

11 September 2024

Submission to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure: Objection to Pathways Cremorne Senior Housing Amended Proposal

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the proposed Pathways Cremorne Senior Housing development. The proposed amendments fail to address key issues identified with the original proposal and as such, I still have concerns with what is being proposed.

Key Issues with the Amended Proposal

1. Excessive Height, Bulk, and Scale

All the proposed buildings still significantly exceed the height limits set out in the North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013 (LEP), despite the proposed reduction of 1-storey for one of the buildings. The scale of the development is incompatible with the surrounding residential character, particularly given the heritage significance of the area. The proposal will negatively impact the visual amenity of the neighbourhood, overshadow local properties, and create an overbearing streetscape.

2. Traffic and Parking Concerns

The increased generation of traffic and demand for parking on Parraween Street - a narrow residential street, will exacerbate existing congestion and safety issues, particularly for pedestrians, including Pathways residents. The access point for all Pathways vehicles is poorly planned, contributing to traffic hazards in a high pedestrian activity area.

3. Heritage Impacts

The partial demolition of heritage-listed cottages and failure to preserve their internal fabric disregards the principles outlined in the Seniors Housing Design Guide. The proposal undermines the historical value of the six locally listed cottages and negatively affects the curtilage of the State heritage-listed Orpheum Theatre.

4. Pedestrian Safety

Residents of the proposed development will face difficulties and safety risks crossing Military Road to access essential services, including bus stops, the post-office, chemists, and supermarkets. The busy traffic, coupled with insufficient crossing time at traffic lights, poses a danger, especially to elderly residents.

Conclusion

The amended proposal lacks site-specific and strategic merit, and continues to raise serious concerns regarding excessive height, bulk, traffic congestion, parking issues, overshadowing, heritage loss, and pedestrian safety. Because these issues have not been adequately addressed, I do not support the proposal.

Yours sincerely,

M. Flynn