



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1023277

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

**RE: PLANNING PROPOSAL FOR THE ST LEONARDS
SOUTH RESIDENTIAL PRECINCT**

PANEL:

**ILONA MILLAR
RUSSELL MILLER
PETER COCHRANE**

ASSISTING PANEL:

MATTHEW TODD-JONES

LOCATION:

**CROWS NEST CENTRE
JOHNSON HALL
LEVEL 2, 2 ERNEST PLACE
CROWS NEST, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE:

9.03 AM, MONDAY, 20 MAY 2019

MS I. MILLAR: Okay. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to this public meeting on a
5 request for – from the then Minister for Planning, dated 20 December 2018, for advice on three things: firstly, the consistency of the St Leonards South Residential Precinct planning proposal, initiated by Lane Cove Council, with the overall vision, guiding design principles and specific design principles of the draft St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 plan as relevant to the planning proposal; secondly, the scale of
10 residential development contained in the planning proposal and whether the whole site needs to be rezoned to meet the Greater Sydney Commission housing targets under the North District Plan; and, thirdly, whether some staging of the proposal is appropriate.

15 My name is Ilona Millar, and I'm the chair of the Independent Planning – this Independent Planning Commission New South Wales panel, which has been appointed to provide advice on the Minister's request. Joining me on the panel are commissioners Russell Miller and Peter Cochrane, and then we have Matthew Todd-Jones from the commission secretariat here with us as well. Before I continue, I'd
20 like to state that all of the appointed commissioners must make annual declarations of interest identifying potential conflicts with their appointed role. For the record, we are unaware of any conflicts in relation to providing advice on this request. You can find any additional information on the way we manage potential conflicts of interest in our policy paper, which is available on the IPCN website. In the interests
25 of openness and transparency, today's meeting will be recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the communication's website.

So, turning to this meeting's purpose, the public meeting gives us, the commissioners, an opportunity to hear your voice – views and voices on the three
30 matters that we have outlined above before we provide our advice to the Minister for Planning. This meeting is just one part of our process in providing advice. We have also met with the Department of Planning and Environment. We've visited the site, and we will meet with the Lane Cove Council later this week. The commission may also convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is
35 required on the matters raised, and records of all of our meetings will be included in our advice and will also be published on the IPCN website.

Now, the next steps following today's meeting. We will endeavour to provide advice as soon as possible; however, there may be delays if we find the need for additional
40 information which we need to request from any stakeholders. Importantly, I'd like to talk about today's ground rules. Before we hear from our first registered speaker, I would like to lay the ground rules that we expect everyone taking part in today's meeting to follow. First of all, today's meeting is not a debate. Our panel will not be taking questions from the floor, and no interjections are allowed. Our aim is to
45 provide the maximum opportunity for people to speak and to be heard by the panel.

Now, we note that public speaking is an ordeal for many people, and though you may not agree with everything you hear today, it's important that each speaker has the right to be treated with respect and heard in silence. Today's focus is on public consultation, and our panel is here to listen, not to comment. We may ask questions for clarification, but this is usually unnecessary. It will be most beneficial if your presentation is focused on the issues of concern to you and on those three questions that I outlined at the beginning. It is important that every registered speaker receives a fair share of time, and everyone who is registered to speak has nominated their preference for an amount of time. We will be enforcing time-keeping rules, but, as chair, I reserve the right to allow additional time for provision of further technical matters.

In terms of timing, a warning bell will sound one minute before the speaker's allotted time is up and again when it runs out, so please respect these time limits. If there are issues that you are unable to address or you feel you could not completely address in the allocated time, we encourage you to provide a written submission to the commission. Written submissions should be made within seven days of the meeting. Though we'll strive to stick to our schedule today, sometimes speakers don't turn up or decide not to speak. So if you know anyone who is not going to be speaking today who is registered, please let Matthew know, and if you'd like to project something onto the screen, please give it to Matthew before your presentation.

Also, if you have a copy of your presentation, it would be appreciated if you'd provide a copy to the secretariat after you've spoken. Please note that any information that you do give to us will be made public, and the commission's privacy statement governs our approach to your information. If you'd like a copy of that privacy statement, you can obtain one from the secretariat, and it's also on our IPCN website. Audio recording of this meeting is not allowed, except for the official recording and transcription, and notes made throughout the day on issues raised will be summarised in our advice.

Today we have quite a long speaker list, so we're proposing to take a break at about 10.30 for about 10 minutes, just for a comfort break, and then to break again at about 12.30 for lunch for half an hour. Finally, I would ask that everyone present please turn your mobile phones to silent, and, with that, I would like to call – I will just ask that if anyone else wants to come into the room, there are seats over here, over on the – my left. And then I will call the first speaker, who today is Tom Goode from the SJD Group. Is Tom – great. And, speakers, if you can just speak from the lectern towards the commission.

MR T. GOODE: Okay. Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to present today. My name is Tom Goode, and I'm a town planner at Ethos Urban. We're speaking on behalf of SJD, who are the landowner of properties at 8 to 22 Berry Road and 13 to 21 Holdsworth Avenue, St Leonards. This is a site that is 400 metres from St Leonards station, 500 metres from Wollstonecraft station and 800 metres from the future Crows Nest Metropolitan – Metro Station. It is a site area of 6668 square metres and comprises 13 individual allotments.

The key point that we wish to stress to the IPC today is that the draft LEP has significant strategic merit. It is in line with the key planks of the Greater Sydney Region Plan: to provide housing within 30 minutes to jobs, school, services, and provide more diverse housing choices. The draft LEP is also in line with the St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Draft Plan, providing a greater mix of housing, proximate transport services and employment of St Leonards.

Of critical concern, however, is that SJD entered into an agreement with the landowners in 2015 to purchase the site now on an endorsed position of council that had been rigorously tested with the community. The process began in 2012, when Lane Cove Council resolved to undertake a stage 1 master planning process for the precinct. Preliminary consultation, including a community information session and meetings, were undertaken between May and August in 2013. This culminated in a stage 1 master plan being endorsed by council in December of 2014, with a decision then made on the preferred approach for the subsequent stage 2 master plan, which is the plan upon which the draft LEP is now based.

The stage 2 master plan, again, underwent extensive community engagement from December 2014 to May 2015, with council adopting a draft master plan on February 2016. Subsequently, in October 2017, the draft LEP was exhibited with a draft DCP and draft landscape master plan. Importantly, this occurred after the release of the interim statement from the then Department of Planning Infrastructure in August 2017. The draft LEP was, therefore, well aligned to the State Government plan at the time of publishing. Unfortunately, since October 2017 the plan has not progressed, and it is these extended timeframes that have been an issue for all concerned in the precinct, from both the landowners and the developers, as well as, importantly, to the surrounding community in the area.

It is this key aspect that our client stresses. This plan has been through a rigorous process and should be progressed. The plan has been widely and repeatedly exhibited. It is in alignment with all relevant state and local integrated transport and land use policy. However, in terms of the content of the plan itself, council have generously engaged with landowners and provided the opportunity for feedback. Our feedback then, as it now, was that the overly prescriptive nature of the controls may, in fact, inhibit the delivery of the overall intent of the plan. We therefore seek that – some minor requests for the IPC to review these in terms of the draft LEP and the DCP content. I think it's important, however, though, that we do not consider that these changes are significant enough to warrant a re-notification of the plan. The changes do not alter the intent of the plans, of the endorsed master plan, nor their anticipated yields or the height, the bulk or the scale.

Our concerns are that the draft planning controls, in their current form, are highly prescriptive and do not allow any flexibility. Firstly, the LEP specifies specific lot amalgamations based on a 2015 mud map provided by real estate agents in the area at the time of site disposals. They were based on the landowner groupings rather than any planning or design intent. Our concerns are that these are highly prescriptive and will restrict flexibility. The amalgamation pattern allowing bonus

FSR and height is highly restrictive and prohibit the variation to amalgamation patterns. In addition, there are a number of requirements in the LEP that are better suited to a DCP. These are in regards to public pathways through site lengths and should be relocated into a DCP providing objectives to those controls.

5

The height of building and FSR mapping seeks to reinforce a green link objective that's clear in the plan; however, the alignment of these controls are through midblocks and will be very difficult to interpret and, again, do not allow any flexibility when it comes to the development application stage. We don't support the deletion of the clause 4.6 control, and, further, there are a number of DCP and landscape master plan items that we believe should be more flexibly applied. Specifically, the – we seek that the IPC consider the controls relating to building envelopes, basements, deep soil, to include objective-based planning.

10

15

So, in summary, we support the work of the council to date, and we ask that the IPC progress the master plan that delivers on council's original intent, an intent that was widely consulted over a five-year time line. Finally, the plan is in line with all relevant strategic planning intent at both the Local and State Government and delivers on the housing targets for the LGA, as outlined by the Greater Sydney Commission.

20

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much, Tom. I would now like to call Dan Keary from Piety THP.

25

MR D. KEARY: Thank you, commissioners, for the opportunity to address you today. My name is Dan Keary. I'm a director of Keylan Consulting, and we're the planning consultant for Piety THP. Piety owns or has options over a number of lots within the precinct and has been working closely with council over a number of years on the planning proposal. At the outset, I wish to state that our client supports the planning proposal. We note that it's based on sound strategic planning and urban design principles and has been produced on the basis of a comprehensive evidence base and extensive community and stakeholder engagement. Today I will briefly speak to these points but also outline our client's concerns about ongoing delays in implementation of the plan as well as some of the issues around the detailed revisions of the plans, which we consider should be carefully reviewed by the commission.

30

35

40

As the commission would know, this planning proposal has had an unusually protracted history. It commenced nearly seven years ago, with council's resolution in October 2012 to prepare a master plan for the precinct. The draft master plan was publicly exhibited for almost six months. It's a comprehensive evidence-based document. It clearly articulates the principles of transit-oriented development based on the creation of high-density mixed-use communities around town centres and transport interchanges, and it then translates these into the provisions that form the basis of the planning proposal. Following the master plan, council resolved in July 45 2015 to prepare the planning proposal. The gateway determination was issued in

45

September 2016, and formal exhibition of the draft plan occurred from October to December 2017.

5 Now, well over two years from the initial gateway determination, the planning proposal remains unmade and subject to further review and consultation. Piety THP is therefore concerned that the commission's review process could result in further unnecessary delays and continuing uncertainty for all parties over the process to finalise the planning proposal. We therefore respectfully request that the IPC review be completed as a matter of priority, with the IPCs recommendations released and made publicly available at the earliest possible time.

15 Turning now to the planning proposal itself, we note that it seeks to facilitate high-density residential development in the locality with excellent access to transport, employment and services, which (a) is consistent with the Greater Sydney Region Plan and North District Plan and the concept of a 30-minute city, (b) contributes to the housing targets outlined in the North District Plan for both the district and the Lane Cove LGA, (c) provides for an appropriate scale of development in a locality that is undergoing significant transition towards high-density development and taller buildings, (d) incorporates sound built form and design outcomes and (e) includes scope for substantial local infrastructure improvements. We also note that the principles and built form controls for the precinct in the draft 2036 plan for Crows Nest St Leonards, released by the Department of Planning and Environment, are entirely consistent with those in the planning proposal.

25 On this basis, we consider that the planning proposal is not only a comprehensive evidence-based document with the ability to deliver substantial housing and infrastructure benefits. It is also wholly aligned to key metropolitan strategic planning objectives and targets. We ask that this point be carefully considered by the Commission in its review and advice from the Minister and that any recommended amendments to the planned proposal are not of the nature that would require re-exhibition and may further delays.

35 Turning now to some of the specific provisions of the planning proposal, we consider the following matters should be carefully considered by the IPC in its review. In particular, we know that the overly prescriptive nature of the outcomes which must be achieved if the bonus heights and FSRs could be realised. For example, the preferred site amalgamation pattern must be met in order for the proposed height FCR increase to be achieved. However, Piety THP has been unable to negotiate land acquisitions with all land owners.

40 This will result in a different land ownership pattern to the site amalgamation pattern. It is understood that other land owners are experiencing similar difficulties. As east side amalgamation patterns cannot be achieved. The LEP, once made, will not be able to be implemented. This could result in a regular built form outcomes, for example, higher-scale development in areas to the south further away from the town centre and the retention of low-density detached dwellings in areas closer to the town centre. This is contrary to the plans' fundamental objectives and design principles.

Piety has also undertaken a detailed urban design analysis which demonstrates that on the basis of realistic amalgamation patterns and other constraints such as topography, the FSRs in the planning proposal may not be achieved. It also shows that with alternative building arrangements, solar access improvements can be
5 achieved. Accordingly, there should be the ability to transfer unused height and FSR across adjacent sites to enable better design and public benefit outcomes. They're also very prescriptive requirements. For example, the community facility requirement which requires a provision of a 600 square metre ground floor facility with an outdoor play space of 450 square metres.

10 These are extremely prescriptive controls for an LEP and would ordinarily provide the flexibility and alternative innovative design outcomes at the DA stage. We also note that the planning proposal does not include clause 4.6 which is a major flaw of the proposal as it will prevent the major merit-based consideration – prevent the merit-
15 based consideration of potentially superior design outcomes and is a major inequity with other urban and rural areas which benefit from clause 4.6. Sorry. How much time do I have left?

MS MILLAR: That's it. Time's up.

20

MR KEARY: That's it. Okay.

MS MILLAR: So - - -

25 MR KEARY: Can I just read a concluding statement, please. In conclusion, Piety supports the planning proposal and its key objectives and benefits. It's based on comprehensive strategic and design studies, an extent of community and stakeholder consultation. It is also wholly aligned with key metropolitan strategic planning objectives and has the potential to deliver substantial housing supply and
30 infrastructure benefits. We request that these issues are carefully considered by the Commission in its advice to the Minister and that this – the review is completed as a matter of priority.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thanks very much. And please provide your full statement
35 to the Secretary out – there are still a few more seats over on this side if people would like to come in and sit down over the other side of – yes. Okay. I'll just get – and our next speaker is Jennifer Schneller from the Northwood Action Group.

MS J. SCHNELLER: Good morning. I think the previous two speakers both show
40 one of the problems Northwood residents have with these planning proposal. The – much of the original discussion went on more or less with the landowners and the developers and that the whole community was not involved. Northwood is only about two k from this area, and they have a number of concerns about how it does not meet the vision. Also, I would say it was not until 13 July at an extraordinary
45 council meeting that the area was increased from where it was going to stop on the eastern side of Berry Street up until - - -

MS MILLAR: Please feel free to reference the maps on the wall, if that's helpful.

MS SCHNELLER: Yes. So – sorry yes. The area was increased from – I think it was this street. It was – yes. Up to a whole another block. So - - -

5

MR MILLER: Berry Street to Park Road. Is that what you're saying?

MS SCHNELLER: Yes, yes. And people originally thought it was going to be – sorry. People originally thought it would be just contained to a smaller area, maybe didn't pay so much attention. Suddenly, without any thought for the public view, it was just increased, and now I understand later on, people are going to ask that they, too, be allowed to make windfall profits, and you've heard the two previous speakers complaining about the fact that they've paid money and big money from some of these properties and that, yet, people are not happy about the outcome. Northwood Action people are concerned about traffic. They already have a lot of delays on River Road.

The traffic study cumulative release where this is now out of date predated the draft 2036 plan does not consider the generation of the 2036 plan in the traffic study. The traffic study had gridlock at some intersections. They had to take off-street – on-street parking away, for instance, on Greenwich Road near my streets to get gridlock away from the intersections. You can see that in the traffic study. At times, Northwood traffic is at standstill on River Road, and Northwood doesn't have a very good public transport system. So it has to use at – their cars. The costs to do things are not fixed by the RMS. We had to pay ourselves, or council did, for a crossing on River Road which is under construction right now, if you'd like to drive along there, and also Blackstone's Corner, black spot, we had to contribute council one million before the State Government would contribute one million to fix it up.

So to say that the RMS is going to overview this and do it all very nicely doesn't really hold much truth. The topography of this area fails because it's very steep. Cyclists won't go up Canberra Avenue, and the 800 metres and the 400 metres talked about – I think that's just radial. It's not really a person walking it. They've got to walk uphill down, across, wait for traffic and so on. Built form – it's not high-quality design. We've already had arguments how they want to get the height restriction removed. Duntrune Avenue was – a lot of effort put into that. That's on the opposite side of Newlands Park by council. People would have expected a similar thing to this on the other side, those white buildings you can see on the other side of the park. What we're getting is not like that. It's way out of scale with everything.

The land use is not met. Now we hear people don't want to provide even a community facility in the area. There's no shops. No ancillary health services. It's not really walkable to Greenwich Shops. People will drive there. More traffic at the shops, less parking, more traffic on River Road. Landscape is not met. They say one hectare park. Newlands Park – poor little Newlands Park. It's already an awkward shape with a hill on which side. These flat drawings do not show this steepness on

this path. Go down and have a look. Even the model displayed of Crows Nest had this park wrong. Just walk up that hill. You'll see you can't walk up that hill on the far side towards Duntrune Avenue. Well, you can, but it's not easy.

5 And this – it does not meet the solar height plane. We get told it has met everything, but it doesn't mean that solar height plane. Figure 11, page 26 of the draft plan say no additional overshadowing between 10 and 3 pm in mid-winter, and the consultant's own drawings show that it is overshadowed. Gore Creek Oval, for example, is already soggy. That's going to be used because Newlands Park and
10 other parks will be used because it's not good enough. There's no new open space big enough for the number of people coming into this area. So I'll have to end there. I think that might be my time for Northwood Action Group because I've got to move on to - - -

15 MS MILLAR: Are you going to speak in your own name? You – please feel free to keep going on that basis.

MS SCHNELLER: Yes. Okay. All right. So you can see Newlands Park – what's happened here? Why is this bit missing? This whole - - -
20

MS MILLAR: Sorry. You just need to be able to speak into the microphone for the transcription.

MS SCHNELLER: Yes. Okay. Have a look there. Why is that bottom corner of
25 Newlands Park missing? Is it because that it's going to be taken up by an intersection to allow for a new traffic signals and pedestrian crossing? At that point, my daughter lives on that opposite side on River Road of Newlands Park. They expect to have loss of parking in Wollstonecraft, increased noise due to traffic, along here, they expect – they say that people will walk to Wollstonecraft because it's
30 uphill to the other stations, and, really, it's not accessible to Crows Nest Metro.

Trains are already at capacity on Wollstonecraft Station at times in the morning, and there also was no consultation on those traffic signals at Canberra and River Road
35 intersection. It will be seen in some of the photos coming up that there's quite a steep section of road there. That's the hill of Wollstonecraft Park that I'm saying you need to go down and have a look. Okay. Moving on to representing BMAC. Lane Cove Bushland – I've been asked to represent them. They're concerned about stormwater sedimentation. There's a gross pollutant trap there in that photo and - - -

40 MR MILLER: Sorry. Could you just take it a little slower.

MS SCHNELLER: Yes. Sorry.

MS MILLAR: You're right. Just - - -
45

MS SCHNELLER: Got a lot to say.

MR MILLER: It's okay. You're fine.

MS SCHNELLER: That's the area. I'm saying what's going to happen to that when the signals are put in there that are essential for getting traffic moving that the report says is necessary. There's a road – you can't have a road raising up like that and an intersection there. There was flooding in that area. Yes. There's a lady pushing a pram. She's going up to the park in the afternoon. It's 4 pm in 3 July. They go over to the park, and there's a little bit of sunshine on the hill, but the park is in shadow, and earlier in the day, it's, essentially, in shadow. You can see the sunshine gets to the hill, but the park is mainly in shadow. Okay. Somewhere else in the report, it says there's already shading by the trees and says, well, park is in shadow anyway, but you can see the sun comes through the trees.

The bushland management people are concerned about sedimentation because that catchment there – that pit had four times as much – four to five times as much sediment removed from it than all the other eight pits in Lane Cove, the gross pollutant traps. They cost about 10,000 or 15,000 dollars each to put in. Downhill of this is Berrys Creek, and under this park is Berrys Creek. This park is filled land. Filled land is failing. That's the steep road of the intersection where they want to put a crossing to make the system work. The – Berrys Creek has a powerful owl habitat which can be affected by this development and increased intensive of use, change of water, you know, dry or wet according to how the detention tanks work. There was a big flood there. It's the flood.

MR MILLER: Can you show us where that was on the plan.

MS SCHNELLER: Yes.

MR MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

MS SCHNELLER:

MS MILLAR: Pointing to the south end of the plan there.

MS SCHNELLER: Yes.

MR MILLER: Thank you.

MS SCHNELLER: All that water goes down Berrys Creek. Okay. For my own further points, I'd like to point out that not only do you have to go up to the St Leonards area, but you have to get time in the lift. It takes about five or 10 minutes to get down a lift in some of these buildings, and that's – gets – adds to the journey time. So the idea of a high-rise building being close to transport has to add journey time within the building. I would like to also point out that the site itself is extremely steep, that the green spines talked about north and south and east to west.

They're not necessarily going to work. They're going to have steps in them that are going to take a lot of space. A lot of the – that's a hole formed after the flooding. A lot of the areas instead of being green, the way they look, they will be covered with painting and taking up space like where the child care centre is meant to be. I think
5 I've run out of space – time, rather. So I also think it's poor built form. A south slope is eminently unsuitable to such a large development.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much. And, again, if you've got extra notes, please hand them on to Matthew.
10

MS SCHNELLER: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: I'd now like to invite Dr Liz Gill to speak.

15 DR L. GILL: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. I'm Liz Gill. I'm going to be speaking from a number of perspectives. Firstly, I'm going to be speaking as someone who works at the Kolling Institute at Royal North Shore Hospital. I want to reflect on the impacts that the overdevelopment that I believe –
20 call it flagged for this area which includes St Leonards South will have on local health infrastructure. The issues that I believe must be addressed include where will all of these extra residents go for GP services?

Many GP practices in this area are taking no new patients. They're closed to new patients. There are virtually no bulk billing practices in this area as well, or within
25 close proximity to this area. The A&E department at Royal North Shore Hospital is already seriously clogged with primary care or what you call GP patients, and this will only worsen as this – if this – all of this development goes ahead and this huge growth in residence occurs. The resultant blowout times in the A&E department will create a potential nightmare for the health minister because we will have more and
30 more and more people sitting waiting in our emergency department.

Also, with the increase in population, as has been mentioned previously, will come an increase in vehicles and traffic in the area that is frequently gridlocked already
35 now at peak times. This will impede emergency vehicle access to Royal North Shore Hospital, compromising the wellbeing of patients and, of course, creating further ministerial pressures.

In summary, speaking with this hat on, I believe it's imperative that health infrastructure impacts of this draft St Leonards South planning proposal on Royal
40 North Shore Hospital must be considered in the context – completely in the context of the St Leonards, Crows Nest 2036 plan and also, I note, the other buildings that Lane Cove Council has already approved and are either completed – notably the Embassy Tower – and those other two major constructions Mervac and JQC that are under construction. It is unbelievable that the well-known health and social impacts
45 in – have largely been ignored in terms of this St Leonards South draft planning proposal.

Wearing another hat, as a local resident, I am most concerned about the whole process that has transpired with the development of this draft St Leonards planning proposal, a process that I believe has been driven by resident and developer greed, and a council that extended their original proposal to accommodate this greed which
5 no doubt relates to council's desire to increase their revenue through developer contributions, VPAs and future rates. To prevent objections from the community, Lane Cove Council confined its consultation process to a very small area. It failed to consult me as a resident of a local Greenwich community until well after the plan was drafted as well as significant knee-jerk amendments had been made to extend it.

10 When council finally did, under pressure, consult the community, it was really too late for the community to have any constructive and meaningful input to help shape a good plan for this area. St Leonards is a very poor – St Leonards South planning proposal is at – in its current form, a very poor plan. All I could do as a resident
15 when I was finally asked for my opinions was to raise my objections and my reasons for objecting.

Then Lane Cove Council had sat on this plan and done nothing to appropriately respond to my submission along with the rest of my community's submissions. This
20 highlights, for me, a complete disregard for the – for consideration being given to the health and social impacts that will result for those who will continue to live in the area. I note that the Commission has a copy of my submission to Lane Cove Council, and I will – won't go into that. The other perspective I would like to speak from is in relation to health impacts in the totality of this proposed development - - -

25 MS MILLAR: Just one more minute, okay.

DR GILL: - - - and I draw on the academic literature.

30 MS MILLAR: Just one more minute. Your time is up.

DR GILL: Bearing in mind, the topography of St Leonards South, solar exposure, even in green spaces will be severely compromised due to the significant
35 overshadowing caused by tall buildings on a very, very sloping site. This, we know, will impact on people's bone health. Accessible level and appropriate child spaces with enclosed proximity will be virtually impossible. I point to the Deacon 218 Study which highlights a lack of readily available access to outdoor play areas restricts active play that is important to identify – to identity and belongings, social skills, risk perceptions, capabilities and over – well-being. A lack of exposure to
40 natural lights being linked to obesity in children. Evidence has shown that living in high rise hinders the possibilities for

MS MILLAR: Okay.

