. Reduced access and open space associated with the Greenway: I understand that the development will build right up to the goods railway line rather than leaving a green space along the corridor. In addition, the green space through the development leading to the Greenway is too narrow, with most of the open space included in the Council's master plan excluded from this application.

4. Unnecessarily large underground shopping centre: This will not only lead to greater traffic congestion, but reduce the amenity of the actual development. Smaller shops on the boulevard/street level that complement those in the surrounding villages would lead to more social interaction and a nicer environment for residents as well as surrounding neighbours which may be attracted to a new village atmosphere.

Thankyou for considering my concerns, I look forward to hearing your deliberations on this development application and how it will impact on our community amenity.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Edney & John Hibbert

92

**Amy Watson - RE: Application No. MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY ROAD
LEWISHAM CONCEPT PLAN**

From: "Ant and Alex" <antandalex@optusnet.com.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 10/01/2011 4:06 PM
Subject: RE: Application No. MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY ROAD LEWISHAM
 CONCEPT PLAN

Attention: Director, Metropolitan Projects
 Major Project Assessment
 Department of Planning

I object to the above Concept Plan, for which an Environmental Assessment is currently on exhibition, for the following reasons:

- The number of residential buildings proposed, with their height ranging up to nine (9) storeys, and containing some 400 flats, is a gross overdevelopment of this site. It provides for a density and scale which is completely at odds with the established and valued character of the surrounding locality.
- The proposed retail/commercial floor space is excessive and the 2,800 sq meter supermarket is not warranted. There are more than adequate shopping facilities (including 4 supermarkets) within 15-20 mins WALK of this site, at Leichhardt Marketplace, Summer Hill, Dulwich Hill and Petersham. The neighbourhood shops at Lewisham Station (5 mins walk) need some support, not competition.
- The provision of public open spaces is grossly inadequate. The developer wants the needs of his 1000 or so future residents and retail/office users to be met on land SOUTH of Hudson St, beyond his site and on land he doesn't control. The proposed 900sq.m 'green boulevard' is just that – a divided street with trees down the middle! Open space needs should be met on-site. The open areas shown between the buildings are likely to be access ways and private courtyards, not usable public spaces.
- The adjoining and nearby main roads are heavily used and gridlocked at peak periods. The suggested line-marking and signage restrictions reflect what the traffic already does – nothing is proposed to cater for the cars and trucks to and from the 400 units and 6300 sq.m of supermarket, shops and offices. The long-term traffic measures are far from certain as they require redevelopment of sites and street changes SOUTH of Hudson St, again beyond the developer's control.

In addition to the traffic impact during peak hours referred to above, I add that there is already heavy traffic outside the peak on the narrow Old Canterbury Rd under the railway bridge. This includes Saturdays, evening after 7pm and mid-mornings. Please don't add to this congestion, and the resulting air pollution from increased vehicle traffic, which would come with this development. While I support increasing housing density across Sydney to some extent in order to reduce the environmental footprint of residential properties, this development is significantly beyond that in both density and scale.

Marrickville Council and the community's planning for this area should not be impeded or pre-empted – this concept plan should be rejected.

Regards,
 ALEX SNELSON
 89 VICTORIA ST LEWISHAM



Friends of the GreenWay
 9A Windsor Rd
 Dulwich Hill NSW 2203
www.friendsofthegreenway.org.au
 6th January 2011

Major Projects Assessment
 Department of Planning
 GPO Box 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001
 Application reference number: MP 08_0195 Old Canterbury Rd Lewisham Concept Plan
 Attention: Director Metropolitan Projects
plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

RE: Old Canterbury Rd Lewisham Concept Plan

This letter by Friends of the GreenWay (Friends) Inc. is in response to the proponents public exhibition of the Environmental Assessment for the proposal to build apartments and shopping precinct adjacent to the Inner West freight corridor and Cooks River to Iron Cove GreenWay. Friends is an independent, non-aligned community group advocating for the realisation of a environmental and active transport corridor (a "greenway") from the Cooks River to Iron Cove. Friends was formally established in late 2007, building on many years work by local volunteers. The group has over 100 active financial members, a contact list of over 300 local residents, and is involved in and supports a number of local events.

Although Friends recognises that redevelopment of these former industrial lands is consistent with local and regional planning, we oppose the scale and bulk of the proposal, and potential adverse impacts on GreenWay, particularly biodiversity.

