

## Kate Freney

---

**From:** yanis garrett <yanis\_g@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 3 June 2017 10:53 PM  
**To:** DPE PS Codes Mailbox  
**Subject:** Submission to Complying Development in Greenfield Sites

Dear Sir / Madam / NSW Planning,

Re. Complying development in Greenfield sites exhibition closing 16th June 2017

I write to offer feedback to this proposal. Overall:

I support 50% of this proposal: the inclusion of 2-3 storey terraces in complying development. This can only be a good thing, allowing for greater density without sacrificing the back yard or front yard, using the space in the air above the land on which existing housing sits, and improving density to allow for communities to flourish and for public transport to be viable.

I do not support the other 50% of this proposal: the rezoning of Greenfield sites for housing, and contend that there should be no further greenfield releases around Sydney, but on the contrary, a green belt and natural parklands area should be set up by the State Government and NSW Planning to ensure protection of the fresh-air providing natural environment for generations. Instead, if I understand the situation correctly, existing low density car dependent sprawl currently zoned R2, should be rezoned as being complying development, allowing for wide 2 - 3 storey terraced housing to gradually replace the fibro houses, red bricks and McMansions, according to the negotiations between the current residents and owners, and developers.

I wish to make the following points with regard to this proposal:

1. That the preference for Greenfield site development for Sydney in particular, which already suffers from chronic traffic congestion, transport issues and issues associated with dispersal of the population in very low density suburbs, including the lack of amenities, the loss of greenparklands to low density sprawl, the proliferation of obesity and other diseases associated with car dependency, should be strongly discouraged in future planning.
2. That given Sydney's population density of 372 persons per km<sup>2</sup>, that we should not be releasing any new land, but should be consolidating the existing footprint.
3. That existing low density suburbs, which comprise the overwhelming majority of the Sydney metropolitan footprint be retrospectively given over to complying development of 2 - 3 storey terraced housing, allowing the city area to gradually and organically move towards medium density while still retaining the backyard for each terrace.
4. That on-street parking be encouraged rather than the incorporation of garaged parking into the terrace design. It may be that in the next 2 decades we will not need to own our own car, but be able to call upon an autonomous vehicle on demand. The need for a garage will then be void, and so there is little point in having terraces with garages when there is no need for them in the future.
5. That where greenfield sites must be developed (and I would seriously question why there needs to be any further greenfield development in the Sydney basin, not unless the end goal is to incapacitate the road network), that complying development for 2 and 3 storey terraces should be the norm and not the exception for any new development.

6. That with regard to terrace design, that 3 storey Victorian style terraces be encouraged, as well as modern design. While the facade could be that of a 3 storey Victorian terrace you might find in Newtown or Darlinghurst, the terrace would still comply with BASIX and internally may be very modern. I did not see a single Victorian terrace in the design competition for new terraces, suggesting a narrow focus on innovation of design for its own sake rather than on fundamental design principles or the larger picture of creating an architecturally cohesive city. Building internally modern but externally Victorian style terraces would enhance the historical quality of Sydney's existing housing stock, and create a particular identity for the greater metropolitan area, as opposed to the dog's breakfast of architectural design that is currently in operation, one that is a direct reflection of the American 1950s model that has been used since that time. The rows of houses that you find in Chelsea, London for instance, or in the Quartier Latin, Paris or Friedrichshain in Berlin are rows of similar looking houses, but they give the city a very unique feel and cohesion that creates a specific atmosphere to the sense of place. No such atmosphere exists in most of the US-style suburbs of middle and outer Sydney. Most of them look identical, even as architecturally they are a jumble of styles, and I do not believe that they foster a sense of place that a city should strive for. This is not surprising, as the original purpose of this style was to sell cars, and the main feature of these existing suburbs is the ubiquitous car.
7. That new developments of greenfield sites with terraces as the norm should therefore be built with an underground metro line. Developers should not be just building the roads on the surface; they also need to include a metro in their design for the suburb, that connects in with the rest of the transport network. In this way the new suburb will succeed as a viable place to live, because it is connected to the rest of the city. This can easily be financed through a levy on each terrace sold, and paid off over time. It can also be run at a profit where apartments are built around the transport node. Furthermore, the cost of tunnel boring for metro is rapidly reducing, and asking a developer to build a metro line is not beyond their capacity but is in fact an achievable requirement providing it is looked at as a long term investment. Having a new suburb with a metro is as sensible as building the roads and water and sewer and power systems and networks. They would own the metro line and they would take a share of Opal revenue for trips taken on that line. This would in addition encourage good development and denser development.
8. Going beyond the brief of terraced housing but staying with the development of greenfield sites, another idea I'd like to see looked at in connection with point 7 above is what could be called "high contrast zoning". This is where instead of density tapering out at the edges of a metropolis, you have a skyscraper or cluster of high rise towers set in a rural area, outside the metropolitan footprint, with no medium or low density surrounding it, and with all services located within the high rise cluster. Towers could be of organic design to blend in with the surrounding nature, and would be serviced by an underground metro back to the city. This would preserve the greenfield spaces for all to enjoy, both those in the high rise cluster and those on the existing periphery of the metropolis. This is not science fiction; this form of housing already exists in areas across the world.
9. Overall, NSW planning department needs to try to think outside the low density car-dependent box that has been the norm for housing in Sydney for the past 60 odd years. The era of the privately owned motor car is drawing to a close, temperatures globally are increasing, and the way the city is planned - to increase density, encourage public transport, and prevent the urban heat island effect - needs to reflect these imminent realities.

Thank you for considering these points.

Yours sincerely,  
Yanis Garrett