

Submission  
No 112

**INQUIRY INTO DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSPORT  
ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

**Name:** Name suppressed

**Date Received:** 27 March 2024

---

Partially  
Confidential

I absolutely oppose the ill informed and ill considered proposals in both parts of TOD and all sections of DWLH particularly as they relate to the Inner West Council area. It is a nice irony that Labor under Neville Wran passed the Heritage Act and now the current Labor government is preparing to trash Neville Wran's birthplace, the Balmain Peninsula, which is a heritage conservation area. The majority of this is slated for six storey apartments, as is much of the former Leichhardt Municipality. 75% of the Inner West will be adversely impacted by the government's proposed changes. Sydney has little enough left of its history and heritage and we have had to battle long and hard to retain what remains. The government's proposals will destroy what is left. It is not only a matter of heritage. I have lived in Balmain for more than fifty years so will take the Peninsula as an example of the damage that will result. The streets here are very narrow and were never designed for cars. There is often already gridlock in streets such as Mullens, and this has been exacerbated by yet another ill conceived project, the Rozelle Interchange which locks cars into the peninsula. Adding multi storey dwellings will make the situation impossible. And where do all those cars park? There is a particular problem in the former Leichhardt Council area as it is zoned R1, not R2 for reasons unknown to me. It already comprises mainly terrace houses and semi-detached dwellings which use space most efficiently and are suited to the area. Thus the heritage of the area could be maintained. This should be remedied and Leichhardt rezoned as R2. It is also an issue of health and safety. How will emergency vehicles access these areas? There are already problems in my street with parked cars impeding access. And what about access to sunlight and provision of trees for shade in an ever warming climate? If a developer buys up a couple of terraces or semis and builds the six storey apartments permissible under these proposals, they will overshadow their neighbours. Any trees in the already small courtyards of the demolished houses will be gone and eventually the whole street will be bare. We can see this with the earlier trend for three storey walkups which has resulted in hideous streets. Six storeys on a wider base would be even worse. These proposals also smack of arrogance on the part of the Minns government. There is no provision for local input or consideration and no avenue for appeals. Communist countries come to mind. We're supposed to be a democracy. And developers have shown that they care about profits not people. There is ample evidence of this in the multitude of cases coming before the Building Commissioner, David Chandler. Badly built, poorly designed and often still expensive. How will this improve housing affordability, let alone liveability? There has also been much publicity about the lack of tradesmen and -women. Minns has already had to revise his estimates of houses to be built down considerably. We could have gaps, like missing teeth in our streetscapes while projects are held up, tho' of course it will be worse once they are built. There are ways of providing more properly built housing but they require some thought and sensitivity, not the sledgehammer approach envisaged under the current proposals which should be rejected outright.