

From: [REDACTED]
To: [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Submission re St Leonards South Plan, following the public meeting at Crows Nest Centre on Monday 20 May, 2019
Date: Tuesday, 21 May 2019 3:17:16 PM

To the Commissioners of the NSW IPC, re Lane Cove Council's SLS Plan.

Firstly, I would like to thank the current Planning Minister for agreeing to a forum where the various community members, should I say stakeholders, could give their opinions and in many cases, share their considerable expertise. This was in contrast to both the previous Planning Minister and to Lane Cove Council, who seemed to do their best to ignore the communities' views. Secondly, I would like to thank the three members of the IPC who listened patiently, intently and respectfully throughout a long day and I hope were made aware of the communities' views, as well as those of the developers, who, in my opinion, tried to jump the gun in positioning themselves for a development plan that had no approval and thus took a gamble, which, as with many gambles, may not be successful.

My main comments, which have been dealt with in detail by many of the speakers at the meeting, can be summarised as follows :

1. Council Issues

A) No community consultation or even information was provided by Lane Cove Council until 4 years after the plan was first put forward, although it was reported that developers were consulted.

B) Council would appear to be using this outer southern tip of the municipality as a cash cow, as it has more than reached its state requirements for additional housing.

C) The current population of the St Leonards South/Greenwich community is approximately 2,000, whereas the proposed development envisages an extra 4,800 people. This would completely submerge and change our vibrant community, as it would be hard for such numbers to be absorbed productively.

2. Physical issues

A) In my view, a hill is not a suitable site for large scale, wall-to-wall high rise buildings, as the results are aesthetically displeasing and provide poor living conditions, especially for children.. The slope is not conducive to worthwhile open green space for active and passive use, as promised by the council. In addition, I believe, according to the local newspaper, that the developers say that they cannot afford to provide any community assets, even though this would normally be part of any development approval.

B) Significant overshadowing of Newlands Park and properties on the Greenwich side of River Road would also occur.

C) Greatly increased traffic and inadequate access to the main through roads, namely the Pacific Highway and River Road, would cause traffic gridlock. It is already very difficult for me to exit my street on to River Road (it is the only exit), due to the heavy traffic in both directions.

3. Facilities and social and community issues

A) Royal North Shore Hospital, despite being relatively new, is already seriously overcrowded, and according to doctors, cannot cater for the proposed increase in residents.

B) The Greenwich School, on its 2 sites, is currently undergoing extensions to cope with current numbers, as older residents move out of the area and families with school age children move in. The amount of school playground, an essential part of school facilities, is being decreased, car parking for teachers is no longer available on the Greenwich Road campus, and there is little scope for expansion.

C) Current preschool/long day care facilities are already inadequate.

4. Suggestions

A) The whole proposal needs to be re-thought, taking account of the issues raised above and of the many issues raised by qualified people and community representatives who made presentations at the public meeting. The main issues would seem to be a significant decrease in the number, height and bulk of the proposed apartment buildings. In addition, more attention to architectural quality and aesthetics would be appreciated.

B) Schools, hospital, green space and roads need to be developed as part of the proposal. I think it was the final speaker, Robert Hunter, who had some excellent proposals re reorganisation of the road system.

C) The community atmosphere and lifestyle need to be taken account of, as far as possible, as this is one of the main reasons people choose to live in this area.

D) Townhouse and semi or terrace development would be more appropriate on the lower two thirds of the area, with low high rise { 8 – 12 stories } on the top of the hill. There are already several very high rise apartment blocks approved and being constructed on the Pacific Highway between Crows Nest and St Leonards.

E) The developments currently taking place are luxury and expensive dwellings, catering for the wealthy, the retired or investors. More family oriented (eg townhouses or small apartment blocks) and homes for younger buyers (semi or terrace dwellings) would better fill the more diverse needs of the community.

Thank you for the opportunity of making this submission.

Margaret Ireland

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]