

RE: DRAFT LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN FILE NO LP/03/79340

I am writing to object to some elements of the Draft LEP.

9 METRE HEIGHTS

Referring to "Response to Submissions", it is pleasing to see that a single submission to rezone the area bounded by Kiora, Karimbla, and Wandella Roads and Public Recreation land to R4 High Density Residential did not gain support of Council. It is disappointing though that a recommendation has been made for R3 Medium Density Residential, with a corresponding FSR of 0.7:1 and 9 metre high limit, in this area, considering Council's own document "9. Building Heights and Amenity Impacts in the Low and Medium Density Zones", clearly states the adverse effects of 9 metre townhouse development. The document says:

- *"Residents concerns about three storey dwellings are not unfounded."*
- *"Such dwellings tend to be larger and bulkier and can result in more amenity impacts than two storey development."*
- *"9m buildings are likely to create greater adverse overshadowing impacts as the wall heights adjacent to boundaries are greater."*
- *"Nine metre dwellings will have a tendency to dominate local streetscape character to a greater extent than is currently typical of new development."*
- *(... facades will dominate the streetscape in contrast to surrounding development."*
- *"It is considered that 9m development is more likely to create privacy and overlooking impacts."*
- *A 9m height limit enables three storey development and windows could be as high as 8.7m above ground level and the corresponding floor level being 6m above ground level – 1.5 m higher than under current controls. The increased height of the upper storey windows increases issues associated with privacy and overlooking."*
- *"It is considered that an 8.5m height limit supports two storey development consistent with the suburban character of much of the Shire's residential areas."*

Council staff recommended an 8.5 metre height limit for R2 Low Density Residential and R3 Medium Density Residential Zones, and in this document acknowledges the problems that residents will experience with 9 metre townhouse developments. Councilors inexplicably chose to ignore staff recommendations in favour of 9 metre development. Given the advice of professionals in town planning, a return to 8.5 metre, 2 storey height is warranted.

TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT ISSUES

Adina Street is a small and narrow cul-du-sac, with at least three potential sites of interest to developers. The street cannot accommodate the level of traffic and parking issues which would follow development of these sites for multiple dwellings. Currently, on weekdays the street is parked out by shoppers and commuters (photos available if required). When Westfield introduces paid parking, shoppers will try to park in nearby streets to avoid parking fees, and as currently, to avoid the hassle of multi-floor parking. Add to the mix, traffic movements arising from housing developments, and this small street will have an intolerable level of traffic movement. Adina Street is not large

enough, in width or length, to accommodate the existing street parking and future vehicles passing through.

In response to LEP submissions, Council explains that the community's perception of increased traffic and parking issues does not correlate to the actual low population growth in the area. Factors such as increased car ownership and multi car ownerships in households, shorter and/or more frequent driving trips, increasing leisure and recreation activities plus older drivers driving for more lengthy years were given as reasons for the community's belief that traffic and parking had worsened. While the link between population growth and traffic might not be proven, the fact is that people do drive short trips frequently, have multiple cars, drive to activities, drive longer in their older years, and so on – so why would we expect that new residents would not do the same? More residents must result in more traffic movement. Though traffic infrastructure is an issue for the State government, the fact remains that until traffic infrastructure can accommodate an existing populations' use of their car, bringing more people and their cars into the area simply has to worsen traffic issues.

The assumption that providing additional accommodation in areas close to the train station will result in fewer cars being used in favour of public transport, is not evident in my street currently. There are 19 dwellings in my street, housing 31 adults and a number of children, with a total of 28 cars). The railway station is approximately 300 metres walk. Amongst my street's residents, only two use public transport daily to get to work. The rest use their car everyday, and for multiple trips daily. Every resident moved into this street knowing that a railway station and bus interchange was only a few hundred metres walk away, yet they overwhelmingly use their cars in preference to public transport. If "the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour", then using current residents and their transport habits as a guide, having public transport at your door does not mean that it will be utilized by possible future residents. Adina Street is proof-positive that being near a train station does not guarantee the resident will leave their car at home in favour of public transport.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY AND ENCOURAGING YOUNG ADULTS AND OLDER PEOPLE TO STAY IN THE AREA

There have been public comments in the Leader lately that developing additional dwellings will result in greater housing affordability and give people an option for staying in the area. How is this true? A developer will not incur development costs, and then sell at a "bargain price" to provide housing affordability and allow people to stay in the area. With an average new townhouse currently selling for high \$400,000's and renting for around \$500 per week, no developer would sell their property for an "affordable" \$200,000, or rent out for an "affordable" \$200 per week, and housing is not so poor that older properties would sell or rent for substantially less than this. Developers are in their business to make a profit and it is misleading to say that an increase in dwellings will give rise to people being able to afford to stay in the area.

UNIVERSITY ROAD REZONING AND IMPACT ON MIRANDA PUBLIC SCHOOL

The potential rezoning of University Road to 7-8 storey units must not go ahead due to its impact on Miranda Public School. The School's infants and special needs classrooms and playground are parallel to the back boundary fences of University Road. Any possibility that someone of disrepute can have unmonitored visual access to children from the privacy of their unit, cannot be allowed to happen. The higher the unit block, the more residents and the higher potential for problematic issues. I have heard

of another school, located next to a high rise unit, where a number of residents displayed inappropriate behaviour in view of children in the playground.

INCREASED DENSITY IN KIORA ROAD, KARIMBLA ROAD, WANDELLA ROAD AND SIMILAR IN MIRANDA

I question the validity of increasing heights and densities in these areas up to 16 metres or 4-5 storeys. Miranda has borne the brunt of development of many years. Though real estate agents will say there is a market for units in the area, people will go where they can find accommodation. If it is not available in Miranda, they will look and find elsewhere. Miranda should not end up looking like other over developed areas such as Maroubra, simply for developers and real estate agents to secure their own financial interests.

INCREASED DENSITY IN KINGSWAY, WANDELLA ROAD TO CLUBB CRESCENT

Similarly, I have to question why such high density is required. Heights of 30-35 metres, of 9-11 storeys are excessive considering the over-development of Westfield across the road and some other buildings in the area. It may be more feasible for a developer to build with these densities, assuming the premises will be occupied, but will they be occupied? Tenants will be needed for the Westfield Centre, the old Paddy Pallin site at Miranda, the proposed dental hospital at Urunga Road Miranda, the Brick Pit at Kirrawee, the Sharks development at Woollooware – all currently approved or in progress developments. Each day I pass two well positioned, large premises at Caringbah, which have been vacant, in one case since October 2011. Miranda does not need to be left with oversized concrete buildings where a tenant cannot be found.

The disturbing thing about the LEP process is that even though only around 2000 submissions were received during the original consultation period, a tiny number of respondents actually supported development to the scale proposed. Councillors are elected by their constituents to represent their views. Clearly, first time around, a vast majority of respondents sent a clear message to their elected representatives that the proposed developments were not wanted – but their messages were ignored.

Despite the council's advertising, many people are still not aware of what is being proposed and how their elected representatives failed to support the overwhelming messages against this overdevelopment at the July Council meeting. Let's hope we do not see a repeat of that this time around.

In short, development is fine – overdevelopment, as proposed in the LEP is not fine. Once done, the damage can't easily be reversed.

Debra Dailly
12 Adina Street
Miranda