



## **Submission by Save Dully in response to the draft GreenWay Masterplan**

The Save Dully Action Group represents residents living in the suburb of Dulwich Hill in Sydney's inner-west. It was formed in 2015 in response to urban renewal investigations in the Sydenham to Bankstown corridor, which has a significant impact on Dulwich Hill. It has assembled more than 300 residents on a mailing list and is meeting regularly and has a website, [www.savedully.com](http://www.savedully.com)

Save Dully would like to make a number of comments in relation to the draft GreenWay Masterplan.

At the outset, we would like to say that the GreenWay is going to be, without doubt, a tremendous asset for the suburb of Dulwich Hill and we warmly welcome the council's initiative to progress this Masterplan. Dulwich Hill will benefit from the increased open space, environmental improvements and improved active transport connectivity which comes about as a result of the delivery of the GreenWay in our suburb. The GreenWay's delivery also comes following a tremendous amount of community activism, by residents in Dulwich Hill and surrounding suburbs, over many years.

However, we do have some specific comments in relation to the draft Masterplan and would like these to be further considered by the council.

### **References to development in the masterplan**

The masterplan, in our view, makes a number of inappropriate references to development in Dulwich Hill. These are listed below:

- A map on page 21 shows the precinct map for Dulwich Hill (taken from the Sydenham to Bankstown urban renewal strategy) and then keys this map as "Future Development". This is inaccurate. Within this map, many streets will be retained for low-density uses.
- Text on Page 21 praises the Sydenham to Bankstown strategy as "a planned approach to growth with infrastructure delivery and development co-ordinated along the corridor". This does not reflect the council's significant concerns about the strategy and its proposed levels of overdevelopment.

- The strategy itself is not described as a draft on page 20, when in fact it is very much a draft.
- On page 123, the western side of Hercules St is described as a “Development Zone”, including showing the proposed extension of Hercules Lane through the western side of Hercules St. This development zone has not been confirmed at this time.

We would prefer the masterplan is amended in the following ways:

- State the corridor strategy is a draft which remains unapproved and in limbo (we have been informally been told by the Department of Planning that the strategy may be abandoned and planning power returned to the council); and
- State that the council strongly opposes the corridor strategy and in fact would prefer to drive strategic planning in our suburb
- Remove the reference to the proposed Hercules St development zone, or at least make it clear it is a draft idea.
- Amend the map on page 21 to remove the inaccurate reference to the Dulwich Hill precinct.

### **Property acquisitions**

We note that page 120 of the masterplan reports that the council is already contemplating liaising with the future “developer” of some land in western Hercules St, to acquire (or get a dedication of) this land to allow a new northern entrance to Jack Shanahan Park. The masterplan is not clear as to whether discussions have already occurred with this developer.

Our concern is that a developer will only be willing to dedicate land if he or she achieves a major increase in development yield on the remaining land in the development site. This can only be achieved by increasing heights and density above the already very high and inappropriate eight storey height limit proposed in the corridor strategy.

As such, we would request that the council not undertake a voluntary planning agreement with the developer and simply instead acquire the land needed.

We also think it is prudent to limit - to the greatest extent possible - any property acquisition to the amount simply required to ensure an entry to the park extension off Hercules St and to not deliver a ‘gold-plated’ option in this area.

### **Future purpose of Jack Shanahan Park extension**

We note that the 1.1 hectare Jack Shanahan Park extension is described as a proposed “Youth Hub”, after there was support in the initial round of masterplan consultation for expanding youth-based activities across the park extension.

However, we are concerned that the masterplan could lock in this concept of a “Youth Hub”, when there has not been deep and rich consultation and place-making with the local community to support this conclusion.

Southern Dulwich Hill has a relatively low level of open space and there needs to be careful consideration about community needs across a range of population segments, before a decision is made to designate this park extension as a “Youth Hub”. There is also a need for the community to better appreciate and reflect on the detailed design elements which are being proposed in this area.

Furthermore, the concept of a “Youth Hub” doesn’t appear to fully embrace the interesting environmental features which are proposed, along with the fact that this area has the

potential to be suburban Sydney's answer to the "High Line" due to the fact that it contains an abandoned rail corridor.

As such, we would ask that the masterplan be amended to refer to the need for a future community-centred place-making process in this area, just as the masterplan refers to revised place-making strategies happening in Johnson Park and Laxton Reserve.

### **Route of cycle path south of Ewart St**

We note the proposal for a cycle path south of Ewart St, to run through specific streets, including turning Ness Avenue into a 'bike boulevard' and removing 12 parking spots in Garnet St to build a dedicated bike path.

We also note that the masterplan acknowledges that planning in this area, including for the golf course, a new Cooks River crossing and sites in Ewen Park, remain ongoing and therefore the masterplan is indicative only.

Nevertheless, it is inevitable that designating a particular street for the GreenWay is going to lead to intense interest from residents who live on this route.

As such, we would recommend:

- Detailed consultation with streets before routes are designated as GreenWay routes
- Consideration that all streets in the entire south Dulwich Hill precinct could be promoted and planned as a low-speed and bike-friendly, without designating one particular route as the GreenWay route.

Yours Sincerely,

Mark Skelsey  
on behalf of Save Dully  
26/6/18