In particular Friends strongly object to the placement of a roadway alongside the greenway/rail corridor boundary on the site's western side. We reject the assertions that this is somehow a "green" buffer. It is essentially a driveway access and parking for the one of the apartment blocks. Access to these buildings should be provided on the side of the buildings not facing the railway/GreenWay corridor, so as to reduce potential impacts from vehicles, lighting and noise on the population of the Long Nosed Bandicoot which is found in the area, and wildlife in general. The development should provide an additional width of land dedicated to Marrickville Council on the western side of the site to provide a viable wildlife movement corridor. Vehicle access to underground car parking should be done via the eastern side of the buildings.

We believe the development is out of character with the area, and would pose high impacts on already overloaded open space, roads, and pathways. Friends support the Masterplan prepared for the area by Marrickville Council, which provides for a greatly reduced number of residents in the site area, a lower "footprint" and more sustainable

integration with surrounding land uses and transport. The development needs to be more sympathetic to Greenway, in terms of provision of biodiversity and biodiversity impacts, its integration of public open space and active transport networks, and the bulk and scale of the proposal. The current concept does not adequately "address" the sustainability goals for the GreenWay, nor maximises opportunities for a new development in this corridor to enhance the quality of open space at the same time provide for additional biodiversity.

Contrary to the assertions in the proponents document, Friends have not discussed this concept proposal with Ecotransit, and have not met with any of the proponents, nor have provided any verbal or written support of their concepts. Thus the assertion in the concept report that in some way there is a nexus between Ecotransit's support for the proposal and Friends of the GreenWay or the GreenWay Steering Committee's support is incorrect.

Friends would be happy to provide further information or clarification on any of the matters in this submission if required. Please contact Greg Stonehouse on gregs@exemail.com.au or ph. 9564 0196.

Kind Regards

Bruce Ashley
on behalf of Friends of the GreenWay

cc

General Managers: Ashfield, Leichhardt, Canterbury Councils (pl CC to Councilors)
John Chudleigh, Inner West Environment Group
Friends of the GreenWay Committee members

94

Amy Watson - Fw: RE: Application No.: MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY RD, LEWISHAM CONCEPT PLAN

From: Irene Glyptis <i_shaker@yahoo.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 7/01/2011 4:59 PM
Subject: Fw: RE: Application No.: MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY RD, LEWISHAM CONCEPT PLAN

ATTENTION: Director, Metropolitan Projects

Major Project Assessment

Department Of Planning

GPO BOX 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001

7th January 2011

RE: Application No.: MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY RD, LEWISHAM CONCEPT PLAN

As a resident who would be directly affected by the proposed development, I object to the above Concept Plan, for which an Environmental Assessment is currently on exhibition, for the following reasons:

- 1) The number of residential buildings proposed (approximately 400 flats) and the height of these buildings (up to 9 storeys) is excessive for the area of Lewisham. The gross overdevelopment of this site is not in keeping with the established character of the surrounding locality and as Lewisham/ Summer Hill is deemed as a "neighbourhood" or "village" centre, I believe this is not in step with urban guidelines set out for these areas.
- 2) The proposed retail/commercial floorspace is excessive and the 2,800 sq metre supermarket is not needed in this area as there are plenty of surrounding shopping facilities (including four supermarkets) which are easy to access at a 15 -20 mins walk from this site. Also the noise and traffic created by incoming and outgoing trucks for loading and unloading of goods is a concern, especially given the hours that this occurs and finally the likelihood that this commercial/retail proposal could encourage "gangs" to hang around and cause mischief.
- 3) The adjoining and nearby main roads are heavily gridlocked at peak periods. Living in the immediate area, I have witnessed constant accidents which include car accidents, stobie polls falling over due to car collisions and then there is the honking and shouting of frustrated car drivers in traffic during these peak times. The suggested line-marking and signage restrictions reflect what traffic already does - nothing is proposed to cater for the cars and trucks which will be introduced to these roads. The long-term traffic measures are far from certain as they require redevelopment of sites and street changes SOUTH of Hudson St., which is beyond the developer's control.
- 4) Street parking for residents will become unmanageable as this space is already limited for existing residents. I personally have had to park my car several streets away when I come home from work (I work night shifts), and I can only imagine this will worsen given the parking facilities this development provides. No thought has gone into the number of residents of the new development which owns 2 (or perhaps more) cars. They will need to find alternative parking to accommodate their other vehicles. This will cause a major problem.
- 5) The provision of public space is grossly inadequate. The developer wants the needs of his 1000 or so future residents and retail/office users to be met on land SOUTH of Hudson St., beyond his site

and on land he doesn't control. The proposed 900sq.m. "green boulevard" is just that - a divided street with trees down the middle! Open space needs should be met on-site. the open areas shown between the buildings are likely to be accessways and private courtyards, not usable public spaces.

