

ATTACHMENT D

ATTACHMENT D

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submissions summary

Individual submissions are numbered as Ind. # for privacy reasons.

1. Residential character and amenity of the Alexandria Park locality		
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Issue Summary
1.1	Ind. 2; Ind. 3; Ind. 6; Ind. 7; Ind. 18;	Rezoning the locality for mixed-uses will lead to an increase in commercial development and in large residential apartment buildings. This will see an erosion of the quiet residential character of the wider area.
		<p>Response</p> <p>The area proposed for rezoning was previously zoned for Mixed uses in South Sydney LEP 1998, and remained so until Sydney LEP 2012 applied an R1 General Residential zoning.</p> <p>The proposed re zoning for these properties responds to an internal review which considered the R1 General Residential zone did not reflect the range of land uses in the area and would impede its ongoing transition. The General residential zone has only been applied to the subject properties for less than one year and has had negligible role in determining the character of the locality.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal therefore seeks to introduce the most appropriate Standard LEP template zone. A Mixed Uses zone for these properties will allow existing non-residential uses to operate whilst enabling the transformation to more residential land uses on some sites.</p> <p>Residential apartment buildings are permissible under the R1 General residential zone and the B4 Mixed Uses zone</p> <p>Commercial and retail uses are permissible in the B4 Mixed Uses zone with the limitation that the floorplate of individual retail premises which must not exceed 1,000sqm. This will limit the potential for an expansion of larger retail activity, but will allow for appropriate active uses along the heavily-trafficked McEvoy Street.</p>

1.2	Ind. 3;	There is already enough retail and light industry in the area. Converting homes to business premises will lead to a loss of the character of the area.	<p>The majority of the properties to be rezoned are already mixed-use or multi-unit residential. The rezoning does not include the area of terraced houses between Buckland Street and Henderson Street, to the north and west of Alexandria Park.</p> <p>There is little potential for homes to be converted to business uses as a result of the Planning Proposal.</p>
1.3	Ind. 10; Ind. 13.	Rezoning the locality to mixed-uses could mean that uses incompatible with the quiet residential character of the area will be developed.	<p>The B4 Mixed Uses zone has a wider range of permissible uses than the R1 General Residential zone. However, in assessing likely development options for the area, Sydney DCP 2012 contains considerations other than zoning, including transport and parking availability, neighbourhood amenity, and compatibility with surrounding uses.</p>
1.4	Ind. 13	Light industrial uses would be preferable to commercial as they generate less traffic.	Light industrial uses are permissible in the B4 Mixed uses zone.
1.5	Ind. 10; Ind.15;	The Mixed-Uses zone will impede the transition of the area from a light industrial area to a quality residential neighbourhood.	<p>The B4 Mixed Uses zone allows for residential development, including multi-unit development, as well as retail, commercial, and other development in accessible locations.</p> <p>The B4 Mixed uses zone allows for compatible non-residential uses, both to support the primary residential uses and to ensure some level of activity and passive surveillance in the location throughout the day and night. Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 includes objectives for retaining a mix of uses in the area and appropriate design solutions for accommodating residential development within close proximity to non-residential uses.</p> <p>The B4 Mixed uses zone has the necessary range of permissible uses to promote the ongoing transition of the area.</p>

1.6	Ind. 1; Ind. 3; Ind. 7; Ind. 8; Ind. 13;	The character of the area and the proximity of the High School and of Alexandria Park makes R1 General Residential a more suitable zone. The area should remain zoned for residential uses only.	Retaining the R1 General Residential zone would mean significantly less flexibility to continue the existing employment uses that operate within the precinct and whose impacts are either not significant or manageable. It would also mean fewer opportunities to activate the ground floor of McEvoy Street properties with appropriate retail or commercial uses. Neither the High School nor the park itself is included in the proposed rezoning. The Alexandria Park Conservation Area is adjacent to the area proposed for rezoning. It is dominated by terraced housing and wide tree-lined streets encompassing Buckland Street, Garden Street, Gerrard Street, Phillip Street, Anderson Street, and Alexandria Park itself. Many of the community submissions received were from residents in this area. The proposal does not rezone any properties in the Alexandria Park Conservation Area. This area will remain R1 General Residential.
1.7	Ind. 1.	There are too many poor quality mixed-use areas which have no activity. Vibrancy will come from having quality residential areas.	The zoning will encourage a range of development, including residential and smaller retail, which will promote a vibrant public domain and create additional opportunities for pedestrian activity.

2. Traffic, parking and infrastructure for the Alexandria Park locality			
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Issue Summary	Response
2.1	Ind. 2; Ind. 3; Ind. 7;	This Planning Proposal will lead to an increase in traffic through having more apartment buildings and more commercial buildings.	The Planning proposal is not expected to lead to significant traffic generation. It does not increase the permissible building heights or floor space ratios for the area. The effect of the Planning Proposal is to apply a Mixed Uses zoning that reflects the existing land uses. The Planning Proposal is not expected to promote change or intensification of the existing land uses.
2.2	Ind. 1; Ind. 2; Ind. 3; Ind. 7; Ind. 13; Ind. 14;	There is already a lack of parking in the area and this Planning Proposal will make the situation worse.	The Planning Proposal does not promote intensification of land uses in the area. It does allow for a wider range of land uses than the General Residential zone, including retail. Retail uses are limited in size to 1,000 sqm to avoid the development of larger, traffic generating retail premises outside of accessible and identified centres.

