

## **Submissions to MP10\_0198 – Mod 2 – Channel 9**

**My name is Philippa Smith.**

**I acknowledge progress and the need for development opportunities as they arise to provide for more housing.**

**I do oppose any change to the already approved scheme which after extensive community consultation and appeal processes were ‘settled’ until a new developer sought to significantly change the already approved concept plan.**

**I have lived at [REDACTED] since 1997. It is a known backroad to the Chatswood shops and travel to the Artarmon Railway Station.**

**My submission is representative of the views of the community of lower Sydney Street, Artarmon who were not able to attend the public meeting on 27 November 2018.**

### **1. Wind tunnel effect of the proposed change to the site plan.**

The currently approved Channel 9 site plan effectively creates a buffer from strong south east, south and south western winds, offering some protection to the streets north of the Channel 9 site namely Edward Street and Penshurst Street from the Penkivil Street intersection to the Laurel Street intersection.

The amended development plan proposes an effective wind tunnel from the Channel 9 escarpment which would have huge impact on the aforementioned streets, not to mention attempts to use the suggested available public use area between between the banks of 7-9 storey blocks on windy days.

The currently approved scheme provides readily available and obvious public use on the corner of Richmond Avenue and a buffer to those southerly winds.

The currently approved scheme with its public area on the Richmond Avenue/Artarmon Road corner, effectively replicates the location of structures currently on the Channel 9 site. It will continue to enable members of the community and those on the new site to enjoy the northerly sun in the absence of a wind tunnel.

## **2. When will it stop?**

The Channel 9 redevelopment has already gone through community consultation and appeal processes.

The IPC should not allow the already approved scheme to be overturned/changed for what is effectively a new scheme with significant changes impacting on the Willoughby community.

Since the original proposed scheme where the community sought no more than 300 units on the Channel 9 site, but after the appeal process, the final number was approved to 400 units, there is now a growing theme of recognition from all sorts of agencies identifying that Sydney is growing too quickly and it not supported by the infrastructure. This has come from members within political parties and other agencies.

Who will control applications in the future by the developer to 'fudge up' heights once any development is commenced? In owning a unit at Chandos St, St Leonards, it is apparent that once development is approved, so begins the round of applications for amendments, normally to height. Once a plan is approved, that should be it and the developer should be required to remain within that envelope.

Who will stop the 'fudging up'?

Who will stop ongoing development applications once an appeal process has been determined?

Should the IPC allow this new development application to succeed then it opens the floodgates as a precedent elsewhere.

## **3. Support of the issues raised by the community speakers on Tuesday 27 November 2018 at the public meeting.**

I support Mr Wilton's presentation which was on behalf of a larger community many of whom could not attend the meeting due to its being held in work hours.

I support the presentations of those who live in Richmond Avenue, Walter Street, the Garland Street community, the Willoughby Mayor and the other speakers addressing specific issues such as educational facilities and the need for vehicular transport to attend, for example, Northbridge shops and Artarmon Railway Station.

**4. Opposition to ‘exclusive use’ of Scott Street under the new concept plan.**

Under the approved concept scheme, Scott Street was part of the development which had the impact on the Channel 9 site being responsible for its private use and upkeep.

Not only does the Willoughby Council lose a valuable contribution of about \$5 million dollars, the impact on the members of the community would require the need to maintain a public road used almost 100% for private use. This cannot be allowed.

**5. “A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid”**

The Channel 9 site is not a city. It is a very small part of the municipality of Willoughby. The IPC must get the development proposal right for the long term benefit of the community and the surrounding community otherwise it will remain a blight on the landscape for decades to come.

The tower rises on a ridge to height of 233 metres but whilst it can be seen from far and wide, including Pymble, Mosman and St Leonards just to name a few suburbs, it is an “iconic structure” that is a ‘transparent structure’.

Willoughby Council’s Local Environment Plan 2012 provides objectives for height control including that any new development be in harmony with the bulk and scale of the surrounding buildings, to ensure a high visual quality of the development, to minimise overshadowing or visual intrusion, to be consistent with setting upper height levels of buildings that are consistent with redevelopment potential of the relevant land and to use maximum height levels in response to the current and desired future of the locality.

I also own a property that sits on Chandos St and faces north towards the Channel 9 tower, the Channel 9 site and Castle Vale. I have an interest in the visual mass from the south. I am not aware of how many, if any, residents on the Chandos Street side of the development have put forward objections or if they are even aware of how they may be affected by the visual impact from the south side of the development.

**6. The application to change the already approved concept plan remains silent as to the quality of the units. It continues to only look at the shape, size, scale of the blocks and amenities. The IPC cannot turn a blind eye to the far bigger picture and the more units, the more potential for quality issues.**

What looks good on paper, as apparently do both the approved concept plan and the application to change this concept plan, do not look into the nitty gritty of the quality of inclusions and the structures themselves.

