

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
6th November 2017

Mr Brendon Roberts

Dept of Planning

By Email

**SUBMISSION TO MODIFICATION 2 TO MP 10 0229 - CONCEPT PLAN - MIXED
USE DEVELOPMENT, CRONULLA SHARKS on Exhibition 20.10.17 to 7.11.17**

LETTER OF OBJECTION – DOC LINKS BELOW

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

I totally object to the changes in this most recent modification for this development especially to the changes made to the hotel. The increased height of the hotel will totally destroy any bay or city views that we bought our property for 15 years ago and built and designed our family home around. We will have no view of Centre Point Tower at all and neither will any other resident of Castlewood Ave. These precious views must be retained by the residents and I am sure the that proponent can design something to minimise the impact on all residents of Castlewood Ave and some surrounding streets.. I have already lost 50% of my view due to the western side of the fields being developed.

Visual Impact

The new modification will severely impact on our bay and city views to a point where we will have no views at all. We bought our home which was to have uninterrupted bay and city views forever as the area was zoned recreation, low rise and light industrial. The NSW State Govt rezoned the playing fields to allow the high rise units to be built on the western side of the fields and a 4 storey retail centre on the eastern side of the playing fields. The PAC accepted the concept plan which Bluestone/ Sharks put in despite huge concerns and over 2000 objections by the local community. It gained support from the local community because it was going to save The Sharks Football Club. We lost 50% of our views from this.

The first modification to add units and a hotel to the eastern side severely impacted our views to a point that we would only have a small glimpse of the city over the football oval. This was when the

hotel was only 8 storeys. The proponent is aware of the impact on our views as their representative (Matt Crews) visited my home to see if any changes could be made to lessen the impact. Photos were taken.

If the hotel was lowered to the height of the stadium or even 6 storeys the impact would not be as great. **Obviously, we would prefer no further development at all on the eastern side.**

The latest change has increased the hotel to 10 storeys which totally destroys any views we have of the city, Centre Point Tower and the bay. This not only destroys our dream but also devalues our properties in our street. Not only this, the hotel has been reduced from 125 units to 75 units. Hotel units have been replaced by more apartments. I know Matt Crews was annoyed that I had commented about the negative impacts of this development on a community overdevelopment website so therefore I feel that the proponent has deliberately increased the height of the hotel as a "payback" for speaking up.

Surely better urban design would be to have the areas separated by the low rise tourist leisure area of the playing fields and the higher rise units positioned to the very eastern side of the retail precinct. (Note I totally object to the units on the retail side) For example- Units western side – stadium, playing field, club, hotel – retail and apartment towers to the far east of the eastern side. severely impact our bay and city views it would not totally destroy them. **(Note I totally object to the units on the retail side)** I remember one of the original supporting arguments was that there is so much open space surrounding the area.

No apartments should be built on the eastern side and the hotel would be better placed on the retail side or kept to no more than 6 storeys.

Consideration must be given to all of the existing residents of Castlewood Ave, Fairs Ave, Church St and this section of the Kingsway. Surely the proponent can improve the design so as not to impact on Castlewood Ave residents.



The above view will be totally destroyed and lost to 100 or more residents. I invite members of the Planning Department to come and actually see the impact.

