

9 February 2011

Department of Planning

GPO Box 39

SYDNEY

NSW 2001

Attention: Director, Metropolitan Projects & Mr Scott Schimanski

NSW 2232

Dear Director & Mr Schimanski,

**Subject: Exhibition of Concept Plan - Proposed Mixed Use Residential and Commercial Development at 566-594 Princes Highway, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee (MP10\_0076)**

I wish to lodge my submission to you about the above matter for the area of the Kirrawee Brick Pit site.

Thank you for giving me and others who live close to the site an opportunity to view our opinions and concerns about the proposal.

**After great thought, review of the model and of the proposal I want to give you the reasons why I strongly object to this current plan.**

Reasons for my decision:

**Traffic congestion problems**

- As you can see by my address, I live on the Princes Highway. However, our unit block and others in this area access our homes from Flora Street. Thus being more traffic on Flora Street than is directly thought. At peak times of the day (especially, the morning and afternoon peak hours), there are already huge problems with entry and exits on Oak Rd, Princes Highway and Flora Streets - going in all directions on these roads. I believe that the current problems are not being taken into consideration as the current situation is not managed effectively with the lights and round-about in place at the present time. The creation of an off ramp from the Princess Highway and running only a short distance along Oak Rd does not mitigate this problem.
- There is another traffic concern that only locals would be aware of, and this is that peak traffic attempt to get ahead in the traffic queue by taking a 'short cut'. Turning off the Princess Highway at Bath Rd (as you are heading south, it is the road just after the Kingsway joins the Princess Highway) and these cars are travelling faster than the speed limit along Bath Rd turning right into Flora St and speeding along until they get to Acacia Rd at which they turn left - a one way left turn, exit only. Thus, they are back on the highway heading south. This problem has not been taken into account for this proposal as there are no details in the proposed plan which alleviates this problem.
- The large volume of increased traffic of those living and working in this proposed development and entering/exiting in general will put a strain on all of the local intersections. This includes, but not limited to, Flora St, Oak Rd, Bath Rd, President Ave, Acadia Rd.
- The entry/exit point to the development from Flora St is not wide enough to support traffic entering/exiting the development. This entry/exit point is a wide section of the road, however, daily there are large vehicles parked and there is only one lane in each direction that traffic can use. There is insufficient space to have multiple vehicles exiting and entering

the development, this includes having sufficient space to allow cars to **safely** pass each other whilst a car may be waiting to enter the development. There are no details in the proposed plan which alleviates this problem and mitigates the risks associated with this entry/exit point.

- For the amount of proposed units, light business and proposed retail in the area, the plan lacks parking space for all.
- Therefore, to increase traffic flow in this area to the extent that 450 residential units and retail shops would increase to the total traffic amount, it is just not sustainable for the smooth flow of traffic on and off the busy highway and surrounding areas.
- The proposed plan does not alleviate the increase in traffic congestion in relation to all the identified problems outlined above.

#### **Problems with the proposed buildings**

- The proposed building height of 15 storeys is not in keeping with the local surrounding area. There are no 15 storey buildings in Kirrawee.
- The quantity of proposed units is too many. We are all aware of the problems in high density residential housing areas. We don't want the negative effects of high density housing happening to Kirrawee. There is nothing in the proposed plan which mitigates this concern.
- To have 2 supermarkets and to have them at the proposed size is not appropriate for Kirrawee and the 'village like' environment.

#### **Noise concerns**

- Due to the proposal being such a large development, I have concerns about the noise that this will create and for the length of time that it will continue for. If work was undertaken during day time hours there are a large number of families, shift workers and others in close proximity that would be greatly disturbed. Obviously undertaking work in the night time would not be a workable solution either.

Again, I would like to thank you for giving me an opportunity to voice my concerns. I believe that my concerns are legitimate and require attention on behalf of your Department to ensure that an appropriate development is approved for this site. I encourage the developer to reconsider their current plans with more thought about the local area, community and their needs.

