

# SAVE MARRICKVILLE

www.savemarrickville.com.au  
hello@savemarrickville.com.au  
www.facebook.com/SaveMarrickvilleSouth/



## Save Marrickville's Comments on Draft Character Report 20/5/19

Save Marrickville is a group of residents taking positive action to ensure that the growth of our suburb is planned properly for our community, the environment and future residents. The key objectives of Save Marrickville include:

- No overdevelopment
- No high rise
- Sympathetic, well designed development and density
- Appropriate and considered transition points
- Preservation of heritage and local character
- Preservation of industrial and employment lands
- Appropriate infrastructure identified and implemented before rezoning
- Affordable housing
- Promotion and preservation of our natural assets and local environment
- Planning control to stay with [Council](#)

The Save Marrickville group invited our community to comment on the ARUP Draft Character Statement for East Carrington Road and the comments below are a collection of what was fed back to various members in the group in both written and verbal form. (Please note the SM group are volunteer residents and the information provided below is based on what has been provided to us, much of it is verbatim).

### Overview:

Save Marrickville supports the statement on page 37 that states, “Urban scale which is not well considered can potentially impact on privacy, liveability and views and ultimately diminish the character of a neighbourhood”.

The character statement does highlight the importance of respecting existing character, however it is unclear how this can then be reconciled with any large-scale development along Carrington Road.

Page 9 explains the evolution of character as outlined by the Greater London Authority. The character of an area evolves over time. Character is organic – not created or replicated. The history that has occurred in Carrington Road, including the current owners and tenants who have managed its use, has contributed to the character of this parcel of Marrickville. Replacing the industrial land for another new high density residential developments will not preserve the character of this parcel

of Sydney with its eclectic mix of tenants and uses. There is only one place in Sydney that has multiple set studios for hire so close to the city. There is only one place in Sydney (actually the world) that has the last remaining heritage Holden building. There are very few industrial and creative clusters left in the inner parts of Sydney and Carrington Road is at risk of losing this.

“I think the photographs in this document say it all! They amply illustrate why the low rise, mixed use character of the East Carrington Road precinct should be preserved. The unique characteristics of the existing environment have led to an ongoing renaissance, creating a vibrant art and heritage rich area where people come together to both live and work. High rise development has no place here and should be banned!” – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

There are specific things that have the potential to **kill** the character of Marrickville:

- Unaffordable housing
- High rise
- Expensive bland shopping strips
- Excess concrete
- Hip shiny blocks of units
- Gridlocked roads
- Inorganic / unauthentic or poorly designed community spaces
- Loss of creative industries
- Loss of industrial lands
- Overshadowed neighbourhoods
- The loss of our village feel and scale
- Poor transition points to residential areas
- Loss of character buildings
- Over-population and overuse of our limited green space

As these things make up our character – they *must* be noted in any document that highlights ‘our’ character. If we are to preserve and enhance character, those specific things that put that character at risk must be named. General statements about the ‘diversity’ of our area are not enough to protect and enhance what is important to the area and community.

“What is being planned for this site? How high and how many buildings are planned? What will be kept of the industrial site and how will buildings be adapted? Without this information it is impossible to determine how the project will fit in with local character” – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

*Question:* ARUP – Based on what you believe the character to be, what do you think the ‘use’ should be and what should the ‘scale’ be?

*Question:* What methodology have you used to get this information and who in the community (page 7) have you spoken to?

The position of Save Marrickville and Marrickville residents is clear:

1. The East Carrington Road site should preserve industrial use of this area.
2. Buildings in Marrickville should be no more than 5 storeys at maximum.

## **SPECIFIC ISSUES RAISED BY COMMUNITY:**

### **Environment: including the connection to the Cooks River, green space and the topography of the site**

“The character study makes a point of saying (page 48) that ...."green space accounts for a significant portion of land within the Inner West LGA. Here, the provision of open space per capita exceeds the council’s benchmark of 11.5m<sup>2</sup> per person” however what it also should say is that the Inner West Council has recently circulated the tree management development control plan which sets a target of 40% for tree canopy by 2030. Marrickville currently is nowhere near meeting this target with currently 11-15% only. Other surrounding areas around this planned development are significantly lower – 0-10% in Sydenham, St Peters and Tempe”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

