

Albert Jubian Park Road St Leonards on the East side of Park Road opposite the proposed developments.

I oppose the proposed planning or rezoning of St Leonards South for a variety of reasons but today I would like to discuss the following aspects:

1- Accessibility to St Leonards and Crows Nest station

To start I would like to quote Council's own report on the rezoning which noted:

“The current North-South connections within the precinct are sloping down from the Pacific Hwy towards River Rd. This does not encourage either pedestrians or cyclists to access the station.”

Council's report goes further to say: “Linkages Outside the Precinct: Access across to Gore Hill Park would require a collaborative approach with RNSH, Willoughby Council and the RMS. To date there is no RMS support for new lights across the Pacific Hwy.”

I would also like to quote a North Sydney council report which noted “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 area is characterised by having a relatively flat aspect near the Pacific Highway at Marshall Ave but this changes drastically closer to the River Road End. From that angle the area is characterised by very steep slopes which are difficult to manage. This issue has been identified in consultant 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 the rezoning will add to pedestrian congestion crossing the Pacific Highway. REFER to PICTURE A

2- Ensure appropriate transitions to lower scale buildings

The proposed setbacks and transitions on the East side of Park Road and River Road are inappropriate and insufficient given the ultimate height of the proposed developments, which will be extenuated by the falling nature of the area.

The impact of transitioning 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 streets in the area then greater setbacks will be required to make any setback meaningful. As well, the proposed development at the bottom of Park Road according to Council reports will have less setback than that shown for developments at the top of Park Road. Hence, not all of Park Road will have sufficient setbacks.

The issue of transition should be carefully considered from all angles, for the entire street and from the perspective of residents on Park Road in single level homes which are situated on a slope. Transitioning and scale is further exacerbated for the properties across River Road which have a lower elevation (due to the topography of the land). These homes on River Road will be facing over bearing developments, looking down at them (refer picture below which proves this point). REFER PICTURE River

The use of trees (including deep soil trees) as a mitigation by itself 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 transition and minimising the visual impact of the proposed bulky developments then maybe smaller developments should be considered instead of accepting a suboptimal outcome.

As well, little assessment is provided on the loss of privacy for homes on Park and River Road which most (if not all) have bedrooms facing the developments from the rezoning.

Moreover, the heritage listed homes which are opposite to the rezoning precinct need to be considered in context of their environment. That is even with setback and transition these heritage listed homes cannot be forced into a situation where they are isolated and surrounded by high density developments.

These homes will be the only homes in the area.

3- 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 the rezoning stop at a particular point. The area has narrow streets which make the properties facing the rezoned 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 Greenwich Road will be impacted and those across River Road will be more than significantly impacted given the sloping nature of the site.

Moreover, the overshadowing will be worst in the other streets past Park Road because they have greater slopes and traffic issues, with more heritage homes impacted. Hence where do you stop the rezoning?

At present the area known as St Leonards South enjoys many natural barriers such as the train line on one side, the Pacific Highway on the other. The slope of the area falling away from the Pacific Highway implies that any high rise developments on the other side of Pacific Highway will not be immediately visible and will not impact the area. Hence, a no development option provides the best long term solution for the wider area. Thank you.