Further Objections

1. It is totally unacceptable that the community was not informed of this recent modification and even more unacceptable that the previous submission writers were not informed.
2. The Sutherland Shire Council do not accept the original modification(only a hotel) due to traffic, parking and negative visual impacts on the community.
3. I note that people living in the completed apartment block are already complaining about lack of parking in a “comment”
4. Cumulative impact due to traffic and lack of parking on the local playing fields and local sporting teams.
5. Increased rate revenue will be negated because council will have to provide more services to cope with the huge population increase.
6. The majority of supporter submissions did not mention the apartments but were focused on the hotel and sporting facilities. I believe the sporting facilities are already included in the original concept plan.
7. There are no medical facilities provided to cope with such a huge population increase in such a small area.
8. I restate my previous objections which still apply to this modification-
9. **Lack of infrastructure for roads.** The road system in the area is at full capacity and the state government and council have no plans to improve the road system. The traffic becomes much worse as you approach Taren Point Rd and on Taren Point Road in peak times. The Dept Of Planning is not taking into consideration the huge already approved developments in Woollooware, Cronulla and Caringbah. Many people cannot get to work by using public transport due to the location of their workplace or they are working shifts so they have to use cars.
10. **Significant loss of city and bay views due to heights of the buildings for a number of residents and a loss of property value.** Many residents in Castlewood Ave, Church St, Fairs Ave and parts of the Kingsway will lose the majority if not all of their beautiful bay and city views. We purchased our home knowing the land was zoned recreation and low density. We should have had uninterrupted bay and city views for the rest of our lives but the Dept of Planning changed the zoning to allow this development to be constructed. Much of the support gained for this development was only gained because it was going to save the Sharks football club and football team. That has been saved. This new modification will leave us and many other residents with barely any views. It is really devastating for us to lose “our dream” and our neighbours will also. We have worked hard all of our lives to achieve this. We are not rich we are just hardworking local people. If the buildings were limited to 6 and 7 storeys the impact would be negligible. The Planning Dept does not take into account the impacts on the lives of residents nor does the proponent. It is frustrating and depressing to see Woollooware Bay advertising how amazing the unit views to the city are, when there has been no consideration given to residents who have had that view taken away from them.
11. **Lack of notification and too short a response time.** I have spoken to a number of our neighbours and they received no notification of this modification although it impacts on them severely. We only received notification because we still own a property in Woollooware North. The Planning Dept needs to send notifications to all people living in the 2230 post code areas.
The 4 week response time is **not long enough** for residents to be able to go through the documents and make a submission. We work and have family commitments so residents have very little time to do a submission.

12. **Insufficient parking.** The local streets are already being parked out by existing and already approved local developments such as units, townhouses, houses and duplexes being built in Woollooware, North Cronulla, Cronulla and Caringbah North. Due to shift work and location of work place most families/couples have 2 cars.
13. **Insufficient parking around the station.** At present people are parking further and further down in the side streets near the station and local residents are having trouble parking outside their own homes already.
14. **Where are people going to park for the football games?** How is the area going to cope with the thousands of people attending these games with this extra development? The area is at a standstill already and people are only just starting to move into the first block of units.
15. Out of character with the area. The original concept plan is already greatly out of character with the area. What started as 6 storeys with council approval grew to 8 and 9 storeys and then to the huge high rise development approved by the PAC.
16. **The negative impacts on our lifestyle and amenity.** We purchased our first home in Woollooware for its village like atmosphere and open space outlook but now we are looking at many multi-storey units and a huge retail centre as well as being impacted by the extra traffic and extra cars being parked in the streets. It is like living in dense city area.
17. The previous development was reduced from 700 to approximately 600 units under the original concept plan that was approved by the Planning and Assessment Commission (PAC) now it is being increased to a total of 800 units and 125 hotel rooms. Would the PAC have allowed this?
18. **Environmental issues-** Further destruction of the essential mangroves. Further negative impacts on the local wildlife and marine life in Botany Bay. Increased air and noise pollution for nearby residents from the greatly increased traffic.
19. **RAMSAR** – this increased development needs to be assessed on the current RAMSAR boundaries gazetted in August 2011.
20. Further significant loss of city and bay views due to heights of the buildings for a number of residents.
21. **Lack of general infrastructure** such as schools, hospitals, medical facilities, sewerage.
22. Insufficient time for residents to adequately respond to this application as most residents work and have families so we only have a limited time on our days off to read through a document of this size
23. **This is not a simple modification.** This is a whole new concept and should not be accepted as a modification. It is doubling the size of the original Concept Plan and should not be accepted as a modification. Even Ex Planning Minister Tony Kelly stated his concerns about heights and densities in the letter approving the Part 3A request. Our local MP mark Speakman has also stated his concerns that the original concept was far too dense and high, and out of character with the area
24. **Ending transitional arrangements for projects approved under Part 3A, including modifications Legislative planning changes announced on May 6th 2016-** How long are these modifications going to continue for? The PAC decision has become a joke! This is not a modification.
25. This is not about saving the Sharks football team and club anymore. The proponent has stated this in their response.
26. It does not provide affordable housing for local families or first home buyers as the brand new units are expensive

Regards

██████████