“This idea of adding trees to cities is to provide cooling to counteract global warming – it should be noted in this study that new developments in and around Marrickville (the library, the developments down Illawarra Road etc have NOT provided any trees, just cement. It should be noted that the very nature of high rise is counterproductive to this target because they significantly reduce sun and hence the number and types of plants that can even grow”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Page 32 references the undulating topography of the area and the importance of this providing a tangible and visual connection to the landscape and position in Sydney. It also sites the high rise development at Wolli Creek. Those in Marrickville have no choice but to look at Wolli Creek, from a distance. This development is imposing, appears congested and has created wind tunnels. However, the Wolli Creek developments are in another LGA, and thankfully separated from Marrickville by the Cooks River and some distance. It is not a part of and is not a feature of the character of Marrickville. Marrickville is a village and residents do not want to have a version of Wolli Creek’s overdevelopment at our front door. We would welcome the opportunity to use Wolli Creek as a case example of poor planning.

The low topography of the Carrington site does not justify putting up tall buildings. We are in a valley and you can truly get a sense of that by the current built form. This sense of space and topography would be lost with endless buildings filling up the space and overshadowing everything around it. Marrickville is a village and buildings should not dwarf the surrounding environment.

*Comment: Any development should nestle into its environment and enhance it, not overwhelm it. Please include that high rise would not be suitable for this site and is not currently a characteristic of this suburb.*

*Question: How will the topography and open space be enhanced by this development? What investment in a tree canopy would be needed on such a site to maintain character and counter a heat sink effect in Marrickville?*

## Community Space

Page 54 – "...the presence of public plazas, such as the Alex Trevallion Plaza adjacent to Marrickville Road (image 64) encourages residents to take pause and linger within the centre". Have the developers ever "lingered" in this plaza? This is a very poor example of a community space. This should not be used as an example of a 'place or community space' that the locals value and should not be replicated in any shape or form. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

## Green Space

Save Marrickville would query that we have a higher than average quota of green space in the Inner West. Is this actually the case for Marrickville? A recent article in the SMH (21 April 2019 by Caitlin Fitzsimmons) noted that the Inner West has the least amount of public open space per person in Sydney according to the NSW office of Local Government.

The maps on page 49 suggest there is enough parkland and green space in the area however, several of the spaces are difficult to access from the site and one spot listed is not actually accessible to the public next to the railway line. Tempe Golf Range is also earmarked to be acquired by the State Government. There is limited information about which is active and which is passive space and how it is used. Currently, Mackey Park and Steel Park are both overused as sporting fields and have no capacity to accept more teams.

*Comment:* Please include and note the impact that increased density will have on green and community spaces.

*Comment:* Please remove 'green space' at end of Carrington Road as it is inaccessible.

*Question:* How much of Marrickville and the study area is made up of families who use open spaces? What is the prediction of the type of resident that would move into any proposed development and what impact would that have on current open space and how would that inform the need for new space?

## Flooding

"The draft situates the development within Marrickville's urban built environment, particularly its units, apartments and high rise protrusions in downtown Marrickville. The draft provides cursory and incidental acknowledgment of the fact that the precinct is built on Gumbramorra Swamp, an area of great importance to Aboriginal Australians of the area and a source of flooding because the natural systems have been suppressed over the last 150 years". – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

The Cooks River is mentioned only in passing, without any understanding of the river's key contribution to the aesthetics of landscape in the environs of the site in question – including the ambiance and feel of the surrounding area is not captured

in the photos or text; and yet this river perspective rather than urban Marrickville is the nearest and most appropriate context for evaluating how the [Carrington](#) area should be treated – as an integral part of the Cooks River and Gumbramorra flood plain and connected open space - not as something which needs to be drained for a hip high rise residential zone indistinguishable from any other such area in the city, but as part of the river’s environment.

“The consultants should read Ian Tyrrell’s book, *River Dreams: The People and Landscape of the Cooks River* to understand how the area will be affected; and to understand the cultural character of historical Marrickville, which is derived from its place in the natural environment of the Cooks River valley, not by referencing some externally imposed dream of a hipster destination or a “diversity” founded on a medium density, or, still less, high rise built environment.” – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Residents noted that when high tide meets flood-water or when waters are being blocked from drains, this area suffers water inundation. “Industrial land is better suited here”.