6) I don't understand how this development was granted and accepted under The Part 3A Concept Plan rules. I believe a development of this genre needs to be deemed "State Significant" and I cannot see how this applies to this development, given my understanding of the meaning "State Significant". Clarification on this point would be appreciated.

Marrickville Council and the community's planning for this area should not be impeded or pre-empted - this Concept Plan should be rejected.

NAME: Irene Glyptis and Michael Holland

ADDRESS: 65 Old Canterbury Rd, LEWISHAM, NSW 2049

Major Project Assessment

Department of Planning

GPO Box 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001

Email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

RE: Application No: MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY ROAD, LEWISHAM CONCEPT PLAN

I object to the above Concept Plan, for which an Environmental Assessment is currently on exhibition, for the following reasons:

- The number of residential buildings proposed, with their height ranging up to nine (9) storeys, and containing some 400 flats, is a gross overdevelopment of this site. It provides for a density and scale which is completely at odds with the established and valued character of the surrounding locality.
- The proposed retail/commercial floorspace is excessive and the 2,800 sq metre supermarket is not warranted. There are more than adequate shopping facilities (including four supermarkets) within 15-20 mins WALK of this site, at Leichhardt Marketown, Summer Hill, Dulwich Hill and Petersham. The neighbourhood shops at Lewisham Station (5 mins walk) need some support, not competition.
- The provision of public open spaces is grossly inadequate. The developer wants the needs of his 1000 or so future residents and retail/office users to be met on land SOUTH of Hudson St., beyond his site and on land he doesn't control. The proposed 900sq.m. 'green boulevard' is just that – a divided street with trees down the middle! Open space needs should be met on-site. The open areas shown between the buildings are likely to be accessways and private courtyards, not usable public spaces.
- The adjoining and nearby main roads are heavily used and gridlocked at peak periods. The suggested line-marking and signage restrictions reflect what the traffic already does – nothing is proposed to cater for the cars and trucks to and from the 400 units and 6,300 sq. m. of supermarket, shops and offices. The long-term traffic measures are far from certain as they require redevelopment of sites and street changes SOUTH of Hudson St., again beyond the developer's control.

I wish to make some further comments about this Concept Plan :

I WOULD LIKE TO RE-ITERATE MY CONCERNS
Re. TRAFFIC FLOW AT PEAK HOURS – ALREADY RIDICULOUS
IN THIS AREA.

Marrickville Council and the community's planning for this area should not be impeded or pre-empted – this Concept Plan should be rejected.

NAME: D. C. & V. A. WETTON ADDRESS: 68 PROSPECT RD,
SUMMER HILL
2130.

Garry Stevens
14 Carrington St
Summer Hill
NSW, 2130
Ph 02 80212893
Email: g.stevens@uws.edu.au

January 11, 2011

To: Director Metropolitan projects
c/- Amy Watson, contact officer

Re: Application No: MP08_0195, 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd, Leiwsham

Dear Ms Watson,

It is a reasonable expectation that higher density developments occur close to transport corridors. As such I am not opposed to such developments but I think there are causes for serious concern regarding the current proposal. Specifically, I would like to raise the following objections regarding the Environmental Assessment for the above concept plan.

My primary concern is that a development of 524 units, with a floor to space ratio of 3.5:1, is a gross overdevelopment of the site and double that proposed in the local masterplan by Marrickville Council. Additionally, the proposal is not consistent with the Council's urban strategy (2007) which proposes Lewisham as a Neighbourhood Centre i.e. a much lower density in terms of retail and residential space.

A proposal of this size and in its current location has the potential to seriously impact the local area in a number of ways:

1. There is a serious, existing traffic bottleneck at the current site. A significant increase in traffic from the residents as well as the large proposed retail outlets in the development will compound an already serious situation, which is not amenable to road upgrades due to its configuration and the location of the rail bridge. Being close to public transport does not guarantee people will use it and it is not always practical or convenient for certain destinations including work.

