



Sutherland Shire Environment Centre

PO Box 589 Sutherland NSW 1499 | office@ssec.org.au

www.ssec.org.au | ABN: 96 127 431 611

31 March 2017

Open Submission GSC Draft South District Plan

Sutherland Shire Environment Centre has considered the content of the Draft South District Plan (SDP). Our key points are as follows.

- A. “A sustainable city” should be our top priority. Without sustainability, we will not have productivity or liveability.
- B. Population increases are not beyond the control of government. More than 50% of our population increase is from immigration and can be influenced by the federal government.
- C. In Sutherland Shire increased number of dwellings needs to be preceded by increased *public* transport infrastructure to major employment areas of Greater Sydney.

3. A Productive City

- a. There needs to be a commitment in the SDP for improved transport between Sutherland Shire and developing centres of employment in Western Sydney. Some type of rail link between Sutherland-Menai-Glenfield would avoid the already over-capacity Illawarra Line.
- b. If commuters are to reach the goal of home-to-work in 30 minutes, then improved transport infrastructure and the appropriate investment is essential.
- c. The Illawarra Line (T4) is already operating at over-capacity levels during peak hour. However, there is no indication in the SDP of how workers from the 20,500 additional dwellings required between Wolli Creek and Sutherland Shire will be catered for.
- d. Increasing housing density must be accompanied by provision of adequate public transport.

- e. F6 corridor should only be used for increased *mass public* transport (e.g. light rail), together with open space/shared pathways. It should absolutely not be used for a “commuter” freeway, as the resulting congestion at end-of-trip, as well as the long delays caused by traffic accidents, outweigh any benefits in travel time. Further, research shows that the building of more roads is a temporary solution to transport problems as it attracts more road traffic.
- f. Existing employment zones need to be better protected and not allowed to be “contaminated” by retail and residential development, either conventional, affordable or retirement living types of development. These existing employment zones should be fully utilised to provide local jobs with less commuting travel required.
- g. Construction of the Sutherland-Cronulla Active Transport Link would reduce pressure on local roads, resulting in less parking problems at railway stations and improved community health.
- h. Figure 3-7 does not accurately reflect the current situation in Sutherland Shire. Yarrawarrah, Kareela and Taren Point are included yet, Kirrawee and Woolooware Bay (both with very substantial residential/commercial developments) and Kurnell are not.

4. A Liveable City

- a. Housing choice. The SSLEP2015 allows for a range of dwelling types in nearly all zones. This severely limits housing choices as developers buy up individual dwelling houses and build multi-unit housing. There needs to be more differentiation between residential zones, with multi-unit developments restricted to medium density areas.
- b. More emphasis should be placed on ACTIVE transport (e.g. bicycles and walking) and adequate provision made to connect them with places of employment, education, shopping precincts, etc. These forms of transport not only reduce congestion but also improve the general health of the community, thereby reducing community health costs.

5. A Sustainable City

- a. ***Sustainability should be the top priority for the SDP.*** Without sustainability there is no longevity in the Plan. A

healthy environment is critical for liveability and productivity. Ensuring that our built environment does not destroy our natural environment is important not only for our own health, and for the survival of our native wildlife, but also for the quality of life we bequeath to future generations.

- b. *Towards Our Greater Sydney 2056* states that “Greater Sydney is experiencing...growth with natural increases (that is an increase in the number of births) a major contributor...we need to recognize that...higher rates of growth are the new norm...” (page 8). However, the Department of Planning website shows (www.planning.nsw.gov.au/projections) this statement is incorrect. Of total growth of 2.7 million over the period 2011-36, 1.3 million is natural increase and 1.4 million is net migration. *The level of migration is not beyond control as it can be reduced by the federal government.*
- c. This rate of population growth and its associated increase in consumption impacts negatively on Sydney’s unique environment through loss of vegetation, increased erosion and weed dispersal from increasing storm water volumes, ever increasing waste management problems, over-use of resources and worsening air quality.
- d. While the SDP expresses support for biodiversity and protection of our (increasingly threatened) green spaces, it does not provide any indication of how we will move from the rhetoric to the actual processes that will protect Sutherland Shire’s natural environment.
- e. Action S5, while laudable for its encouragement of solar power, can undermine attempts to retain/improve tree canopy. More consideration needs to be given to *requiring* renewable energy use/production on commercial/community buildings and on large developments.
- f. Several large natural areas are omitted in the SDP, especially the West Menai area owned by Gandangara Local Aboriginal Land Council, Spring Gully at Bundeena and areas in Kirrawee and Kurnell Peninsula.
- g. Targets, key performance indicators and direct actions need to be included regarding canopy protection/improvement and biodiversity.

- h. Biodiversity offset schemes must be like-for-like and exclude supplementary measures such as cash payments.
- i. Figure 5-1 is incorrect and does not include Port Hacking Catchment.

Jenni Gormley, Chair