

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 22 November 2017 6:50 PM  
**To:** Brendon Roberts <brendon.roberts@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Fwd: OBJECTION TO MODIFICATION 2 TO MP 10\_0229 - CONCEPT PLAN - MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, CRONULLA SHARKS

Dear Brendon  
I neglected to put my address on the objection below.. I do not want my name published.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**Subject:** OBJECTION TO MODIFICATION 2 TO MP 10\_0229 - CONCEPT PLAN - MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, CRONULLA SHARKS  
**Date:** 22 November 2017 at 4:57:11 pm AEDT  
**To:** [brendon.roberts@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:brendon.roberts@planning.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Brendon

**OBJECTION TO MODIFICATION 2 TO MP 10\_0229 - CONCEPT PLAN - MIXED  
USE DEVELOPMENT, CRONULLA SHARKS**

**Document links:** [http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view\\_job&job\\_id=6907](http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=6907)

[http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view\\_job&job\\_id=8269](http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=8269)

**Name not for publication**

Dept of Planning  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

**22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2017**

**OBJECTION TO MODIFICATION 2 TO MP 10\_0229 - CONCEPT PLAN - MIXED  
USE DEVELOPMENT, CRONULLA SHARKS**

**Document links:**

**[http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/  
index.pl?action=view\\_job&job\\_id=6907](http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=6907)**

# [http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view\\_job&job\\_id=8269](http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=8269)

## OBJECTION

I object to the modification requested to the Woollooware Bay on many grounds but will address the lack of parking, the token amount of low cost housing, the unacceptable traffic impacts and the staging of the development.

### Parking

The 1170 parking spaces for the eastern development are clearly inadequate as in the 'Response to Submissions and Preferred Project Report Woollooware Bay Town Centre' from 10 October 2017, page 30 it states that '...590 vehicles that are expected per hour'. It is obviously assumed that cars are changing over in under 2 hours. This is optimistic since these spaces include residential parking and club parking where people obviously will stay longer than that. Even those visiting the medical centre will pick up groceries or have a coffee so there definitely not enough parking to cater for the additional apartments.

### Low Cost Housing

Despite the developer using low cost housing as a justification for this massive increase in apartments, there is little real effort to address low cost housing. As can be seen in the quote below from the same document mentioned above, there will be only 10 low to moderate rental places in the development. 'The affordable housing package would ensure that approximately 10-12 apartments are retained as affordable rental housing for low, low-moderate and moderate income households for a period of ten years' (page 11).

The provision of affordable housing argument was also produced in order to convince the State Government that the initial concept plan was in the interests of the community. When you look at the price of a 2 bedroom unit at around \$ 850 000 then it can't be considered 'affordable housing'. In the same way, a token 10 apartments is not a huge advantage to the community when the development is having such an adverse effect.

Another issue is who will ensure that this rent is 'affordable'? The promised shuttle bus service that was part of the PAC conditions for the development has already been abandoned. Why have the developers been allowed to get out this expense and hand it over to the government? How can we be sure that the 'affordable rent' will be monitored.

### Traffic

The PAC condition regarding a frequent shuttle bus has been abandoned in favour of a less attractive alternative. Since the development was well outside the distance from the station regarded as necessary for a major development, it was meant to ensure that the residents would not add to the traffic. When people are now relying on a less frequent bus service which has other stops on its route and therefore slower, it is unrealistic to think that they will not use their car. The uphill distance to Woollooware Station means that residents will not walk there. Adding more apartments to this development will create major traffic problems to the area. This will also impact residents from Kurnell and Cronulla who use this route to move out of their suburbs.

The 1 block of units (out of 6) that is so far occupied on the Western side is already holding up the traffic with the lights going in and out of the development constantly stopping the flow of traffic. When all 6 blocks are occupied there will be a huge impact. Adding additional units on the eastern side will be a major impediment to the flow of the traffic.

### Staging of the development.

The original development application had this retail development on the eastern side as Stage 1 and this was so that residents would again not need to be adding to the traffic as there would be a supermarket that they could walk to as soon as they occupied the buildings.. Why has the developer been allowed to build the retail section last? There

**should not have been an opportunity for modifications as it should have been built first. Is there a timeline for when a supermarket must be built ?**

**This modification is totally unacceptable to the local community who will bear the brunt of this massive development. It is already impacting the community due to traffic and parking. It should not be allowed.**

**[REDACTED]**