**I request that my name and address is not made available on the Department's website.**

I look forward to receiving acknowledgement that you have received this letter. If you require further information please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

A large, dark, irregular blacked-out area covering the signature and any handwritten notes, indicating redaction.



PMU010624

RECEIVED

- 7 FEB 2011

Director-General

12 Avery Avenue,  
Kilrauee. 2232.

3/2/2011

Dear Sir,

Re: Proposed development of former brick pit site at Kilrauee.

With reference to the above, I wish to express concerns I have about this proposed development.

Firstly, increased motor traffic. From my observations, afternoon peak hour traffic on the Princes Highway at Kilrauee heading west is sometimes like a parking lot. Also, nearby Flora Street is occupied by large numbers of parked cars along the industrial premises located between Oak and Bath Roads. I feel that the proposed parking for 1,349 cars will greatly compound the problem of traffic congestion, given that many residences have more than one motor vehicle.

Secondly, if this proposed development is approved, it could set a precedent for similar developments in the shire.

Thirdly, in relation to the proposed retail shopping areas, I am concerned that if any alcohol outlets are introduced, they could create anti social behaviour.

To date, this immediate area has, fortunately, been spared such behaviour. As a long time resident, I hope it stays that way.

Fourthly, if this proposal proceeds, there would be additional demands placed on our water and power infrastructure.

I am in favour of the 9,000 square metre park, but feel that the proposed high rise residential buildings will spoil the area. Why not reduce the number of high rise residential buildings, and replace them with more parkland. Sydney needs more open spaces, not less!

Finally, I would like to thank you for inviting public comment on the proposal.

Yours Faithfully,  
Chris Jacobo.

## **Scott Schimanski - Online Submission from Michael Blumor of GyMEA United Football Club (other)**

---

**From:** Michael Blumor <mblumor@westpac.com.au>  
**To:** Scott Schimanski <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 10/02/2011 2:00 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from Michael Blumor of GyMEA United Football Club (other)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Attachments:** Soccer Letter Head Kirrawee Brick Pit.pdf

---

Attached is GyMEA United Football Club's (GUFC) response to the Kirrawee Brick Pit Development Proposal. GUFC is the biggest sporting club in the Sutherland Shire with some 1500 playing members.

Name: Michael Blumor  
Organisation: GyMEA United Football Club

Address:  
37 Marina Crescent GyMEA Bay 2227

IP Address: - 203.24.7.8

Submission for Job: #3951 MP 10\_0076 - Mixed Use Development, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee  
[https://majorprojects.onhivve.com/Index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3951](https://majorprojects.onhivve.com/Index.pl?action=view_job&id=3951)

Site: #1538 Kirrawee Brick Pit  
[https://majorprojects.onhivve.com/Index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=1538](https://majorprojects.onhivve.com/Index.pl?action=view_site&id=1538)

---

**Scott Schimanski**

E: [scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au)

---

Powered by Internetix Affinity



PO Box 268, Gymea NSW 2227

ABN 49 749 229 482

Phone: 9525-7937

Email: [donoghuez@bigpond.com](mailto:donoghuez@bigpond.com)

## Response to Environmental Assessment Kirrawee Brick Pit Site from Gymea United Football Club ("GUFC")

Having reviewed the documentation provided in relation to the above development, GUFC provide the following comments:

1. GUFC is very concerned that this development has reached environment assessment stage without any definite direction on the form and nature of a 9000 square metre park other than some broad principles. How the community and responsible decision makers are expected to provide and receive feedback and provide necessary approvals with this matter outstanding is inexplicable. GUFC contends that prior to any approval of this environmental assessment the form and nature of this Park should be determined and this information be made available for comment.

2 GUFC also submit some part of this Park should be made available in the form of playing fields.

The Sutherland Shire Councils 2009-2010 annual report lists one of the Council's Key Directions as "Managing the balance between use and sustainability of sporting fields and ...Increasing the capacity of playing fields." In their own assessment of performance against these goals the Council commented further "Bookings for use of council playing fields average 44.3 hours per week. This was double the nominal horticultural capacity of 22 hours per week, which is the ability of the field to sustain use without permanent damage."

