



*PRESERVING AUSTRALIA'S OLDEST GARDEN SUBURB*

*P.O. Box 85, HUNTERS HILL, N.S.W. 2110*

15 March 2018

Barry Smith  
The General Manager  
Hunters Hill Council  
Alexandra St.  
Hunters Hill

Dear Barry,

**The Planning Proposal for  
The Gladesville Shopping Village Site**

The Planning Proposal for the Gladesville Shopping Village (GSV) site is to revise the Local Environment Plan (LEP) in order to change the planning controls that relate to the site.

The changes, which include a number of qualifying clauses, if approved will allow the developers to increase the heights and densities on the site above what is allowed under the current LEP.

This will allow them to build more units and make more profit. The only winners from this proposal, if it is successful, will be the developers. The rest of us will suffer from day one, when the existing shopping and parking facilities are closed, right through the dust and noise and heavy vehicle movements during the build and after completion, when the traffic and population increases will have continuing negative impacts right across the region.

This is typical of the way planning is conducted in NSW. Essentially it has nothing to do with creating places or maintaining character because the State and Local Government are stuck with the existing land ownership patterns and do not have the will or the finances to even attempt to change those patterns. This is particularly so in Hunters Hill whose tiny rates base renders it incapable of any major financial input into this proposal.

The recent resolve of Hunters Hill Council to develop a Master Plan for Gladesville is to be welcomed. However, because the Council does not have the wherewithal to pay for a professional plan, let alone enforce the necessary co-operation between landowners to allow for block amalgamation, the chances of its success are probably nil. We also have to ask the question "whatever happened to the old Master Plan?"

There are already a number of the sites along Victoria Road to the west of the Gladesville Shopping Village (GSV) site that are subject to current Development Applications and, no doubt there are more to come. All of these sites require on-ground vehicular access across the western boundary of the GSV site for underground parking areas for residents, tenants and the public, as well as for deliveries of goods and services.

As a result, vehicular traffic movements along the existing access lane between Cowell and Massey Streets will increase dramatically. This will have a seriously detrimental impact on people using the area, particularly the GSV site. It will result in a badly designed

hodgepodge of ingress and egress ramps to each development. This is in stark contrast to the idea of a pedestrian-only laneway with shops and cafes that was part of the original Master Plan.

It is blindingly obvious that the parking requirements and access for goods and services for the whole site should be integrated in a properly designed underground carpark so that vehicular movements do not happen at ground level and are an impediment and danger to pedestrians using the complex.

If these applications and the other developments proposed along this part of Victoria Road go ahead, it will be the end of any chance of achieving reasonable and responsible redevelopment of the whole site bounded by Victoria Rd, Massey, Flagstaff and Cowell streets.

The Trust has already submitted objections to the current DAs for the BWS site, the Commonwealth Bank site and the Gladesville Arcade site.

Until a Master Plan is in place for the whole site bounded by Victoria Road, Cowell, Flagstaff and Massey streets there can be no proper consideration given to any proposal to change the planning controls in the LEP or DCP. The Trust would not support any change that would increase the density of the site over and above what is allowed in the current LEP

We do not support any of the clauses proposed by the Pre-Gateway review.

The clauses relating to open space, "good design", etc. have been designed in a pathetic attempt to ameliorate the negative impact of proposed increases in density on the site. When "good design" is proposed as a bargaining chip for increased densities it implies that "bad design" is acceptable provided the arithmetic control boxes have been ticked. This, of course, makes a mockery of the current LEP and DCP as well as begging the question: "who will be the arbiter of "good" design?"

We are particularly outraged by the idea that Council would offer up to the developer potential sites for the relocation of the once publicly owned heritage item at 10 Cowell St, which are public parklands and essential open space.

The Trust has opposed Council's sell-off of 10 Cowell St to the developer since it was first mooted. We have never deviated from our opposition to this act of barbarism from a Council that claims to be a champion of Heritage.

To now have Council proposing that the developer should plonk the cottage down in public parkland just adds insult to injury.

It is clear that any proposal for the GSV that increases its density, population and building heights will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding low density residential areas and on the amenity of people wishing to visit the shops and offices housed in the site.

The Trust therefore objects to the Planning Proposal in its entirety.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tony Coote". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tony Coote  
Vice President  
The Hunters Hill Trust