

## **Submission**

**Re:** SSD-11429726-MOD-4 Community Facility and Design Changes  
26-42 Eden Street & 161-179 Princes Highway, Arncliffe 2205

### **Introduction**

I have carefully read SSD-11429726-MOD-4 prepared by Ethos Urban for the Eden Street Redevelopment and wish to express my objection.

The Arncliffe Mixed Use Redevelopment currently in progress will result in a substantial amount of traffic in Eden and Burrows Streets, and the surrounding roads. It will become a very busy and congested area at all times. There will also be a considerable increase in the demand for street parking in the locale. Consequently, I strongly oppose the proposal to increase the number of units available by 45 and to the loss of 9 Market Residential parking spaces, because of the added traffic and parking implications these changes will bring.

I question the real-life validity of traffic and parking modelling data indicating that there will be no negative effects resulting from the design modifications. I believe that any increase in the number of units, combined with the loss of residential car parking spaces in the development, will inevitably have an adverse impact on local traffic and especially on parking.

### **Parking**

As a resident of Eden Street, I can attest to the fact that there are extremely few available parking spaces on the street most of the time. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, residents of houses and units in and around Eden Street have inadequate off-street parking for their cars. This highlights the fact that, regardless of the proximity to and use of public transport, people demonstrably maintain a strong dependency on car ownership. Secondly, there are many commuters from the wider Arncliffe area that use the untimed parking in Eden Street when catching the train from Arncliffe Station, necessitated by the high demand for the railway car park.

The Eden Street Redevelopment, as it already stands, reduces the number of needed street parking spaces for the existing population of Eden Street and their visitors, as well as those coming to the Islamic Imaan Centre. While parking is currently available on both sides of Eden Street, the proposed creation of a bike path on one side of the road will greatly exacerbate the loss of available street parking.

The Redevelopment has adopted the minimum parking requirements because of the precinct's proximity to Arncliffe Station. It is naïve to think that the planned parking facilities for residents, visitors, retail workers, childcare staff, retail customers and others coming to the community space will be sufficient to meet the actual demand. To add 45 more units will clearly intensify the problem. Reducing the residential parking spaces by 9 will make it even worse.

Any failure to accommodate all the residents' vehicles on-site will mean the additional cars will need to vie with existing Eden Street residents for the scant street parking spaces. With insufficient spaces available for existing residents of Eden Street, where will they, and their visitors, be able to park?

### **Traffic**

The modification to the existing Redevelopment Plan has failed to adequately consider the increase in traffic which will inevitably occur. Increasing the number of units will also result in more vehicles, adding to the already significant traffic congestion that will be seen in Eden Street, at the Eden Street-Burrows Street intersection and surrounding roads.

The main access route to and from the precinct will be via the Princes Highway, Burrows Street and Eden Street. Due to the proximity of the Eden Street-Burrows Street intersection to the Burrows Street-Princes Highway intersection, a backlog of traffic will inevitably be generated. Currently during peak hour, the line of cars waiting at the lights of the Burrows Street-Princes Highway intersection extend across the Eden Street-Burrows Street

intersection. This delays traffic turning right from Eden Street into Burrows Street to access the Princes Highway. The demand on these intersections will significantly increase once the precinct is opened, and this will only be exacerbated by the additional vehicles associated with an increase of 45 units. Thus, I am opposed the proposed modification.

### **Public Transport**

The proposal also fails to consider the rail service limits of Arncliffe Station. Arncliffe receives only all-stops train services from Hurstville and is the last station before the Wolli Creek interchange. Currently during the morning and afternoon peak periods, the trains are already over-crowded. Demand for these services will increase significantly with the opening of the Eden Street precinct, and 45 more units will certainly mean more people wanting to catch trains.

### **Conclusion**

Arncliffe has seen an increase in the number of high-density developments in recent years, which have a cumulative impact on existing infrastructure. The Eden Street Redevelopment is the largest by far and will place a significant demand on local traffic, parking and public transport facilities, which are insufficient for the size of development. Thus, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed redevelopment modification to add a further 45 units to the site, and to reduce any parking spaces, should not proceed.