2. The height of the proposed development is not appropriate for the location or area in general. I do not think the development should be higher than 3-6 stories. Most

buildings in the area are only 1-2 stories high. A nine story building would be the highest in the area, above council regulations, and set a precedent for future developers.

3. The proposed underground shopping centre is simply too large: As noted, this will not only lead to greater traffic congestion, but have the perverse effect of reducing the amenity of the development. Smaller shops on the boulevard/street level that complement those in the surrounding villages would lead to more social interaction and a nicer environment for residents as well as surrounding neighbours which may be attracted to a new village atmosphere.

Thankyou for considering these concerns.

Sincerely,

Garry Stevens

Garry Stevens
14 Carrington St
Summer Hill
NSW, 2130
Ph 02 80212893
Email: g.stevens@uws.edu.au

January 7, 2011

To: Director Metropolitan projects
c/- Amy Watson, contact officer

Re: Application No: MP08_0195, 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd, Leiwsham

Dear Ms Watson,

It is a reasonable expectation that higher density developments occur close to transport corridors. As such I am not opposed to such developments but I think there are causes for serious concern regarding the current proposal. Specifically, I would like to raise the following objections regarding the Environmental Assessment for the above concept plan.

My primary concern is that a development of 524 units, with a floor to space ratio of 3.5:1, is a gross overdevelopment of the site and double that proposed in the local masterplan by Marrickville Council. Additionally, the proposal is not consistent with the Council's urban strategy (2007) which proposes Lewisham as a Neighbourhood Centre i.e. a much lower density in terms of retail and residential space.

A proposal of this size and in its current location has the potential to seriously impact the local area in a number of ways:

1. There is a serious, existing traffic bottleneck at the current site. A significant increase in traffic from the residents as well as the large proposed retail outlets in the development will compound an already serious situation, which is not amenable to road upgrades due to its configuration and the location of the rail bridge. Being close to public transport does not guarantee people will use it and it is not always practical or convenient for certain destinations including work.

2. The height of the proposed development is not appropriate for the location or area in general. I do not think the development should be higher than 3-6 stories. Most

January 7, 2011

buildings in the area are only 1-2 stories high. A nine story building would be the highest in the area, above council regulations, and set a precedent for future developers.

3. The proposed underground shopping centre is simply too large. As noted, this will not only lead to greater traffic congestion, but have the perverse effect of reducing the amenity of the development. Smaller shops on the boulevard/street level that complement those in the surrounding villages would lead to more social interaction and a nicer environment for residents as well as surrounding neighbours which may be attracted to a new village atmosphere.

Thankyou for considering these concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Garry Stevens'.

Garry Stevens

97

From: Tamara Winikoff <tamara.winikoff@gmail.com>
To: "Plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au" <Plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 7/01/2011 12:56 pm
Subject: Submission re Part 3A Application No. MP08_0195

Attention: Director, Metropolitan Planning
Major Projects Assessment
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
Sydney 2001

7 January 2011

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Application No. MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY ROAD, LEWISHAM
CONCEPT PLAN

I am writing in support of the submission in relation to the above proposed development lodged by No Lewisham Towers (NLT) Incorporated of which I am a director. As a local resident living one block away from the proposed development, I have a keen interest in ensuring that major changes to this site should be designed and delivered in an optimal way to offer the best possible amenity to the neighbourhood, the city as a whole and to both existing and new residents and people who would use the area for other purposes (eg who are employed or run businesses, might use the area as a connecting route to other destinations or for recreational purposes).

Since the lodgement of initial concept plans for the site, there has been keen interest from the community in what has been proposed both by the developer and subsequently by Marrickville Council through its Masterplan for the whole McGill Street precinct and more broadly, its LEP. There have been several well attended public meetings at which the community was both informed of progress and voiced its opinions. Meetings have been arranged with both our state government representatives and the Minister and Shadow Minister for Planning as well as with council members and staff of the local councils of Marrickville and Ashfield. Petitions and letters of request and objection have been sent to state and local government representatives and people's opinions aired on the website established by NLT as well as communicating responses from about 1500 local people through the Community Referendum held at the same time as the last federal election. There is evident shared concern over the lack of transparency of the Part 3A process and its inability to take a coherent approach to consideration of the wider strategic implications of development proposals. There is a strong community perception that developer profit motives are being allowed to take precedence over good planning decisions.