It is obvious that flooding is a serious issue in Carrington Road. One recommendation of this character study should be that Mirvac needs to say what they plan to do to mitigate flooding risk and how this will impact on current ecosystems i.e. if they divert flood water, where will it be diverted to and what effect will this have on the Cooks River and adjacent parklands and birdlife, and flooding downstream? – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Page 50 – Hydrology acknowledges that “Flooding results in economic and social impacts (e.g. damage to property, social disruption)” and that climate change-related increases in rainfall are predicted to exacerbate current flooding levels. “True character of site is Wetlands/swamp so one would question the wisdom of planning to increase population density on this site”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

**Comment:** The community fear that building on a flood zone will result in buildings that will become damaged and too expensive to maintain or repair. This could result as one Save Marrickville supporter stated, “the slums of the future”. The continued denial of this area as a flood zone will not enhance or help the Cooks River. The pressure of thousands of more people on the local ecosystem will inevitably have an impact. Please add a recommendation around the flooding issue outlining the impact on current ecosystems.

**Question:** How will the developers/owners ensure the river and local ecosystem will not be damaged by this development (including into the future)?

**Question:** What consultation has been done with the Aboriginal elders and community about the significance of this site and how will that be reflected in the site?

## Transport (cars, trains, roads, traffic, parking)

### **Trains:**

Page 52 – "Within Marrickville, the utilisation of the train network is higher, with 31.1% of working residents relying on this method of transportation. Does this then tell us that a greater number of working people do not use trains or buses? Does this then indicate that car use is in fact the most utilised method of transport? This needs to be clearly documented in an open, honest and transparent way".

"There is also no mention of stay-at-home residents such as primary carers and retirees. These "non-working" people are a huge part of Marrickville's "local character" and, therefore, their transport use should also be noted". – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

"If Tempe station is recognised as the closest station (250m) to this proposed development, then some home truths about this very station also need to be mentioned. The very fact it does not have an elevator is one of the main concerns. People who need an elevator will not want to walk or push their way to Marrickville or Sydenham".

| Marrickville to the Eastern City CBD data needs s revising – Estimate of 28 mins by car and 22 mins by bus may be possible in the middle of the night but does not reflect actual travel times during the day and definitely not during peak travelling times.

| Page 52 – Public Transport links: although "The study area is also served by several bus routes (412, 418, 423, 425, 426, L23, M30 & N40)" the majority of these require long walks from Carrington Road before being able to access them.

### **Roads:**

The character study talks about the movement and legibility (page 54) .....

"In addition, several street typologies abound the study area, offering varied movement and place-oriented experiences for motorists and pedestrians alike. To the south of the East Carrington Road site, the Princess Highway (A36) is the primary movement corridor within the study area. The Princess Highway is a strategic corridor for freight movements and is characterised by six lanes (three northbound and three southbound). At key intersections, additional turning lanes are offered, allowing access to adjacent big-box commercial and industrial premises residing within the enterprise corridor at Tempe".

| There are major arterial roads, but it needs to be recognised that these are currently congested and slow bottlenecks for a large part of the day. There is no mention here as to how many cars currently use Carrington Road, or Unwins Bridge Road, or their capacity; that these are one lane each direction and there should be images of the gridlock that occurs every afternoon and morning. There should be a recommendation around this.

"Collector and distributor roads are also present within the character study area. These roads typically connect communities to major sub-arterial and arterial roads and are illustrated in Figure 27". Warren Road is the MAIN "connector" of Carrington Road

residents through to suburbs to the west, such as Canterbury, Dulwich Hill etc. Warren Road is the clearest route connecting drivers "west" from Carrington Road. With this in mind, super narrow, accident-prone Warren Road should be marked under the banner of a "Collector and Distributor Road" NOT a "local road". – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

### **Cars / Traffic:**

There are too many cars on our local roads already. "Obviously there is already a huge strain on local roads brought on by overdevelopment elsewhere, including Canterbury, Mascot, Marrickville, Wollli Creek. The morning peak hour, which used to be okay a few years back is now a nightmare and lasts longer". (Specific reference to the roads in the vicinity of the roundabout at Gannon St (Tempe) going south to Rockdale).

