

From: Ian Thomas
To: [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Fwd: SLS PLANNING PROPOSAL
Date: Monday, 27 May 2019 1:37:40 PM

Subject: PLANNING PROPOSAL FOR ST LEONARDS SOUTH
PRECINCT (SLS)
ATTN: The Responsible Officer

We wish to register our outrage concerning this development proposal.

It contains many highly objectionable aspects.

THE PROCESS AND LANE COVE COUNCIL

The most objectionable is that Lane Cove Council (LCC) developed this plan with no resident input other than from those who stood to make substantial profits. LCC's approach has completely lacked a comprehensive, timely and one would have thought mandatory major publicity for such a huge project with its critical impact on Greenwich.

Even the title - St Leonards South (SLS) for what is part of Greenwich, and thus somehow remote and creating little impact, could be seen as misleading.

Unlike most development proposals occurring around Sydney with residents and councils combining to fight unacceptable developments, LCC has uniquely sponsored, planned and relentlessly supported this proposal in the face of citizen outrage and virtually total opposition. A poll around our area showed 100% opposition.

Despite our repeated requests, not a single councillor who supports this proposal has been prepared to front the community and spell out the justifications for their support. Why not?

LCC's submission to the IPC, seeking to paint the process undertaken as collaborative, transparent, open with long standing community involvement is false.

If as the LCC submission claims this has been a 7 year journey of detailed extensive research, workshops, public consultations etc. and use of words and phrases - "liveable precinct", "holistic approach", "vibrant..walkable community", "protecting its past" etc. etc to justify its support, why then have we ended up with such an egregious proposal?

Most residents only became aware of SLS around 2017. contrary to LCC's portrayal. "Consultations" etc. since have resulted entirely from sustained pressure from outraged residents and have been all about box ticking.

Alice in Wonderland is a reasonable description of LCC's submission.

Nowhere in the submission is there any acknowledgement of the stress and distress LCC's position is having on local citizens and the social dislocation which will result.

The mayor offended many of us by publicly expressing support for the view that if as a result of resident opposition, restrictions were now included, the developers would have a case for even taller high rise in order to make a profit. These are the developers who took the risk years ago and spent up to \$600m acquiring properties which were and are still zoned low density, and who are now, no doubt applying enormous pressures to have the area rezoned to meet their commercial imperatives. Extraordinarily, LCC has also consistently opposed the imposition of the infrastructure levy, on the same grounds of risk to developers profits!

LCC's continuing support for the developers, in opposition to the interests of residents defies logic.

PLAN OUTCOMES AND CHARACTERISTICS

As has been repeatedly acknowledged by experts, the proposal fails basic good planning principles, which makes councillors' continued support mystifying.

The 3D display graphically shows a massive, intensely dense alien intrusion into Greenwich, completely at odds with the surrounding environment.

Greenwich is a small, peninsula suburb, one single lane each way road in and out with, we understand around five thousand five hundred

residents. This development would add we understand around a further 5000 residents, and we further understand up to four thousand additional vehicles.

This would totally overwhelm the suburb, the surrounding and local infrastructure.

It has no regard for the massive adjacent residential developments which were not conceived when LCC engaged in initial planning. Nevertheless despite the vastly different situation now, LCC has made it seems, no fundamental modifications.

To take one key day to day outcome: Continuing ability to get in and out of our suburb.

Currently 138 dwellings, the site will increase to almost 2500 with no business or commercial precinct and a topography which will force the new residents into their vehicles to exit and enter where?

Traffic congestion east to Crows Nest and St Leonards areas and further west is already unacceptable.

Claims by LCC that an already stressed River Rd, which would be the southern entry/exit point to the development, is two lanes each way and could accommodate further traffic load by extending mythical no parking zones, are false. Traffic now banks up at what would be the southern access point to SLS, crosses a single lane bridge, eventually becomes two lanes for a short stretch, one of which seeks to turn left into Shirley Rd and then filter through Crows Nest, the other to turn right into and filter through the narrow back streets of Wollstonecraft and Waverton. More traffic?

The northern access through Berry Rd to Pacific Highway, already a congested intersection, will further disrupt highway traffic and cause serious delays.

How will emergency vehicles - ambulances, fire trucks, health services etc., access the suburb unimpeded, particularly Greenwich to the south of River Rd?

We could be trapped in our own suburb!

Public transport connectivity will be made far more complex ,particularly bus routes east and west of Greenwich Rd.

Internal traffic and parking throughout Greenwich particularly, will be seriously impacted, and particularly around the schools with consequent safety issues.

Open space is completely inadequate and fails even LCC's requirements for the rest of the LGA.

Local hospitals, already under pressure, will be overwhelmed by this and adjacent developments.

Local schools only now being expanded to meet current demand, will also be overwhelmed.

Contrary to LCC's submission claim, we understand MWS & DB indicated they were unsure of the impact on and capacity of the sewage system to handle all of the increased demand. There have in recent times already been overflow problems.

No additional community facilities to support pre school and general needs given what is likely to be a significant demographic shift.

The impacts go on and on emphasise the unsustainable nature of the proposal.

We entreat the IPC to reject the proposal in its present form and require a significantly reduced scale, density, housing, business, cultural, commercial and community diversity.

We entreat Mr Stokes to also reject the proposal as completely unacceptable.

It will be an early and stern test for the IPC and the planning minister to set a new path for future developments elsewhere and demonstrate their

determination to maintain and protect Greenwich and its citizens from and outstandingly damaging proposal which in its present form benefits only the developers who appear to have had such outsized influence to date.

LCC also needs to get a powerful message that Greenwich is not a dumping ground for LCC's development ambitions.

Thank you for your considerations.

Susan Thomas

Ian Thomas

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

