Signe Westerberg

Mobile 0412 920 057 Email: swesterberg@iinet.net.au www.signe4liverpool.wordpress.com



Georges River Precinct Master Plan: Ref 2015/3245).

Attn: Acting CEO Liverpool City Council

Locked Bag 7064

LIVERPOOL NSW 1871

Delivered via email: lcc@liverpool.nsw.gov.au

Cc: Kieran Woolfe

I wish to register my concerns/objections and ideas concerning the proposals relating to the Georges River Precinct Master Plan.

While I am supportive of development and providing more homes for people coming to Liverpool the density proposed for stage 1 (and 2) is excessive and in my opinion unreasonable. This area is amongst the most flood prone in the LGA and the idea of marooning 50,000 residents or more on an island when the worst of weather is realized is irresponsible and potentially dangerous.

I have many concerns and some suggestions, for brevity I will do this in point form rather than what could become a very lengthy document.

• The statement made by Mr Sean Macken that council wants its river back was perhaps a poor start to the information session I attended. It concerns me that council often appears to forget the River belongs to the people of Liverpool, not the organization tasked with managing the day to day servicing of the LGA. While a small point Council works for us and on most occasions, does so efficiently and appropriately however, neither the money they manage or the land are owned by council nor its staff and on too many occasions is being referred to as 'theirs'. I know this is a small point but it most definitely plays to the attitude of the workers tasked with many important actions on behalf of the community. While a sense of ownership encourages local conscious thought, not losing awareness of the importance of representing the ratepayers and residents should always be front of mind.

- Another concern is that the enormous costs associated with doing these master plans with
 consultants etc when the Greater Sydney Commission could simply rule them out of hand without
 debate or discussion is potentially a great waste of rate payer's funds. Clearly the former Council set
 out to capitalize on development however losing businesses or worse encouraging plain greed will
 impact heavily on our community for a long time to come.
- Ensuring the river and surrounding land is used for the best outcome for all Liverpudlian's and to ensure that jobs, and not just retail outlet type jobs are kept in the LGA.
- The density proposed for stage 1 is of real concern. The idea that possible 40 storey buildings could be built is way in excess and I would suggest that in keeping with development in and around the CBD this be capped at 30 stories at the highest point. It is also important that any large residential/commercial buildings be stepped in height with the lowest at shore level and the highest being in the centre of the precinct ensuring that a graded balanced look and feel to the area is maintained. This would help create an exclusive look to the precinct and ensure an attractive addition to the visual amenity.
- It is essential that degradation of the shore line be kept to an absolute minimum, moving soil deposits from the lower lying areas to create higher areas I believe will have untold effects on local flora and fauna and needs to be dismissed.
- The foreshore area surrounding any development along the river should be twice what is already being proposed in the LLEP, this would mean that the area for community use and buffering would be sufficient to provide amenity and ambiance for both residents and the local community. It would also allow a greater buffer point when the waters do rise and they will.
- Any development should ensure that at least 1/5th of the area being developed be left for deep root planting, play and recreation. It is essential that we prove to developers that providing an environment as well as a dwelling will ensure they can optimize their profit while creating a home that encompasses lifestyle and pleasure. The days of how many humans can be fitted into every square metre must stop.
- While I am a huge advocate for social and affordable housing developers will resist when there is much more money to be made producing more rentable space. We should be aiming for 15-20% affordable and social housing. It will prove difficult to convince developers to see this as a positive we need to mandate this for each development.
- 7 possible walk-bridges across the river sounds good except building all those bridges would not only be expensive, the potential for damage to the ecological environment is huge. The balance between what is wanted and what is practical and environmentally sound is a balance that doesn't' appear to have been given enough attention.
- Avoiding the horrible and unpleasant cramping of buildings as is on the North side of the CBD to the Hume is a must. The buildings built along the highway are indicative of poor planning and poor workmanship. Some of those buildings under 7 yrs. old are showing signs of degradation and

- degeneration already. We need to demand a level of good workmanship to protect our residents into the long term.
- Boxes containing people is not good design, a good example of what not to do is the newest building on Elizabeth Street. There is no green amenity to anyone on the street level, building concrete to the curb is not inviting nor is it a good use of the space nor does it add to the visual amenity of the city.
- Concrete en-mass creates heat islands, this can be avoided when planning is done in such a way as to incorporate deep and shallow root plantings, trees and open space.
- Jobs being moved from the site of the 2 major Precincts is a real concern. Workers in area 1 are already aware their jobs are going but have no indication where, it is essential for Liverpool that these jobs remain in the LGA. Whether it requires incentives for the maintenance of those businesses to keep them in the LGA or not, every effort needs to be made to keep them local.
- Housing should include green walls and terraced plantings to add to the visual appeal and balance the heat island generated by so much concrete.
- Walk and cycleways need to be interconnected, well-lit and tree lined.
- Services available on the waterway need to be accessible and affordable and could include water taxi's (reducing the need for a plethora of bridges) paddle boat hire, café's etc.
- Water quality testing and maintenance is essential, Prof Alberto D Albani from WSU has done some studies, (available I believe on the GRCCC website) and he identified some areas already in distress. i.e. Barium near the hospital.
- All drainage to be using the highest WSUDesigns, there are some attractive, environmentally sensitive designs available that the developer could be required to include, rather than just simple drainage that requires council provide additional services to protect the waterway further down the system.
- All development needs to be visually appealing from the water and the land.
- Any biodiversity offsets need to be guaranteed, other areas in the LGA have supposed Offsets and are then used as links etc which circumnavigates any real advantage and causes distress to local fauna
- I have concerns regarding the walk-through areas to the river. While I love the concept, walkways in areas like the Green Valley area have been closed due to safety issues and systematically over the years absorbed into residential homes. These will only work if they are incorporated into well lit, wide passages without areas that can support anti-social behaviour.
- Traffic is going to be a huge issue for Precincts 1 and 2 particularly. Developing areas where there is only one or a proposed two accesses roads and that feed into already overcrowded main road is going to be exacerbated by the potential of 1.5 cars per residence and a transport terminal. This will not only require enormous parking facilities supplied by the developers (& NOT off loaded onto council) but very carefully timed and managed traffic movement accessories ie traffic lights, calming devises and from the beginning of the development not an afterthought.

My concerns and suggestions have focused on stage 1 however would be equally relevant to stage 2 and 3. It is very important to me that what I have presented is represented in the summary, if there is anything I have not been clear on, caused some discussion, misunderstanding or interest I am more than happy to be contacted for clarification. The development of the Georges River is most important, sadly it won't be something easily fixed if we get it wrong. For me concerns are that the area is environmentally considerate, aesthetically pleasing, totally livable and accommodating for the residents who will inevitably pay a lot to be able to live there. Creating a balance of what is necessary and what is desired is always going to be a challenge however with the potential high earnings the developers will realise it is necessary that council sticks firm to the goals and needs of the community it serves.

Kind regards

Signe Westerberg (Mrs)

Digne kuhsterloore

Resident / rate payer