In addition, the Annual Report comments on the work Council is undertaking to increase playing capacity through the introduction of night games. While GUFC supports this initiative it will only further exacerbate the existing problem in relation to the over use of playing fields.

In GUFC's view as supported by the Councils Key Directions statement the only real solution is addition capacity.

The Kirrawee brick pit site is located within the central zone of the Sutherland Shire. This area is the worst served in terms of playing fields capacity with additional capacity coming on line in the west and the east of the Shire but no opportunities identified within this central zone.

In addition to the above GUFC believes the introduction of playing fields on the Brick Pit Site would provide the following advantages to new residents and the community in general.

A. There will obviously be a number of children residing within the development, the inclusion of playing facilities is a valuable resource for these children and the community in general.

B. Organised sport is a large part of the "culture" within the Sutherland Shire.

C. The site as planned would have more than adequate parking (commuter).

D. If the playing field(s) were equipped with appropriate lighting and amenities as part of the plan for the site, many of the issues currently faced as residents object to the introduction of these facilities on existing playing fields or open space would be avoided. New residents would be aware of the fields and as mentioned above generally in GUFC's view see them as a positive.

Further, within the Shire there exists a number developments that blend playing fields and residential development for the mutual benefit of residents and the sporting public with the shire. Miranda Park and Glen McGrath Oval being obvious examples.

GUFC is the largest sporting club within the Shire with some 1500 playing members alone. We thank you for the opportunity to respond to the EA and look forward to a response in relation to the issues raised in this submission.

Michael Blumor  
Treasurer  
GUFC

**Scott Schimanski - Online Submission from JOHN LAWLER (object)**

---

**From:** JOHN LAWLER <jlawler45@optusnet.com.au>  
**To:** Scott Schimanski <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 10/02/2011 3:54 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from JOHN LAWLER (object)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

The major concern is traffic. Oak road, Flora street and the princes highway are extremely congested roads now particularly since the new Bunnings complex opened.

Traffic at peak times is in gridlock. Putting right/left turning only at Bath road and the Princes highway is almost going to halve the 2 right turn lanes into the Kingsway from Princes highway (east bound)

PM traffic from Bangor/Bankstown can only turn right at Glencoe St, the right turn lane can take approx. 6 cars at the moment. The Acacia rd right turn lane can hold about 8/9 cars as well.

Vehicles travelling east bound leaving Princes hwy into Oak rd between the hours of 3pm and 7 pm only have a very short timeframe to do so. Putting in additional traffic lights will only worsen an already bad situation.

It would mean that between the intersections of President AVE and the Princes Hwy and the intersection of the Boulevard and the Princes Hwy there would be 7 sets of lights in less than 2 kms.

The entry to the proposed development from Oak rd is a concern as this entry is very close to the Princes Hwy, if congestion occurs for traffic entering the site from Oak Rd, a flow n situation will occur for traffic leaving Princes Hwy into Oak.

Will cars be able to leave the BP garage and go south along Oak Rd with this extra traffic, will petrol tankers be able to negotiate the congestion.

Will there be a give way sign for traffic leaving the site before entering Oak rd.

Durbar Av is a short st presently used by traffic to avoid Princes Hwy, coupled with Flora st this makes an easy way of reducing the delays on the Princes Hwy for traffic coming from Gympie.

Making Bath Rd north and south traffic lanes will make Durbar Av and Clements Pde rat runs. Particularly dangerous to school students attending the Kirrawee Public school.

Will the existing 2 school crossings be given lolly pop persons the control the additional traffic. There is also a long day Care centre in Bath rd as well as a Coptic Church, are they both at risk with the additional traffic.

Today for example our daughter did the journey from Bangor to Caringbah at the time of 7.50 am, the time taken for this journey was 50 minutes with major holdup being at the Princes Hwy near to the proposed site.