45 DR GILL: I'm just – yes.

MS MILLAR: I think if you can just provide the details - - -

DR GILL: And it results in - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - of the studies to Matthew.

5 DR GILL: - - - children's decline in physical activity.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

10 DR GILL: I will provide a copy of the last bit of my speech.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

DR GILL: I will email it. Thank you.

15 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. I think we've now have a slight change in the speaker order. I think it's now Albert Jubian speaking next.

MR A. JUBIAN: Good morning. Albert Jubian from Park Roads, St Leonards. I live opposite all this development that's going to happen. I oppose the proposed
20 planning or rezoning of St Leonards South for a variety of reasons, but today, I would like to discuss the following aspects. Accessibility to St Leonards and Crows Nest stations. To start, I would like to quote council's own report on the rezoning which noted:

25 *The current north-south connections within the precinct are sloping down from the Pacific Highway towards River Road. This does not encourage either pedestrians or cyclists to access the station. Therefore, it is not accessible.*

Council's report goes further to say:

30 *Linkages outside the precinct access across to Gore Hill Park would require a collaborative approach with RNSH, as in the hospital, Willoughby Council and RMS.*

35 To date, there is no RMS support for a new light crossing the Pacific Highway. I would also like to quote the North Sydney Council report which noted:

40 *The Pacific Highway only has a limited number of signalised crossings and is too busy to cross elsewhere.*

These quotes set the scene for the issue of accessibility of the precinct to the new metro station and for that matter, the current train station. The fact that it's only 400 or 600 or even 200 is irrelevant when the topography works against you. The area is categorised by having a relatively flat aspect near the Pacific Highway at Marshall
45 Avenue and it looks great. But this changes drastically closer to River Road end. From that angle, the area is categorised by very steep slopes which are difficult to manage. The issue, as I noted, has been identified in council's reports prepared for

the Department of Planning and Council. Hence, the precinct cannot access the current train station and the new metro station which are on the other side of the Pacific Highway in any meaningful way. And the resultant increase in population from rezoning will add to pedestrians' congestions across the Pacific Highway. This picture tells 1000 stories. Even council's own plans only shows you going halfway through the precinct because they cannot make you walk up the precinct and there is no way to cross to the station without being impeded by the Pacific Highway.

The proposed setbacks and transitions on the east side of Park Road, that's where I live, and River Road are inappropriate and insufficient given the ultimate height of the proposed development which will be extenuated by the falling nature of the area. The impact of transitioning should not be seen by – should not be simply assessed from a perpendicular perspective, ie, looking at the property head on, but also viewed from the immediately adjoining houses down the hill. These houses will be impacted more than that shown in council's single dimension reports. Moreover, the proposed setbacks of having the height pushed to the back of the proposed developments might only work for a head on view, not from a side view, which is the case in this area.

Given the narrow blocks and the streets in the area, then greater setbacks will be required to make any setback meaningful. As well, the proposed developments at the bottom of Park Road according to council's reports will have less setbacks than that shown for developments at the top of Park Road. Hence, not all of Park Road will be sufficient – will have sufficient setbacks and it is an important point where council is selling the setbacks at the top of Park Road, but that's only being sold in one area and not further down. So those reports are not providing a complete and accurate picture of the entire situation and as I've explained, because the site is sloping, anyone looking at the developments at the top will see them higher and will see the side of them and so pushing back any development will not make a difference to the residents looking down.

The use of trees including deep soil trees as a mitigant by self will be of limited benefit due to the sloping nature of the area. It can be argued that trees are the only option to deal with the transition and minimising the visual impact of the proposed bulky developments, then maybe smaller developments should be considered instead of accepting a sub-optimal outcome. As well, little assessment is provided on the loss of privacy for homes on Park and River Road which most, if not all of them, have bedrooms facing the developments from the rezoning. In fact, council's reports makes the comment that hardly any bedrooms are at the front. That's wrong. Moreover, the heritage listed homes which are opposite of the rezoning precinct need to be considered in context of their environment. That is, even with setbacks and transitions, these heritage listed homes cannot be forced into a situation where they

are isolated and surrounded by high density development. The homes will be the only homes in the area and how could they survive as homes?

5 The site in question is isolated. Residents across from the rezoning precinct need to have their neighbourhood protected from facing high density which will impact their quality of life and lose significant value in their homes. Deep soil planting does not provide an answer. The precinct does not enjoy a natural boundary that could justify having a rezoning stop at a particular point. The area has narrow streets which make the properties facing the rezoning area significantly impacted. Stopping the rezoning development at Berry Road or, say, Park Road is not the answer. Rezoning of the entire wider precinct to Greenwich Road is also not the answer because properties on 10 Greenwich Road will be impacted and those across River Road will be more significantly impacted given the sloping nature of the site. In fact, on the majority of the maps from council, River Road is hardly given a mention.

15 The houses by their nature are sloping downwards and the developments that are facing them are considerably higher that no amount of shading – tree cover will give them any coverage and they are hardly given any credence in the reports. In fact, if you take a close look at the shadow reports, you will be find that one particular property hardly gets any sunlight. Moreover, over-shadowing will be worse in the other streets past Park Road because they have greater slopes and traffic issues with more heritage homes impacted. So if you push it out further, you will get the problem magnified because the slope becomes even worse, you will hit more heritage houses and the traffic cannot be managed.

25 Even the current traffic can't be managed and that's why council introduced a new road which is classified both as a shared road being open space and a traffic mess. Moreover, hence, the – sorry. So to Park Road with greater slopes and issues with more heritage buildings. At present, the area known as St Leonards South enjoys many natural barriers as it stands. It is on one side covered by the train line; the Pacific Highway on the other. But its greatest asset is its weakness – it's sloping downwards.

35 The sloping area falls away from the Pacific Highway implies that any high rise developments on the other side of the Pacific Highway will not be immediately visible and will not impact the area, hence no development provides the best long term option. So because it's falling downwards, when you stand where I live and the houses beneath me, you look up and all you see is a normal suburb. You don't see the high rise. When you get all the comments of saying that the area is in transition, good luck to all of that. Come and stay where I am. I don't see that transition because the falling backwards gives me an isolated area. The train line and the shops at the top give you a protection and therefore you're protected. If you were to put this rezoning at Park Road, then the people across from Park Road will say, "Rezone me" and you will go on forever.

45 Leaving that aside, once you get on to River Road, the houses across River Road will get overshadowed. The land is on a significant drop. And therefore they will be

overshadowed. Once they also ask for rezoning, then where do you stop? So the question here is not about rezoning these couple of areas. It's where the rezoning stop – and that's a critical area. The other aspect is to consider all the issues retaining to the site. Its biggest asset is everybody standing up, saying, "It's a TOD. It's a TOD." As you can see from my presentation, that aspect is not an asset. It's a negative for the property. And so what is left with it is an overly overshadowed environment that is not conducive to over-developments. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Next up, we have another slight change in the speaker list and it's Bruce Donald.

MR B. DONALD: Good morning. My name is Bruce Donald. I'm a 45 year resident of the North Sydney Municipality, closely involved over those years with community effort to enhance the amenity of the Lower North Shore as an appropriately developing region in which to live and work. My family own property in Waverton and Wollstonecraft. I a commercial media and environment lawyer. I've been engaged with the processes of proper public decision-making as a partner of two major city law firms, as chief lawyer at the ABC and then during 10 years on the board of the Environmental Defenders Office, including five as its chair, and I've served a term on the Australian Heritage Commission and I've filled roles in North Sydney planning committees. I'm a foundation member of the Committee for North Sydney, based on the Committees for Melbourne and Sydney, a group of senior North Sydney planners, architects, engineers and lawyers seeking to improve planning across the Lower North Shore.

I address the Commission today as one of a community group, a number of whom will be addressing you, as well, formed last year in the midst of what we describe as a developer-led tsunami of over-development which capitalises on the facilitation by government and councils of spot rezoning outside the proper planning process. We consider this is destroying the amenity of St Leonards and Wollstonecraft, with the potential to roll over Crows Nest with the Metro proposal for 30 storeys over the Crows Nest station.

While the Commission's reference is directed to the St Leonards South proposal, it must be seen in the context of the area in the Draft 2036 Plan, an area which has already seen the overwhelming impact of spot rezoning by Lane Cove Council in its unusual enclave parcel east of the railway adjacent to St Leonards South. Here, a great wall of towers, 30 to 50 storeys, is already arising along Pacific Highway, towering over, and we say destroying, the residential amenity of suburban East Wollstonecraft below them in the North Sydney Municipality, removing the northern sky, sky which in this country is the very definition of suburban amenity.

Members of our group will be addressing particular issues, but the foundation submission I wish to make on behalf of our group is that the St Leonards South proposal is proceeding under a process we see as the very opposite of planning. Selecting such a limited area for spot rezoning is a flawed process. Proper planning involves careful assessment across appropriately defined regions or Local

Government Areas of all elements of land use and impacts. Well before this land has been up for rezoning, it appears that the council became involved in a dubious process purportedly ensuring that residents selling to the speculating developers achieved equivalent value. This was before one of the most essential parameters of value for an informed and proper market-based negotiation, the very zoning of the land itself, had been determined.

The initial consultations do not appear to have been community-wide but were first limited to potentially affected residents. Infrastructure and transport requirements are not yet properly defined, indeed, I understand RMS has indicated further traffic study is required. Educational impacts are undefined and any open space provision remains speculative at best because of the processes yet to be followed to determine whether council can provide this. Yet already there is a design to be assessed against possible criteria in a draft plan, a plan on which the Department of Planning has not yet published its initial comments on the submissions and which is far from complete in terms of community review and consultation. Not only is this the antithesis of planning, it means that community groups are flying blind in trying to respond to the St Leonards South proposal.

We therefore contend that the IPC should recommend to the Minister that any assessment you may make under the current reference be the subject of a reconsideration and review, including assessment of further community input following the completion of the Draft 2036 Plan and the determination of fully articulated and actually achievable infrastructure, traffic, transport, educational and open space requirements. Thank you very much.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much. I think we are now at what was speaker number 8 on our registered list, which Anita Jubian.

MS ANITA JUBIAN: Good morning. My name is Anita Jubian. I live in Berry Road, St Leonards. So I live in St Leonards South. I would like to express my disapproval of the St Leonards South development proposal or, as we refer to it as, the council rezoning plan. This council rezoning plan has proved to be incapable of delivering on the intended outcomes, inconsistent with the overall plans for Crows Nest and St Leonards, in collision with the State Government guidelines and planning framework and does not provide viable development. I would speak to the points of new open space and locate new open space.

Council plans only allow for less than .42 hectares of open space for 1000 people in St Leonards South compared to .91 hectares in adjacent LGAs and 2.8 hectares for the default level in many parts of New South Wales. It is almost impossible to deliver a sufficient quantum of open space and green space given the constraints of St Leonards South due to its steep sloping sides, limited available space and shadowing effect - - -

MS MILLAR: Perhaps just a little bit further away from the microphone.

MS ANITA JUBIAN: Open space needs to be assessed on a cumulative basis across the wider area, taking into account all developments that are built or on the way, to ensure that available open space is not double counted as available. For example, we have Gore Park and we have Newlands Park. It is inaccurately counted
5 as open space for every development in St Leonards.

We have so far eight of them in St Leonards South and they keep using the same open space and they keep selling it to us again and again and again. So you can't use the same open space so many times. The current proposed open space in the precinct
10 comprises of patches of small, not connected alleys that technically meet the definition of open space but are not practical or useful for the community.

The north-south connections and green open space are not connected or linked because they are steep due to the typography and hilly nature of the site. East-west
15 connections face similar issues, are not flat and require steps and ramps, so this stops being open space. This will require retaining walls of varying height which adds to the issue of safety and overshadowing, which will make these walkways less appealing. So here, picture 1 – this is what they have as spines, as green space. It's stepped. They need ramps. They have retaining walls. And they can't sell us this as
20 green space – it just doesn't work. We deserve something better than this. Sorry.

So this picture shows the typography of the east-west connections that are stepped and un-user friendly. In any event, travelling east-west does not lead anywhere since the hub of activity is on the north side, which is steeply sloping, as discussed above,
25 hence a connection to nowhere. And what I mean by that – this picture is showing you the connections there. It ends nowhere. Everything's happening up there. This is where St Leonards station is. So this takes you nowhere, which is what this rezoning plan's doing.

Moreover, it is not clear if the open or green spaces can be connected because these areas will be owned by developers, who will seek to have these areas levelled to suit their own development, and even fenced so it's no longer accessible by the public. Due to the issue of overshadowing, these walkways cannot be built with any green element and would have to be constructed from harsh concrete-type material that is
35 not green. I'd like to refer to council's report stating that green spines, in the Annand model, might be fenced. So this is a problem for open space in St Leonards South and becomes unviable. Creating adequate open or green space will not be possible and be squeezed between developments. So that's not open space. It will not be
40 connected and remain isolated.

As well, the open space would require developer contributions through VPAs, which will come at a cost in the form of even higher developments, more concrete, more bulk. That will exacerbate the issue, namely, by increased population, increased overshadowing and even less open space. There is not enough recreational parks,
45 natural environment and green large sunny areas provided, including the new park, because St Leonards is starting from a low level of open space. So we don't have that open space already, and yet they're bringing all this population and more

concrete. So that would be insufficient and overshadowed, and Newlands Park, which is always busy on weekends with existing residents.

5 The plaza over the railway cannot be considered as open space. It is not recreational
for a place where residents can play with a ball, have a picnic or a barbecue. It's
mainly for paying customers that use the seats and the cafés. Moreover, open space
should be seen in the context of the wider demands of adjoining areas because St
Leonards does not live in isolation – does not exist in isolation, as these residents
tend to use the same open space. So there is an acute shortage of open space, and
10 SLS does not work.

I'm going to speak now about minimise overshadowing over public open space. It is
important to note to the panel that St Leonards South is not suited for any
development due to the steep sloping nature with south-facing topography. Even
15 council consultant report has noted this deficiency. We are not able to walk up these
hills, carry our shopping, have a pram or do anything because they are really, really
hard to traverse. The rezoning plan is characterised as having a west north-to-south
sloping fall, which is not conducive to high-rise developments due to the extensive
overshadowing. According to council reports, the buildings within the rezoning area
20 only get 1.5 hours of sunlight, and hence the rest of the precinct – and especially the
open space and the public domain – will get less. So this is not an optimum
situation.

In assessing shadowing impact on all green and open space in the precinct, we need
25 to take into account the proposed new park, the green spines and other linear spots
between buildings which have been included by council in order to get to the 1.63
hectares, which is less than optimal. So they're having to rely on every green patch.
They're probably going to rely on my backyard as well just to make up that green
space. It's not optimal. This is not the way to do it. You're starting from a new
30 plan. If you can't provide these things, then why go ahead? It means it doesn't
work. They keep saying TOD, TOD, TOD. This is the only thing that's working for
this area. Nothing else. Do not give us this. We deserve something better than that.

35 So the pictures which I will show highlight that the proposed new park and the green
space between buildings and green spines will have considerable shadowing from the
developments. In particular, the corner of the new park, which is closer to the
building, will only have a small amount of effective sunlight, and we question the
ability to grow any lawn which can be used by residents. So the solution given to the
community is an overshadowed, overcrowded park that will not be useful.

40 So what I mean by that – this is the three – these are the diagrams, and, as you can
see, right here where the park is, it's overshadowed. This is at the best time in the
day the park is overshadowed, and these are from council reports. So if you get that
overshadowing, what's going to grow there and why would people want to go there?
45 It's suboptimal again. So they always keep giving us suboptimal options, and they're
trying to sell us that as something good.

I would continue. So the pictures at 9 am and 12 pm, which are supposed to have the maximum sunlight, show extensive overshadowing and show that this area and the new park do not even get the sunlight that's needed. So, as described so far, due to the topography, all of the open and green space are impacted by overshadowing by
5 varying degrees but not an acceptable level and certainly not in line with good town planning practices. This should be planning 101, and they should abide by all these things. The community of St Leonards deserves better outcomes and better solutions than this proposal.

10 In summary, the rezoning plan, under any development setting, is out of context. It contravenes the requirements of SEPP 65 and the ADG. Even the buildings inside and around do not abide by SEPP 65 and the ADG. It's contravened. Every principle is contravened, yet it keeps going and getting the ticks. It doesn't make sense. On merit, the plan cannot be supported, as it is conflicting with the State
15 Government vision of the strategic, commercial importance of St Leonards, which is more commercial offices that sustain long-term employment and medical health services. It is not all this high density and residential. This is the vision for St Leonards. It's more commercial offices, long-term employment, medical and health services.

20 But if we keep having all these concrete and high towers development, there's no room for this. It will be more expensive to realise this vision from the state planning. Please consider the lack of planning merit and community opposition to this plan and communicate to the Minister our deep dissatisfaction with the merit, process and
25 outcome of this council rezoning plan that doesn't meet the state and DPE plans, and that the Minister needs to scrap St Leonards South planning proposal or rezoning plan due to all the reasons the panel will hear today. Thank you.

30 MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Rachel Falk.

MS R. FALK: I'm one of the more nervous speakers, so you'll have to - - -

MR MILLER: Just take your time.

35 MS MILLAR: Take your time.

MS FALK: You'll have to bear with me. I speak a lot, but not often in this setting. I'm going to refer to draft 2036 plan and the inadequacies from a particular
40 perspective. I live in 11A – and I own 11A Park Road, which is a small street across from the proposed development, and I also speak for 18 out of 20 residents in west Park Road and also for 27 out of 31 residents in Portview Road and for a majority of residents in Anglo Road, which is partially commercial, highly rental, a few heritage properties and other properties as well. We've spoken to all of these residents, and they support what I'm going to say.

45 I want to make a quick comment about the process with Lane Cove Council for this development. A lot of things that have been said and that are documented are not

accurate. The only proposal that was publicly displayed stopped at Berry Road, and the proposal that was extended to east Park Road was never exhibited. So the people most directly affected, the people that live a small street away or across the road from that, we were never advised that this was happening, that the only people that
5 were advised were the people that benefited, who sold their land to the developers, and that's been the process of this development, which is not satisfactory. I presume it's not legal either. I don't know.

We understand and support – I think we have to – that the population of Sydney will
10 grow, and St Leonards has been designated one of the 30-minute cities by the Greater Sydney Commission. However, we have serious concerns about this development. When we've communicated our concerns – and we've had three meetings with Anthony Roberts. I've had a meeting with Gladys Berejiklian, and we've had three meetings with the Department of Planning, and no one actually contradicts what we
15 say. They all support what we say but that it's too hard, and the ball's been kicked back to Lane Cove Council to take over the planning of this area, and it's too big for them, because it doesn't just affect us that live directly opposite. It affects the residents of Greenwich, Wollstonecraft, the surrounding areas, and it's in the context of very high-rise buildings that have been discussed today in the rest of St Leonards,
20 because the impact is – it's so significant in terms of traffic, infrastructure update.

I should declare I'm a doctor. I've worked at North Shore Hospital. I've been a patient there recently, so I've seen firsthand what overcrowding does. I was admitted with broken bones after an accident to North Shore Hospital. In a six ward there
25 were four men in the ward, two women. There were no curtains around my bay. One patient there I know – I'm also a psychiatrist – was psychotic from the medications discussed. One had dementia. They were both specialised. And when the specialist came in to see me, the cardiologist, he took one look and said, "You can't stay here. You're going to get sicker. We will transfer you to North Shore
30 Private." Too bad if someone doesn't have private health insurance. It's a hospital under enormous pressure. And when the development is considered, they have to – that hospital needs to be updated. It's too big for Lane Cove Council to undertake the project. And it needs to go back under the control of state planning. It's just not
35 adequate.

This is a prime area and we understand that. There's two train stations, Wollstonecraft and St Leonards, within easy walking distance. The new metro coming, a comprehensive bus service that goes to all sorts of areas along the Pacific Highway and it needs consideration of the best use of this area. The proposal of
40 2036 has no planning merit, in the fact that it doesn't take into account – it has eliminated residents that are just a small street away. It stops before there, because it's too difficult. No one can say that it's fair that we have to take the full impact, all the negatives of that development. And so it's – each time it's put off and there are – there are delays. The plan doesn't address the problems of the area inherent in this
45 huge development. And it ignores the impact on the community.

I would dispute I – I grew up in that street when I was in a little girl. It has been in my family for 65 years. I walked to school up the highway. We all walked – and up River Road to go down to Greenwich Public Infant School, which I attended. And it is walkable. But it is – it is a gradient that's not walkable, but does provide
5 overshadowing and it will with these developments. So it needs planning, the whole area. And the argument we make – and no one can dispute it's a logical argument – is that the whole area needs to be revisited and holistically and comprehensively planned. And because the residents that live in that area are on side, it is a
10 brownfields site. And because of the value – both financial value and the proximity to the city and to transport, it's a valuable area that deserves a comprehensive plan that will be an asset not just to the local area, but also to Sydney – to the whole of Sydney.

We also know, because we've seen the plans, that the owners along the Pacific
15 Highway, which is on the north from Park Road to Greenwich Road, they haven't submitted their plans but it's in train for high rise all along there – all the owners – and that the site of the old Northside Clinic is also high rise. So we're wedged between 2030, the highway, which is coming – it will be approved, I'm sure. So the whole area needs to be comprehensively planned. I will also wear another hat at this
20 moment. I'm also a psychoanalyst and child psychiatrist. I endorse what Dr Gill – yes, I think it's Dr Gill – said, that it's just not feasible. And there's ample research all around the world that if you build high rises, as is planned here, masses of buildings close together, it's antithetical to development for people's physical and emotional wellbeing and for child development.

25 There needs to be space, there needs to be light. There needs to be an opportunity for people to socialise. And it has happened in areas of Sydney. And if it is comprehensively planned, there can be thought given to development of architectural merit, of community benefit. And this isn't happening with this plan. And it's not
30 necessary. The developers bought this plan – bought the land to do what they want to do, before it was rezoned. I don't think they've got any moral right to say that it should go according to what they want. They bought it on speculation and they will be able to develop, but it should be in a way that actually enhances the area and takes into account not only the present community.

35 We want to get out. We – it is not fair that we are going to face this development. And I should actually say that when the first plan by Annand was put forward, which – where the development stopped at Berry Road, they said in that report that there should be no clear winners and losers in the development of St Leonards. There are
40 dramatic losers. We are the losers on every single count, financially and it will be uninhabitable. We've lost every amenity possible. But I think the whole area has, indeed. I think Wollstonecraft, Greenwich, everyone until it's planned – unless someone can look at traffic, infrastructure, the need for schooling, the hospital has to be upgraded, it – it cannot cope at present with the population there.

45 It's going to be much, much worse. It doesn't matter how this area is developed. We've been told that trees will provide some sort of screen for this high rise; that's

nonsense. I'm also a gardener. That's the other hat. I love gardens. And trees will not survive without sun and – in that environment. So we would ask that state planning takes over this area again or control – that it's comprehensively planned. It needs to be developed, we accept that, in a way that enhances Sydney, that provides amenity to the whole community and that doesn't – and that's – it's design and planning driven in the best possible way.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. I will just say to those of you standing up or out the door, there are still quite a few seats over this side of the room on the – my left. And out next speaker is Meredith Southwood from the Greenwich Community Association.

MS M. SOUTHWOOD: Good morning. My name is Merry Southwood. I'm speaking to you today as president for the Greenwich Community Association. Now I do have a PowerPoint, but now I see the constraints of this room, it might be a bit inappropriate.

MS MILLAR: That's okay. We will move around.

MS SOUTHWOOD: I will do my best to address it, but – and they're already addressed anyhow in my submission.

MS MILLAR: That's okay.

MS SOUTHWOOD: Just a bit of background: the Greenwich Community Association, it's an incorporated association that was established in 1944. And it has operated uninterrupted since then as a forum for discussion of issues of concern to the community. The GCA distributes a bimonthly newsletter to 2000 Greenwich households in advance of its general meetings. In December 2017, the Greenwich Community Association passed a resolution.

The context of this resolution is that the rezoning of St Leonards South had been a major focus of Greenwich meetings in the lead up to the July 2015 extraordinary meeting – mind you, a focus only from February 2015, because that's the first time we heard about it – the 2015 meeting and in the period from October '17 to the present, following exhibition of the plan. I would like to emphasise this resolution that Greenwich Community Association is not against development. We just wish for the process of consultation to be correct, so that we can come up with something that works for all of us. So just to – the resolution read as follows:

The GCA calls on the council to cancel the master plan and put the community first, including by providing community consultation and not allowing more density without more infrastructure, and to include consultation with residents of all in east ward that have been excluded to date and to work with the whole community, other LGAs, New South Wales Government authorities, to formulate a sustainable and living precinct that does not place unacceptable

pressure on the infrastructure, amenity and character of Greenwich, and all the other areas included in the St Leonards and Crows Nest Planned Precinct.