"More cars are parked in our local streets because State Rail parking is inadequate. Years ago there used to be several vacant car parks at Tempe train station, but now they park the entire Undercliffe Rd, local streets and in parks". – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

One resident suggested retaining the Sydenham to Bankstown line and use the Carrington site to build electric cars, fitting in with its historical foundations.

*Comment:* Please be more honest about the physical constraints of this site in relation to roads and access. The reality of having a rail line at both ends of the site creates a funnel for traffic, which already is very problematic. This should be included under 'road network' and highlighted as current congestion issues. Character is informed about how people feel in a space/place, if road rage is the predominant emotion; it significantly reduces feelings of connection and community.

*Question:* How will higher density and a significantly increased population impact on the way this area is used by foot, cycle, train and car? What impact might that have on current local residents and their connection to South Marrickville? What plans does Mirvac have to provide adequate parking for this area?

### **Building Heights and Population**

"I don't think I saw if there were intended reductions in proposed building heights, or proposed units, even square metres of each. The original proposal was grossly over in height and unit numbers".

"I was concerned that the previously released Interim Consultation Outcomes Reports did not appear to mention any feedback specific to the heights of any proposed development. I know that myself and others at the consultation session I attended raised concerns about loss of backyard privacy and obstruction of views from high-rise apartments. I searched the document and the words "high", "height", "density", "level", "storey" or "stories" and they were not mentioned in the feedback relating to the development scale at all". – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Page 4 – Refers to NSW Government Planning & Environment's desire to ensure that planning to accommodate housing and job growth in the new and existing communities recognizes and enhances local character. "This has been achieved

through adopting a place-based and designated approach for the study area, which builds on the valued characteristics of existing neighbourhoods and their places”.

Please note that if the end product is to be high-rise and high density then local character will be lost and statements on page 4 are meaningless.

Page 34 – Statement from Inner West Community Strategy Plan 2036 that “there is a low proportion of separate houses within the Inner West LGA (24% to compared with 55% in Greater Sydney) does not really apply to the immediate area around Carrington Road which is currently zoned as R2 and is predominantly large numbers of single houses that are single storey.

It would be good to see the percentage for the Marrickville village area, and not just overall Inner West data. Density data of 49.27 persons per hectare in Marrickville would indicate that many people continue to live in houses. The 2011 Marrickville LEP tried to limit medium density to shop top developments in order to save the houses and streetscapes. We question the statement that 66% of Marrickville’s total residential built form is medium/high density. Very little of Marrickville’s current residential development could be classified as being high rise at over 8 storeys, and there is little over 5 storeys.

Several developments, Anzac Club are now townhouses, Revolution apartments are on old RSL site is 5,7& 9 stores and the old Council car park 6/7 storeys. Revolution Apartments at 9 storeys has been the highest before the one planned 11 storeys tower on the old hospital site. Note that the old hospital site has been multi-storey since it was built, and this was seen as an anomaly for its special use. Shop Tops range from 3 to 6 storeys, some corner blocks 7 so not medium/ high rise.

“Page 37 – Agree that “Urban scale which is not well considered, can potentially impact on privacy, liveability and views and ultimately diminish the character of a neighbourhood”. Placing large towers on East Carrington Rd would diminish the character and liveability of the surrounding area”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Page 38 – Would question the statements that allotments are zoned for taller 35m (10 storey) buildings within the study area. Is that reference being made to Wolli Creek? In which case it is incorrect, as Wolli Creek is not within 800m. The only 11 storey building in Marrickville is under construction on the old hospital site.

**Comment:** Carrington Road is nestled in a residential area. Some of the houses in this area have been here for 100 years. Increasing density in the area should be done sensibly to retain the village feel. Please include that consistency of character in the area would see no building over 5 storeys high.

**Question:** How will thousands of new residents connect with the Marrickville community and with each other in high density and high-rise? What type of ‘community’ will it attract with a high price tag?

**Question:** What does intensification (page 9) mean and who determines suitable density?

## Heritage / look and feel

“The area has deep history. The warehouses, the building styles are classic and I think they should stay. Development should not be all about how much money the developer can make at the expense of the community”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Pages 41 to 46 Character Areas – “It is very disappointing that photos of residential streetscapes much closer – within 400m and 800m have not been included, but Earlwood in different LGA and mixed use areas on Marrickville and Illawarra Roads are.” – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

**Comment:** Please include photos of the houses in the nearby surrounding area such as Renwick, Cary, Warren, Ruby and Premier Streets to highlight the residential form of this area.

