

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for the time to speak today.

I live on the East side of Park Rd St Leonards and am directly effected by the 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 Rds. I believe it is too small and a 'token' park. A better solution is a linear park running the length of Park Rd adjacent to existng 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 Masterplan precinct.

The pocket park is 3,500 sqm in size. If the linear park is 17 metres wide the total area of the park can be up to 5, 500 sqm in size., Under the proposed LEP the top two thirds of Park Rd has a ten metre setback, thus only another seven metres of setback is required for the whole length of Park for a park 2,000 sqm larger than the pocket park..

I have consulted a Landscape Architect and a Town Planner who believe the linear park along Park Rd East is a better solution than the proposed pocket park.

Some may argue the steep slope of Park Rd 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 ten properties subject to compulsory acquisition. These ten properties are not owned by a developer. This means there will be no direct developer contribution from these ten properties as no developer is going to purchase properties subject to compulsory acquisition. It is believed the cost of acquiring these properties is between \$30-50 million dollars and will need to be acquired by LCC from developer contributions. This will be a costly and time consuming activity for LCC. The linear park does not require compulsory acquisition. There is also the added advantage the construction of the linear park and development can occur concurrently.

It is not certain how the council came to determine the size or location of the pocket park. There is no report or study contained in the documentation to Gateway that clearly shows how the council decided on the pocket park's size or location. The September 2017 Oculus Landscape Master Plan is fifteen months after the Gateway submission. It can be concluded the landscape plan is only dealing with the proposed LEP as presented to Gateway and does not validate the pocket park size or location.

It is a pity the LCC did not employ Oculus Landscape Architecture and Urban Design during the pre-Gateway process as 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