We believe that the sheer scale of the project is too big for this site. Kirrawee has a large number of unit blocks and an additional 484 seems units seems excessive.

2 additional supermarkets in the area also seems to be unwarranted , 2 in Sutherland, 1 in Gympie 1 in Kareela and 4 in Miranda as well as 2 in Jannali. We believe that we are over serviced with supermarkets in our area.

John and Valerie Lawler



Name: JOHN LAWLER

Address:

7 Meehan Place Kirrawee 2232

IP Address: c122-108-137-132.mlrnd3.nsw.optusnet.com.au - 122.108.137.132

Submission for Job: #3951 MP 10\_0076 - Mixed Use Development, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee

[https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3951](https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3951)

Site: #1538 Kirrawee Brick Pit

[https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=1538](https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1538)

-----

**Scott Schimanski**

E: [scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au)

-----

---

Powered by Internetix Affinity

## **Scott Schimanski - Online Submission from Eamon Lawless (other)**

---

**From:** Eamon Lawless <celawless@optusnet.com.au>  
**To:** Scott Schimanski <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 10/02/2011 3:28 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from Eamon Lawless (other)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

In favour of the proposal with the exception of the high rise buildings. 14 or 15 storeys is much too high for the suburb. A height of 8 storeys would be acceptable in a set back position.

Name: Eamon Lawless

Address:  
2/263 Sylvania Rd South  
Gymea Bay 2227

IP Address: r220-101-24-122.cpe.unwired.net.au - 220.101.24.122

Submission for Job: #3951 MP 10\_0076 - Mixed Use Development, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee  
[https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/Index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3951](https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/Index.pl?action=view_job&id=3951)

Site: #1538 Kirrawee Brick Pit  
[https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/Index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=1538](https://majorprojects.onhllive.com/Index.pl?action=view_site&id=1538)

-----  
**Scott Schimanski**

E: [scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au)  
-----

---

Powered by Internetix Affinity

## Scott Schimanski - Full Submission

---

**From:**

**To:** <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>

**Date:** 7/18/2011 9:52 AM

**Subject:** Full Submission

---

YOU MAY NOT USE MY NAME PUBLICLY.  
FULL SUBMISSION FROM

I am not opposed to the site being developed. However the current proposal is too large.  
Issues it will cause (in summary)

1. Traffic - there are already considerable delays on the Princes Hwy and Oak Road Kirrawee at peak times without the development there. The development will add unacceptably high traffic volume to the intersection of Oak Road and Princes Highway. Congestion and queueing across the intersection is already occurring. The traffic impacts are these:

\* economic - congestion and a log jam further delays traffic coming into the city for work from as far south as Wollongong. It increases travel time for commuters, and causes an economic cost on business by workers being late or tired at arrival at work.

The other economic flow on from the unacceptable levels of traffic are for those heavy vehicles and trucks using the Kirrawee industrial area. They already have trouble crossing the Oak Road, Princes Highway intersection with the traffic light change time very short. It will make the economics of conducting business in that area less attractive because of the delays and congestion for those wishing to access businesses in the industrial area.

\* local amenity - the local amenity for homes and businesses is destroyed by the traffic volumes. It causes pollution, noise and unacceptable impacts on those already living on Oak Road, not just immediately near there, but also on the southern part of Oak Road where people have to queue to get across President Avenue. The flow on effects are considerable.

\* Pedestrian and traffic safety - There is a primary school and kindergarten on Bath Road South which will be heavily impacted by traffic volumes. It causes safety dangers to those walking to school or needing to stop to drop off children at school.

Social Impacts:

2 - the proponents are proposing that the Sutherland Shire Council take ownership of the "park" in the middle of the development. As a ratepayer this adds undue burden financially because it will leave the council out of pocket.