2. Traffic, parking and infrastructure for the Alexandria Park Locality		
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Response
	Issue Summary	
2.3	Ind. 1; Ind. 7 There is not sufficient infrastructure to deal with an intensification of development in the area, particularly commercial development.	The Planning Proposal does not promote intensification of land uses in the area.
2.4	Ind. 9; The area should be improved with better connections and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians	<p>The City is moving toward a network approach to all traffic facilities and is developing a Liveable Green Network (LGN) as part of the Liveable Green network Strategy, which is a key <i>Sustainable Sydney 2030</i> project. The LGN will connect bike riders and pedestrians to the city centre, village centres and neighbourhoods, to public transport, education and cultural precincts as well as to major parks and recreation facilities. It will provide alternative transport choices that will make walking and cycling more attractive than using the car, particularly for short trips. The City will continue to investigate parking and traffic issues as part of the development of the LGN.</p> <p>The City of Sydney has an extensive bike network planned for the LGA. This vision will be carried out through the Cycle Strategy 2007-2017. The Cycle strategy shows a proposed cycleway in the location along McEvoy Street (nominated regional route).</p> <p>The cycle strategy identifies several regional and local bicycle routes offering north-south and east-west connectivity through the area.</p> <p>All proposed cycleways will also go through a process of a feasibility study to determine whether it is the best location and alignment. Following on from this, the community will be consulted for their ideas and feedback before taking the matter further.</p> <p>Intersection improvements associated with new development should greatly improve pedestrian and cycling amenity to allow greater transfer of people throughout the neighbourhood.</p>

2. Traffic, parking and infrastructure for the Alexandria Park Locality		
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Issue Summary
2.5	Government Agency - RMS	<p>Raise no objection to the Planning Proposal which proposes amendments to the controls for various sites.</p> <p>Development is to ensure that the integrity of the existing road widening reservation in the area is maintained.</p>
		<p>Response</p> <p>The proposed changes to the land use zone will not impede on the land currently reserved for the existing road widening. The road widening reservation will be maintained as part of the properties subject to rezoning in Alexandria Park.</p>

3. Park Road, Alexandria		
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Issue Summary
3.1	Ind. 3; Ind. 4; Ind. 5; Ind. 11; Ind. 13; Ind. 12; Ind. 16; Ind. 17.	<p>Re-opening of the Park Road closure at the intersection of Buckland Street would lead to increased traffic, deterioration in amenity for residents and park users, and a decline in safety for residents and park users.</p>
3.2	Ind. 4; Ind. 5; Ind. 7; Ind. 12; Ind. 17.	<p>Extending Park Road through to McEvoy Street would also increase traffic in the area around the par and Alexandria Park school, and would not make sense unless Park Road was opened at Buckland Street.</p>
		<p>Response</p> <p>There is no proposal to re-open the Park Road closure. In the Planning Proposal, the figure indicating the subject properties in the Alexandria Park locality did not show the road closure. This was inadvertent, but was interpreted by some as signalling the removal of the road closure. The Planning Proposal does not remove the road closure or in any other way seek to change the operation of Park Road.</p> <p>The extension of Park Road to McEvoy Street was one of the suggested locations for a new 20m wide local street identified in the Green Square Built Form Review (2007). This was translated into the relevant maps in <i>Sydney DCP 2012</i>. Proposed streets are shown in Council's preferred location with the intent of breaking up large blocks and increasing accessibility in the neighbourhood. If a future proposal is put forward to extend Park Road, it would be subject to a separate public exhibition and consultation process and a traffic study. The Planning Proposal does not seek to extend Park Road.</p>

4. Other – Alexandria Park			
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Issue Summary	Response
4.1	10	The underlying reason is to allow for an increase in building heights and floorspace ratio without public notification.	There will be no increase in the permissible height of buildings or of floorspace ratios as a result of this Planning Proposal.
4.2	10	The Alexandria Park locality has been placed in the Green Square area without any publicity or explanation	The area identified in the Alexandria Park locality statement (Section 2.5.1) in Sydney DCP 2012 has been identified as part of Green Square Urban Renewal Area since the development of the Green Square Structural Masterplan and its adoption by South Sydney Council in 1997. A Development Control Plan for this area was developed in consultation with the community and came into force in 2002 as an amendment to South Sydney DCP 1997. The area between Buckland Street and Henderson St is not part of the Green Square Urban Renewal Area.

5. 287-289 Crown Street			
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Issue Summary	Response
5.1	Ind. 19	The increase in allowable building height would lead to a building that is disproportionate to its surroundings, and which would be incompatible with and have an adverse effect on the attractive residential village streetscape of Crown Street. It will create an unwelcome precedent for other developers to follow.	<p>The recommended height increase from 15m to 18m for the site reflects a scale of development that is appropriate for the site in its context. The maximum height of 18m (5 storeys) can be achieved on the site without adversely impacting the surrounding properties.</p> <p>A setback from Crown Street above the third level will reduce the perceived height of the building when viewed from Crown Street, ensuring that a new building would be no more visually intrusive than the existing building.</p> <p>A setback is also defined at the back of the property, along Reservoir Lane. This setback is proposed to provide a transition in height from the existing 1 and 2 storey dwellings (at Reservoir Lane) to the maximum 5 storey height control proposed for the subject site. The floor area of level 5 (i.e. 5th storey) will also be limited to accommodate up to 50% of the level 4 floor area.</p>

5. 287-289 Crown Street		
Issue No.	Submitter/s	Issue Summary
5.2	Ind. 19	<p>The extra traffic will be detrimental to residents in the area.</p>
		<p>Response</p> <p>The existing three storey building on the site operates as the City Crown Motel. A café operates from the ground floor at the Crown Street frontage.</p> <p>The proposed development is appropriate in this context and is not likely to generate significant additional traffic impacts.</p> <p>Increasing housing in well-connected existing centres aligns with the key strategic directions at the State Government level. The proposal will result in greater housing choice in an area that is well connected and well serviced.</p>