

I live at Jannali the Sharks development but I am concerned about the precedent for the whole Shire from approval of any Gateway application irrespective of the LEP zoning, such as foreshore protection areas. The Sharks development has twisted the concept of a true Town Centre to suit the site's disadvantages.

I now object to any **further** increase in scale.

---

### **Visual impact**

A justification for Concept Plan approval was that the western high-rise precinct was at least 300 metres from an existing house,

but new high rise now proposed in the eastern precinct would be only 120 metres away.

The same angle of elevation demands a building no more than five storeys at the corner of Captain Cook Drive and Woollooware Road

much less than even the Departments recommended reduced height of 8-9 storeys at the edge or 9-14 stories in the middle.

---

### **Traffic**

Except for the intersection with Captain Cook Drive, no published traffic study has ever appeared for roads in Woollooware North that would substantiate claims that the local road network would continue to operate at acceptable levels.

Claims of Roads and Maritime endorsement are irrelevant because these are not RMS roads.

---

The proponent argues that the traffic increment from the increased development would be minor.

However the residential traffic has been underestimated from misusing the intended concept of a town centre

and the greatest proportional traffic increase, about 85% or more, over present traffic from the development will occur in Woollooware Road.

This suggests exponential problems from increment piled on increment.

At least one remedial requirement might be a developer funded right hand turning lane from Denman Avenue into Woollooware Road for shopping traffic.

---

The 2002 RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Developments states that Safety is a primary consideration in planning for developments.

Nowhere in any traffic report or assessment report have i seen any reference to road safety.

## **Parking**

Planning NSW states “to ensure the approved road upgrade measures and traffic management measures remain effective” has now capped parking provision

with the hope of reducing the demand for private car ownership and any associated use of surrounding car parking spaces by future residents.

The Department’s response to Council comments about **existing** overflow car parking impact has been to reclassify them as **unexpected** problems and to dump the problem onto the Council to apply and enforce car parking restrictions.

---

The proposed shared parking for retail and residential uses will not prevent the need for overflow residential parking

but **will** paradoxically free up retail parking during the day as the development’s residents will overwhelmingly need to drive to work places not well served by public transport

or opt to commuter park near Woolooware Station, leaving only the shire’s typical small percentage using the bus.

With the claimed critical shortage of shopping facilities, the attraction of extra retail car parking would make the standard parking rates a severe underestimation of the generated traffic.

---

## **RAMSAR Wetlands**

Bird strike in this internationally important wetland would be increased by more high buildings.

The promised Ornilux glass has been shown in overseas studies to reduce, but not eliminate, birdstrike.

---

Capping of the site over the tip could create a dam to and the flood pressure gradient could force seepage of poisons from within the old tip into the bay.

A previous report quoted “Elevated concentrations of arsenic” in the ground in addition to the methane gas problem.

---

**The following risks highlight the imperative not to expose even more people to harm.**

---

### **Fire hazard**

The Fire Safety Engineer's report proposes that excessive compartment sizes and extended travel distances will be overcome by performance based engineering with enhanced smoke detection, smoke control, and sprinklers.

However these would become inoperative if the electrical supply is cut off or the plant room fails or may itself be the cause of the fire.

---

It is unclear if the proposed high rise towers would be protected by a sprinkler system, particularly with the compounded risk of the propensity for shopping centre fires posing a risk from below, exacerbated by a tenuous evacuation route down through the retail area and a multiple level car park before reaching ground level

---

### **Flooding**

The only responses to the Director General's requirements is a reference to widening the flood path above the storm water channel,

and a recurring statement:

“During a flood event, residents will not be affected by flooding as all areas are well above peak flood levels. Evacuation should not be necessary except in the case of medical emergency.”

unquote

They can't fix this problem but prefer to expose an extra 500 residents to be stranded by flooding.

---

### **Electromagnetic dangers**

I made a submission about this issue for the Concept Plan.

Successive Magshield reports have retreated from the precautionary principle to more recent general statements that the electromagnetic fields are substantially smaller than the highest safe level for exposure recommended for the general public by the national and international standards.

Why **highest** safe level why not **lowest**?

They don't say if they refer to the readings from measurements or take into account future changes and peak electrical demand.

There is no medical opinion that allays concerns about the increased risk of child leukaemia, now proposed for another 220 families.

---

I reiterate my objection to increased development over that already approved