As a ratepayer I don't feel I should have to maintain a park which effectively a forecourt for a shopping mall and unit block development. The park should remain with owners of the development. The costs associated with it (maintenance and public liability) should be borne by those using it (ie tenants in the shops and owners of the residential units). There will be limited benefit of that park to residents in the near vicinity.

There is also considerable opportunity cost for local residents because money council would be forced to spend to buy 'the park' would mean the opportunity for the purchase of another park for residents in the area would be lost.

Social impacts are also the potential for an oversupply of shopping retail space. There are already large tracts of empty retail space at Kemp Avenue Kirrawee, empty shops at Miranda Mall.

The oversupply of shops and retail space is likely to result in negative economic affect for owners of strip shops in Kirrawee, Gympie and for shops in Sutherland. Significant new investment in retail (Supabarn) has been made in Sutherland (2km away) already. More retail space - particularly of this enormous size is completely unnecessary given we have a major shopping centre already under expansion at Miranda Westfield.

The proponents proposed 'park' has a lack of active recreational space available and is limited by level changes and steps and concrete. Access for people other than those in the residential units above is restricted.

3. Environmental/Historical - the development is not in keeping with the village style atmosphere of the area. It is not capturing any of the heritage value of the old brick pit site and it would be detrimental to the existing ironbark forest and endangered bat colonies in the area.

There is no way to ensure the ongoing water quality and the safety of having the proposed ornamental lake in the development.

4. Stormwater/drainage - the Princes Highway already gets inundated with water during heavy rainfall. Additional concrete structures, particularly the proposed underground parking near this ornamental lake need further consideration and study to ensure stormwater runoff and drainage is properly managed. The large amount of concreted areas means that soil drainage won't occur and this will create problems for the highway and create a traffic water flooding hazard.

5. Access to the site is inadequate. The entry points into the shopping area are narrow, would slow traffic on Princes Hwy unacceptably and be difficult for trucks to negotiate.

6. Waste disposal - the waste disposal from the site is a concern. It is potentially contaminated with asbestos and other byproducts of its former use as a brick pit.

7. Developer's disregard for wishes of the local community. Sutherland Shire Council on behalf of its ratepayers has rejected past proposals for this site by the developers concerned the scale of the development was too large (especially retail component) for the site and for the district. The Land and Environment Court upheld the decision to reject the earlier developments and instead of working with the local community to develop the site with the views of the local residents in mind, the developer has come back with double the number of residential units and a much, much larger retail component. The Land and Environment Court also said the design of the park would not be satisfactory. Yet the developers persist with unacceptably large-scale development on an unsuitable site. The retail space allowed by SSLEP 2006 controls is only 2094 metres squared - yet the developer is requesting 13,540 square metres which is completely unacceptable, unnecessary and will create problems for other retailers in the area.

My overall view is the developer has shown complete disregard for the local community, the Sutherland Shire Council and existing planning constraints and tried to push an unacceptably large development through.

8. Concern that the developer makes political donations. I believe there is potential for undue influence to be borne on decision-makers looking at this proposal as Henroth is a contributor to political parties.

9. Property speculation concern. My final concern relates to the potential for property speculation. There is no guarantee the development will proceed as proposed and that the developers are simply trying to expediate approval in principle so that they can use the property speculatively and onsell, either part or all of the site. This is not beneficial to housing policy as it does not result in housing, and when the housing is finally built it costs more ultimately because of the speculative element. The other thing is the potential to develop the retail space for a supermarket to occupy (as stage one) then not to finalise the housing component. Again the spirit of the current govt's legislation to infill urban areas with residential development to ease the housing shortfall is then not delivered. It is for these reasons I believe the decision on the project should be held until after the State election in just 7 weeks time.

### Summary

With an election in March and a likely change in State planning policy I believe you have an obligation to wait for the new policy position to be made known and to come into effect before deciding on a \$220 million development which has the potential to have such major impacts on nearby residents and other residents further away who commute through the area to work each day.

