Page 1 of 2

Phil Pick

From: Sharon Armstrong

Sent: Monday, 17 January 2011 9:32 AM

To: Phil Pick

Subject: FW: Objection to the proposed development of Lewisham Towers

From: Thomson, C (Cassie) [mailto:Cassie.Thomson@rabobank.com]

Sent: Monday, 17 January 2011 9:32 AM

To: Sharon Armstrong

Subject: Objection to the proposed development of Lewisham Towers

To The Hon Tony Kelly MLC, NSW Planning Minister,

I am writing to object to the proposed development of Lewisham Towers.

ATTENTION: Director, Metropolitan Projects

17 January, 2011

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:

G
☐ 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 propose 900sq.m. 'green boulevarde' 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 t 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.

☐ Whenever there is heavy rainfall the intersection at Old Canterbury Road and Railway Terrace floods

at the water main that is under the road. More people without supporting infrastructure will only make this flooding occur more often.

 \Box More residents without sufficient parking will cause an overflow into surrounding streets so my street will not be quiet anymore.

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

NAME: Cassandra El-Azzi

ADDRESS: 14 Elizabeth Avenue, Dulwich Hill, NSW, 2203.

This email, including any attachments, may be confidential or privileged, and is sent for the personal attention of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please delete it from your system immediately, do not use or disclose the information in any way or store or copy the information in any medium, and notify the sender by email or telephone immediately. The views expressed in this email are those of the individual and are not necessarily those of the Rabobank Group. No warranty is made that the email or attachment(s) are free from computer viruses and other defects.

The Rabobank Group collects personal information to provide and market our services (refer to the privacy policy links below for more information about use, disclosure and access). If this email contains marketing material and you do not wish to receive such material by email in future, please reply to this email and place the words "Unsubscribe - Electronic Messages" in the Subject Header.

The Rabobank Group Australia: 1800 025 484 New Zealand: 0800 500 933

Privacy Policy:

Australia: http://www.rabobank.com.au/Global-Content/Documents/Privacy-Policy-Australia.pdf
http://www.rabobank.co.nz/Global-Content/Documents/Privacy-Policy-NZ.pdf



24 January 2011

Ms Amy Watson Major Projects Assessment Department of Planning GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2000



Department of Planning Received 1 FEB 2011 Scanning Room

Dear Ms Watson

RE: Revised concept plan – 'The Lewisham Estate Masterplan – Amendments to Part 3A Application'

I am writing to feedback my concerns on the revised Demian concept plan for the Lewisham

I have previously written to the Minister for Planning, Infrastructure and Lands: the Honourable Tony Kelly MLC and my local MP for Marrickville: Carmel Tebbutt MP expressing my concerns over the proposed project and I hope it isn't too late to feedback in relation to the Environmental Assessment.

As a resident of Lewisham since 2003 I support developing the industrial site for residential use. However I don't believe that the proposed development is suitable for the area or is in the interest of current Lewisham residents.

The proposed development has some key differences from the Council's approved masterplan for the entire McGill Street Precinct:

- 1) Traffic –The existing streets are not able to handle the current flow of traffic yet both the short and long term proposals from Demian involve reducing the traffic flow and make no provision for the additional volume of cars stemming from the 400 unit development.
- 2) Height and density of the buildings Demian is proposing a development of 400 units with a combination of 9 and 2.5 storey buildings and a floor space ratio greatly increased from the council's masterplan. A development of this size is not in keeping with the existing houses in the area that are generally single and double storey and will tower over the landscape.
- 3) Public green space Instead of a green park the developer is proposing public green space in between buildings and a substantially smaller green boulevard with the rest of the green space to be completed by future developers. This is not satisfactory green space for the inhabitants of the development, nor does it enhance the area for existing residents.

Further more the plans presented by Demian are misleading as they suggest that space outside the proposed site would be green space when this is out of their control.

When considered in light of additional development of the remaining land including the Summer Hill Mills an additional several thousand people would reside in the space without any increased provisions for road or park space.

I believe this development should comply with Marrickville Council's Masterplan for the McGill Street precinct to ensure the design is revised to deliver an appropriate development for this site and the neighbourhood.

Yours sincerely

Amy Kitchener

65 Victoria Street, Lewisham NSW 2049

E: amykitchener@y7mail.com

fr'them



ATTENTION: Director, Metropolitan Projects

Major Project Assessment

Department of Planning

GPO Box 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001

Department of Planning Received 2 8 JAN 2011 Scanning Room 28 Du 2010 ... December, 2010



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 1520 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 boulevarde' 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:

DUN'T MAKE US ANOTHER

(MATSWOOD)

DUST have crazy and the greens at Manuckalle Canal?

This is a clew excuple of AN's over micerals yearly of

I if - new of clad contributy roacus med an halfice

not man.

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

NAME.

Anna Hirider

ADDRESS:

7 Searl St Relushum NSW 2049

(171)

ATTENTION: Director, Metropolitan Projects

Major Project Assessment

Department of Planning

GPO Box 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001

Email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

PCU018972

Department of Planning Received

3 1 JAN 2011

Scanning Room

gameary 2011)

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 boulevarde' 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:

. It is difficult to see welly this type

of closelop ment should not be

clealt with by The relevant Council

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

NAME: GAYLE ADAMS ADDRESS: 11 ELIZABETH AVE

DULWICH HILL

NSW 2203