5 This is the background to our submission. So why is the GCA concerned about what happens in St Leonards South?

10 Panel members will be aware that the St Leonards South master plan, designated by council back in October 2017, went all the way to Greenwich Road. It went Greenwich Road to the rail line, highway down to River Road. The roads of
10 Greenwich Road, Anglo Road, Portview Road and Park Lane are all in the suburb of Greenwich. In addition, the area from Park Lane back to Canberra Avenue was known until 2006 to many as Greenwich North.

15 We've always thought of it as Greenwich. So to all intents and purposes, Greenwich and St Leonards South are part of a single community. They're both in the east ward of the Lane Cove LGA. They – all the children in St Leonards South go to the Greenwich Public School. And the communities of Greenwich and St Leonards South access all the facilities in the Greenwich Village.

20 We're one community. Curiously, notwithstanding the clear connection between Greenwich and St Leonards South, the GCA was excluded from representation on council's community liaison committee that was formed in November 2012 to develop the plan. Community association representation was limited to two
25 representatives each from the St Leonards North Wollstonecraft Association and the Marshall Avenue Action Group.

30 These associations represented landholders who ultimately benefitted from the plan, but those left to take the brunt of the plan had no association representing them. The St Leonards South proposal will add 4800 residents to an existing Greenwich Community of 5613 – and that was based on 2016 stats – without any significant infrastructure implementation.

35 So what is planned for St Leonards South directly impacts Greenwich. The scale of development contemplated by the plan will place unacceptable pressure on the limited and strained infrastructure of Greenwich, and you will hear from other speeches – speakers on the infrastructure of adjacent communities. For the above reason, we welcome the decision of the Minister to ask the IPC to review this plan.

40 We will be making a lengthy submission later this week to address all aspects of the terms of reference, and I wish to address today the term of reference as follows: to consider – can I please – sorry; yes – to consider the scale of residential development contained in the St Leonards South Residential Precinct Proposal, and whether the whole site needs to be rezoned to meet housing targets identified by the GSC.

45 Whilst what I'm going to talk about initially is not within the scope of reference, I would also like to address whether Lane Cove Council is required to deliver housing

within the St Leonards and Crows Nest Station precinct, and whether Lane Cove is required to deliver housing by virtue of SLSs inclusion in an urban renewal area. I will look at the latter considerations first. The GSCs North District Plan identifies St Leonards South as a strategic centre, because it is a health and education precinct. St
5 Leonards/Crows Nest has been identified as a planned precinct, and St Leonards South lies within it. I have now – sorry, Matthew. Can I just have the next one, please.

10 When you look at the actions and responsibilities required in respect of this strategic centre, basically they are jobs focused. There's hospital upgrades, public areas, enhancing character, active transport connections. There is absolutely no mention of housing this action. So the – the thrust of the St Leonards/Crows Nest Planned
15 Precinct is providing jobs to enhance the commercial aspects that are already there. There is no action relating to the provision of housing. Sorry. Next one. Thanks, Matthew. So you can actually see that the North District Plan specifies job targets, but no housing targets. So, in short, there is no requirement in the North District
20 Plan to include housing in St Leonards South as part of the St Leonards/Crows Nest 2036 Plan.

20 I'd like now to look at whether or not it is necessary to deliver housing because St Leonards South is part of an urban renewal area. The District Plan says that opportunities for urban renewal need to be considered by location and by capacity of
25 existing and proposed infrastructure. Can I just have the next one? Thank you. Keep going. Thank you. All right. Now, let's have a look at what's already happening in the east ward of Lane Cove in the St Leonards South precinct. We've
30 got enormous constructions either completed, under construction, or about to start. These will add 1900 dwellings to an area that's a very small portion of the 2036 Plan. Infrastructure within and adjacent to the designated urban renewal area is already at
35 capacity, particularly in terms of green open space for recreation, educational facilities and traffic management.

These developments here, these 1900 developments, will exacerbate that stress. Lane Cove has advised in its submission on the 2036 Plan that it does not support the
40 levying of a special infrastructure contribution on the developers for the St Leonards site. Furthermore, two of the developers who have recently lodged planning proposals for the site have indicated that they cannot pay all or some of the section
45 7.11 contributions. Lane Cove was originally planning to double those contributions to fund the park. So in the light of the fact that we've got 1900 already that have – are placing great strain on infrastructure, we've got a potential 2400.

Those 2400 are not proposing, by council's own admission – or the council does not expect them to pay the Special Infrastructure Contribution, and we have the
50 developers saying that they are unable or unwilling to pay their section 7.11 contributions. The site – the St Leonards South site will be rendered totally
55 inappropriate as an urban renewal area.

Now, back to the housing targets I've identified, by the GSC. The Greenwich – the Greater Sydney Commission has identified housing targets for each LGA within the North District area to 2021. Matthew, sorry. Keep going. Thank you. You're all familiar with this, I'm sure, but anyhow, it's up here. 1900 dwellings is the Lane Cove 2000 – target for 2021. The chief executive officer of the Greater Sydney Commission confirmed to the mayor of Lane Cove on the 16th of May 2018 that Lane Cove is not only on track to achieve its 1900 target, but to exceed it by 900 dwellings by 2022.

10 A copy of the letter is already available on the IPC website. We – nearly there. We note that the Department of Planning submission to you as follows also reinforces this statement. It says here that Lane Cove, according to the Department of Planning's own submission to you, says that Lane Cove is 138 per cent ahead of its 2021 target. So it's clear that Lane Cove has well and truly met its 2021 target.

15 What we're having difficulty with is getting clarity around the future targets for our council. The message we get from our council is that east ward is going to do or is doing the heavy lifting, as they call it, but we're unable to secure an explanation of why St Leonards South needs to do this heavy lifting. Housing targets are LGA wide, they're not St Leonards South specific.

20 But what we do know is that there are no new targets until our council prepares its housing strategy and we have heard nothing about this housing strategy, although we understand that it should be well advanced. Can I please have the next one? Thanks, Matthew. So if you look – nearly there. Can I just – it's – this is a technical - - -

MS MILLAR: That's okay.

30 MS SOUTHWOOD: Now, if you have a look at the Department of Planning's guidelines on how to produce a housing strategy, there's a lot of community and stakeholder engagement. We haven't had any of that yet. We've got no idea what council's proposing for its housing strategy. But what we do know is that if St Leonards South is council's answer to the housing strategy, it must fail. Because the GSC has designated the principles that a housing strategy must address, and they include – and these – my highlights are my own: diversity of dwelling type, market preferences – what sort of places do people actually want to live in, where do they want to go – alignment of infrastructure, amenity, and engagement with the community.

40 We submit that St Leonards South does not address any of these highlighted principles, much less satisfy them. So we are submitting to you that the St Leonards South plan is not needed to meet Lane Cove housing target to 2021, and it cannot be justified on the grounds of future targets that do not exist. And for the same reason, staging of the proposal is unsupportable. Thank you.

45 MS MILLAR: So we had planned to schedule just a short – very short five to 10 minute break, just in case people need to, you know, use the facilities and grab a cup

of tea or coffee. So I will be starting the speaker list again very promptly at 10.40. Okay. So back in your seats by 10.40. Thank you.

5 **RECORDING SUSPENDED** [10.30 am]

RECORDING RESUMED [10.39 am]

10

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great. Thank you very much. We will recommence the meeting, and the transcription will recommence. We now have Barbara DeGraff.

15 MS B. DeGRAFF: Okay. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. I live here on Ernest Street, about half a block behind you, and I've lived there for 25 years. Like many local residents in postcode 2065 – and from my perspective, this affects all of us, and that's St Leonards, Greenwich, Crows Nest, Wollstonecraft – as a community, we're very concerned about the cumulative impacts of the planning proposal for St Leonards South, on top of the enormous number of new high-rise residential developments that are currently being built or have been approved in St
20 Leonards/Crows Nest. And that's been referenced previously.

I'm also very concerned that the social infrastructure is not in place to support the massive growth in population. And I found it very interesting early in the year when
25 I heard the Economic Commissioner, Geoff Roberts, speak at the local character workshop, when he said that the – “we”, meaning the government and Department of Planning, had done a good job on delivering transport infrastructure, but they had not, in his words, done a good job at understanding and delivering the infrastructure needed to support the massive changes that are happening in transport and
30 infrastructure. And I think this planning proposal is an example of that.

Today, however, I want to focus my comments on local character, building community, and whether the planning proposal in fact meets the design guidelines set out in the plan. I would like to start with local character. The Department of
35 Planning deemed local character so important it hosted a number of workshops this prior – this past year, and has recently published local character guidelines, in February of 2019. Now, why? One of the reasons they've stated is that there is economic value in paying attention to liveability indicators; and that improving the identity of a place, and supporting its local character, does in fact have a positive
40 impact on liveability; and ultimately, improving liveability makes an area more desirable, which improves profitability. Local place, in fact, was also added as a design guideline.

45 So does this planning proposal meet the place design guideline? I would argue, it doesn't. It doesn't build community, let alone vibrancy. Instead, it's proposing to decimate a community, and isolate people in high-rise buildings, without adding

existing amenities such as cafés or playgrounds, a local store where you can pop in to get some milk and bread, public meeting places, or much needed new outdoor space.

5 I want to touch on the importance of active space. Again, you know, we're learning and seeing that active spaces are a major drawcard for buyers. They're proven to attract buyers, especially first home buyers and young families. Active spaces increase land value, they increase housing prices, and often they encourage interaction of new community members and people from different backgrounds, and they often become a social hub for the community. I don't see this happening in this
10 planning proposal.

With regard to built form, with both Lane Cove and North Sydney Council doing such an excellent job of meeting or exceeding their housing targets, I can see no good reason to jump from a low-rise residential community to a high-rise residential
15 ghetto. High-rise buildings do not create a human-scale neighbourhood: that's one of the key things that these guidelines say we're meant to be doing. They do not create vibrant communities. High-rise buildings separate us from one another. They separate us from the street, and that increases the level of alienation and isolation. I don't think that's something we can afford to do. It creates public health problems.

20 Land use: the planning proposal, in my mind, misses on three key levels. Diverse housing: while high-rise buildings may offer profits for developers, they rarely offer diverse housing, because they're so expensive to build. Currently there's a severe lack of affordable housing in the area, as well as three- and four-bedroom housing.
25 Variety of land use: the local character and place guideline published in February emphasises that a variety of land use contributes to an interesting and vibrant streetscape. Turning 138 houses into high-rise towers does not contribute to variety and, I would argue, does not create an interesting or vibrant streetscape.

30 I see this planning proposal as a missed opportunity. It's effectively an infill urban renewal project, and this parcel of land represents an important opportunity to purchase the whole or part of the site to develop much needed schools and playing fields, as well as active spaces for the community.

35 So what do we want? We want St Leonards South to be a vibrant, healthy community, with a mix of small-footprint shops and four- to six-storey residential activity, not an ever-expanding group of high-rise residential towers. We want more open spaces. We want buildings that remain human in scale, with beautiful streetscapes, wide sidewalks, generous setbacks, lovely gardens, and street seating.
40 We want the social infrastructure requirement impacts to be assessed in total, not development by development. We want the development in this area to contribute to locals' ability to age in place, whether it's making it possible for older people to stay in the neighbourhood or enabling younger people to continue to live here.

45 So we must plan for the entire area, not building by building, and not planning proposal by planning proposal. I endorse the overall concept of the 2036 plan. I would request that the Commission not support this planning proposal, and request

that you recommend that the plan for the area be revisited, and that no further planning proposals be approved until we understand the cumulative impacts of what is already in the pipeline.

5 MS MILLAR: All right. Thank you very much. Next up is David Astridge. Is David here?

MR D. ASTRIDGE: My name is David Astridge. I'm a Greenwich resident. The adopted draft master plan 2014 is very much a flawed document. Instead of
10 providing a considered assessment and a well-reasoned and balanced response to a complex planning problem, it is instead nothing more than a narrowly focused blueprint for developers and real estate speculators. The simplistic outcome it proposes, and the ethos behind it, is quite clear: bulk housing, close to transport.

15 In the early section of the document, there is mention of principles of urbanism, where they talk about connectivity, mixed use and diversity, mixed housing for all ages and incomes, and a traditional neighbourhood structure. But where are any of these in the preferred scheme? What is proposed is row after relentless row of
20 identikit slab blocks marching down the hill like an invading army. Where is there diversity? Where is there connectivity? Where is there anything which resembles a neighbourhood structure?

The previous council is in large part responsible for this regrettable situation, showing a now obvious lack of knowledge and a determination to ignore alternative
25 proposals. We are now faced with the very real prospect that the community will have inflicted on it one of the highest densities of housing in Australia. The presumptuous and impatient tactics by some of the developers is outrageous. One particular developer has released to the media a considerable amount of highly developed information on the proposal, giving the clear impression that this was a
30 scheme which would be approved. It exceeds the height suggested in the master plan; it very likely does not comply with SEPP 65. But my calculation is based on an average apartment size of 58 square metres.

35 Sadly, what they propose is the all too familiar, blandly efficient and cost-effective construction built to an envelope. The planning and detailing is predictably mediocre: no diversity, but a choice between one-, two- or three-bedroom apartments. This is housing at its most reductive. Despite the master plan's promise of diversity, what we can expect will be hundreds upon hundreds of apartments which are all the same, in homogenous blocks floating like lily pads in a pond of
40 ambiguous residual space.

Everyone involved with the master plan has learnt nothing from the past, is ignorant of the present, and lacks imagination for the future. Within the master plan there is, beyond the cursory but meaningless nod to urbanism, no rationale or philosophy
45 behind the decisions that have been made other than that they are the most rational, most profitable and most politically palatable, as though the prospective occupants were nothing more than battery chickens, all with the same basic wants and needs.

Being close to work and transport seems to be the only criteria which need to be satisfied. Consideration of what makes a lively community, what makes a successful neighbourhood, how a considered built environment supports wellness, how meaningful shared open space encourages social interaction, are not only wholly
5 absent, but not even possible with the master plan in its current form.

The so-called green spines in the master plan's preferred scheme are a central component and perceived major benefit of the building arrangement. Purporting to be a shared green space, which is public/private, it will in fact be a private fenced-off
10 area of hard paved pathways and planter boxes above car parking. This is supposed to be the leafy green outlook for the inward-facing apartments, which would otherwise stare blankly at the other 10-storey building opposite.

This sort of wilful ignorance of human needs and the importance of one's surroundings is simply inexcusable. A great deal of research is readily available on the impact that the built environment has on physical and mental health. We have learnt, through Jane Jacobs, William Whyte and others, the importance of placemaking, and the positive effect that a well-designed urban setting has on
15 people's lives. The master plan treats the St Leonards South site as a collection of isolated buildings, with no consideration given to street hierarchy, edges, destination points, active local retail, or any of the other components which go to make up a vital
20 neighbourhood. This needs to be urgently rectified.

It is apparent to all that the council is completely at the mercy of developers. The master plan was driven by a feasibility study, and it is through this lens that all
25 decisions were and are still being made. With the liberal use of incentives in return for questionable benefits, the FSRs have gone way beyond the blanket 2.75 to one as recommended. The ill-conceived and poorly executed master plan started a feeding frenzy, with absurd prices being paid on the basis of figures contained in the draft.
30 The average prices of houses used in the study was approximately \$2 million, plus a 30 per cent premium. However, houses are now changing hands for between six and seven million dollars. How is this rampant but avoidable speculation of benefit to the community, or conducive to a satisfactory outcome?

I accept and support higher density for this area. I have travelled and built up considerable experience in urban design and architecture. I have experienced lively mixed communities that are a pleasure to be in. It is possible to provide all of the positive aspects of medium- to high-density living and still make it profitable for
35 developers. I know this because I've done the research and worked out the numbers myself, just to prove that we can in fact have it all. It just needs political will and the
40 imagination to make it happen.

I call on the panel to instruct the council to commission a new master plan, which addresses and gives priority to the creation of a nourishing neighbourhood and a
45 dynamic community over satisfying the insatiable appetites of rapacious developers and greedy speculators. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Paul Mitchell, from the Country Garden St Leonards Proprietary Limited.

MR P. MITCHELL: Madam Chair and Commissioners, thank you for the
5 opportunity to speak to you today. I'm a director of City Plan Services, and as
you've mentioned, I represent Country Gardens St Leonards who are major land
owners in the planning proposal area. Country Gardens site is bounded by a park,
river and Berry Roads in the south-western corner of the planning proposal area. It's
10 currently in the form of 19 separate allotments. It has an area of approximately 8600
square metres. It's the largest consolidated landholding in the planning proposal
area.

We've made a detailed submission, and I'm not going to – you will be relieved to
15 know that I'm not going to attempt to go through all of the points in the speaking slot
that I've got. I just want to focus on three key issues. The first of these is that
Country Garden welcomes and strongly supports the draft 2036 plan for Crows Nest,
St Leonards. We support its vision for the precinct generally and specifically for the
St Leonards South planning proposal area. Specifically, we support the proposed
20 development standards with two small exceptions which I'll point out shortly that
would go into the new LEP noting that they are designed to achieve best practice,
quoting best practice development outcomes.

The second thing is – that we support specifically is the planned upgrades to
25 infrastructure, community facilities and open space. That will be funded by a well-
considered state infrastructure contribution. We note that in St Leonards South, this
will – the SIC will provide for new open space, pedestrian and cycle links, a multi-
purpose child care centre and a new committee hall. We are confident that the
development standards that are set by the new plan will, indeed, achieve best practice
30 development outcomes and be of community benefit, thus helping to achieve the key
goals of the overall plan itself.

This confidence is based on the fact that we've undertaken massing and apartment
design guideline compliance testing of our proposal against the standards that are in
35 the draft plan, and we believe that the result will be both high-quality housing that
will address – rather, high-quality housing and outcomes that will address concerns
about suitable transitions in scale, avoiding overshadowing and traffic problems. In
that regard, I say that shadowing will comply with the ADGs requirements for solar
access. There will be no increase in overshadowing from the Country Garden
40 proposal over any existing or proposed parkland, nor any residential areas including
that to the south of the site on River Road. The second specific point I want to make
is that traffic growth from our development we have modelled. It will be negligible.
There will be increases of - - -

MS MILLAR: Can I just remind everyone of our rules and respect for all of the
45 speakers, please.

MR MITCHELL: The traffic modelling has been undertaken for our proposals will be negligible. I would be happy to explain why, but we estimate point 4 to point 9 per cent growth over current volumes on River and Greenwich Roads respectively. As I mentioned at the beginning in the – relation to this first point, there are only two
5 small reservations that we have with the draft DCP and the draft LEP controls. The first relates to a small part of our site in its north-east corner where the DCP says that the built form should be 10 storeys high, and yet the draft DCP imposes a 31-metre height limit. To achieve 10 storeys, you cannot do it within 31 metres. You need 37. This has been discussed with Lane Cove Council a number of times, and we believe
10 that the anomaly is a mistake, is an error and the 37 is the correct height for that particular portion of our site.

The second point that I wanted to make in relation to the development standards is the proposal that clause 46 provisions in the LEP – standard provisions in LEPs
15 across the state should apply in this circumstance because of the highly-detailed and prescriptive nature of the controls that are in place. They – those prescriptions and that detail, in fact, could inhibit better development outcomes. The second principal point that I wanted to make is that we strongly support the draft plan's goals providing greater housing choice and price range. We also note that the community
20 itself has given strong support for housing as a preferred land use. It is rated third by the community of the six preferred – of six preferred land use outcomes.

So notwithstanding the strong support for housing that the draft plan provides, there are a number of issues that we want to raise in that regard. Firstly, there are very few
25 zoning changes that will, in fact, introduce new housing opportunities, particularly for medium-density housing. The draft plan says, and I quote, identify areas suitable for medium and higher-density housing, concentrate higher-density housing along the Pacific Highway and potential to provide medium densities at St Leonards South. That's page 54 of the draft plan. St Leonards South is the only area proposed for
30 new medium-density housing, however, and I refer you to figure 28 of the draft plan which shows that, but only about half of the St Leonards South planning proposal area is allocated to medium density.

The third point I'd make in this regard is that all new residential zones – all other,
35 rather, new residential zones apart from that relatively small part of the St Leonards South area are to be high density mostly in mixed-use form. So all of the medium density, all of the housing diversity is dependent upon that portion of St Leonards South that is allocated for medium density. The next point I want to make is that the forecast growth in local employment, some 16,500 new jobs, is much larger than
40 forecast growth in new housing, 7500 new dwellings. That significant discrepancy itself will provide increased housing stress within the area.

The final anomaly we want to make in relation to the plan's emphasis on housing is that achieving the employment growth targets, the ones that I have mentioned, will
45 be difficult, if not impossible, if sufficient and appropriate range of housing choice is not provided, particularly for key workers in the health sector. The overall implication of these points is that the achievement of key goals in the whole St

Leonards Crows Nest Plan is dependent upon a positive outcome for the St Leonards South planning proposal. It is dependent – the plan’s goals for housing mix, affordability and employment depend upon a positive outcome for the St Leonards South housing proposal. Alternatively – rather, planning proposal. Alternatively, if
5 St Leonards South does not proceed, there will be insufficient housing, only high-density housing, no mix, and housing with, effectively, no price range. All against the primary goals of the draft plan itself.

My third and final point is this, and it has to do with the Minister’s request that you
10 consider “some staging of the proposal”. I first note that staging is not mentioned in any of the planning documents, the many planning documents that precede the planning proposal for this area, they being the master plan, the draft St Leonards Crows Nest plan, the Land Use and Infrastructure Plan, the North District Plan and the council’s planning proposal itself. In none of those documents is staging
15 mentioned. This means that there is no strategic planning basis for staging of the proposal. The converse applies.

Staging would jeopardize the previously mentioned major planning goals that I
20 pointed out relating to housing and employment as well as the planned new infrastructure community facilities and open space, all of which are dependent upon the six that I mentioned which, in turn, are based on a protected housing yield for the whole of the planning area. In addition, stage rezoning would not be practical, and for this reason, it is not accepted practice in New South Wales. Staging a
25 development normally or universally follows rezoning and then the consent for an overall concept plan followed by detailed DAs submitted progressively for particular stages of development.

Any decision to stage rezoning – I’ve only got about a minute to go, Madam Chair –
30 would, in reality, be an indefinite deferral of the zoning decision. In effect, a decision not to rezone. Such a decision would be inconsistent with many years of strategic planning that has been undertaken in this area, is unjustified at this very late stage of the planning proposal – of the planning process, that being post-the gateway certificate that was given some two years ago.

35 In my experience, the only possible means of staging – of staging the development by rezoning would be to have an LEP that includes a satisfactory arrangements clause. But, again, in my experience, they are only used in areas where there is a need for essential infrastructure to be provided before development can occur. That is not the case at St Leonards South. I know of no other instance – no other way that
40 satisfactory arrangements clauses have been provided in LEPs, but I know of no other way that that staging can occur by way of rezoning.

It’s not – it’s not appropriate in this case because essential infrastructure is in place and the circumstance that applies here, because of the SIC, and therefore would be
45 cumbersome and unnecessarily – unnecessarily cumbersome and achieve no public interest benefit. It would have the reverse, of introducing unnecessary complexity.

Accordingly, we ask the Commission to endorse well-established planning practice and recommend against any attempt to stage zoning of the proposal. So I will conclude with that, Commissioners. We have made a very detailed set of submissions to you which we – we ask that you fully consider and I note that that includes the massing and compliance checking that I referred to earlier. Thank you very much.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Okay. We now have Colin Rockliff from Greaton Development.

MR ROCKLIFF: Sorry. We clarified before, it was just Helena.

MS MILLAR: Just Helena? Okay. Helena Miller from Greaton Development. Thank you.

MS H. MILLER: Madam Chair, Commissioners, thanks for hearing me speak. My name is Helena Miller from MG Planning. I'm a planning consultant, speaking on behalf of Greaton Development. Greaton Development owns 22 per cent of the land in St Leonards South, including two sites which we know as the East and the West quarters. Now, Greaton has road tested council's planning proposal and, in doing that, what we found was that it was a viable planning scheme for the area and that it will deliver high quality outcomes, both for future residents and the existing community.

Accordingly, Greaton supports council's planning proposal and considers that it should be rezoned as soon as possible to end the uncertainty that is currently around the area and the consistent delays, to meet government dwelling targets in the – in a location which is highly suitable to higher density development, with excellent access to transport and employment and also to support government infrastructure spending. We also concur with council's view that the SIC levy should not apply to St Leonards South, as it has been proposed under the 2036 plan, and I will speak to that issue a bit more later.

