

Director Sydney Urban Renewal
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Submission link http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=9579

Concept State Significant Development Application – SSD 18_9579
Sydney Metro City & Southwest – Crows Nest Over Station Development

I strongly object to the above referenced application for the reasons outlined below:

1. The proposed OSD consisting of 2 x 27 storey residential towers, a 17 storey hotel and a 8 storey commercial tower is a wrecking ball for Crows Nest. It completely ignores the requirements of the Placemaking and Principles Study that underpins the St Leonards Crows Nest precinct. It is a shameful grab for value capture whilst ignoring the community's preference for retention of the Crows Nest village.
2. The proposed OSD would encourage developers to submit planning proposals for adjacent sites seeking to vary planning controls in the St Leonards Crows Nest precinct, thus further destroying the fine grain nature of Crows Nest.
3. The DPE has vowed to protect Crows Nest village more simply described as the Willoughby Road strip and this proposal destroys it. It is the duty of the DPE to reject the OSD proposal and insist on an alternative that meets the existing planning controls in the NSLEP 2013.
4. The buildings above the Crows Nest Metro station should be designed to support our destination as a Health and Education Precinct and to bring more jobs into the area, enabling achievement of the jobs target set by the Greater Sydney Commission.
5. I object to a change in planning controls for this site as proposed by the rezoning proposal. The proposed setbacks are designed to maximise the building footprints; not to enable Crows Nest to be a viable vibrant place.
6. I object to building any high-rise residential towers on this site. Residential developments do next to nothing to bring jobs and business to the area
7. I object to the proposed 17 storey hotel which if history is any guide would be doomed to failure just like the Ramada. That building has been converted to residential apartments and has done nothing to help create jobs.
8. There should be no building on Block C thus leaving that site available for a pedestrian plaza directly near the station entrance/exit.
9. I object to any parking on this site. We want the area to be as CAR FREE as possible.
10. Rather than residential buildings, this site must continue as a vital employment and business generating retail/commercial/service district without the encroachment of residential development which does nothing for jobs or business.
11. Any buildings above the Metro site should be part of an education hub. They could contain for example: a high-tech technology park; TAFE that specialises in technology, hospitality, cooking

and the film industry; a comprehensive, non-selective high school; a selective technology high school; a language school; a music school; a drama school; a dance school and a culinary institute.

12. I want any buildings above the Metro to contain services and activities that maintain and improve the health of the community: medical services; alternative health care; recreational spaces; a performance space; movie theatres; a new community centre; more childcare; a start-up hub and serviced offices.
13. I want any buildings above the Metro to become a go-to destination that bring people and jobs to the area – not more high-rise residential towers.
14. I object to the visual impact and dwarfing effect that the proposed buildings will have on Crows Nest and Wollstonecraft. The low-rise suburb will feel 'hemmed in'. The OSD development must reflect the fine grain nature of Crows Nest that currently exists.
15. I object to the overshadowing of Nicholson Street, Hume Street Park, Willoughby Road and Ernest Place in particular year-round, not just between 9:00 am and 3:00 pm.
16. I object to the inadequate setbacks as proposed along the Pacific Highway, Hume & Oxley Streets and Clarke Lane.
17. I want to ensure there are generous setbacks to enable wider sidewalks and tree lined streets.
18. I would like part of the site between Pacific Highway and Clark Lane dedicated to open space with a tree line to Pacific Highway and some green space as well.

Name:
(CAPS)

LISA MAUDE

Address:
(CAPS)

3/6 MICKLE CRES Wollstonecraft

Email:

lisa.maud@bigpond.com

Date:

22.01.2019

Signature:

Lisa Maude

http://planspolicies.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=9247

St Leonards Crows Nest 2036 Draft Plan - Special Infrastructure Contribution (SIC)

1. Introduction:

The proposed SIC is a new approach by the Department of Planning to up-front funding to be paid by developers and to be used for priority infrastructure delivered by government at the same time development is occurring. The St Leonards Crows Nest precinct proposed SIC is set at \$15,100 per dwelling and is just another form of tax. Like planning, spending on Infrastructure is required before not concurrent with the construction of buildings.

In the SLCN precinct the amount that is indicated to be collected is \$113,628,000. This suggests there will be 7,525 dwellings (the Draft Green Plan nominates 6,800 dwellings)

2. Feedback

I object to the introduction of this proposed SIC because:

- The planning package for SLCN is based on a 100% increase in population from 13,250 in 2016 to 26,400 in 2036. This is non-sustainable and well above the increase in the Greater Sydney population of ~36% and substantially above the increase in the North District plan of 22%.
- The number of apartments already approved by the Lane Cove Council or Independent Panels will significantly reduce the number of apartments that will contribute to the SIC over 20 years. This is especially so if the St Leonards South project does not go ahead as planned – which it certainly should not.
- The plan is therefore theoretical and must be rethought entirely based on a lower population increase and a lesser number of apartments.
- Spending on major infrastructure must be made well in advance of the developments proceeding. It ignores the basic requirement that infrastructure planning needs to be done well in advance and not on ad hoc developments dreamed up by developers for individual sites. That is why Councils are best suited to dealing with In-Kind agreements (VPAs) for particular community issues.
- Government's role is to provide basic infrastructure funded from existing taxation and grant funds raised from things like Stamp Duties and Commonwealth contributions.
- The SIC is just another form of tax ultimately paid by consumers
- The SIC will not help in the pursuit of affordable housing.
- The report from SEC is hardly an endorsement of the SIC. Instead it points to the finite nature of the ability to raise even more tax.
- 1800 people have raised objections to this SIC plan in signed petitions.
- Councils will lose the ability to raise money or In-Kind agreements by the abolition of Voluntary Planning Agreements.
- The thought that negotiations will be led by government and not at the coal face with Councils is abhorrent.
- It is micro management to the extreme.

- The proposal is designed to achieve or has the result of more central control by removing the ability of local government to perform its proper role.
 - The proposal in its present form provides no guarantee that money collected will be quarantined for its intended purpose and no guarantee that it will actually be spent at all. If past experience is any guide, the funds collected will go into consolidated revenue where it will be lost in the perpetual arguments between state and local government to release funds.
-

Name: LISA MARCHE
Signature: Lisa Marche
Address: 316 MILNER CRES WOLLSTONTHORPE
Email: lisamarche@sympoud.com 2061-
Date: 22/01/ 2019