Now that an Environmental Assessment of the Concept Plan is on exhibition, I would briefly like to respond by emphasising some of the main areas of concern shared by most members of the community. In doing so, I request that these community concerns be given detailed consideration before any decision is made. These concerns have not been raised selfishly or frivolously but with the desire to achieve an outcome which is strategically well planned rather than allowing the profit motive of the developer to override all other considerations.

An issue which should be taken into consideration is that this site is

not an island. The application is for only half of the McGill Street precinct site for which Marrickville Council has commissioned a much better considered and resolved Masterplan. This Masterplan, Marrickville Council's LEP and two other Part 3A proposals - the Allied Mills site and the Sydney Light Rail extension - have immediate bearing on this site. To achieve a good planning outcome, it is strongly recommended that the terms of reference for the Planning Assessment Commission require it to take a coordinated approach by considering the three Part 3A applications together with reference to Marrickville Council's Masterplan, and in collaboration with Transport NSW with reference to the requested RTA traffic study for the whole area affected,

1. Height, Bulk & Scale

The scale of the proposed development would take it out of the realm of what is appropriate for a 'neighbourhood centre' to being a de facto 'town centre'. This is not consistent with what has been planned for in the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy.

The floor space ratio (FSR) of the development proposal is more than double what has been proposed as desirable for such a development in Marrickville Council's Masterplan and would compromise the possible future development of the rest of the McGill Street site.

The development designed by Tony Owen for the developer is unsympathetic to the scale of residential buildings in the streets adjoining and turns a blind face to the proposed Greenway. In the site it creates long corridor access rather than multiple entry points, and the activity of the loading dock area for the proposed supermarket is in conflict with the light rail station and crossing point between the site and the Summer Hill area.

Overshadowing for most periods of the day in any season would compromise the usability of the public and private open spaces depicted. The eastern side of the Greenway corridor would be deprived of all morning sun, while the narrow 'green boulevard' parallel to Hudson Street would also be overshadowed.

According to the observations of Marrickville Council's Development Control Engineer, flooding could be a problem caused by some aspects of the development proposal and a flood study has been recommended.

2. Public and Private Open Space

The Marrickville LGA is undersupplied with public open space and Council proposes provision at the rate of 1.6 hectares per 1000 population (below the accepted standard of 2.83 per 1000 population) should be agreed by the developer through a Voluntary Planning Agreement. Council recommends this be provided free by the developer as part of his Section 94 contribution.

The Marrickville Council Masterplan has recognized the requirement for adequate public open space. It is planned to provide a well located and reasonable sized public open recreation area, bordered by services and a small scale 'village square' style of retail which would be interactive with passers by and provide optimal connection between the proposed light rail station, Lewisham station, Greenway and surrounding residential streets. This is one of the attractive features of this Masterplan.

Instead, the developer currently provides misleading representations both of the quantum and extent of his proposed public open space

provision. The depictions of 'central park' and 'greenway corridor frontage' are outside the applicant's site and are therefore unable to be delivered. The fact that the land south of the developer's land is in multiple ownership makes it highly unlikely that it ever will be available for the proposed public open space application.

The triangular so-called public open space areas are a poor substitute for the Masterplan's semi-private open space provisions for new residents.

3. Supermarket and Retail/Commercial Uses

There is already more than adequate provision of supermarket and high street large scale retail in close proximity to and in every direction from this site - at Ashfield, Summer Hill, Marrickville, Petersham and Dulwich Hill. The developer's claims that there is unsatisfied over-demand on current retail in the area is not substantiated. Residents are particularly concerned over the impact of the proposed large scale retail which also goes against the specific comments made in the Director General's report. The deleterious consequences would be several-fold:

- increased traffic pressure in already gridlocked commuter streets
- increased parking in surrounding streets already insufficiently coping with demand
- unfair competition with local businesses
- noisy large scale delivery vehicles at all hours day and night
- interference with site permeability and through site pedestrian access
- compromising of what could be the enhancement of the quality of public open space with the provision of small cafes, domestic scale retail and other compatible services.

4. Traffic, Parking and Servicing

Possibly of greatest impact on the whole area surrounding the development site would be the traffic generated somewhat by new residents but most particularly by supermarket patrons and deliveries. There is already severe congestion during peak hours and at weekends along Old Canterbury Road and Longport Street particularly at the railway bridge where it becomes Railway Parade. Consequent rat runs through surrounding streets are already problematic as the result of severe traffic congestion along the major commuter routes and street parking is highly competitive. The higher the proposed FSR the worse this will become. It is all very well for the intention to be to minimise car dependency but this is not what would necessarily happen. There is limited possibility to achieve street widening to cope.