So just in terms of a bit of background, St Leonards South has been earmarked for higher density development since 2012, some seven years. Sites have been purchased and amalgamated by developers in good faith. Repeated delay in rezoning has caused uncertainty, both in the community and significant landholder's holding costs. Most recently, the exhibition of the 2036 plan was intended to resolve this matter and we were delayed waiting for the outcome or the release of the plan to find out whether the Department supported St Leonards South. But the 2036 Plan was largely silent on the St Leonards South area and it referred the matter to the IPC for review, which has resulted in even further delay.

To inform the debate, Greaton went ahead and road tested the council's planning proposal and prepared two concept EAs, together with a proponent-led planning proposal which was submitted to council. These applications have been submitted to the Commission for your information and also to the Department, as a submission on

the Draft 2036 Plan. And they provide additional information on how our sites would be developed if the plan goes ahead. Just to clarify, we submitted our own planning proposal as a fallback position, essentially, just in case the council's planning proposal doesn't proceed, and also to allow us to start the debate about – a
5 conversation about what the form of the development is, so that we could get the concept EAs into the public realm, so we could start to debate the actual detail of not whether this land is rezoned for higher density development, but how it should be rezoned and how it should be developed, what that form should look like.

10 So Greaton has five minor issues, fairly consistent with other issues that have been raised by other developer representatives today. Our concerns in relation to council's planning proposal are really related to the rigid site amalgamation pattern. The exclusion of clause 4.6. We have a very minor issue with height on one of our sites, which is only a – a discrepancy of half a metre. We also see that there's a lack of
15 flexibility in the scheme, in terms of the location – not the outcomes.

We agree with the outcomes of council's planning proposal, but just how those outcomes are delivered is quite rigid in the way it's put forward at the moment. The other issue is – relates to just the basements and the deep soil, but – but we consider
20 that these issues are matters of detail, which we can resolve with council and they don't affect the suitability of the land to be rezoned.

So we acknowledge that the IPC has been requested to provide the Minister with advice on the consistency of council's planning proposal with the 2036 Plan,
25 specifically in terms of the overall vision, the guiding design principles, the specific design principles, the scale of the precinct development and also whether it should be staged. In – we would say that the – the 2036 Plan vision is – I will read to you:

30 *The – the St Leonards South/Crows Nest area will become a major centre for workers, residents, students and visitors, offering a variety of homes, jobs and activities for the diverse local population. The area will continue to be a place that people would be proud to work in, visit and call home.*

Underlying that vision are a number of principles, in terms of place. It states that the
35 – the precinct should be a vibrant community and a place that protects its past. In terms of movement, an accessible place. In relation to built form, a well-designed place. In respect of land use, an employment hub and a home for people of all ages. And in respect of landscape, a greener place. As demonstrated by Greaton's concept EAs, council's planning proposal is entirely consistent with this vision.

40 We – our concept EAs demonstrate that the plan works and will provide a high quality architectural form that responds to the site characteristics and scales down towards the edges; a range of apartment options to build a community and cater to the needs of people of all ages, including local residents who are wishing to
45 downsize in the local area; a highly accessible development that is permeable and that promotes active and public transport and a new development that maintains an

improves the landscape quality of the area whilst increasing dwelling supply and choice.

5 In terms of the guiding design principles, council's PP is entirely consistent with the guiding principles, as stated, and we have prepared a compliance table, which I will leave with the secretary, but I won't read out to you today. And also in terms of the specific planning proposals for St Leonards South, it's entirely consistent with those, as well.

10 So coming to scale. Council's planning proposal provides for the development of the area in the order of 2400 new dwellings. We note that the Greater Sydney Commission letter has confirmed that council is on track to meet its five-year dwelling targets. However, going beyond this, demand will continue to grow. While there's no 10 – specific 10-year targets that have been set for the Lane Cove LGA, 15 the north district plan does identify additional housing targets of 25,950 dwellings, nought to five years, and 92,000 dwellings in the next 20 years to meet housing demand. The St Leonards South precinct has a significant role to play in both meeting both these local and district targets for housing, particularly in light of its location and its accessibility.

20 Coming to staging. St Leonards South, therefore, is required to meet the existing dwelling targets in the LGA and the broader district and we do not believe that a staged approach is required or would result in an over-supply of developable land. Staged release of the site is not necessary or appropriate, as it would undermine the 25 council's masterplan, which has been in – which has been seven years in the making, disadvantage land owners and developers left out of any early release, impact future viability due to holding cost and is not required for any good planning purpose, i.e., to prevent multiple development fronts, to ensure appropriate infrastructure provision etcetera.

30 As I mentioned before, Greateron doesn't support the inclusion of the – of St Leonards South in the SIC levy and would ask that the panel recommend to the Minister that the proposed SIC levy be waived in relation to the St Leonards South area, consistent with council's view. The 2036 Plan proposes an infrastructure levy of \$15,100 per 35 dwelling and seeks to apply it to St Leonards South. The Department itself engaged consultants AEC to prepare a feasibility report testing the SIC levy back in April 2018. In relation to St Leonards South, AEC concluded:

40 *Market evidence indicates that the majority of sites in St Leonards South character area were purchased at price reflective of proposed planning controls, prior to the announcement of a proposed SIC levy. Accordingly, any resulting up – value uplift is subsumed, resulting in little capacity to pay a SIC levy.*

45 In short, the consultant's report recommends against applying the SIC levy – sorry, in short, the Department's own consultant recommended against applying the SIC levy to St Leonards South. Further technical studies prepared by council also

confirmed that the proposed development levels do not warrant additional regional or district infrastructure, as supporting infrastructure is proposed as part of council's plan for the precinct. Section 7.11 funding would be applied to fund local infrastructure.

5

And just a point of clarification on that, I think a previous speaker indicated that the developers had indicated they couldn't afford to pay section 7.11 contributions. That's not correct. We fully expect and are required to – under the Act to fund local infrastructure under section 7.11. I think the confusion may be that we were suggesting that any works in kind would be offset against those levies, which is the normal practice.

10

So contrary to the findings of the – contrary to this – the consultant's finding, the Draft 2036 Plan seeks to apply the SIC levy to St Leonards South. We believe that this would make the land commercially unfeasible – development of the land commercially unfeasible and therefore jeopardise the ability of council to – to deliver on its housing targets, as set out by the GSC.

15

In conclusion, it is recommended that IPC support council's planning proposal and accordingly advise the Minister that council's planning proposal is consistent with the vision and design principles of the Draft 2036 Plan, has strategic and site-specific merit and should accordingly proceed to gazettal as soon as possible. The scale of the proposed rezoning is appropriate and will provide approximately 2400 additional dwellings in a strategic location with excellent access to employment and public transport to meet dwelling targets and support government investment in infrastructure.

20

25

Staging of the proposed rezoning is not necessary and would undermine the integrity of the master plan, would disadvantage land owners left out, would impact future viability and is not required for any good planning purpose. We also, therefore, recommend that the Commission advise the Minister that the sick levy proposed under the draft 2036 plan be amended so it does not apply to St Leonards South. Thank you very much.

30

35

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Arlette Jubian. Is she here? Yes.

MS ARLETTE JUBIAN: So Arlette Jubian. I live one street away from Park Road. So I will be impacted in a massive, big, huge way. Good morning. There are several issues with the St Leonards South Planning Proposal St Leonards South Planning Proposal which I will refer to as the rezoning plan because, really, that's what it is. I would like to express my opposition to the plan for a number of reasons including traffic and transport. Recently, several excessive high-density residential developments were approved and constructed in the St Leonards and adjoining areas with more on the way. The St Leonards – sorry. In St Leonards alone excluding this proposal, there are over 4000 new units already approved which is around, say, 8500 to 9000 new residents in the one area.

40

45

This is an increase of around 300 per cent over the current levels. This excludes the RNS development. This is a massive amount of development for one small area. Any further increases in high-density residential development are not justified due to severe lack of infrastructure, services, transport and excessive traffic. The
5 community is feeling the effects and the impact of reduced amenity and increased traffic. I will discuss my main concerns with this rezoning in relation to traffic and transport. I will speak to the cumulative traffic impacts. Assessing the traffic impact of the proposed rezoning of St Leonards South needs to consider that the area is
10 located at a key juncture of a vital set of link roads. For example, Pacific Highway, River Road, Herbert Street and Falcon Road.

Accordingly, it is essential to accurately assess the impact of this rezoning plan on immediate streets as well as across the network now and when the other proposed
15 developments are completed in two to three years' time. So not far away. The traffic assessment reports on the rezoning had a number of shortcomings including not taking a cumulative assessment of the whole area. They simply concentrated on the immediate near streets. Even the PTC report – that's in the submission – only took four developments into account as being cumulative. Just four. Only four. The
20 reports were not comprehensive in considering all aspects.

For example, that PTC reports that's in the submission only concentrated on pedestrian traffic only. No consideration was given to the likely acceptance or the
25 adoption of the proposed changes by the RMS. For example, proposing changes to traffic management on Falcon Street or the Pacific Highway are not likely to be accepted by RMS since they will impact other flows in the network. Most of the traffic studies have relied on reports submitted by developers to account for a new development which have limited scope and pre-agreed objectives. No consideration was given to the fact that the area has a wide catchment.

30 River Road is a major feeder road for the lower and wider northern side of Sydney. At the same time, the Pacific Highway has a wide catchment that covers a major hospital and a growing industrial park. This additional congestion will adversely impact the emergency vehicles approaching the hospital. Cumulative impacts from
35 developments that should have been considered on the already heavily congested River Road include the residential towers at Greenwich Hospital, two large developments on Greenwich Road, the RNS Hospital site development, the six large developments on the Pacific Highway, the developments on River Road and large developments in the adjoining council. It's a one small area.

40 The majority of the developments listed above are already approved or in the pipeline and cannot be stopped while the St Leonards South rezoning is not final and can be stopped or reduced to leave capacity to cater for the traffic from organic and other known growth. Currently, there is already significant traffic congestion around
45 St Leonards. It is chaotic and very dangerous to exit out of streets on River Road or the Pacific Highway. I actually dread driving my car out of my street to turn into River Road or even the Pacific Highway. It – if this rezoning proceeds, it will exacerbate a dangerous problem. Council's own reports notes that traffic modelling

indicates that further increases in densities may not be supportable in the precinct under currently known traffic planning policies and also notes, I quote:

5 *Substantial traffic measures such as new traffic lights for Park Road or Port View Road on Pacific Highway would be necessary, and there is no basis for confidence that RMS would agree to such changes to the regional traffic flow.*

I will now speak to the plan for improved active transport connections. The St Leonards train station is already well above capacity. The figures from Sydney
10 trains show St Leonards at 141 per cent capacity. Hence, the rail network will not cope with additional commuters. The Crows Nest Metro Station is five to six years away, while this rezoning will be finished in two years. The problem of congestion – of congested trains will be exacerbated at the end of May when the Chatswood Metro will open. More than 4500 commuters from the north-west will be added to the train
15 network via St Leonards.

If the train network is already at 141 per cent capacity, then the trains won't cope. This doesn't even include additional demand from developments in North Sydney or Willoughby council side. The new metro and train stations are located on the other
20 side of the Pacific highway which has restricted pedestrian access from the precinct, and any additional pedestrian access across the Pacific Highway will impact the traffic flow. It's already a bad situation there. Just have a look. Go there. Visit it in the morning. Therefore, this – just two paragraphs. Sorry. One paragraphs.

25 Therefore, this rezoning is not appropriate per the 2036 plan and does not have the elements of a TOD with the already overstretched rail network. In short, the proposed rezoning is not good planning and will have detrimental impact on the area and residential amenities in St Leonards and should, therefore, not be supported. I mean, I hear developers saying, "Look, we've already – have options that we gave to
30 people". Well, that was – that was something they wanted something to do, and it's a risk. It's a business risk. They should live with it. It – there's nothing – no guarantees in business. So thank you for your time and for your consideration.

35 MS MILLAR: All right. Thank you very much. We're just going to go back up to some earlier speakers who switched around. So I think next on my list is John Hancox from the Wollstonecraft Precinct and then followed by Penny Mabbutt, and then we'll go back down to speaker 20 after that.

40 MR J. HANCOX: Thank you. Good morning. My name is John Hancox. I've lived in Wollstonecraft near the station for 25 years and have been chair of Wollstonecraft Precinct for three years. I'm also involved in community action groups to try and make a better place to live in our community. This morning I want to talk about project scale, population density and the effects on adjoining suburbs, including Wollstonecraft and Crows Nest.

45 The 2016 census shows that Wollstonecraft have 4283 dwellings, a population of 8323 and a land area of about 120 hectares. On that basis, population density was

just under 70 persons per hectare. By 2018, population density had increased marginally to 75 persons per hectare. Contrast this with this planning proposal: 2400 dwellings, a population of 4800, land area of about nine hectares, population density 533 people a hectare, seven times that of Wollstonecraft. It is like a storage area for shipping containers, with only 3300 square metres of new open space.

It relies on Newlands Park of one hectare, also claimed by developers of another almost 2000 apartments on the Pacific Highway in St Leonards for use by their residents. This is a measly 1.34 hectares of open space for about 9000 people. Council claims the Gore Hill Oval is park land available to these new residents, which it is, as it is to the other 5000 people and also to those that live in Willoughby and North Sydney. But the oval is distant and isolated across a busy highway. These widely published statistics on population density, dwellings and areas are all matters that are clearly important. Yet this planning proposal has been prepared without mention of the population density, without mention of open space and ratio and without mention of their impact on the wider public amenity and the infrastructure.

The SLS plan was conceived about seven years ago by a group of landowners who consulted with developers to sell their homes in a block. The enthusiasm resulted in Lane Cove Council taking up and expanding the proposal on behalf of those landowners to negotiate an equitable financial result. The average price paid of about \$6 million for each of 91 homes was about three times market value at that time. All this done without the rezoning approval represents a huge financial risk. In simple terms, this was and remains a developer-led plan promoted by a council with possibly good intention, but is not the way to do urban planning. From the moment the pricing was agreed, all other planning considerations were secondary to the return on investment, which remains the overriding requirement today. This is very poor planning.

Consultation with the wider community – and I mean the wider community – including Crows Nest and Wollstonecraft, St Leonards generally, has been limited, there being none – I repeat, none – until after the planning proposal received gateway determination and was placed on public exhibition in December 2017, five years after the idea was conceived.

It is therefore understandable that the proposal is contentious and why the Department of Planning has asked for your advice. Approximately 340 submissions were lodged in response to the public exhibition on that proposal. The great majority – 96 per cent of them – were objections. Regrettably, the council took little notice of the community's objections in relation to scale, density, open space, overshadowing and traffic. Council is knowingly or otherwise trying to use this proposal as a bank to save the rest of its protected suburb from overdevelopment.

The consequences of that strategy will impact adversely on the infrastructure and the residents of St Leonards, Crows Nest and Wollstonecraft. Council has been very active in approving other spot rezoning of residential developments in St Leonards, with almost 2000 apartments recently on the Pacific Highway. The additional 2400

apartments in St Leonards South are not needed to meet the GSE housing targets for 2021, nor probably through to 2030. They're already 38 per cent ahead of their target to 2021. The majority of the residents of St Leonards South will use St Leonards and Crows Nest as a place to shop, a place to eat, a place to relax, perhaps school and visit hospitals.

Traffic will be chaotic, infrastructure overtaxed, open space impossibly crowded, schools and hospitals – particularly the Royal North Shore Hospital – even more overcrowded than they are at present. As the public submissions to the planning proposal show, it is too dense, has insufficient open space, not consistent with the 2036 plan. And rezoning of the site should not proceed until after the 2036 plan is finalised.

Additionally, there is no case to support a partial rezoning. I urge that you recommend to the department to modify the proposal to deliver much lower population density, much more open space, a requirement to exclude at any time any overshadowing on Newlands Park, proper engagement with the wider community and no influence from vested interests of developers or other landowners. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Next we have Penny Mabbutt.

MS P. MABBUTT: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning. My name is Penny Mabbutt. I am a local resident and I'm speaking in my own capacity. At the outset, I want to state I applaud the government for initiating planning reform and the development of a coordinated, integrated system. Over the last few years, I have attended several official meetings with various government offices on planning issues, and participated in workshops. I have been genuinely impressed with their professionalism, determination and resilience, as we transition to a better planning system. We are now unavoidably in a lag period until plans and budgets are totally aligned. This transition will take several more years.

Before I address the key points I wish to present, I want to talk briefly about human behaviour and change, given this is my professional expertise. The changes surrounding the 2036 and 2056 plan are likely to be the most significant change program any of us will ever have any involvement with. What we know of humans and their inherent decision-making capacities is that we are flawed. We aren't perfect.

And decisions made often need to be revised when more information becomes available or vested interests are brought to light. We can do our best in aiming to make decisions rationally; however, our brains find the process very taxing and decisions taken will and can be strongly influenced by limited time, resources, emotions, politics and financial gain. This is not a criticism of anyone involved in the decisions which have led us here today, not at all. And so when we get the opportunity to reconsider something, it is a rare opportunity that we must manage carefully.

I have been impressed with this current consultation process, as it is clear that the commission wants to provide as much time as is needed to hear submissions. There is a lot riding on the recommendations you make in assessing St Leonards South compliance with the 2036 plan. My view, however, is that there is a fundamental
5 mistake that has not been put onto the table to be addressed, which must be if we are going to be thorough in ensuring that the final 2036 plan is what it should be. St Leonards South was effectively excised from the area available for planning and was presumptuous. Why presumptuous: it presumes that the proposal will proceed by ring fencing it from other possibilities. I cannot find what the department's plans
10 would be – if anything at all – if the proposal did not exist and if it is not approved.

The community does not know whether the department would otherwise have left the area alone as it is, protecting important character housing, stock, or acquiring it for other critical services. The 2036 plan has directed that the area is to become an
15 internationally competitive health, education, research and innovation precinct. The parcel of land we are talking about here is a stone's throw from three hospitals, medical and allied services, three railway systems and a bus route. So what would the Department of Planning have recommended for the site – if anything at all – if the zoning proposal was not already in train by Lane Cove Council. Would it be to
20 allow zoning limited to address our missing middle problem? This is a problem our council is yet to address.

A little further along from the site in the very same block bounded up by Greenwich Road are for zoning already exists. Would the department have recommended the
25 area for a location of a school or for a world leading establishment for dementia care or cancer research using Nano technology. By excluding the site and allowing the council's proposal to continue with its commercial rezoning proposal, we have missed the opportunity to consider alternative land use to deliver internationally competitive health, education, research and innovation. Is the rezoning proposal
30 related to building an internationally competitive health, education, research and innovation project? No. It has caused confusion during the consultation process. Were we supposed to comment on the effectiveness of land use proposed by the GSE in the draft – a plan excluding the Lane Cove Council Rezoning? Or were we
35 supposed to assume it would be achieved and an additional 4800 people would move into an area that previously housed some 400 people?

I want to just talk briefly now about commercial gain versus good planning. Council's proposal began in 2012 initiated by residents and developers with a shared
40 financial interest. There's nothing wrong with that. We are a market economy. But be clear, at its genesis and still today, it was and is a commercially driven development. Its timing meant its design was not informed by the principles of the 2036 plan.

So what's the big problem you might be thinking? That's what we're here for, right?
45 All the IPC needs to do is make a comparison and report on the gap to the Minister which can then be fixed. That sounds right. No. Wrong. That is not right. That is a simplistic solution to a problem that has not been properly defined. The rezoning

proposal is not designed to address a problem or a need. It is a commercial venture that will bring high rise development with insufficient housing mix.

5 As time has progressed, St Leonards South has turned into a false solution to a
problem that doesn't exist. The 2036 plan, however, is very different. It is one
integral component of a plan for greater Sydney with a vision to take us to 2056. It
considers a very broad range of elements to make the best living environment
possible. It is a staged plan that considers employment, access and a whole range of
10 other criteria. It is seriously limited, however, by the developments underway in St
Leonards South and very old infrastructure.

To deliver the plan, councils are able to propose from many alternatives for future
development of land. Land use and infrastructure needs to be carefully assessed for
the best outcome possible. The 2036 plan is driven by the need to provide good
15 planning for the people of New South Wales. In doing so, if it had not excised the
area from its planning area, it would have and should have been free to consider what
the community needs if, in fact, there was a need for any change at all in that area.

20 So the fundamental problems for the community could be considered and
commented upon by you. Whilst you have been given a brief, there is nothing to
prevent you from commenting on what I have raised and recommending a broader
review because I am sure what follows me today and what has preceded my
discussion will be a host of very well thought out submissions by professionals,
ordinary residents, from across several disciplines.

25 They have invested their own personal time and their money on behalf of their own
communities for the greater good. This is not about "not in my backyard" as many
might glibly say. As taxpayers, we have limited resources and critically, we have
little land here for a strategic area. Once we develop here, if at all, it can't be
30 undone. After reviewing technical submissions, I am sure you will find that the
proposal does not comply with the design principles of 2036. My view is that the
issues are deeper and that this and the department should reject the proposal in its
entirety. Thank you.

35 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much. I think we're now up to Peter
Deane.

MR P. DEANE: Good morning. I'm Peter Deane. I'm a local Greenwich resident.
I, like most residents this area, am not against development. However, the
40 development needs to be carefully planned, targeted to the community's future
needs, supported by suitable infrastructure with landform and geography taken into
account. Bearing this in mind, I would like to highlight to you some of my concerns
with the St Leonards Precinct proposal and the way in which it has been developed.
Firstly, I refer to page 2, fourth paragraph of a letter from the Minister to the
45 Independent Planning Commission dated 20 December last year in which he states:

...furthermore the Commission may also wish to inquire with Lane Cove Council about the outcomes of a community workshop in relation to the Draft 2036 Plan held on 12 December 2018 if this is not captured in council's submission –

5

community consultation is captured in page 6 of the council's submission, however, I can state categorically, as I took part in the workshop, that this summary is sadly distorted and incorrect. Of 12 identified items or issues, the results have been summarised by council as follows. Eight items or issues were supported, one mixed
10 view, one acknowledgement, one preference and four only items of concern. If you were to scan only this page, you would form a view that the community workshop supported St Leonards South by more than a ratio of 2:1.

15 Unfortunately, you would be forming a totally incorrect view as buried in the back of the report on page 26 of the 27 page report under Community Sentiment, the true results are revealed and the depth of the community concern as expressed at the workshop is shown. Also, ignored totally by council but formalised in the workshop consultant facilitator's report, is a matrix summarising the workshop satisfaction results, which I've included in my report.

20

This matrix bears no similarity to page 6 of the council's submissions. The matrix forms part of my talk today and copy, no doubt, in this thing here, but in summary it said eighty-six and a half per cent of attendees were either highly
25 unsatisfied or unsatisfied, 8.3 per cent were neutral and 5.2 per cent were either satisfied or highly satisfied.

30 What a different picture this represents – or presents to page 6 of the council's submission and bearing in mind extraordinarily council invited the St Leonards South developers and multiple persons from the developers attended the community workshop so you can draw your own conclusions as to whom would have expressed satisfaction or high satisfaction.

35 Finally, what is even more troubling in this age when total transparency is encouraged, during the same month of the workshop – December 2018 – council planning officers were meeting with the St Leonards South developers, presumably to assist these developers to ensure correct documentation is produced for their submissions for planning assessments. We are aware that these meetings took place but we're told under the Freedom Of Information request that no records or minutes exist of these meetings.

40

Housing targets. We are told by Lane Cove Council that St Leonards South is required to meet housing targets. However, when we speak to the Greater Sydney Commission, they say that this is not the case. Lane Cove Council with
45 developments already completed or underway will well exceed the only targets set so far for the year 2021. No other future targets have been set and the Greater Sydney Commission has told us that any future targets will be set with council following council's completion of a housing strategy plan which is supposed to be completed

some time in the middle of this year. However, we understand that the Lane Cove Council has not yet commenced this strategy.

5 Residential transition, overshadowing and play space. The current developer-led proposal has no tradition from low density housing to the proposed high rise unit blocks. Newlands Park, the only real, usable park in this area, will be overshadowed in mid-winter at 3 pm just when children who have been at school all day need to come out to run and play. There is almost no additional play space created for the 5000 approximate additional residents for St Leonards South and to suggest that they
10 cross the highway to the new artificial grass and child's play area at Gore Hill Oval is dangerous and not sustainable.

On Saturday last, I was at Gore Hill Oval attending my grand-daughter's birthday. The oval, team warm-up space, that is, the banks surrounding the oval, and child's
15 play area were all being heavily used enjoyably by all ages and teams. However, it was at capacity. To add approximately 4000 new residents from the 2000 high rise units along the highway previously discussed, plus 5000 more residents from St Leonards South, with no additional recreation space is plainly and seriously wrong.