“I do not agree that heritage should be looked at separately and its value determined outside the current document (Page 8) – heritage is very much part of character and contributes significantly to the character of a place. And why are we drawing on a London based document to decide questions of OUR heritage? Surely Sydney should be developing its own strategy for protecting heritage”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Page 8 – Reference to NSW Government Planning & Environment defines local character as “what makes one neighbourhood distinctive from another and mentions subdivision patterns”. This study site is an industrial part of Marrickville, which is surrounded by streets of period houses, which contribute greatly to the character of the area. When looking at the immediate surroundings within 400m and 800m there are other factories, creative spaces, a mosque and houses. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Figure 4 shows clearly that the study area is surrounded by R2 Low density residential. However, photos provided in study do not reflect this, e.g. on page 22 “B4 Mixed use photo” is not anywhere in Marrickville and looks like Wolli Creek – well beyond 800m. Page 23 – Only two photos of single-storey houses, which does not reflect the surrounding R2 area. It is seriously misleading for pictorial representation to not accurately reflect the character of the study area.

**Comment:** Pg 8 “...character is understood to be separate from considerations of heritage and conservation....”. The SM community does not agree with this statement and would like heritage to be looked at and considered as part of this report.

**Question:** Page 19 Images of both heritage listed and heritage protected are shown. What is the difference and how will each of these be treated in any new development?

## **Industrial Land, Jobs including creative industry**

“This area does not need to have a huge set of high rise units with shops underneath or nearby to justify the idea of meeting some sort of employment requirement, because destroying one form of employment and substituting it with a different set of employment does not address the loss of skill sets”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

Looking at the activity section you speak mainly about creatives and how they are 32% of the business but only take up 10% of the site area. Creative industries rely on each other and cluster together to share resources and ideas. Unique spaces and affordable rent has created a micro cosmos of industry here that is unique so close to the city. These industries are part of the identity of Carrington Road. Losing them to high rents, shifting while building, difficulty of access or noise during building etc will destroy them. Please not that other industrial uses of the site are also important to the local community and to the region.

*Question:* How much space do you intend to leave for creatives? Does this take into consideration the impact on function clusters and co-dependency of these clusters on each other? How will they be nurtured during potential years of building? How might rezoning East Carrington Road to residential impact on West Carrington road and what will this mean for ‘character’ in the area?

“Industrial jobs are our local character. The character of the area cannot and should not be simplified to artisanal products sold at markets. Historically (and to this day) the area has produced functional everyday items, eg. cars and vacuum cleaners. To value only those discretionary items such as jewellery and ceramics goes against the character of the area”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

“The statement is prioritising the 'cool stuff' which is also the 'stuff' that will help sell apartments. What about the rest of the manufacturing and industry? Why are they deemed disposable? It seems that the statement's authors are only interested in the 42 businesses that are deemed as creative via research findings from Hill PDA Consulting. This entirely misses the point of the *Made in Marrickville* report which stresses the importance of the mix between the creative and other manufacturing industries. The diverse clustering of businesses was a key component to the success of the businesses in the area. Keeping only one type of business (ie. creative businesses) on the east side of Carrington Rd will damage the precinct. Consistent with cities around the world, the successful mixing of creative and manufacturing sectors in the precinct is a result of IN1 zoning. Continuation of IN1 zoning is a basic prerequisite to sustaining local character”.

“They have not accounted for indirect jobs created by the businesses in the East Carrington Rd precinct, for example, musicians who use/rent the rehearsal and recording studios”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

“The limitations mentioned such as flooding seem arguable. Flash flooding does not occur often and is a reason why the original IN1 zoning was applied to the land”.

*Question:* Page 9 talks about ‘employment that is right for the area’. What do you mean by this? Who determines this?

*Comment:* Please note that areas are zoned industrial so that a broad range of industries can use the area, and there should be no artificial limitation on these industry types.