It is strongly recommended that the traffic study commissioned by Marrickville and Ashfield Councils be given detailed consideration and that a more detailed traffic study be commissioned from the RTA before any decision is made.

5. Conclusion

Though the residents and local small business representatives have reservations about the height and density of Marrickville Council's Masterplan for the McGill Street precinct, there is strong support for the approach taken to staggering the building heights over the depth of the site (the lowest with top storey setbacks facing residential streets), small scale retail and commercial provision instead of large supermarket/s, substantial and strategically well located public and private open space and well considered location of on-site streets and their connection to main roads. By contrast there is strong objection to most aspects of the developer's proposal which is regarded as badly designed, over-developed and insensitive to the realities of the site

and its surroundings.

We respectfully request that the developer's proposal be considered in relation to the requested traffic studies and together with the other immediately relevant Part 3A proposals for the Allied Mills site and the Light Rail extension. At the very least we ask that the proposed development be required to adhere to the Marrickville Council Masterplan and LEP as well as other major strategic planning instruments including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy.

We also request that the Planning Assessment Commission visit the three adjacent Part 3A sites to see the context for themselves and that community members be allowed to address the PAC at a public hearing.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission.

Yours sincerely

Tamara Winikoff



**Re: Application No: MP08_0195 78-90 Old Canterbury Road, Lewisham
Concept Plan**

Dear Sir / Madam

I wish to voice my objection to the above Concept Plan as a resident of the Lewisham area who will be directly affected by the proposed development.

My reasons are as follows:

- 1 The sheer size - up to 9 storeys - is totally out of character with the local - it is opposite little Federation homes and totally 'swamps' them in scale.
- 2 **Neither** the density **nor** the scale reflect the character of the local streetscapes
- 3 Living and driving on the local roads I know (from experience, sitting at the lights at Old Canterbury Rd and Toothill Sts and Old Canterbury Road and The Longport - for at least 4 changes of lights between 8:00am and 9:30am) that those local roads simply cannot take another possible 350 - 800 cars !
The trains are great if you are going to work in the city, the buses are totally inadequate if you need to go cross-country and will be further impeded by adding more private cars.
Then we have delivery vehicles servicing the supermarket and shops!
Signage and line-marking will do nothing to improve an already-stretched
- 4 The provision for public open space is very poor and is not in the *spirit and intent* of public open space - it is really only *scratchings* on the plans. Little attention has been taken into account around the issue of over-shadowing by the massive height of the proposed towers - pokey, dark spaces do NOT provide any amenity to the Public.
- 5 The proposed retail / commercial floorspace is excessive and directly threatens the viability of the local shopping strips - Summer Hill - which is the envy of so many city villages - Petersham, Lewisham and Dulwich Hill.
These shopping strips are owned by Locals and provide employment for Locals - they should not be allowed to be threatened by the big chains!
- 6 'The Lewisham Estate Concept Plan: The Proposal and The Site' which was on display at the local RSL Club was very disappointing. It contained many inaccuracies and really was an example of an exercise in the mis-use of language and graphics. It left me feeling like someone - with NSW Govt support - was trying to pull the wool' over our eyes.
Urbis - who produced the display - should be reminded that they are contracted to give a 'true and real' picture of the neighborhood and the proposed development's effect on that area.

Yours sincerely

Judy Benjamin
86 Denison Rd
Lewisham NSW 2049

14 Carrington Street
Summer Hill
NSW 2130
Ph: (02) 8021 2893
Email:nataliecollins1@hotmail.com

6/1/11

To: Director Metropolitan Projects
c/- Amy Watson

Re: Application Number: MP08_0195
MacGill Street Lewisham Precinct Master Plan
Old Canterbury Road, Lewisham NSW

Dear Ms Watson

I would like to raise the following objections to the proposed concept plan for the above application;