20 I will be very quick. Infrastructure and community facilities. We do not know how the existing infrastructure, power, water, telecoms and sewer will stand up to the additional loads imposed by the St Leonards South as council has refused to release any information they have, however, I will – just two paragraphs – however, we do know that the roads, such as Pacific Highway and River Road are at capacity at
25 various times during the day. Whilst the council is planning to formalise two lanes in either direction along certain sections of River Road, the bottleneck of the bridge over the railway near Duntroon is ignored, therefore council's proposal is ad hoc and hardly likely to have any impact at peak hours.

30 It is also worth noting that – but never mentioned in any reports that due to the typography of St Leonards South, most rail Metro commuters to the city will access Wollstonecraft station, not Crows Nest station, which will cause severe overcrowding on the city-bound station platform. This is because the distance is less than the walk is downhill. In conclusion, having pointed out the shortcoming of the
35 St Leonards South proposal and having stated that I support sensitively planned development, it is worth noting how well situated and integrated is the recent development on Duntroon Avenue, backing onto the railway overlooking Newlands Park and adjacent to St Leonards South. This development, of up to six storeys, with articulated frontage, nestling behind mature trees, is a good example of the maximum
40 density that could be supported within St Leonards South, not the proposed block after block of high rise.

Finally, it's somewhat ironic that Lane Cove Council, who fought against this development a few years ago, is now promoting this St Leonards South
45 overdevelopment. Thanks.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Next we have John Southwood.

MR J. SOUTHWOOD: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is John Southwood. I'm a resident of Greenwich. And I have over 40 years experience in finance funding projects and evaluating feasibilities. I have a PowerPoint presentation which will appear on the screen shortly and then we will get underway
5 that's the one.

MR: That one?

MR SOUTHWOOD: Thank you. Thanks. And, as we move from slide to slide,
10 Matthew will move it on, but I've also given you a copy in front of you. Turning to page 2, slide 2 – IPC terms of reference on landscape, green space and open space and compatibility. There are many quotes throughout the 2036 Plan as to what's required. These focus on high quality open space of communities and sufficiency of open space but let's see what has actually happened. The St Leonards South
15 Planning Landscape Proposal of 4800 residents in 2400 units gives a total of only 5020 square metres of new green space, which is .105 hectares per 1000. And, I must say, the numbers are going to come thick and fast because that's my background, so I apologise for it but we will try and keep it focused.

20 By contrast, Lane Cove Council has 2.9 hectares in the LGA per 1000 residents and, as other speakers have said, beware double counting of Newlands Park, which has been in every development, Gore Hill Oval, which is not for passive use any more, and Gore Hill Cemetery. So I think it will be clear that although St Leonards South Planning Proposal is inadequate for the density proposed, can it be delivered? Well,
25 the fact is that the landscape plan is integral to the planning proposal and the planning proposal cannot be – cannot proceed without it.

I now turn to economic feasibility. In 2015, Hill PDA prepared the feasibility for Lane Cove Council and, as another speaker said, it was based on a 30 per cent uplift
30 of then market value properties would incentivise home owners to sell or with a base FSR of 2.75:1, development would occur. At that time, this equated to an average land cost of 4036 per square metre and showed acceptable developer returns. Looking at the next page, which has a mass of detail, there are only two numbers to focus on here. Every property here was those that were selected by Hill PDA for an
35 estimate of market value, with an uplift of 30 per cent to show what would likely happen. And down at the very bottom, you will see two red arrows.

The one on the right – it shows Hill PDAs calculations in 2015 is that development would – developers would pay 4036 per square metre. The second arrow on the left,
40 in fact, shows what has happened for completed, realised sales for these properties of \$11,495 per square metre. And the plot is going to thicken. In July 2007, Hill PDA again was asked to review, for Lane Cove Council, the feasibility of what was being undertaken, and again they referred to the base FSR of 2.75 to one, and they said,
45 “Well, if we value the land at 8250 per square metre, then you will have sufficient – you would have sufficient funds for acquisition of the community facility plus the open space.”

In this report, in 2017, Hill PDA referenced three unconditional sales to support it: 2 Berry Street, 11,691; 14 Marshall Avenue, and 16 Marshall Avenue, but they were only 7800 per square metre, and, as we will see in two slides' time, they're the absolute outliers, in terms of cheapness, of property that was sold. I'll come to that shortly.

Also in July 2017, there was letters concerning open space and parkland. It was noted, on this next slide, that up to 11,500 had been undertaken – had been – sorry – been realised on property in the area. It refers to a conditional and one unconditional sale. The next slide, we do see what happens: at \$8250 per square metre, this one here, the projects remain viable. At 11,000 per square metre, to get viability requires 3.51 FSR. But that's never on the table, except for a trade-off for community services, because the base in the plan was 2.75.

I think this was misinformed, in July 2017, because at that date, as shown on this slide, there had been 27 properties sold, at an average of 11,439 per square metre. The settlement date, in the third column from the right, shows the dates that these were recorded with the Land Titles Office. But apparently Hill PDA may not have – for whatever reason, hadn't sourced this more up-to-date information. They referenced the three that I've highlighted only, which then showed one at 11,600, 2 Berry Avenue, plus the two outliers at 78000. Had they properly informed the council at that time, some bells should have been going off as to the feasibility of this project.

So here we come to a key issue on the feasibility and the deliverability of the open space. The original feasibility, done on 4036 per square metre, which includes the 30 per cent, and on those same sites that Hill PDA evaluated, the owners achieve 11,495. Hill PDA, in its advices to Lane Cove Council in July 2017, calculated that it would be not feasible where the land cost exceeded 11,000 per square metre, at the then established FSR of 2.75 to one. Hill PDA inferred developers were expecting a higher FSR than 2.75 to one. And there's two links there.

Now, where are we today in terms of residential sales? We've analysed every property in St Leonards South as recently as in the last week, and here we have a summary of all the key developers. And it shows, 98 properties out of 138 have been sold, for in excess of half a billion dollars, at an average of 5.65 per – million per home, 50,000 square metres, with an average per square metre price of just on 10,000.

There's a couple of lower ones in there – Marshall land, 8900; Grand Luxe Group – they bring the average down. But the people talking to us today, Greaton, they've paid 12,148; Country Garden, they've won the Top of the Pops: they've paid 13,421 per square metre. And Silver Plum Investment, aka Top Spring, has paid 11,755 per square metre. You can understand why they want high-density, and you can understand why they're going to want higher FSR.

So let's put this down. What does this mean? The reality is that the actual sales price was 285 per cent higher than the market feasibility conducted in 2015. And yes, property prices have moved between February 2015 and July 2017, but not at this magnitude. Based on Hill PDA's base market evaluation, this figure goes up to
5 370 per cent.

Council resolved to progress the plan, 23 October 2017. I can find no mention of financial feasibility in the council's online meeting papers. The Hill PDA reports do not appear to have been included as appendices to the report to councillors, and
10 actual market sales evidence appears to have been overlooked or discounted.

Further, in November 2017 – this is an extract from the document that was produced for residents on inspection, and there's some key words here that need to be considered. The first underlining refers to:
15

These studies incorporated recent sales data to ensure a high level of market accuracy.

This is demonstrably not correct, from the earlier slide that showed 28 properties
20 having been settled. It then goes on:

All three Hill PDA studies have helped to inform the viability of the built form.

I question this. These comments seem contrary to the Hill PDA July findings re
25 viability for an FSR of 2.75 to one and then available market sales evidence. At this time there was no review of feasibility conducted, of the developments or the capacity to make section 7.11 contributions, in July 2017. So it was released to the public with a lot of questions still to be asked.

Now, why the planning proposal with the landscape plan cannot be delivered. I have
30 the benefit of using Estate Master software, which I've used in my business and since retiring to evaluate projects, and the conclusions I've come to are pretty stark, that there's no miracles here. Developers have clearly paid top land prices, at the top of
35 the market, before any rezoning. Unit sales values in – have collapsed because of oversupply of completed units throughout Sydney, further units in the course of construction nearby – Mirvac, which is out of the ground; Landmark, which is yet to come out of the ground; and JQZ, that will contribute 1900 units – that other speakers have referred to.

The presales market has collapsed, thanks to Opal, and, speaking to senior real estate
40 figures, they say it's as dead as a doormat; in fact they use rather stronger language than that. Bank credit for both construction finance and end owner finance has tightened up post the Royal Commission, and that was well established. It is also well established that Chinese government is restricting capital flows to Australia.
45 I've got four slides to go.

Increased construction costs have continued, because of the demand for steel and other infrastructure projects. And we have seen, in their DAs, that the developers can't afford a full 7.11 contribution or an SIC and maintain financiability of their projects, let alone increase FSR. This is the reality Council faces.

5

The developers' position: all developers are in the same boat, and made rezoning assumption based on a uniform R4. The majority of land was pretty much at uniform prices. Two planning proposals and concept DAs have been submitted: one rules out cash payments – and don't forget, the council needs cash to buy the land from the existing landowners before they can develop the land; one wishes to negotiate 7.11 payments; both rule out an SIC payment. One offered to share their feasibility with Council, to plead poor, so that they didn't have to contribute the SIC or the section 7.11 or the section 94 payments. Two slides to go, please.

10

15

Lane Cove problem is of its own making. It should not have proceeded with the plan after July 2017. More to the point, Council management appears to have overlooked available market evidence and advice in July 2017 that the developments were not feasible at the agreed base FSR that was put to and approved by councillors in October 2017. So Lane Cove's plan is demonstrably inadequate for the proposed new residential density. Can it be delivered? The answer is no. The only reason that developers want rezoning is so that they can frank their proposal, to give them more options to either hold or sell until such time as the market recovers.

20

25

So, please, Commissioners of the Independent Planning Commission, advise the Minister to not approve this plan, as it is not financially feasible, and the new open space is totally inadequate for the density proposed. Work with the community, please, to develop sustainable, well planned solutions; ensure adequate infrastructure, based on sensible population density, that achieves equitable outcomes for both existing, new and adjacent residents. Thank you very much for your time.

30

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much. Now, is Ian Thomas with us? No, okay. In that case, our next speaker is Sue Wadley.

35

MS S. WADLEY: I live in Lamont Street, Wollstonecraft, just three streets away from the proposed St Leonards South development. My home and my neighbourhood, which is within the North Sydney municipality, will be significantly impacted by this development if it goes ahead. And yet the Lane Cove Council has never informed us; the Lane Cove Council has never consulted us on the impact of this development. In fact, no one has ever asked us how it will impact us, until now. So I acknowledge and thank the Commission for the opportunity to speak today.

40

45

I echo the concerns expressed by previous speakers about density, the potential for around 5000 people living adjacent to our neighbourhood, where 400 once lived. I echo the concerns about the horrendous traffic that will result, the lack of meaningful open space and infrastructure, the loss of liveability, and the loss of sunlight. But I don't want to waste the Commission's time by repeating those concerns at length.

Rather, I want to expand on what the previous speaker, John Southwood, said about the investment by developers in the St Leonards South area.

5 The fact that developers bought land at the peak of the market, and paid three to four times the then unrezoned market value for the land, should not be allowed to influence the decisions on the St Leonards South proposal in any way. In particular, it should have no bearing on increased height and density developers may seek to recoup any potential losses. They speculated at their own risk.

10 However, there is a deeply held fear and concern in our community that because developers have invested over half a billion dollars in acquiring land within these few suburban blocks, all the time actively engaging with the Lane Cove Council before any rezoning, that this proposal will go ahead regardless of the outcry from the community. We fear that the bulldozers will effectively roll over the top of our
15 community, because of this engagement by Lane Cove Council. We fear that the council will feel obliged to acquiesce to the developers' proposals.

A member of Lane Cove Council reportedly said that if the St Leonards South proposal is cancelled, there will be "consequences". The community is therefore
20 extremely concerned council will acquiesce because of the potential for legal action against them. We're also concerned Council will acquiesce because this is a once in a generation opportunity to impose thousands of people on a small pocket of land, sacrificing this area to protect the rest of Lane Cove Council's leafy, lower-density catchment area, in effect to future-proof it against further State Government housing
25 targets.

I want to finish by saying that our community is exhausted. We're exhausted by the unrelenting struggle to save our community from the rapacious development
30 destroying St Leonards and threatening Crows Nest, and I don't use those words lightly. While I understand your remit is to examine the St Leonards South proposal, I believe this must not be done in isolation of what's happening around it.

5000 people in St Leonards South will be added to the approximately 12,000 people planned for the St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct as currently identified in the
35 draft 2036 Plan. These people, many of whom will be living in 30-, 40-, 50- and 60-storey towers, will all be trying to utilise the minuscule open space and inadequate infrastructure, making what was once a desirable, liveable community a nightmare in which to live. So I urge the Commission to reject the St Leonards South proposal.
40 Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you. Next we have David Johnson.

MR JOHNSON: Dear Commissioners, thank you for your time to speak today. I live on the east side of Park Road, St Leonards, and am directly affected by the
45 proposed LEP as my home is included in the proposed LEP. Today I want to talk about the proposed pocket park running between Park and Berry Roads. I believe it is too small, and a token park. A better solution is a linear park, running the length

of Park Road, adjacent to the existing footpath. This linear park would be a similar size and orientation to the green spines within the proposed LEP. Thus linear parks are already part of the open space planning within the St Leonards South precinct.

5 The pocket park is 3500 square metres in size. If the linear park is 17 metres wide, the total area of the park can be up to 5500 square metres in size. Under the proposed LEP, two-thirds of Park Road has a 10-metre setback. Thus, only another seven metres of setback is required for the whole length of Park Road for a park 2000 square metres larger than the pocket park.

10

A consulted landscape architect and town planner who believed a linear park upon Park Road East is a better solution than the proposed pocket park. Some may argue the steep slope of Park Road prohibits a linear park. If it is an issue, it is also an issue for the proposed green spines which follow the same contour. At present, the pocket park consists of 10 properties subject to compulsory acquisition. These 10 properties are not owned by a developer. This means that there'll be no direct developer contribution from these 10 properties. There's no developers going to purchase properties subject of compulsory acquisition. It is believed the costs requiring these properties is between 30 or 50 million dollars and would need to be acquired by Lane Cove council from developer contributions. This will be a costly and time-consuming activity for Lane Cove Council.

The linear park does not require compulsory acquisition. There is also the added advantage of construction linear park and development can occur concurrently. It is not certain how the council came to determine size and location of the pocket park. There was no report or study contained in a documentation gateway that clearly shows how the council decided the pocket park size or location

September 2017 Oculus Landscape Master Plan is 15 months after the gateway submission. It can be concluded the landscape plans only dealing with the proposed LEP have presented a gateway and does not validate the pocket park size and location. It is a pity Lane Cove Council did not employ landscape – Oculus Landscape Architecture & Design during the pre-gateway process. There would have been a much better integration of open space within the LEP. In conclusion, a linear park is larger – less costly and a better solution than the proposed pocket park. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you. Next up, we have Alan Winney.

40 MR A. WINNEY: Good morning to the panel and thank you for the opportunity of speaking today. One of the key issues raised in both the recent Federal and State elections by politicians and wannabe politicians is the importance of well-planned infrastructure as part of any development. A key component is green space, and this is clearly enunciated in the Greater Sydney Commission Crows Nest draft 2036 plan the community needs for recreation space to foster the community values for healthy, vibrant and active living.

This raises the point that the Lane Cove draft plan for St Leonards South does not provide the required urban space to achieve the objectives of the meeting – of meeting the community needs for recreation space as part of the proposed development for 2400 apartments. The St Leonards South draft plan provides very
5 limited urban recreational space with a proposed park between Park and Berry Roads, two small parks at the bottom of Berry Road and Holdsworth Avenue and some small pockets of open space totally inadequate for the number of units being proposed. The only area that could be adequately defined as being suitable for recreation activities would be the proposed park between Park and Berry Road.

10 It is important to note that all green spaces in the St Leonards South master plan will be completely dominated by surrounding high-rise development including the Park and Berry Roads resulting in overshadowing for most of the day, if not all of the day. In Lane Cove's submission for the development of St Leonards South, they've
15 included access to additional greenspace outside of the St Leonards South area being Gore Hill Oval and Newlands Park. There's been considerable investment in Gore Hill Oval by Willoughby Council to establish it as a sports venue with limited recreational facility for families and is obviously included as a green space for their ongoing developments in St Leonards. This recreation and sport facility is already
20 fully utilised over every weekend, and it's also busy during the week. This then just needs Newland Park as an optional recreational greenspace for St Leonards South.

An important factor needing to be taken into consideration regarding access to greenspace is Lane Cove Council's approved and already under construction
25 developments in the area defined as St Leonards East precinct. This is the area along the Pacific Highway and includes Christie Street that would generate approximately 1734 additional apartments. The areas included in the St Leonards Crows Nest draft 2036 plan, and the greenspace is, once again, defined as being Gore Hill Oval and Newland Park to cater for this substantial influx of new residents.

30 Combine this with the proposed 2400 apartments in the St Leonards South draft plan, and it is impossible to see how the limited greenspace available will be able to cater for potential increase of in excess of 8000 new residents. It will certainly not be able to provide the community needs for recreation space to provide healthy, vibrant and
35 active living. An important factor with proposed development of the St Leonards South plan is the lack of transparency regarding the topography of the area.

The topography of the site is defined as being generally steep with the majority of the site being 1 to 2 and 1 to 5 with a slope in many parts exceeding 1 to 5, particularly
40 in the southern end of the site. An important factor in support of the proposed developments for this site is the walkability and cycling access. Yet, the report done by on behalf of the Department of Planning and Environment states the St Leonards sub-precincts in St Leonards South presents different pedestrian experiences. Nearly finished.

45 Depending on location to the south of Pacific Highway steep grades affect all the north-south routes. For cycling experience, the site features challenging topography

and high-volume roads reducing the attractiveness of cycling. Also for residents in the St Leonards site, the St Leonards/Crows Nest draft 2036 plan shows that the pedestrian desire line is, in fact, Wollstonecraft and not St Leonards Station, once again highlighting the topography of the site. Another key component, the St
5 Leonards/Crows Nest 2036 draft plan is the urban tree canopy. What we will have with the development of St Leonards South – one more.

Okay – plan will be the destruction of a large area of well-established trees already providing a tree canopy. They will be replaced with high-rise development and
10 planting of trees that will take years to compensate for what will be lost. This is totally contrary to what the St Leonards/Crows Nest draft 2036 plan is aiming to achieve. Now, I would ask the panel is this the legacy we would like to leave for future St Leonards, Crows Nest and Greenwich residents. I thank you for your attention.

15

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Genia McCaffery. Ms McCaffery.

MS G. McCAFFERY: Good afternoon and thank you very much for allowing me to address me this afternoon on the planning proposal for St Leonards. My name is
20 Genia McCaffery, and I've lived in North Sydney for over 40 years. I don't feel that old, as funny as – I was mayor of North Sydney from 1995 till 2012, and during that time, I was also president of the New South Wales Local Government Association for six years and national president for two years. During that time, I dealt with many planning ministers and lots of different experiments with state planning
25 system.

I have to say that the worst, least transparent and most corruption-prone planning system I've witnessed in my professional life is the current one in New South Wales. And I think the primary offender are planning proposals. And that's assisted, I think,
30 by the lack of community consultation from the Greater Sydney Commission. I'd invite you before you make your decision to have a walk along the Pacific Highway from Crows Nest down to St Leonards, and I think you can experience first-hand the horror that is the New South Wales planning system. Most of these new buildings breach local planning controls, sometimes by 10 times the allowable height and FSR.

35

When we've talked to the local community as a community action group about what is in the development pipeline, they are shocked and dismayed, and their – the most common comment is, "Why is no one talking to us?" The consequence for all – for all of us, the people who actually live here and want to stay living here, will be
40 congested roads, a lack of hospital beds, congested schools, and inadequate parkland. Local infrastructure just can't keep up with this sort of unplanned growth.

The sort of increased development now being requested in St Leonards is just more of the same – a massive increase in development with none of the proper planning
45 needed to support that growth. So what's happening now in our area is really serious. And I think it's so serious that we must call a moratorium on all rezonings until there is a proper assessment of the impacts of all the planning proposals that

have been approved in our area, and we need a new local plan that recognises the regional impact of all the development that's occurred in Crows Nest and St Leonards.

5 And that's not even to mention all the development that's going on down the highway in the North Sydney CBD. I would therefore urge you not to allow any further planning proposals in our area. Instead, I would think it would be fantastic if you would recommend to our new Planning Minister, who seems very amenable to these things, that we need to develop a new local plan and deliver to the Lane Cove and North Sydney communities the sort of planning they've been promised in our EP and A Act. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Denis Moore.

15 MR D. MOORE: Good afternoon. My name is Denis Moore. I am an architect and resident of Lamont Street in the LGA of North Sydney, which is just three streets away from this overscaled proposal for an existing low-rise residential area at the edge of Newlands Park. I do have some images that I would like to illustrate my – my comments with. I frequently use the park itself for exercise and walking, mostly
20 in the late afternoons, and I'm horrified that these proposals will substantially overshadow the park. This park is the only substantial green space in the area. As a local resident, I think the council should've been more active in engaging the community, rather than the cat and mouse game they have been playing for the last
25 few years.

I think this area deserves so much better than this overblown and truly appalling scale development that contains no community benefit whatsoever, but will be a massive payday for the developers. We deserve good town planning and urban outcomes, as clearly delineated by previous speaker David Astridge. The noted
30 architect Renzo Piano once said that you can put down a bad book, you can avoid listening to bad music, but you cannot miss the ugly tower block opposite your house. That is what these buildings will be: ugly, overscaled blocks that no extant and mature trees can hide. As mentioned by Bruce Donald, this plan has not yet even been approved, yet here we are making submissions on a proposal plan that is
35 already overwhelmingly rejected by the community.

The scale and height of proposed buildings are vastly excessive. As noted by previous speakers, they are way out of line with any reasonable appraisal of the area or, indeed, existing context. Proposed heights will overwhelm existing community,
40 overshadow Newlands Park, and create a dangerous precedent for further development across the whole area. I believe this entire area should be medium density, as opposed to what is shown on – on this diagram. This shows 19 storeys at the corner of Marshall Avenue and Canberra Avenue, working down to 10 storeys. I think this whole area should be no more than six to seven storeys, as with Duntroon
45 Avenue on the opposite side. Embassy Tower should be the line in the sand, with any further development appropriately transitioned down to a scale that is relevant to Newlands Park.

Transition of development has been completely omitted here in favour of developer needs and the profit margin, with no benefit whatsoever to the community. I believe density should be reduced and appropriate to context. The proposed 2400 units is too dense and should be scaled back, with reduced building heights, to about half of that, providing about maybe 1000 or 1200 units max. My next point, the LC proposal first introduced the community in – was first introduced to the community in 2015. Panels 1 and 2 – sorry – 2 and 3 – I’ve taken the liberty here, because no information has been available from the council, of taking current proposals and linking them together to give some impression of what we are looking at from the Embassy Tower down to River Road, and that echoes what has been shown on the LCC proposal of 27 storeys, 19 storeys at Marshall Avenue, down to 15 storeys, 12 storeys, 10, and ultimately down to four storeys at River Road.

I think this is vastly overscaled for the area. And the next diagram shows what I think that should be. I think it should be similar to the development in Duntroon Avenue. And I think it would be more appropriate to Newlands Park. The council proposal area covered a larger area than is now the case. It was based on the concept of transport-oriented development, which completely ignored the existing context. The LCC proposed maximum density at the top of Canberra Avenue to satisfy transport-oriented development criteria. All guidelines in relation to transition, scale, context and appropriate built form seem to have been thrown out of the window.

In relation to the built form, it is over three years since the LCC presented their proposal and in that time the community – all the community have seen is a single, misleading massing diagram that looks reassuringly similar to the popular Duntroon Avenue building heights. I think that may be on the next one. Next – bit further. Yes, shown here. Excuse me. The LCC proposal shows buildings that vary from 19 storeys at Marshall Avenue to just about four storeys at River Road. What these proposals do not show is any sense of building life and the drawings I have already shown show what I think they might – they might look like.

The last panel shows what the community believe should be a more appropriate scale of buildings that reflect context, sit well with Newlands Park and, more importantly, reduce building scale at the most sensitive part of Canberra Avenue, to reduce overshadowing to the park. Buildings at this point should actually be configured to allow sunlight through with larger gaps between buildings. Buildings fronting River Road have the opportunity to incorporate lower height townhouse or courtyard townhouse developments that could act as a buffer to River Road, with sunlight penetration to perimeter. Next slide. Something like this would be a buffer to River Road. It might be a more interesting transition to River Road.

Finally, the community have been clear in their demands for development that council respects the existing local character of the area. The draft plan talks about all of these qualities, yet most of these requests have largely been ignored by a council more intent on satisfying developers’ concerns and the huge sums of money already spent substantially exceed property values in the area. This is not the way to plan development and not the way to treat a community who do not have a problem with

additional development and are generally supportive of increased density, due to the adjacent transport network.

