

Maria Nugent



PCU078295

19 Sept 19

Norrell 2039.

Attn: Director, Transport Assessments Planning
Reference: SSI 7485

Department of Planning
Received
25 SEP 2019
Scanning Room

I am writing to object to the Crescent Overpass Modification proposal, at every level of the design.

It takes no consideration into improving and supporting active transport use in our area and will be discouraging due to its long winded path connections and ugliness.

The original design is much better in balancing the facilitation of active transport between the foreshore, parks and roads for shared use.

When you are walking and cycling you want to take the most direct path possible and the new proposal will add too much time between Balmain, Norrell + Annandale Jubilee Park.

My daughter attended Sydney Secondary College Blackwattle Bay + like other students on the peninsula and surrounds cycled to school. The new proposal would increase the journey considerably for locals. It also disconnects walkers and cyclists from the foreshore.

Beyond this modification whilst attending the recent RMS meeting I learnt the existing bridges over Victoria Rd would also be removed. This is shocking as a regular walker to be honest again it would force people into the Norrell Yard Park and stop us from accessing the foreshore path to Jubilee Park which is the most direct route. There should be maximum choice of paths not less.

This situation needs Vision and consideration of the White Bay Power station developments which together with the Cruise Terminal and New Fish Market will encourage, as it should, people to access the foreshore of Rozelle Bay by foot and bicycle.

There needs to be an ^{extra} underpass connection under Victoria Rd. from the Rozelle yard park to the foreshore at Anzac Bridge and/or James Craig Rd. This will allow people their right of access to the foreshore of the bay. Eventually this route would complete a circuit of Rozelle Bay when the Glebe Island Bridge is repaired, creating a great tourist and active transport Harbour attraction.

This is a very important area of increasing urban density. It has the opportunity to be a world class sustainable active foreshore amenity. The new modification is ugly and cumbersome, too difficult and long for active transport users and restrictive in terms of facilitating choice at turning right at Johnson St.

There are alternative options: keep to the original design; consider an underpass for traffic and probably others that are all more preferable than those proposed.

The new modification should be rejected for all the above reasons. All designs should be much more considerate of active transport encouragement, choice of pathway rather than restricting, access to foreshore views and space, safe pathway that are direct and appealing and easy to use to encourage greater sustainable transport use, consideration of increasing density at White Bay requiring ^{Terminal} active path connections between foreshore, Parks, CBD, Cruise and Fish Market.

Yours Sincerely,

Marie Nugent

[REDACTED]
Kozelle 2039

PS The UN has recommended governments dedicate 20% of transport funding to non-motorised active transport.

Sydney falls ridiculously short of this. This unique urban harbour area needs careful and considered planning to MAXIMISE ACTIVE TRANSPORT rather than hinder or prejudice it now and in the future.