No-one will know, until it is too late, as to the actual quality of the blocks and their inclusions, including inferior drainage, inferior kitchen appliances, inferior kitchen, laundry and bathroom fixtures.

**7. The continued need to look at the bigger picture re traffic, schools and community amenities**

It is submitted that the new Channel 9 concept plan cannot be considered without first looking at current smaller developments in the community, each of which will generate properties that house 'McMansions' for larger families or low to medium density complexes. There are many developments in my immediate location in Sydney St, Artarmon, that have changed in character housing 4-6 bedrooms each when in the past there were elderly one person owners or no dwellings on the site previously. In Garland Rd, Naremburn there are a significant number of medium density complexes where before they were simply 'mum and dad' homes.

Since the original Chanel 9 plan, there have been further medium density developments which have contributed the Willoughby Council being to meet its obligations to meet the housing targets numbers required by the State.

As pointed out by the Mayor and others, an additional 60 units are not needed to help the Council meets its housing obligations.

The majority of the new developments have been along the transport/bus corridor with the flow on effect of city bound buses being filled before they turn into Willoughby Road, impacting on bus stops, in particular at the Artarmon Road and Garland Road bus stops, the very stops which would be used by residents living in the Chanel 9 complex.

I catch buses regularly into the city from the intersection of Frenchs Rd/Willoughby Rd. Often my bus 'sails past full' and therefore impacts on the reliability of the services.

I catch trains regularly into the city from Artarmon Station. In peak hours the trains are often crammed full and it is not a pleasant experience to stand next to someone with BO or who decides to have a coughing fit. These are health issues.

By the time the Metro Train line is completed, it will be carrying a full complement of passengers from the north west by the time it gets to Chatswood so reliance cannot be placed on this new line to alleviate full trains at Artarmon in peak hour in particular.

The new concept plan cannot be allowed to ignore the current infrastructure problems and expect that they will go away. Any further increase in unit numbers will only add to the problems of school accommodation and accessing community facilities such as the Willoughby Leisure Centre/Netball complex.

The proposed new concept plan still does not have taken into account that whilst there are other high rises at Chatswood and St Leonards, each of those developments is within a stone's throw of a railway station or numerous buses. That land is basically flat which enables better use of parents with prams and the elderly with their use of walking sticks and frames.

The proposed site is about 1.5km to Artarmon Station (about a 20 minute walk and relatively pleasant if you are not in a rush, not carrying a relatively heavy briefcase/bag/that distance, it is not a hot summer's day or it is not pelting down with rain at which point shoes and clothing are often ruined). It is not sufficiently close for the elderly or parents and children/prams.

The city bus routes on Willoughby Rd sound good on paper, 'just about 400m down to the bus' but the practicality is that one has to be able to get on the bus in the first place. On the return journey there is a steep hill to face normally after a hard day's work. These bus accesses differ considerably to those available at Chatswood and St Leonards and the ability to actually get on the buses.

## **8. Traffic studies**

It is submitted that proper traffic studies need to be done again, not just on one day.

The original concept plan did not provide for adequate on-site parking spaces, basically twice the number of parking spaces currently said to be on the Channel 9 site.

The local roads in the vicinity of Chanel 9 are now almost at saturation point in terms of on-street parking. There are many reasons for this but most of it has occurred due to the change in dynamics of larger homes and more cars per home.

Not only will the currently approved concept plan of 400 units have a further impact on the local roads, an additional 60 units would have an even greater impact. Over time, the number of 'time restricted parking' areas has increased to attempt to address parking close to Artarmon Station but also Chanel 9.

Channel 9 currently runs a shuttle van to and from Artarmon Railway Station for Channel 9 employees. This is an alarm bell as to the inadequacy of comfortable easy access to the Station.

I am unaware of any relatively recent traffic studies undertaken during a 'normal school term' time which is the vicinity of 40 weeks per year.

An additional 60 units will only add to the traffic.

**9. Visual impact of a different type**

**Visible WASHING/DRYING on balconies.** I do not detect anything other than shapes and heights and proposed densities in the concept plan. Nothing as simple as providing space to dry washing on a clothes line in part of the open space. In any proposal of this magnitude, there needs to be a place where clothes can be dried in the fresh air and not on balconies.

Power prices continue to rise. Should unit developments contain tumble drier space, given the high cost of power and, unless of a high quality heat efficient drier, unit owners gravitate to drying on balconies and, it would appear, no strata by-law seems to be able to overcome this problem.

Philippa Smith

██████████  
████████████████████