1. The Old Canterbury Road/Longport Street intersection is an already choked bottleneck for traffic in peakhour periods. The exiting train line allows motorists only a very limited number options in regards to bypassing it and this intersection is invariably at a standstill weekday mornings from about 7am onwards and again from about 4pm. The large volume of extra traffic generated by this proposed development will markedly exacerbate this situation. Furthermore, the combination of increased motorists due to this proposal AND the adjacent Allied Mills site will be overwhelming, and an independent analysis of increased traffic flow should be undertaken before either site's rezoning is approved.
2. The proposed number of 524 units with a floor to space ratio of 3:5:1 is double that of Marrickville Council's proposed local masterplan. 524 units will significantly increase population density. Summer Hill and Lewisham are 'small' suburbs that are not equipped to cope with such increased density.
3. The proposed height of the buildings is excessive. In a heritage area where there are no buildings higher than 4 stories (the Summer Hill mill stacks excluded), the proposed heights are excessive, above Council regulations and would set a precedent for developers in the future.
4. The large underground shopping centre is unnecessary and would lead to greater traffic congestion. It should instead be replaced by smaller shops and cafes at street level. Summer Hill is known for its village atmosphere and residents would welcome a pleasant area in which to socialise.
5. The developers have failed to leave a corridor next to the goods line and have excluded Council's masterplan.

Lewisham and Summer Hill are heritage suburbs which have for many, many years had an industrial component. I understand that as our population increases these sites are being fast replaced in the need to produce housing. But developers too must understand that their developments are to be in keeping with the existing character of the area and that their greed cannot leave residents with the legacy of reduced quality of living. I guess what I'm trying to say is that when the developers are long gone I'll be sitting in my car in a traffic jam.

Yours sincerely

Natalie Collins

100

6th January, 2011

From: Mr Eugene de Leon and Mrs Crystal de Leon
9 McGill Street
Lewisham NSW 2049

Pages included: 2

ATTENTION: Director, Metropolitan Projects
Major Project Assessment
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001
Email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

**RE: Application No: MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY ROAD,
LEWISHAM CONCEPT PLAN**

To Mr. Michael Woodland,

We write to you in regards to the Concept Plan at the location of 78-90 Old Canterbury Road, Lewisham NSW. We have deep concerns about the over development that is currently on display for the following reasons:

Firstly, the proposed residential buildings of up to nine (9) storeys and up to some 400 flats in this location is far too overdeveloped for such a small site. The development is out of character for the suburb of Lewisham. It is to be noted that the submission does not take into account the additional impact of the Flour Mill redevelopment, which is also currently being considered by the Planning of NSW.

Secondly, the proposed retail/commercial floorspace is excessive and the 2,800 sq metre supermarket is not warranted. There are more than adequate shopping facilities (including four supermarkets) within 15-20 minutes WALK of this site, being Leichhardt Marketown, Summer Hill, Dulwich Hill and Petersham. The neighbourhood shops at Lewisham Station (5 mins walk) need strong local support, not competition.

Another objection to the proposal is that the provision of public open spaces is inadequate. The developer is wanting to use land (which he does not own or control) other than the area which he has proposed to develop on to suit his needs and seems to not have taken into consideration the needs of the residents in the surrounding areas. The intended open areas proposed by the developer are more likely to be used as access ways and private courtyards which will not be used as public spaces. In addition, in my (Eugene de Leon) experience as a Police officer I believe that there will be a high risk that young groups of people will loiter and misuse the area. This can also lead to anti-social behaviour, which will impact the residents.

Furthermore, as a resident of McGill Street, Lewisham, we find that the traffic on Old Canterbury Road is already congested. Having an extra 900 or so residents in the area will only make matters worse especially during peak hours which is already too busy. This will not only affect Lewisham but all the other surrounding suburbs that pass through this main road on a daily basis. The peak hour will definitely be extended for the whole day and throughout the night.

Finally, there are also parking considerations to consider. At the present time we currently find it hard to park on our street even though we have "PAID" parking permits. At times, we have to park a couple of streets away as we have to compete with the businesses already surrounding us. Even though the proposed development intends to accommodate parking spaces for the 900 or so residents, where will their visitors park? You also need to consider the parking spaces that the business owners and their clients will need. This will also add to our parking space problems and to the surrounding residents around Old Canterbury Road.

In summary, we Eugene de Leon and Crystal de Leon of 9 McGill Street Lewisham, NSW 2049, strongly object to Application No: MP08_0195 78-90 OLD CANTERBURY ROAD, LEWISHAM CONCEPT PLAN and ask that the **PROPOSAL BE REFUSED** for the reasons outlined above.

Regards,

Mr Eugene de Leon and Mrs Crystal de Leon
9 McGill Street,
Lewisham NSW 2049