5 We want genuine consultation with council and engagement with the issues of traffic, congestion, overlooking building height, massing and good design, to create a vibrant community rather than serve as a dormitory town to the city. I see that the LCC proposal is totally unsupportable and request the Commission to – to look at a new proposal, which is based on actual housing needs and not developer-promoted maximum height. Thank you very much.

10 MS MILLAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Kate Bartlett.

15 MS K. BARTLETT: Thank you to the Commissioners for the opportunity to speak today. Mecone is the planning consultant for Top Spring, who is one of the key landowners within the precinct. Our perspective, and – and it's within our submission so it's known quite well, is that the planning proposal that council has prepared is the cumulation of many years of strategic planning work and it's intended to deliver a high quality transit-oriented development that does provide additional housing close to transport and jobs and, in return, in provides local infrastructure, including new parks, green spines and then childcare and affordable housing.

25 Mecone and Top Spring are strongly supportive of both council's planning proposal and the government's broader Draft 2036 Plan, but we did want to highlight a few concerns we have regarding some aspects of council's planning proposal and also some aspects of the Draft 2036 Plan's recommendation. With respect to council's planning proposal, we're strongly supportive of it. We encourage its progression. We think that it aligns with the government's view with respect to the 30 minute city and that it's also counted as part of the Lane Cove's ability to achieve its additional dwelling targets by 2021.

30 There are a few elements that we think should be refined prior to finalisation and they reflect essentially what you've heard from some of the other planning consultants today. Critically, we consider that there should be some additional flexibility around some of the amalgamation patterns, particularly if there's genuine evidence demonstrating that certain landowners have attempted to achieve the amalgamation patterns and haven't been capable of doing so. Similarly, we think clause 4.6 should be retained, just to enable some variations to occur where appropriate. In particular, my experience has been that on sites that slope steeply, there often is the need for 4.6 full height, particularly because of the way that ground level existing is defined in the standard instrument.

45 In addition, we're generally supportive of the objectives in the draft direction of the plan. There are a few elements that we consider could be problematic and we would like the Commission to look at more closely. In particular, some of the design principles in the 2036 Plan appear to possibly contradict some of the work that council has been doing and I think the – the issue of how it relates to overshadowing of Newlands Park – is it – and then the second aspect, critically, is really around the

SIC levy and – and the fact that the government is still proposing to proceed with it on St Leonards South, despite the fact that AEC – that’s their own consultant – noted that in addition to the community infrastructure and the 7.11 contributions, which our client doesn’t dispute, the SIC levy would be the – the element that could possibly affect feasibility sitting around it.

In terms of Newlands Park, I think the critical issue, from our perspective, is that one of the principles that 2036 Plan asked the Commission to investigate is the minimising of overshadowing to public open space and streets with a significant public domain function. We have no objection to – to exploring that issue. I think, for us, it’s really the reality of the fact that the Lane Cove Council Planning Proposal does envisage buildings of between four and 12 storeys in proximity to Newlands Park, which, on one hand, it essentially acknowledges that there would likely be some overshadowing of Newlands Park in mid-Winter, and the council put specific criteria around what they see to be reasonable. And our view is that the planning proposal always considered that as – as a trade-off, when considering the other benefits that are delivered through the precinct. In particular, the precinct will deliver additional infrastructure, green corridors and local pocket parks, as well.

I think probably the second issue really relates to the SIC levy and that, in terms of the infrastructure that St Leonards South is required to deliver, you’ve obviously got community infrastructure, which is identified through the plan, a series of green corridors and – as such. And then, on top of that, you have the 7.11. The – we have no issue with either the contribution of community infrastructure of the 7.11. The issue is that the SIC does on top of that – and that would be for specific state-level infrastructure, it’s not associated with Lane Cove infrastructure – does affect the feasibility.

I think the final thing for us really is that this planning proposal and strategic planning framework really has been in progression for almost seven years and that the IPC review, while we don’t object to it, doesn’t seem to have a set timeframe or clear scope at this point in time and, I think, from our perspective, it would be good to understand what that scope and timeframe is looking at, at the moment. So, in conclusion, we obviously support council’s planning proposal. We obviously support the Draft 2036 Plan. There are some areas that – that we would like the Commission to look at in a bit more detail and I’ve got this in the written advice here. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much. It has just turned 12.30. I think we might break now for a half-hour lunch break and then recommence at 1 o’clock. And our speakers, starting at 1 o’clock, I’ve got Dr Peter Sweeney and then Suzanne Yelland and then the list following on from there. So half an hour break and then if everyone can be back in their seats at 1 o’clock and I will restart the speakers’ list then. Thank you.

RECORDING SUSPENDED

[12.31 pm]

RECORDING RESUMED

[1.02 pm]

5 MS MILLAR: Okay. I think we're going to get started again. Our next speaker is Dr Peter Sweeney. Is Peter here? Dr Sweeney, thank you.

MR MILLER: I'm going to go and sit over here.

10 DR P. SWEENEY: Sorry. Yes. The PowerPoint you're going to see has got a bit of info on it, so – yes.

MS MILLAR: If you've got a – great, thank you.

15 DR SWEENEY: So, Madam Chair, Commissioners, good afternoon. My name is Peter Sweeney. I represent the residents of Eastview Street, in Greenwich: it's directly adjacent to the proposed development. We're not asking for special treatment. We're not anti-development. We're simply asking to be treated fairly, with respect, and be allowed the same opportunity to shape the plans as others.

20 As a member of the Lane Cove community, like every other community member, I expect to be informed and given an opportunity to provide input when there is a significant change to the environment proposed. This simply did not happen in the case of St Leonards South. From the very inception of this proposal, there was evidently an intention to exclude stakeholders who were not within the area subject
25 of benefit by redevelopment.

This is on the public record. Looking at the timeline slide, you can see just how this proposal has progressed, and how little opportunity there has been for genuine, broad
30 community input. So – again, I apologise that it's quite a busy slide, but a lot happened over that period, and hopefully this will inform you a little as to how things transpired.

35 So there's three timelines there. Our first one is 2012 to 2014, showing what happened pretty much with the original conception of the plan, and working solely with the residents within the boundary area. Then, following on from that, 2015, which was quite a busy year: that's when residents outside of that area first found out about this plan, and were given a couple of months to respond in some way. It was also the year that the council met and approved pursuing the proposal, and extended the proposal. Then, following that, down the bottom timeline there, we've
40 got 2016 to the present, with what's happened with regards to gateway over that period up to the current day. So I won't go through that in immense detail, but you've got it there for reference.

45 Some documentation associated with St Leonards South suggests that the community is substantially divided on its view of the St Leonards South proposal, or that there are mixed views in the community. Reports have been published containing phrases such as “the planning proposal is contentious amongst the community,” and that

there is “significant community interest in both supporting and objecting to the proposal”. In fact, there is no substance to support any assertion of such division in the community. A review of the available published submission contents for every point during the life of this proposal, since it was effectively disclosed, shows that
5 the objections to the proposal have outweighed support many times over.

The only point where there was any evidence of significant resident support for this proposal is in the very early days in the conception of this proposal, when the details were shared selectively, only with those in the immediate precinct area. Naturally,
10 many of those residents who supported it have long since left the area. Nonetheless, a review of the available documents from that early consultation period reveals that there was by no means unanimous support for development from residents within the precinct.

15 Planning proposal 25 states that the evaluation of planning options was based on 10 principles. The two primary principles cited are zoning density and financial viability. So it is unsurprising that the outcome was the plan that you see before you. Following this early consultation in the development planning period between
20 Council and the residents within the immediate area, a plan was formulated, which was then effectively presented as a fait accompli to the community. This was known as the Annand plan.

The first opportunity for the community outside the area to comment came in April 2015 – somewhere around where the red is on the second bar there – when Council
25 held a presentation that was made known to all residents within the proposal area, but very few others. However, this presentation entailed no community consultation whatsoever. It was in fact a presentation of additional distinct unsolicited development proposals. The objective of the presentation appeared to be to present development options that expanded the scope and scale of the Annand proposal.
30 There was no opportunity or facilitation in this presentation session for any objective discussion on the merits of alternative development pathways in a broader sense. The presentations were very much focused on alternate, higher-scale development options.

35 As it became clear to the broader community just what had been pursued by the precinct group, concern levels rose, and members of the broader community acted to provide alternative points of view to the council. A petition was prepared and circulated at short notice, and quickly attracted over 500 signatures within the weekend just prior to the Council hearing of this proposal in 2015. The petition was
40 presented to Council prior to the July 2015 hearing, and we are still awaiting a response.

Since that time, Council has consistently advised that the next opportunity for any community input would be the gateway public exhibition. Unfortunately, this
45 exhibition, scheduled over the 2017–18 Christmas break, comprised a poster show, with very little new information, and critical questions on infrastructure, solar access, transition zones, green space, overshadowing, funding, credible traffic studies and

others were not satisfactorily answered. This is clearly evident in the 955 pages of community submissions that you see down there on the lower bar. Many significant issues remain open. Many gaps remain. Critical questions remain unanswered.

5 So up to this point, I've simply been relaying the facts of the lack of genuine community consultation that's been characteristic of this proposal since its inception. But you can see a bit more of that in detail on the slide. In terms of alternatives to the proposal before you, there are many, many other, more visionary, beneficial and intelligent approaches that deserve close consideration. Such alternatives will bring
10 additional benefits to the business community and the community at large, and will provide a style and housing diversity mix that is far better aligned to the demand, location and unique topology than the of buildings that are conceived to maximise population density and development profits.

15 No doubt you've already heard or read about some of these ideas and concepts or will have the opportunity to review them in the coming weeks. I say again, we are not anti-development. We are pro consensus, pro balance, pro fair go. During more than 20 years in the Greenwich/St Leonards area, I have seen many developments take place. Indeed, one particular multi-storey development – a residential
20 development – was constructed directly opposite our background. We accept that reasonable and appropriately scaled development is beneficial and necessary for a growing city like Sydney.

What we and many members of the community object to is the complete absence of
25 any meaningful broad community involvement in planning and decision-making. St Leonards South offers a unique opportunity to further the concept of a strategic centre through the expansion of its health and professional employment hub. The unique location of the St Leonards South precinct also presents an opportunity for considered development of medium-density diverse housing to complement the
30 substantial quantity of high-rise dwellings already in development. Let's not squander this opportunity or waste any more time with a proposal that is not necessary, not supported, is not fully funded and will block the execution of far more worthy developments. We request that the IPC consider recommending restarting the entire proposal process with a view to incorporate local community input from
35 the outset. Thank you very much.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Susan Yelland.

MS S. YELLAND: Thank you. I've lived in Wollstonecraft for 25 years and my
40 family owns an apartment in Duntroon Avenue, just across Newlands Park from this proposal. Several people have already spoken about Duntroon Avenue, so I won't say too much. But it consists of too four buildings of five to seven storeys, just under 200 apartments. There are also several images of the Duntroon Avenue apartments in the 2036 draft plan documents, with comments such as, "Duntroon Avenue, a
45 good example of development with setbacks and height transitions", or on page 18 of the draft local character statement, "Some of the community has identified development along Duntroon Avenue as a good example for new development in the

area.” I also notice the Department of Planning upload to the IPC site a couple of days ago also includes an image of the Duntroon Avenue Development.

5 Seeing these inclusions in the draft plan documents, I was quite hopeful that any new development in the St Leonards South area would be along the scale of that of Duntroon Avenue. Someone earlier talked about the years of consultation – I think even our previous speaker alluded to that – that occurred getting to the final proposal for Duntroon Avenue, so I won’t go into that. Now, what the residents of Duntroon Avenue and those in the other three perimeter streets and, indeed, those in the
10 adjoining communities are facing is the type of development which will significantly diminish the amenity of the area and the quality of life of both existing and future residents. The Minister for Planning has specifically asked you to advise that this proposal is consistent with the overall vision and design principles of the draft plan.

15 I will talk about some of the specific principles. One of these design principles is that taller buildings be contained between St Leonards Station and Crows Nest Station. Clearly, this proposal is not consistent. The St Leonards South proposal is for high-rise towers of between eight and 19 storeys in a currently low-rise residential area. It is therefore not contained between St Leonards and Crows Nest
20 Stations. What is proposed is on a scale not contemplated for any other part of the draft plan area. It is the only low-rise area in the draft plan which is slated for this type of development. Having mentioned Crows Nest Station, I also note that the Minister for Planning has asked you to consider accessibility to St Leonards and Crows Nest Stations. There are many references in a variety of documents
25 associated with the proposal, as to how close the St Leonards South development is to the proposed Crows Nest metro.

One of the developers, in documents they have produced, says the new metro station is 450 metres from their site. As a local resident, I can say this is clearly inaccurate
30 and a false representation of the facts. I also did three separate searches for three separate addresses in St Leonards South on whereis.com, to find how far it is to walk to the Crows Nest metro from St Leonards South. For each case, the walking distance is around one kilometre. I was going to talk about the topography, but enough speakers have covered that. I won’t go into that. Another design principle of
35 the draft plan is to ensure new development contributes to a range of dwelling types in the area, to cater for all life cycles. Again, not consistent. The only dwelling type included in this planning proposal is high-rise apartments.

There are no proposals – other than tokenistic offerings to make the plan sound more palatable – for low-rise or medium-density dwellings, such as townhouses and
40 terraces, which would give families and downsizers more long-term options. The developers talk about a range of dwellings. I assume they’re talking about a range of 50 square metre one-bedroom apartments to three-bedroom apartments, which are also quite small. The last thing this area needs is more stock standard, high-rise
45 apartments. There are already almost 2000 high-rise apartments in towers up to 48 storeys, approved and under construction in the Lane Cove Council area on the Pacific Highway near St Leonards. This is just in three separate developments. One

of the developers earlier, I think, attempted to classify St Leonards South as a medium-density plan. It's not. It's high-rise towers, which includes blocks of 15 and 19 storeys.

5 Apart from not providing any variety in dwelling types, the cumulative impacts of these developments on the area are yet to be realised. We don't need more high-rise apartments. The next design principle I will refer to is that of ensuring appropriate transitions to lower-scale buildings. Once again, not consistent. The draft 2036 plan is clear that appropriate transitions in scale to existing lower-scale areas, including
10 areas not proposed for height changes, are to be taken into account. This appears to be a very important consideration in the planning framework. Could you put up the next slide, please? The St Leonards South proposal creates unacceptable transitions to adjoining low-rise and medium-rise residential properties. The numbers in red are the heights of the buildings which adjoin the proposal. The ones in black are the
15 proposed heights. Properties at the northern end of Duntroon Avenue are five storeys.

Immediately next door to the north, a six-storey apartment building is under construction at 2 Canberra Avenue. That's in this area. That's the six storey. If this
20 plan is approved as displayed, these homes will be directly opposite 19 and 15-storey towers. This is neither fair nor reasonable. And, I might add, these residences also have the railway line at their backdoor. I guess nothing will be built there, though, so that might be a blessing. Low-density residential properties in Park Road West and River Road are opposite eight-storey buildings. Again, not reasonable. And many of
25 the residences in Marshall Avenue are six and seven storeys. They will be opposite 10, 12 and 15-storey towers, clearly inconsistent with the design principles of the draft plan. The heights along all of the perimeter streets need to be significantly reduced, so that existing residents are not swamped by new development. Another design principle of the draft plan is no additional overshadowing of public open
30 spaces. Clearly, this is not consistent again. Overshadowing and its cumulative effects is mentioned in several of the design criteria. Page 49 of the draft plan is unambiguous when it states:

35 *Amend planning controls to introduce solar height plans to prevent additional overshadowing of specific areas in winter between 10 and 3.*

Newlands Park is one of the specific areas included in the list of open space to be protected from additional overshadowing. From approved by yet to be built
40 apartment towers, Newlands Park will already be seriously affected by cumulative overshadowing impacts in the morning. I won't say everything I was going to say about Newlands Park; other speakers have covered it. But if you could please put up the next slide. The green outlined area is Newlands Park. I took this image from the development application submitted by JQZ, which was heard by the joint regional planning panel late last year.

45 It's for the development on the southern side of the Pacific Highway on the eastern side of the railway line – three towers up to 48 stories, 654 apartments. You can see

that much of the St Leonards South area and most of Newlands Park will be in shadow at 9 am. As if this level of overshadowing is not enough, the heights of the towers in the St Leonards South proposal create entirely unacceptable additional overshadowing effects on Newlands Park in the afternoon. Next slide please. This one shows that by 3 pm, the park is almost entirely in shadow. This is from the St Leonards South development. The area not in shadow is actually an unusable steep bank.

Newlands Park must not be subjected to any additional overshadowing. The draft plan is unequivocal on this. While on this point, I would also note that Top Spring, one of the developers in the St Leonards South area, recently submitted their own planning proposal to Lane Cove Council for their land holding. Obviously, realising their vulnerability to the overshadowing design principle of the draft plan, they asked for any future controls related to overshadowing of Newlands Park to be flexibly applied. As well, in their response to the 2036 draft plan, they devoted over one page of a five page submission to a section on overshadowing of Newlands Park, again asking for flexibility in the application of this important principle.

I suppose if you're a developer only interested in profit, never intending to live in the area, overshadowing of precious over space will have no effect on your living amenity. But for members of the community who live here, it's not okay. I would also suggest that access to sunlight after 3 pm in Newlands Park is also fundamental irrespective of whatever density is eventually approved for St Leonards South, there are going to be many, many new residents in the area when all the construction that has started is completed. After 3 pm when school is finished for the day is just the time that children need sunny outdoor areas in which to play.

To conclude, the scale of development proposed in this plan is too much, too high, too dense and too many people. The plan must be reduced in height, density and number of people. A reduction in height, density and number of residents in this proposal, along with design that focuses on outcomes and not profit, could go somewhere in making the proposal achieve consistency with the draft plan on many of the design criteria I've spoken about, especially overshadowing and transitions. I also want to say that many of the impacts of this proposal will be felt by those in adjoining council areas.

There has never been any notification about this plan to anyone living even just across the street, but in a different council area. So many local residents have only recently become aware of it. Those of us who belong to this community and want to remain in this community feel somewhat disenchanted that this plan was originally driven by people who no longer live in the area. Since then, the remaining community's voice seems to have fallen on deaf ears. Please hear our voice in your review and make a recommendation to the Minister that this is the wrong plan for this area. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Thank you. Our next speaker is Judith Croxall. Is Judith here? No. She's not with us. In that case, Lisa Perry.

MS L. PERRY: Hi. Lisa Perry. I live in Greenwich, and thank you for this opportunity. First of all, I would just like to say that South St Leonards is an unsuitable area and it cannot accommodate this high level of density. St Leonards does not have a primary school or a high school and with the proposed increase in population, this definitely needs to be addressed now. We need to know where it is going, the facilities that it may offer and be able to properly assess it as part of the overall plan. St Leonards does not have a church, therefore, there's no opportunity for the community to utilise the hall to accommodate for social or recreational activities – after school care, playgroup – those types of things.

Despite all of the development that it has already endured, currently the only supermarket is the IGA at the St Leonards station and since there isn't any attached parking facilities, it's, therefore, impossible to do a big family shop. You can only get as much as you can carry. There's no designated kiss-and-ride at the station and no taxi zones at the station. The nearest swimming pool is a long ride away in a bus ride away in Lane Cove or a train ride away in North Sydney and interestingly enough, Trent Zimmerman, our local MP, is campaigning for Commonwealth funds to actually fix up the pool there at Lane Cove. There's nowhere to kick a football around in the local area and there is nowhere to have a barbecue and for children living in the units, well, they definitely won't own a pet.

There is very limited over space for the number of residents in South St Leonards. Newlands Park is shaded and is a very difficult site. Gore Hill is used for sport and is booked out by Willoughby Council and shouldn't really be included as green space with this plan. It seems that you really need to leave St Leonards to be able to access all the necessary facilities. It appears that the required infrastructure as indicated on the infrastructure list is to be provided using special infrastructure charges or VPA. Developers are desperate to get this plan moving, exploiting as much air space as possible. Whilst at the same time, advising us of their lack of capacity to pay for infrastructure.

The Royal North Shore has already indicated its concern to manage the demands that the increase in population will bring. They have nowhere else to send people once the hospital is at bursting point. I have my own medical issues and I require to access the facilities at the Royal North Shore Hospital. I think it would be fair to say that I'm alive as a result of modern medicine and I also need to utilise a medical suite at 66 Pacific Highway. That's a suite that has many, many specialists working out of there and because there's no designated patient car parking, we rely on street metered parking which I understand that the council has the intention of removing in order to improve the exit capacity from Berry Road to Pacific Highway.

In all honesty, my doctor has indicated to me it's probably easier for me to whip up the highway to Wahroonga to attend an appointment at 6 am in the morning rather than negotiate the difficulties around St Leonards. I appeal to you, the panel, to think very deeply when considering this plan, this development on steroids plan. It's the biggest social experiment of our time, a mass high density everywhere – the proposed development consisting of numerous imposing towers, unattractive and

litter in the skyline. If this is allowed, I feel that in the future, we will regret this action. 40 years from now, when these buildings are decaying high in the sky, too ugly to stay but too expensive to go, we will all wonder how could it be that that this was allowed. Developers must not influence the outcome of your decision.

5

Please think about the social impacts of this plan. Mental health and obesity are major issues for some and I have not seen any studies that have been undertaken in that regard in respect of this plan. I would like to see the entire plan for the South St Leonards Residential Precinct scrapped and rethought with the community being on board from day one. I would definitely like to see town planners planning this city rather than developers who motives may only be financially driven. Spot rezoning by developers is not the best way forward for St Leonards. Like the previous speaker, I also have been made aware that this plan could be easily pulled, except that there could be consequences. I'm yet to determine what those consequences are despite asking.

20

25

A lot of the development that has already occurred in Lane Cove, St Leonards, Crows Nest, Wollstonecraft area, and you're probably aware of 460 units recently approved on the Channel 9 site in Artarmon. We have already experienced an unacceptable level of traffic congestion and the level of development that has occurred today and with other development currently underway on the highway at St Leonards, it's only going to get worse. In the proposed special infrastructure booklet under Progressing the Plan for St Leonards and Crows Nest, it promises collaboration with Lane Cove, North Sydney and Willoughby Council. This is really important because we are already affected by the level of development that is occurring.

30

35

40

I will just – I just like to say that in the proposed special infrastructure brochure, it also states that the department will work closely with each council and other State Government agencies to implement the plan and deliver priority infrastructure in tying with demand and this is simply not happening. At a Lane Cove Council meeting on 20 August 2018, councillors unanimously moved a motion to write to the then Planning Minister, Anthony Roberts requesting immediate moratorium on new development. They unanimously recognised and agreed that infrastructure was not keeping up with the pace of development. Gladys Berejiklian also placed a hole on development in Ryde for the very same reasons. The development that is being proposed at St Leonards replacing 138 houses with 2400 units is a gross overdevelopment of the area. It is irresponsible to continue to develop areas in such a manner where roads are becoming dangerous to navigate and emergency vehicles risk being held up.

45

I won't go on about the roads being congested. You know about that. The only – in my opinion, the planning proposal for South St Leonards Residential Precinct does not comply with the guiding design principles: meet solar height planes; consideration of quality streetscapes; aspects such as setbacks, street wall height and heritage buildings; acknowledge key views and vistas, such as long-distance vistas which offer sky view and vistas where a building may terminate the view; avoid a

monolithic street-wall effect, through the distribution of higher building. I would like to request that the Commission think hard about this decision, and I request that you do not support this plan. Thank you.

5 MS MILLAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Don Murchison. Is Don with us?
Yes.

MR D. MURCHISON: Good afternoon, Madam Speaker and panellists. Thank you for the opportunity to talk today. I'm Don Murchison, of Innes Road, Greenwich.
10 I'm currently on the school council at Greenwich Public School, Lane Cove Council's Bicycle Advisory Committee, and a committee member of the Greenwich Community Association. I'm speaking today as a private resident with concerns, not representing any one particular group.

15 Thank you to the previous speakers, who have given fantastic speeches today, and addressed some of my concerns that I have with regards to high-rise creep and also the precedent it would set for our area. I'm here today to talk about two topics: the effect of the massive population increase on Greenwich Public School, and active transport solutions to chronic traffic congestion in our area.

20 I will begin with education. I have two children at Greenwich Public School: my son is at the kindy campus, on Greenwich Road, and my daughter at the Kingslangley campus. Both campuses are undergoing significant building work to accommodate an increase in their rolls. The playgrounds in both schools have been
25 chronically depleted as a result of the building work which is currently in progress. Once completed, both campuses will be able to contain more children, with less open space.

30 There are many pressures on the school, which to date has had a village-type atmosphere, rather than the hustle and bustle of a busy metropolis. Parents don't want to see the personable tone of the school changed. With the massive increase in dwellings proposed for St Leonards South, from 138 to 2400, I can't see how Greenwich Public School can contain such an increase in kids. Figures are floating around that this will result in 240 extra kids on the roll, and also another 150 kids for
35 high schools. I contend that these figures are significantly less than would be the case.