**Scott Schimanski - Online Submission from Kim Shade of This is private and confidential and not for distribution (object)**

---

**From:** Kim Shade <Kimshade@optusnet.com.au>  
**To:** Scott Schimanski <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 11/02/2011 9:05 AM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from Kim Shade of This is private and confidential and not for distribution (object)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

This is a gross overdevelopment of the site.

There would be nothing in the region to compare this too in way of bulk or size - except Westfields complex at Miranda. the proposal does not meet the guidelines of the Sutherland Council LEP for height etc. in the Zone 7 Mixed use category.

It appears there are a lot of discrepancies in the forecasting of traffic movements ie: please check RTA assessments as the roads in the area are already at capacity or over. The traffic on the highway and through the local area is already chocked in peak times. This is a disaster for residents on both sides of the highway and for those people who need to use the highway to get to Wollongong, Engadine, Heathcote etc. as their only means of transport to and from work. the congestion as a result of this development will add valuable time to commuters and commercial road trips daily.

I object to the council having to pay the developer for the public open space this should be part of their contribution. The purchase and maintenance of the public space will send our council broke. Thanks very much we are one of the few council's which hasn't gone into receivership.

The developer lost the case in the Land and Environment court with a 50% less dense proposal now it seems that the state government has the power to override democracy and take away our rights. this is a gross injustice which should not be tolerated. especially when it overrides the communities consultation which had started almost 10 years ago and is now being ignored. Please revisit the information and time spent trying to get it right.

We want a mixed use development on the site in keeping with the needs of the local community which will recognise and protect our ecologically endangered communities including our open space on the site. I don't believe that there has been any consideration of the needs of the ecologically endangered communities or the need for open space which meets the communities needs. This proposal will destroy the local amenity and local community in the quest for over development.

The brick pit site is interesting in that it has stormwater implications. One of the reasons why it closed as a brick pit was because of the artesian water supply which comes and goes depending on the build up of ground water etc. In the area. The new plan does not address this issue. This is why it is important for the area to be designated with Zone 13 public open space in order to accommodate the need for storm water management for the whole area as well as creating public amenities.

with the increase of retail space in this proposal there will be a significant impact on the shopping villages of Kirrawee, Sutherland and Jannali. It will make these areas unviable in terms of the retail competition in the local area. These centres which at times appear to be struggling will be put out of business costing local jobs, and concentrating retail in one small area will result in less competition and less choice for consumers. This will most likely create a monopoly at the cost of community amenities and decrease competition.

The Sutherland Shire Council has done their utmost to ensure from the outset community input. They have addressed residents concerns and put the local communities interests first. they should be commended for their efforts. There are plenty of examples of State Government ignorance when it comes to knowing or caring about local communities, I sincerely hope that the Brick Pit site will not become another example of ignoring the local community. I implore you to have a heart and really think about the consequences of your decision even though

your government seems to be resolved to defeat in the next election please consider making the right decision. Put yourselves in our shoes and see what a big disaster this will become. Please do not leave us with this legacy from the hard work and contributions of the past 15 years.

Name: Kim Shade

Organisation: This is private and confidential and not for distribution

Address:

Private and confidential please do not advertise my name or address  
64 Ingrid Rd, Kareela

IP Address: - 203.55.211.53

Submission for Job: #3951 MP 10\_0076 - Mixed Use Development, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee  
[https://majorprojects.onhliive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3951](https://majorprojects.onhliive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3951)

Site: #1538 Kirrawee Brick Pit  
[https://majorprojects.onhliive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=1538](https://majorprojects.onhliive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1538)

-----  
**Scott Schimanski**

E: [scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au)  
-----

---

Powered by Internetix Affinity

## **Scott Schimanski - Online Submission from Ethan Aroney-Smith (object)**

---

**From:** Ethan Aroney-Smith <aroneysmith@optusnet.com.au>  
**To:** Scott Schimanski <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 11/02/2011 9:05 AM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from Ethan Aroney-Smith (object)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

1

The OAK ROAD ACCESS is NOT VIABLE and will destroy accessibility of Oak Road - let alone my own driveway

2

This current plan has OVER DEVELOPED the site. There should be MORE open PUBLIC SPACE (plus basketball courts etc for youngsters) This could be managed by having LESS BUILDINGS but making them HIGH RISE (so that the project would still be viable).