The array of 12 demountables which are currently on the Kingslangley site are supposed to be removed so the netball courts can be reinstated. At present, they
40 house about 250 kids. The new Kingslangley building is planned to house approximately – well, approximately 320 kids, with 16 new houses – new classes, rather – which leaves 70 kids left for St Leonards South at the Kingslangley Road campus, and, of course, that doesn't include the extras – there will be extras that will be available for the Greenwich Road campus.

45 The – so at St Leonards South – and where will the additional kids go? With local high schools at capacity, where will high school kids go? We're told that there will

be a new school at St Leonards. Where is the planning for this? No one wants to see their kids at a school on the top of a high-rise building, where the only benefit is one of the best views of the Sydney fireworks.

5 School pick-up and drop-off times at Greenwich Public School is like Piccadilly
Circus, with traffic in all directions, and sometimes lined up right the way back to
River Road. Because stage 1 classes have been added to the Kingslangley campus
this year, due to the rebuild at Greenwich Road, half the school now has to exit at
10 3.10 via a gate into Henningham Park; the path from the road to the school won't
accommodate the extra kids. Furthermore, the teachers are to lose their car park, so
where will they park, without competing for four-hour parking on the street and
lugging books long distances from their cars to the school – to the classroom?

This leads me to my second topic, active transport. Riding to schools is a solution to
15 relieve chronic localised traffic congestion. Indeed, it is quicker to ride to school
than travel by car – and that's currently. However, most parents won't allow this,
because there isn't functional off-the-road infrastructure. There needs to be a shared-
user path or separated off-the-road infrastructure to all schools in the area, and,
critically, from St Leonards South to both campuses of Greenwich Public School.

20 At present, there is a 19th-century goat track of a footpath at the narrow cliff section
of River Road, where cars whiz past up to 80 kilometres an hour, and many parents
won't allow their kids to walk, due to safety concerns. This is approximately 200
metres from Greenwich Public School. After years of lobbying Council and the New
25 South Wales Government, and despite falling boulders, this has still not been
widened to a shared-user path and made safe. So what confidence do we have that
the proposed cycling infrastructure planned for St Leonards South will be built? And
if it is, will it be constructed before residents move in, or in donkey's years' time?

30 To Lane Cove Council's credit, there is planned shared-user pathway infrastructure
for St Leonards South, and this I strongly endorse. However, this is needed now,
with the existing population. Given that Lane Cove Council's reluctance to commit
to sufficient previous active transport funding, and its current bike budget of only
150,000, I think – sorry about that. Wasn't thunder; no electrical storms – I think
35 priority and more substantial government funding, coupled with developer
contributions, is absolutely essential.

Vital active transport infrastructure must include a ramped bridge crossing River
Road, linking Berry Street to Wilona Avenue and the laneway leading to Greenwich
40 Road. This could be at a sufficient elevation to reduce uphill climbs that would be
associated with the more dangerous crossing at Canberra Avenue. The traffic lights
proposed for Canberra Avenue raise all sorts of safety issues for cyclists and
children. A bridge would give safe and direct access to the schoolkids to Greenwich
Road campus, and also to Wollstonecraft Station, which for many in St Leonards
45 South will be closer than St Leonards Station.

There needs to be – secondly – there needs to be significant investment in off-the-road cycling infrastructure beyond St Leonards South, which directly links to Greenwich, Crows Nest, the Kingslangley campus, Willoughby and the Lane Cove town centre. This means the small stretch of shared-user pathway on River Road
5 needs to be extended, to stretch from Canberra Avenue to the entrance to the Lane Cove Golf Course, then through the bushland to 266 Longueville Road, as is planned in part of a seniors development there, and onwards beside Longueville Road to the Lane Cove town centre. This would then enable St Leonards South residents to access the shops, the libraries, aquatic centres, tennis courts and other destinations
10 and amenities that are not currently available in St Leonards South.

The narrow footpath on the bridge crossing of the railway line over River Road needs to be made safe, with an active transport underpass that directly links St Leonards South to Greenwich and Crows Nest. Shared-user pathways need to be
15 completed along Greenwich Road to the Greenwich Public School, and likewise along St Vincents Street and Kingslangley Road to Kingslangley Campus. Shared-user pathway or off-the-road cycling infrastructure needs to link St Leonards to – or St Leonards South – to St Leonards Station, the Crows Nest Metro, North Sydney at Nicholson Street, and Willoughby at the crossing of Berry Road to Reserve Road and
20 Royal North Shore Hospital. This would then link to Willoughby Council's proposed shared user pathway along the Pacific Highway from St Leonards Station to the Epping Road Cycleway at Epping Road.

The proposed shopping plaza – nearly finished. The – thank you. I passed too many niceties at the beginning, I think. The proposed shopping plaza over the railway line at St Leonards, which will link Canberra Avenue to Lithgow Street, must include an active transport link, free of steps and lifts – and that's very important; you can't expect parents to be pushing prams up steps, and so on and so forth, and likewise
25 cyclists e-bikes, etcetera. There should be no steps on any footpaths, so they are all cycle- and pram-friendly. The previous underpass by the railway line at St Leonards needs to be reopened as an active transport link to Willoughby and the Gore Hill Freeway cycleway.
30

In summary, traffic congestion is already chronic. People in Greenwich now have to
35 queue hundreds of metres to cross River Road. School pick-up and drop-off time is a nightmare. Our area can't cope with the extra traffic burden of St Leonards South. St Leonards South can't be treated in isolation. It is part of the big picture for active transport in Lane Cove and, indeed, also for North Sydney and Willoughby.

40 So substantial government funding must be committed to ensure active transport infrastructure is meaningful and substantial and likewise, so new appropriate schools are built and existing schools, especially Greenwich Public School, are not overcrowded. The safety predicaments, without proper shared user pathway or separated, off the road cycleway infrastructure, are too dire to comprehend. Thank
45 you for listening to my concerns and for my over time.

MS MILLAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Steven Mandalidis. Is that - - -

MR S. MANDALIDIS: Yes. So my name is Steven Mandalidis. I'm a local resident and I speak on my behalf. As a local resident, I support a coordinated plan led by the Department of Planning for the entire precinct. This includes the area bounded by River Road, Greenwich Road, the railway line and Pacific Highway.

5

The draft plan fails to address the two and a-half streets that are wedged between the proposed – the proposed site on the eastern side and the commercial buildings on Pacific Highway and Greenwich Road. I propose a mix of commercial buildings on the eastern side and high density residential on the western side of the St Leonards South precinct. This would deliver on one of the key land use objectives in St Leonards, as an employment hub. High density residential buildings can be slimmer and taller, to mitigate problems with open space and access to sunlight.

10

I suggest the rejection of the proposed plan by the Lane Cove Council. The plan fails to deliver some of the key areas of employment, liveability, build form, land use and movement of people. It fails on employment and land use, as the entire plan is geared towards high density residential. It fails on liveability and employment, as there are barely any commercial – any commercial space allocated. There is an emphasis on residential units over commercial spaces.

15

Furthermore, there is a lack of genuine open space and access to sunlight. The Department of Planning and Environment has a guide of 2.83 hectares per 1000 people, which the plan fails to achieve. The figure of 21 hectares of open space and parklands is misleading. It is currently 12.7 hectares of open space with the remaining 8.3 hectares outside the boundary of the draft plan area. It fails on built form, as the buildings proposed are walls and concrete blocks that does not have any architectural merit. More open space is essential to support active living, making it a liveable community and to give our children open space for active play.

20

Again, it fails on movement and people, as the plan only connects people from Park Road East to St Leonards and it leaves the majority of people from the western side with no clear connections to key places of infrastructure. The connection is hemmed in by large wall to wall high rise residential, which can lead to safety issues for pedestrians. The plan fails to adequately deal with the massive traffic congestion that will clog up our roads and place enormous pressure on our infrastructure.

30

35

Furthermore, there is an overwhelming dissatisfaction from the local community with council's proposed plans for St Leonards South. In the last community consultation, held in – held by council in 2018, there were over 350 submissions made by the community. The submissions have not been made public, as the majority of the submissions sought to reject the council's proposed plan. We seek a better planning outcome.

40

I support the use of Artarmon as a key light industrial area. I also support the meaningful open space and connections of the quality and size to accommodate a range of recreational pursuits. A connection from Greenwich Road to key pieces of infrastructure, supported by commercial spaces along these connections.

45

In summary, the proposed plan by Lane Cove Council does not deliver good planning outcomes. It does not have the support from local residents and therefore, the plan must be abandoned for a better planning outcome. It does not meet the needs for public space, employment, liveability or liveable connections.

5 Furthermore, there is minimal access to sunlight, open space and a disconnect from the community. There is an emphasis on residential units over commercial spaces, small, useless pocket parks over large parks, and inadequate green connections. I support the state government to take over the planning for St Leonards South. A mix of commercial buildings on the eastern side and high density residential on the
10 western side of the St Leonards South precinct. Thank you for your time.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Brendan Morse.

15 MR: He had to go.

MS MILLAR: He has had to go? And Diane Willis. Is she here?

20 MS D. WILLIS: Greetings. I'm Diane Willis and I live in Anglo Road. The planning proposal for the St Leonards South residential precinct is a massive overdevelopment and is inconsistent with the Department of Planning and Environment's draft St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Plan. Accordingly, I wish to comment on the specific issues referred to by the planning minister to the Independent Planning Commission:

- 25 (1) Accessibility of St Leonards and Crows Nest – to St Leonards and Crows Nest Stations. Access to St Leonards Station from St Leonards South depends on climbing to the high point of the area, the highway. The concentric circles drawn on the Department's maps purport to show proximity to the train stations but they fail to warn of the significant aerobic exertion needed to get up the high point to St Leonards Station.
- 30 (2) Minimising overshadowing of public open space and streets. The proposal for St Leonards South permits exemptions from the minimum requirement for sunlight access in the name of providing low-cost accommodation. In addition, overshadowing of south – of St Leonards South was – sorry; if additional overshadowing of St Leonards South was allowed, amenity would be greatly
35 compromised. The conditions that now provide light-drenched solar access, green, small, domestic gardens and tree-lined wide verged roads on the steep south-sloping topography should prevail. The proposed tall buildings do not factor in the steep south slope of the land and the shadows they throw.
- 40 (3) Minimising overshadowing of the heritage conservation areas and residential areas outside of the plan boundary. There is no evidence of the claim in the 2036 Plan that a connection to the past will be maintained by – by protecting heritage conservation areas, celebrating their historic character in the area. The St Leonards South proposal merely retains solitary heritage houses. These houses will be degraded when they are no longer located with their

contemporary neighbours but are instead challenged by massive residential towers.

5 The 2036 Plans also desires that the best bits of the surrounding leafy neighbourhood that the locals love will be bought into the heart of St Leonards for residents, workers and visitors to enjoy. The irony is that the St Leonards South precinct currently provides a leafy neighbourhood and celebrates the historic character of the area. In sunny weather, workers enjoy their lunch on the council verge outside my home. That area has life, scale, personality and is an area I love to live. I will need an extension.

10

MS MILLAR: That's okay. Please go ahead.

MS WILLIS:

15 (4) Ensuring new open spaces improves connections to existing surrounding open spaces. There needs to be more open green spaces. Gore Hill Oval in Willoughby's local government areas, Newlands Park and Smoothey Park should not be counted over and over again and somehow thought of as new green space. The proposed new park between Berry Road and Park Road is not large, is on a slope and would not be viable for ball sports or running.

20 (5) The cumulative traffic impacts. The proposal for St Leonards South will result in a huge increase of cars. The traffic studies obtained by council in 2015 show peak hour failure. In 2019, the traffic is worse. It is delusional to attempt to address car flow issues in St Leonards South by merely providing one new small shared road from Berry Road to Park Road and replacing the roundabout with a give way intersection.

25

(6) Transitioning buildings appropriately to lower-scale buildings. The St Leonards South plan fails to deliver on one of the key land use objectives, namely the provision of mixed housing. What is needed is medium density with a mix of housing, including social housing. Denser housing can be done creatively, not just row upon row of high rise. There is a golden opportunity here to show how development could be done sustainably and well.

30

The Commission has also requested to consider the scale of residential development contained in the proposal. The scale of the St Leonards South proposal is a major concern for many residents, as it will only exacerbate the overdevelopment of the St Leonards area that is now underway. The current version of the proposal extends to Park Road East and is unacceptable. It contemplates a dense, high-rise residential zone, housing 4800 residents. It does nothing to resolve the issues raised before and during 2015 and in fact makes them worse. The whole site needs to be rezoned to meet housing targets identified by the Greater Sydney Commission. Housing is important. Lane Cove Council is on track – even ahead – of the present target. Advice on whether some staging of the proposal is appropriate: reducing the density and the height of the St Leonards South proposal and providing a genuine mix of

35

40

housing types may make the proposal more acceptable to the community. Residents don't want to be looking at 10 and eight-storey apartment buildings, but instead should be able to enjoy gradual, sensitive height transitions of modest, low-rise neighbouring buildings. The type and extent of this and any development should be informed by good planning and excellent standards, aiming for moderate density done well. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Dr Greg Purcell. Not here? Not with us? Okay. And then we will move on to Gregory Perry, if he's with us.

MR G. PERRY: Thank you. Yes. Thank you for the opportunity of speaking here today. My name is Greg Perry. I'm a resident of Greenwich. I used to head up the Australian Equities division of Colonial First State. And at that time we were the biggest investors in toll roads in the country. In recent years, the Greater Sydney Commission has told communities all over Sydney how high to jump, when it comes to increasing population densities. But even the Federal Government recognised at the recent federal election that congestion is becoming a major issue for communities all over Sydney. All these developments I would classify as – for want of a better term – frogs in boiling water developments.

Property developers are allowed to rip and then hang on, we've got a problem, urban congestion and urban dysfunction. It's happening all over Sydney and now we have it here in St Leonards. As a resident of Greenwich for the last five years, to use the frog in boiling water analogy, we are at a tipping point in terms of congestion in and around St Leonards, due to cumulative over-development. St Leonards is a major juncture for roads leading into the city. Already Chandos, Albany Street and Greenwich Road are becoming over-burdened. Traffic congestion is fast becoming critical and worse.

At some stage in the future, we will also have cars from the Northern Beaches Tunnel, a new Cross Harbour Tunnel surging into the area, if they can surface. If South St Leonards is allowed to go ahead in its current form, it will need major increases in infrastructure, schools, preschools, childcare facilities, sporting grounds and maybe even a new hospital. But you can't build any more roads. It's a recipe for chaos. So I urge the committee to look at the development through the frogs in boiling water prism. Already we have the chair of the North Shore Hospital and Medical Staff Council, Dr Bruce Cooper – let me quote this – saying that:

The number of cases facing the hospital's emergency department was already growing at six per cent a year and was outstripping the current growth in population. We just can't absorb a further significant population increase.

He said:

If we have to turn people away, we won't have anywhere to send them.

Dr Cooper is also concerned about increased traffic congestion:

5 *This raises serious questions about how emergency vehicles will access the hospital, if the traffic is gridlocked, let alone how staff, patients and visitors will access the hospital –*

10 he said. To give another example of critical infrastructure – to give an example – which is growing at six per cent per annum, it is Sydney International Airport. It has been growing at that rate for the past 10 years.

15 Now, you can hardly get in and out of the place. It's chaotic. That will be the future for St Leonards, if this overdevelopment goes ahead. Proper planning and vision prevents poor performance, so, please, I ask you to look at South St Leonards not in isolation, but what it does for the overall development of the area. 400 cars will become at least 2000 cars, if South St Leonards gets the green light. I finish by saying we are already at a tipping point in South St Leonards, in terms of congestion. We do not wish to become an urban congestion nightmare, but that is the risk if all the current development proposals are allowed to proceed in their current form. It will overwhelm an area which is already being overwhelmed by overdevelopment.
20 Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Dr Greg Purcell, you're with us now. Would you like to speak now or in a minute or two?

25 DR G. PURCELL: No. I'm fine.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great. Just from the lectern.

30 MR MILLER: Excuse me, Doctor. You're talking to us. Thank you.

DR PURCELL: Okay. Sorry to be late. But my name is Greg Purcell. And how do I turn the thing on? Okay. That's fine. Thank you. Sorry to be late. I do apologise.

35 MS MILLAR: No.

DR PURCELL: Okay. So, look, my name is Greg Purcell. I'm an antitheist. And I put people to sleep on a regular basis. And I just hope I don't do that today – or at least if I do, I hope I can wake you up. I've been at Royal North Shore for quite some time. And I'm speaking on behalf of the Medical Staff Council from Royal
40 North Shore. And I needed to take this opportunity to give a narrative of poor old Royal North Shore, where it is today and how it got here. So it has been on the campus that it currently is for about the last 110 years. And for the first 40 or 50 of those, it was purely, entirely funded by a local businessman, local benefactors. And it was – and that continued. So if you wanted to be on the board at Royal North
45 Shore, you paid money to be on the board.

Now, it's quite the opposite. It opened with not enough beds and sort of everyday I think since that time it has never had enough beds. It used to be quite an open ward. We moved – I started when we had this hospital, which was about 35 years ago, 40 years ago. It had over 900 beds. And we've moved today to this new hospital – the
5 one you see on the campus at the moment – and it's built as part of a public-private partnership and I would have to say the outcome – it may look a new hospital, but it's a pretty mortifying experience as a hospital. It doesn't have enough beds. It's an anachronistic hospital, in that 70 or 80 per cent of the patients are in four and five bedded rooms.

10 In the rest of the world, you could not build a hospital like this. It is absolutely despairingly inadequate – today. If everyone's on the run, the only way you can get things done is to push, push, push. It is an unfortunate place. It is a difficult and complex place, because patients die on you. It's what's called a safety net hospital,
15 effectively, at the moment, because it does effectively just emergency work, and the medical patients are all unwell – can't be managed at home. The surgical patients are usually post-trauma or needing major surgery within a short period of time. It is a stressful environment. We went through, six or seven years ago, with the previous government, looking to redevelop the campus, and they wanted to build this new
20 hospital, a blue hospital.

MR MILLER: I'm sorry. I can't see what you're talking about, Doctor.

25 DR PURCELL: Sorry. They wanted to build this hospital, the blue hospital.

MS MILLAR: Can you see now?

MR MILLER: Yes, I can.

30 DR PURCELL: And this is the Kolling Institute. And then the government wanted to build all these other new buildings on campus. And it came to pass that the staff had to protest – we had to march down – the doctors, the nurses, in substantial – sort of – compromise of their – of their, you know, honourable intentions, had to march
35 down Macquarie Street to get a stop to this, because, of our 30-odd acres, more – you know – almost 20 acres has been donated, or achieved through benefaction. People gave land, because, as the hospital expanded, and, post the bridge, as the place expanded, we needed places. We needed – mothers wanted to – well, we thought it was a better outcome for mothers to deliver. People had diphtheria, typhoid,
40 etcetera.

So we bought land, and we ended up with 30-odd acres – over 30 acres. The government, effectively, when they started to run the hospital, in about 1950, to fund the hospital, took over all the land. And then they wanted to, basically, give it away,
45 or, you know, develop it, which was a dreadful – and we had to march, and – there was a change of government, and Jillian Skinner, at the time, changed her mind. Poor old Royal North Shore.

There is an ambition amongst the staff. It is to – we do – we do want to serve the community, but we also – in the geographic sense, once you're across the bridge, Royal North Shore is the senior premier hospital between here and the border. And we would like – the staff would like it to be an absolute iconic centre of excellence.

5 It's not listed in the top 10 hospitals in Australia, and a lot of that's to do with inadequate funding, inadequate resources, inadequate beds, an inadequate surgical load. That's the state of play as it stands today.

10 The hospital – because of the urgency with doing things, the hospital – the care of the hospital is not rated as good as it might be. That is, here, some 40 per cent – 60-odd per cent rate their hospital as very good, but that means, approaching 35 per cent don't regard it as being very good. They regard the interactions with the nurses and doctors as very good, but – and a lot of that's to do with, you know, difficulty with being – being cancelled, with not getting the operation done when you need it to be

15 done, and – and sharing rooms – unable to get sleep in these crowded bedrooms, etcetera, etcetera. So it leaves a lot to be desired at the moment.

Our emergency department receives the best part of – well – 200,000 presentations per annum, and a substantial 40 per cent of those are admitted. It's a huge case load,

20 a bigger case load. We don't have the same number of beds as PA, and yet we see more patients in emergency department. So we – everyone's on the edge. Every year, you've got to do 10 10 per cent more presentations, five per cent more admissions, on a one per cent budget increase. You know, you just can't – it wears people down, let me assure you.

25 So what – where – this is a sort of a – an icon I found with a view to the number of developments in the area. And there's no doubt the axis of development between the bridge and Chatswood and beyond is massive. It is massive. If we construct this Southern St Leonards, we will have some – we've been led to believe – we will have

30 over 2000 units. There will be an addition of almost 5000 new residents, and it says – what infrastructure's planned? Virtually none. There are no shops, no schools, no medical centres, no new roads and virtually no open space.

As for hospitals, we will not cope. We can't cope at the moment. We won't cope.

35 We will not cope with this incredible expansion, and they are not just the St Leonards but all of these other buildings – the Eighty Eight entity with, you know, 45 storeys, 500, 600 apartments, etcetera, etcetera. There's just no foresight into providing the infrastructure that is needed. How am I close to time? Keep going. So we know what the situation is with the forum and how that's developed, but you've

40 got things like the St Leonards Square from Mirvac, the – both of these buildings, the landmark and the St Leonards, they have over 500 apartments. The thing at Atchison, etcetera, etcetera, the – they wanted 51 storeys, but they've now only got 47 storeys, over 650 residences.

45 So we've heard that we're trying to – we've heard from the previous mayor of Lane Cove we're trying to rezone St Leonards to build up apartment living. This is an opportunity which has come at quite a time. That may be so. The difficulty with

getting councils involved with hospitals – I mean, they’ve removed themselves. It’s purely a State Government thing. But councils must prevail upon government to improve the beds and the resources in hospitals if they’re going to continue this sort of expansion of apartment living. A spokesman for the Planning Minister said the –
5 that there’ll be – 2.2 will be added in the next 15, 16 years, requiring more than 700,000 homes. That may be so, but we need the hospitals and the medical resources to cope with that. You’ve probably seen all these numbers before – what is that? Okay.

10 MS: Please - - -

MR: It’s an emergency warning.

DR PURCELL: It’s an emergency. That’s right.

15

MS: Please extend him extra time.

MS: Yes.

20 DR PURCELL: I - - -

MS MILLAR: No. You’ve got one more minute officially - - -

DR PURCELL: Yes.

25

MS MILLAR: - - - but, you know, you can go on for a couple of minutes if you like.

30 DR PURCELL: No. I think I’ve got the emotional side of the – emotional component out of the system. Thank you. I will leave it at that.

MS MILLAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Justin O’Farrell.

35 MR J. O’FARRELL: Hello, everybody. This is a model I prepared earlier. So I just thought I would bring that because it does demonstrate – I’m Justin O’Farrell. I live at Park Road east, just opposite – so – look, essentially, where this started is Lane Cove Council, from the start of this, in terms of consultation – when we went to speak to them, they said, “Look, it’s – this is all going to be developed. It’s just a question of how much.” Some time later, what happened is that they – with sort of
40 four days notice, on a Thursday – we were overseas at the time – there’s a proposal to develop this thing still further from the area, which is essentially from Berry, which is down here, to these extra things there.

45 This sort of talk about consultation, there was none, and then that all got approved on that night. So at that stage we consulted with council. We went to them. We spoke to them about it all, and they sort of said, “Well, that’s the way it is, and we’re not prepared to do any further consultation.” We then went to see our local member.

We had various meetings with them, and over a time it became apparent to us that there was just an inevitability about this whole development and that, essentially, what we needed to do was then say, “Well, we don’t want to be stuck.” So we’re living just opposite here. If you can see the difference in the scale between what is proposed – and we’re living in this house over here.

And we basically decided, “Well, if this is all going to go ahead, we’d prefer actually just to be getting out of here and exit gracefully,” and so we went to people and said, “Well, okay. You’ve now got an opportunity here to do a massive brownfield development if we can get support from the residents.” So we went round doorknocking, doing all sorts of things to get support from people, who said, “We don’t actually want the development, but if it’s going to happen and it’s inevitable, well, then just do the lot. It would make sense to have this thing as something which can be properly planned, as opposed to this big monolithic wall of apartments here.”

So all of us felt a bit stuck, and I understand you’re – the – you’re here today to talk about, you know, design, place, greenery, access. We’ve heard a lot about that today. That’s the sort of design that we got there: the monolithic blocks. Now – so that’s an example of what it looked like, and if you actually want an example of the design excellence which is coming forward, have a look at some of the development applications which are going forward. They’re just boxes. So there’s no – and what we’ve heard here today is that the height of those – people are saying, “Well, we’re unhappy with the height. Let’s increase it by another seven metres,” and we all know that what’s going to happen is that once this thing is – once you’ve got a plan there, we’re then going to have to – we’re going to have to deal with years of development applications which are asking to go outside those parameters.

One of the things that the council has tried to do is say, “Well, let’s make this very strict and box it in so developers can’t do this,” but actually what you’re hearing is that that’s exactly what’s proposed. So I’m struggling to see any evidence of design excellence in this. History has shown that developments of this sort of nature over the world – so looks like very much the Soviet Bloc architecture – they end up with soulless dark windswept. They’ve knocked this sort of ***** down in the UK, and they’re now trying to do other things: Elephant and Castle and those sorts of things. So the other thing is what kind of design excellence leaves out half of the precinct from the design? There’s no indication as to what’s to happen to the rest of this area between Park Road and Greenwich Road up until the year 2036.

So all of this is part of the study area but actually then wasn’t addressed in any – it’s just been left, and then the State Government has sort of said, “Well, the council had progressed its things. We won’t even talk about that.” So one of the things that we’re sort of saying about it is, “Well, do one of two things. Either plan this thing properly, address the issues which everybody’s talked about today, do it as a whole site, or, alternatively, scale it back massively,” and that’s basically the – that’s basically where we’ve been coming from.

So there is a massive opportunity here to plan a new community in a cohesive way. It is an incredible opportunity, this site. It's only 10 ks away from the city. To build something here which people would like to come to, to have – you could do showcase of the world sort of stuff here, right, but if you build this sort of ****, it is not going to be in any way like that. So the only redeeming feature of this is meant to be this park here. You see the – you know, the famous green corridor, you know, the spine.

Now, what the story's – you heard here earlier today the amount of money which it actually – these things are selling for. So just next to that – how – to there – the last one that sold was for about twelve-two, I think, per square metre. So what the council has done is said, "We need to resume this land in order for this to happen." What they've done is they've relied on those three, you know, seven and a half thousand, all those sorts of things. They've relied on those to say how much it is it's actually going to cost them to compulsorily resume that park, but there's no way that anybody who is actually living in one of those houses is going to accept that because they'll go along to court and they'll say, "Well, I'm sorry. All of the houses in this area are selling for 4000 a square metre more than that."

So the costings of this – we've asked the council about this, and they get very hazy when we say, "Will you actually be able to deliver that park?" and they're not sure, and I think they're right not to be sure because of the amount that's going round for the other blocks. Okay. So then going on to place. A huge issue for this site – and we've all heard about it – is solar access. Right. So that is a massive issue for this site. The sun comes in from this direction in the morning. In the afternoon, you get shaded by those buildings. All of these areas down here, they are all planned to go up. We had a meeting with the – with some of the people there. They're going to put in proposals for all of those to go up. This area here is going to be hemmed in from all sides, but still people say, "We're not going to do anything about it."

So our thinking is that if you have a solar access problem – we spoke to the Department of Planning. They said, "Look, one of our main concerns with this sort of south-facing slope is solar access. You need to do something more intelligent with solar access than that." So I don't know whether that's more widely spaced buildings, some taller, different sort of – different heights at different spots. I don't know exactly what the answer is; I'm not a planner. But that you know is going to be a recipe for disaster. So that's the – the other thing about this – I've had interesting conversations about overshadowing of public spaces. Let's not overshadow any of those, but when it comes to all these houses here, that's fine. What are you meant to do, sort of live in a – in darkness, you know, write your Dostoyevsky? So there is a question, you know, frankly, as to whether this site is appropriate for this kind of development at all.

So then greenery. Look, the idea is that all the trees are going to be cut down, and what's going to happen is that they're going to plant new ones, and in time they'll grow, and then you'll have a series of trees planted in front of 10 to 12-storey buildings, as though somehow that eradicates the buildings. I mean, looking at the

pictures, if – one – when you go through, you’ll see that – you’d almost think that the proposal is for a new forest in the area. Everything’s leafy. It’s, you know, maintaining the – you know, the greenery of the area. Where is the bloody concrete?

- 5 So access. So traffic. Can I recommend you look carefully at the traffic studies? One of the persons mentioned here before but they have done a – a traffic model and in that model, it said – they had a glitch in the – in the modelling software. So this is seriously what is being put forward. Right. They had a glitch. And what they found is that they could fix that glitch by converting a roundabout into a give way sign.
- 10 This is on – this is on Berry. They said, “When we did that, the model all worked.” The recommendation which they have made to fix traffic congestion in the area – this is 5000 more people coming to the area and they’re saying the recommendation is to change that roundabout into a give way sign. I mean, Jesus wept.
- 15 So the current proposal is that this be deferred to the DA stage. And how is that meant to work? So all the developers are going to get out there and say, well, I recommend the traffic be dealt with in this area. Look, so, a conclusion, what has been suggested is, look, we – what we’re saying about it is, plan the thing properly. Plan the whole of the precinct. Actually seek to address some of these issues, solar
- 20 access, sense of place, design, that sort of thing.

- We appreciate that in some cases it may be necessary to compromise, that an hour – hour and a-half of sunlight, which they’re saying is appropriate. If you read, they’re saying an hour and a-half of sunlight is appropriate for a day. It may be necessary in
- 25 some cases. Why is it necessary here? Is it just because the developers have bought the land? So – or is the idea to cram as many people as possible and ignore any evidence which is inconvenient before us? So – or otherwise, why not scale the thing back significantly and see how you go? Assess what actually can be managed in this area. If there’s already large amount near the station, maybe take it back a
- 30 few streets and see how it goes. At the moment, this thing neither works for developers, nor for the residents, nor for the people in the surrounding communities. A possible conclusion might be, it hasn’t been properly planned.

- MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Kim McIntyre.
- 35

- MS K. McINTYRE: Hello. I live in Park Road West with my husband, the previous speaker, and our three young children. Our home is one of the heritage listed properties. So from my front door, I look out over the eastern part of St Leonards South, towards Crows Nest and North Sydney. Embassy Toward in
- 40 Marshall Avenue is prominent and substantial. It’s a really big building. It houses 269 apartments.

- So what does 2400 apartments within my field of view look like? That would be nine Embassy Towers. All between Park Road and Canberra Avenue. That is a
- 45 confronting image. However rearranged and density managed and whatever, it is a massive volume of apartments to impose on a relatively small area and a huge

number of residents. And fundamentally, this scale impacts the design, the built form and the capacity to create a liveable environment.

5 So as we've heard, the proposal is for row upon row of monolithic rectangular apartment blocks. The sheer scale of the buildings – these buildings and their unrelenting form, packed onto the south facing slope, is destined to create a shady and gloomy area that leaves little space for community or vibrancy, which are two of the distinct sort of qualities that are emphasised in the 2036 Plan.

10 We've heard about the transition at Newlands Park. The proposed Park Road transition is very poor planning. It's inconsistent with the vision of the 2036 Plan. It's inconsistent with the special design principle regarding transition. The southern section of Park Road is probably the steepest and the shadiest in the whole precinct, and yet that's chosen for the position to have one and two storey, single standing
15 homes, opposed to long blocks of eight storeys. It's extreme. It's unlike any transition to low density in the entire 2036 plan. Council's argument that 10 to eight storeys transitions down from the 30 and 46 storeys approved nearby in St Leonards sort of inverts the logic. The transition should be viewed from the perspective of the low density land and with the objective of creating a liveable precinct.

20 One of the challenges for the proposal is the overshadowing of surrounding low density homes. A special St Leonards South design principle refers to minimisation of overshadowing of heritage conservation areas and residential areas outside of the plan boundary. From the perspective of Park Road West, this misses the mark on
25 both counts. Park Road West is outside the rezoning area but inside the plan boundary, and so irrelevant. There are no heritage conservation areas anywhere near St Leonards South. There is, however, a group of heritage listed properties in Park Road West but they are not in a conservation zone, and so irrelevant.

30 It's hard to concede why this special St Leonards South design principle was drafted, other than, I suppose, to account for the fact that it's a really poor planning proposal that doesn't actually conform otherwise to the 2036 guidelines. There is another special St Leonards South design principle that addresses overshadowing the streets with a public domain function. In Park Road West, we are wondering why
35 overshadowing a public street should be guarded against but not overshadowing our homes and gardens.

I had lots of things to say about the park in Park Road and the roads. I will skip over that because lots of other people have and move on to heritage. Council proposal is
40 inconsistent with the protection of heritage. The heritage properties in Park Road will be dwarfed and overwhelmed by the eight storey apartment blocks proposed the other side of the road. Council's heritage report acknowledges that the setting of the heritage properties will be radically transformed by the scale of development proposed, which well exceeds even the scale of the commercial buildings on the
45 Pacific Highway, and that was evident – yes, evident from here. The scale is actually more on par with the – what I call the blue building, on the corner of Greenwich

Road and Pacific Highway, which is a substantial 10 to 12 storey building up there, and that's the kind of scale that we're looking at.

5 The Weir Report, which is part – the Heritage Report for the 2036 Plan, notes that the proposal creates risks for heritage properties through loss of setting. Potential concessions around a few extra metres of setback make little difference to this position, given the scale and location of what is proposed. In response to the gateway conditions in September 2017, council states that the proposed park will be – which we heard about earlier, with issues around pricing and shading etcetera, etcetera – is to be located immediately opposite the heritage items. This is not
10 accurate.

The Development Control Plan indicates that two of the three heritage properties are to sit directly opposite a block that is to be up to 35 metres long and eight storeys
15 high. In fact, it seems to align with the sole vehicle entry point for this building with my front door. My heritage property front door. The conclusions of council's heritage report, which are rather tentative, I must say, rely on an extended six metre setback of the apartment block opposite from the northern side boundary of the park. The effect of that is to – sorry – is to push the apartment block further up the hill and
20 away from the heritage – would be to push the apartment block further up the hill. However, this setback is not reflected in the Development Control Plan, which is where it should be if it still eventuates, presumably.

I note that a similar thing happens with the shadow diagrams around the shadow of
25 the park. There is an extended setback shown from that northern park boundary that is not replicated in the Development Control Plan.

The importance of preserving solar access for heritage properties is specifically noted in the Weir Heritage Report. The heritage properties will be deprived on morning
30 sun. This does make a difference because the orientation of the properties – and overshadowing from buildings further up the hill. Being constructed in the early 1900s, the buildings were not designed or orientated to maximise solar access in a high density setting as proposed. The sun that floods into the front of my home early in the morning is an important part of the amenity of the heritage property as a home,
35 particularly as it occurs in a time we're actually all home. The morning solar access would be blocked by the apartments. The heritage properties currently have far-reaching district views towards North Sydney and even CBD. These will be lost completely.

40 Privacy will also be affected. The Development Control Plan supports apartment design, including balconies to enable passive surveillance of the street. This will equally allow surveillance of our front gardens and homes, given the proximity and the eight storey scale, options for effective tree screening are limited. The Weir Heritage Report specifically states the trees proposed as mitigation measures to
45 address transition to low density should be located on the high density land and not the low density. This will not be effective, given the scale proposed.

In short, council's proposal will significantly decrease the amenity of the heritage properties. The Weir Report, again, states:

5 *It is critical that the amenity of heritage listed buildings is protected. If amenity is substantially reduced, the desirability of properties will be eroded and their long-term protection threatened.*

10 The Weir Report also addresses strategies for optimising the limited development potential of heritage buildings as a means of protection. Council's proposal does not address these and, indeed, any such potential as heritage items would seem to be closely tied to preservation of amenity, which brings me to this point. If the heritage of St Leonards South is to be protected, it must be properly included in planning that protects its heritage values, its amenity and its economic viability in private hands, or appropriate plans made for conversion to some public purpose.

15 However, if the character of St Leonards South is to be so radically altered that heritage classification cannot be properly supported, then that classification should be removed. And I note that is at odds with all of the objectives of the 2036 Plan and personally, I think, would be a very poor outcome but with what has been proposed, if that is approved as proposed, that will be the outcome.

20 So that brings to – finally to what would a proper area – plan for the area look like? Well, as we've heard, the study area for the plan includes all of the St Leonards South precinct, defined by four very distinct boundaries. Council's proposal covers most of this precinct but leaves out a small group of two and a-half streets of low density dwellings, including the seven heritage listed properties. These residents have to carry the most significant burdens of redevelopment, loss of amenity, property devaluation, years of life in a construction zone with no corresponding benefits and, frankly, years of uncertainty, particularly given, as we've been told, it will all eventually get to Greenwich Road.

25 That's what we've been told at various stages by politicians and all sorts. Aside from council's proposal, the 2036 plan proposes nothing at all for the St Leonards South Precinct. This means it is important that whatever is approved for St Leonards South works for the entire precinct. Now, what would this look like? A plan for the precinct could provide for increased density in a more balanced way taking account of the difficult topography, overshadowing issues, providing useable open space, effective connections and a mix of development conducive to a community.

30 A plan for the whole precinct could address the likely future need to increase capacity of River Road to the south. A plan for the whole precinct could consider the commercial buildings along the Pacific Highway, I'm nearly done, and at the top of Greenwich Road and how their future inevitable redevelopment might impact or be impacted by the area that they overshadow to the south. A plan for the whole precinct could provide a more certain and equitable outcome for the residents of St Leonards South that are otherwise left behind. Alternatively, in the current climate, the only plan in the precinct for the next 18 years, to 2036, is high density residential

and this should be restricted to the areas closest to the station so that the remaining low density homes are not overwhelmed by large apartment blocks and can retain their amenity and collective sense of identity. Thank you. Sorry for going over time.

5 MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is John Dowey.

MR J. DOWEY: Madam Chair, Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen. Firstly, thank you for the opportunity to speak this afternoon. My name is John Dowey and I'm a long-term Greenwich resident who's very concerned about the increased traffic
10 resulting from the St Leonards South plan development and the obvious constraints on egress we're dealing with in respect of this site. I speak as someone who is already experiencing bottlenecks when going to and from my home each day. And on this, I'm somewhat surprised and disappointed that the various inferences from the developers today that, the existing infrastructure is coping. I would say that is
15 unsupported and it's incorrect.

On this, I challenge anyone to go to some of the existing bottlenecks each day to see this evident. You can see that people exiting Greenwich Road into River Road, but for one example, or you can see that people struggling to get through the bottleneck
20 which is Shirley Road up to the highway. There's similar examples all along River Road at Riverview, Northwood and Longueville. And none of this actually reflects the impact of the incremental and major residential construction that has been spoken about earlier today.

25 These would obviously expected to compound the current issues with the traffic. This is really not surprising because on the maps that are clearly shown up here, the St Leonards site is clearly an island. The only two spots – the only two conduits to exit are the Pacific Highway and River Road and both of them are constrained. Some of the better and earlier speakers have already described in great detail the
30 problems caused. So I won't labour this point in this sort of graveyard shift after lunch to do it, but, obviously, I think you've got more than enough detail there.

So I've been waiting for – and I think noting this timing – I've been listening patiently to any answer to these things and I haven't heard it. And I do note, that
35 Roads and Maritime Services in their letter to the council dated 26 February 2018, and I quote, they:

40 *...consider the modelling analysis undertaken for the subject planning proposal as an inadequate and limited in scope. In that, it doesn't address the cumulative traffic impacts associated with the proposed development and the full development uplift of the planned precinct.*

From what I've heard and from what I've seen submitted in these May submissions to yourselves as the panel, this remains unanswered. Tell me if I've missed it. So I
45 think it is unreasonable to look at the development solution in isolation and in the absence of a proper context of the entire development and the wider precinct impacting this. A further example of the expert reports that I've read on this site is

the Cardno report of 3 October 2018 prepared for the Department of Planning and Environment as a strategic transport study for the St Leonards and Crows Nest station precinct. This report says, and I summarise, that the increase in demands and I highlight it for – make sure I’m reading it correctly – but particularly this corner
5 around the station between Herbert and Christie Streets is already under significant pressure under all future scenarios. The demand is expected to exceed the capacity in this section of road for all tested future scenarios.

10 There’s a few tactical solutions put up and people have already spoken to that, but I think it becomes really clear when you go down to this portion of the map, which I make sure I get it there for people in the back, you’re dealing with River Road squeezing into one narrow piece on s-bends. There was a good picture showing what happened when it was flooded, so I’m not trying to go there. There’s some tactical things which then seem to squeeze into the park which seems to have been double-
15 countered in every benefit exercise put up by each developer earlier on, but that seems to be a potential road solution. But even if you solve that, you seem to squeeze onto a single lane bridge which would have every developer this morning say they’re not going to pay for. So I’m struggling see where we’re going with this, who’s going to pay.

20 In the interest of time, I would summarise that we have a site bounded by an over-capacity network. We have a recognition that the St Leonards South proposal should, but doesn’t incorporate the likely impacts from new developments in its broader assessment. We have but one example, and I think I heard him correctly, the
25 expert supporting the Country Garden development case saying that he was going to have an incremental impact of one per cent on the road traffic each morning. I think we need to have clarity on the definition of small or negligible used by the various developers because I challenge everyone waiting in traffic to, sort of, go, “I got one per cent there. I got one per cent there,” and whatever as you’re struggling to get
30 home. We don’t have a solution or a sustainable solution that I’ve heard or that I believe has been outlined, I’m getting to my last point, and we’ve got no one willing to pay for any of these solutions outlined. So we seem to have a problem for which we don’t seem to have a solution. So I would ask the panel to properly assess this and this difficult situation we’ve got to deal with, but do it properly, please. Thank
35 you very much.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you. Our next speaker is Bill Hartnell.

40 MR B. HARTNELL: Good afternoon. Based on the October 2018 Cardno Strategic Transport Study, developing South St Leonards should not be considered until well after the opening of the Sydney Metro. It is unclear whether the current proposals to massively increase development in St Leonards, Crows Nest area can be accommodated by the current road network and enhanced rail network. The Cardno
45 study revealed the road network will not be able to handle existing projected capacity by 2030 with the Pacific Highway at St Leonards station being key blockage.

Sydney's rail future notes that by 2031, demand will exceed total capacity on large sections of the existing T1-North Shore line between Chatswood and Wynyard. With the highway in T1 line projected to be exceeding capacity limits on an as is basis, only the Sydney Metro can make the planning proposal feasible. The primary
5 purpose of the Sydney Metro has been to provide a rail link from the north-west to the City. Whether the Metro can accommodate significant additional demand at St Leonards, Crows Nest cannot be known with any certainty at this time. The challenges have tried to reasonably and robustly forecast demand and available residual capacity on the rail line on the Metro are revealed by some apparent
10 anomalies in the Cardno Projected Data which may understate demand and which warrant further investigation.

An assumed approximate 35 per cent increase in cars in the am peak from the low scenario to the high scenario, yet when it's put into the traffic modelling, it only
15 shows a five to seven per cent increase in traffic on the highway south of St Leonards station. Yes. The high scenario has a 35,000 increase in residents, but only a 9000 increase in departing trips by trains in the morning. Yes.

The high scenario will involve nearly 30 per cent of the stated capacity on the two
20 rail lines being used solely for trips from St Leonards/Crows Nest. Looking at those numbers, you think that the demand may well be understated. Projections may be able to be improved and made more robust, but only to a point. And note that the projections would be improved by also including probability scenarios at P10, P50 and P90.

When it's proposed to add up to 35,000 people in an area of about one kilometre square, and encourage billions of private investment, you would need to be certain that public transport and the road network can support such extreme density. The
25 key point is what residual rail capacity will be available for St Leonards/Crows Nest commuters, when you've already got North West and North Shore commuters already on the trains. The Sydney Metro can be expected to be very popular with these commuters, due to the speed, shorter distance to the city, and new station locations. We will only know what actual passenger capacity is available for St
30 Leonards/Crows Nest once the Metro has been opened and operating for at least a few years.

Where there is uncertainty about the capacity of infrastructure to meet demand, then it's crucial that development is phased until better and more reliable information can be gathered. Consideration of any further development in this area should wait until
40 then. Robust planning decisions can only be made with reliable transport data, because, once approved, the construction of additional residences can't be undone, especially if the transport projections are not right and transport capacity can't meet demand. If the projections are wrong then the result is a planning and residential nightmare. And the experience at Green Park and Mascot has been that high density
45 does cause significantly increased traffic and rail congestion, especially in the peaks.

In the meantime, this area is making a significant contribution to new residences through the ultra-high rises approved for the – already approved for the area before there was any additional rail capacity and without augmentation of the road network. And note that gridlock on the Pacific Highway around Royal North Shore cannot be
5 allowed. Effective emergency ambulance access must maintain at all times of the day. Further, unmodelled traffic demand may also arise for the Pacific Highway, depending on the tolling arrangements for the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link. Congestion on the Pacific Highway between Artarmon and North Sydney
10 would be even worse if, because of the new road capacity, tolls were effectively applied to the Gore Hill and Warringah Freeways.

Tolls on the two freeways and extensive high-density development in this area are mutually exclusive. In conclusion, development decisions for this area cannot be made with confidence at this time. For Sydney Metro, it's the rationale for the extra
15 development that the actual peak hour capacity available at both St Leonards and Crows Nest Stations cannot be known with certainty until the latter 2020s.

MS MILLAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Robert Hunter.

20 MR R. HUNTER: Good afternoon. I'm Robert Hunter. I'm a local resident. I live in Greenwich. My expertise is in architecture and building, and my experience is in the design and construction of major projects, development, large – and large major infrastructure projects. Right. My first point is that the draft master plan should have reduced population density and reduced building heights. The current plan, as
25 no doubt many people have said, is 2400 dwellings. That equates to 4800 people. And when you add that to the populations – the increased populations in the major projects in the area, it's going to be far too many people for the area.

The building heights in the draft master plan are 15 to 19 floors near the station, and
30 eight to 10 at the edge. This is too bulky and too overpowering, and there's too much over-shadowing of the very precious and limited green space. There's no justification for the population of 4800 people. And there's no transparent correlation with the Greater Sydney Commission population targets. The current master plan does not meet the guiding design principles in the 2036 Plan in a number
35 of key areas, particularly in the design of the transition between low rise and high rise, as has been done for – or has been designed for Naremburn and Willoughby Road, where it has been sensitively handled.

It's totally ignored in St Leonards South, and the overshadowing of public open
40 spaces, especially Newlands Park, is a particularly bad outcome of this design. Any review of the feasibility study should not include the land values based – should not include land values based on the recent inflated sales in the precinct, which have been based on the FSR – the excessive FSRs in the draft master plan. The precinct population should be reduced by at least 30 per cent. The precinct should also have
45 low rise, and I'm – I – I'm suggesting – I believe maximum three floors, medium-density residential to the whole of Park Road, River Road and Canberra Avenue, to better manage the transition with the surrounding residential areas.

The second point I want to make is that River Road should be substantially improved. The road network round the precinct is finite and the increased population is going to have a huge impact on this network. River Road is one of the few opportunities for improvement, but it's at capacity in the morning and afternoon peaks, and also at other times in the weekends. River Road is a major east-west connector, and needs a significant upgrade.

It should be widened to two lanes in each direction, all the way from Crows Nest to Lane Cove, and it should have a shared bike path for its full length as well. There should be a pedestrian bridge connection over River Road from the St Leonards South precinct to access Smoothery Park and Wollstonecraft Station, and certainly the grades would facilitate that. This would give better access to green space, and better access for bike traffic.

The intersection at Duntroon Avenue and River Road should be upgraded and signalised, and should be the main point of access on the southern side of the precinct. And that would take some load off the access into the Pacific Highway, which is already overloaded, or will be overloaded in this – if this scheme goes ahead. Canberra Avenue should be closed, and the road alignment added to the limited green space. And also consideration should be given to upgrading the Greenwich Road intersection to improve its performance.

So, to recap, the current master plan should be amended; the population should be reduced by 30 per cent, and it should have two- to three-storey townhouses around the edges, to better relate to the other residential areas. River Road should be upgraded to provide better access, and to manage the increased traffic generated by the increased population in the precinct. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you very much. I had one last speaker for my speaker list, John Fitzgerald. Is John with us still? No? Okay. Well, I think that, then, closes my speaker list. I'd like to thank every one of you for attending today's meeting, and listening, you know, carefully and respectfully to everyone's presentations today. As I mentioned in my opening, this public meeting is just one part of our consideration of the process that we're undertaking to advise the Minister.

We will be meeting with Council later in this week, and we'll also be reviewing any further submissions that we receive in writing. And if people are making those submissions, if you could provide them to the Secretariat within the next seven days. Once we've received those submissions, you know, we'll then be looking at whether there's any additional information that we may require, but we'll endeavour to, you know, provide our advice to the Minister as soon as possible after – after that time. Once again, thank you very much for your time and patience today, and enjoy the rest of your afternoon. Close of business Monday for written submissions, if possible.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[2.45 pm]