Name: Ethan Aroney-Smith

Address:  
10/72 Flora Street  
KIRRAWEE

IP Address: d122-104-210-140.riv24.nsw.optusnet.com.au - 122.104.210.140

Submission for Job: #3951 MP 10\_0076 - Mixed Use Development, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee  
[https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3951](https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3951)

Site: #1538 Kirrawee Brick Pit  
[https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=1538](https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1538)

-----  
**Scott Schimanski**

E: [scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au)  
-----

---

Powered by Internetix Affinity



## **Scott Schimanski - Online Submission from Michele Smith (object)**

---

**From:** Michele Smith <aroneysmith@optusnet.com.au>  
**To:** Scott Schimanski <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 11/02/2011 8:42 AM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from Michele Smith (object)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

1

The OAK ROAD ACCESS is NOT VIABLE and will destroy accessibility of Oak Road - let alone my own driveway

2

This current plan has OVER DEVELOPED the site. There should be MORE open PUBLIC SPACE (plus basketball courts etc for youngsters) This could be managed by having LESS BUILDINGS but making them HIGH RISE (so that the project would still be viable).

Name: Michele Smith

Address:  
10/72 Flora Street  
KIRRAWEE

IP Address: d122-104-210-140.riv24.nsw.optusnet.com.au - 122.104.210.140

Submission for Job: #3951 MP 10\_0076 - Mixed Use Development, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee  
[https://majorprojects.onhllve.com/index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3951](https://majorprojects.onhllve.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3951)

Site: #1538 Kirrawee Brick Pit  
[https://majorprojects.onhllve.com/index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=1538](https://majorprojects.onhllve.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1538)

-----  
**Scott Schimanski**

E: [scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au)  
-----

---

Powered by Internetix Affinity

## Scott Schimanski - Online Submission from Peter Rusbourne of Kirrawee Chamber of Commerce ()

---

**From:** Peter Rusbourne <peter.rusbourne@watkinstapsell.com.au>  
**To:** Scott Schimanski <scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 10/02/2011 4:31 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from Peter Rusbourne of Kirrawee Chamber of Commerce ()  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

### KIRRAWEE BRICK PIT AMENDED PLANS

I am lodging this submission on behalf of the Kirrawee Chamber of Commerce.

We have viewed the amended plans regarding the Brick Pit site. We object to the plans proposed for the following reasons:

- 1 A large scale shopping centre will severely impact upon the Kirrawee Village shops. The design and layout does not tie this development in with the Kirrawee centre.
  - 2 Access to and from the site is limited. Both Flora Street and Oak Road will be severely impacted by the traffic generated. Parking spaces on Flora Street will be removed. Insufficient parking will therefore be available for the general public and commuters.
  - 3 Businesses currently operating in Flora Street will be adversely affected by the increased traffic, being unable to continue their business operations. Some businesses use Flora Street for vehicle testing.
- The Kirrawee Chamber of Commerce is not opposed to development of the Brick Pit site. The Kirrawee Chamber of Commerce is concerned about the application for the reasons indicated above.

Name: Peter Rusbourne  
Organisation: Kirrawee Chamber of Commerce

Address:  
9521 6000 (Wk)

IP Address: mail.watkinstapsell.com.au - 203.100.236.198

Submission for Job: #3951 MP 10\_0076 - Mixed Use Development, Kirrawee Brick Pit, Kirrawee  
[https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3951](https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3951)

Site: #1538 Kirrawee Brick Pit  
[https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=1538](https://majorprojects.onhlive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1538)

-----  
**Scott Schimanski**

E: [scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:scott.schimanski@planning.nsw.gov.au)  
-----

---

Powered by Internetix Affinity