## **Affordable Housing**

“Respecting a suburb of creatives is admirable, but these apartments will not do that if there is little affordable housing amongst them. It is an investors dream to be inhabited by transients. I guess the model as we know it is Wolli Creek”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

“Page 5 refers to Greater London’s Authority’s Shaping Neighbourhoods Character and Context Planning Guidelines (2014). Would be good to follow London’s Affordable Housing Strategy in the revised plan of 2017 which requires 35% to a maximum 50% of new developments providing for affordable housing”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

*Comment:* Marrickville’s diversity and sense of community is a direct result of the eclectic mix of people from all income brackets, educational backgrounds and various cultures. The community does not want housing that only attracts those with a lot of money and locks out people who may not have the same opportunities as others to access wealth. Affordable housing should be meaningfully done, not in a tokenistic way.

## **Noise / Health**

*Comment:* Please update us on any conversations you have had with Sydney Airport.

“Noise needs to be added – when will this be addressed? There is also no mention of a health impact assessment of any development in the area. We should be looking to health impact like those done for Green Square and other big Sydney developments”. – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

## **Build and Design Quality**

“I do note that they highlight an example of inappropriate development on Illawarra Road No. 415 (Page 37 and Figure 37). That is an unfinished three-storey wall of a shop and apartment complex butting against a small cottage. Oddly enough Wave 415 which is nestled in that complex is an example of great urban design”.

“ This raises the huge question of build and design quality which is not addressed but should be part of any local character study. Our area is characterised by organic layering of development. Some of it is awful and scruffy but much is good quality and interesting – mainly anything built pre-1960. New builds, as Carrington will have to be, are routinely designed to look as sparkly and new as possible for impact. That rarely sits well within an old suburb. And because the sparkle is generally superficial with citrus coloured panels and poor render, new builds tend to look scruffy in a

very unappealing way within a few years. 'Building the slums of tomorrow today' as someone said at one of our community gatherings. The design quality of Wave 415 really is exceptional and exemplary but possibly not transferable to high-rise". – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

*Comment:* Please include the importance of good design and quality buildings.

## Fears

### **Wolli Creek:**

“Walk around Wolli Creek units and sadly trees are not a major consideration. Even the shopping strips are lacking. When I say this, Tempe House and its well kept gardens are not included.” – *Save Marrickville Supporter*

There is only one small strip of interest there with coffee shops and restaurants (near the train station entrance). The rest is a whirlwind of businesses stuck in there. There is also a wind tunnel effect and over-shadowing. There is also a reminder of unfinished multi-storey development that has crept along the river that this area is overdeveloped. We are aware that public access to historic Tempe House has been severely restricted.

### **Overdevelopment:**

Page 24 – Agree with statement that people of Marrickville are “Bound by a strong sense of social justice, everyone is welcome and can participate in local life.” “There is a strong sense of belonging”. This aspect of the character of Marrickville would be destroyed should the study site be overdeveloped with multiple high-rise buildings, which increase social isolation and decrease community ties and the ability of people to easily connect with each other.

*Question:* How do you propose to ‘create’ (and maintain) the feeling of belonging?

### **Too much strain on local environment:**

Page 26 – Agree with statement “The community are informed and possess a shared desire to implement strategies that are both environmentally-focused and target climate change.” However local concerns regarding suitability of site for high-rise development, considering current and past flooding, climate change and more frequent weather/flooding events, increased sea levels and higher tidal surges and the fact that the lowest part of the site is only 1.4m above sea level are not being taken seriously, and have not been included in this study.

### **Kill current and emerging character:**

“I did not spot any comment of the recent and slowly improving revitalisation of the shopping strip with new bars and restaurants on Marrickville and Illawarra Roads, which may lose momentum if a new shopping or restaurant area is introduced”.

## General comments on document

- No recommendations are provided, “...the aims of ‘articulating the diversity and values that contribute to the fabric of a place’ have not been

achieved in this document”. If you are going to go to the effort of describing character with a view to its impact on development then it should make a series of recommendations as to what will be in keeping with character and what will not.

- Page 8 speaks of character being about people. “The document should then go beyond crude statistics about gender, ethnicity and numbers of people per hectare”. Data telling a more complete story about the types of households in Marrickville (renters, owners, families, singles etc). The rents as compared to other parts of Sydney. Public and social housing use and demand, and other affordable housing, and the potential impact of overdevelopment on the most vulnerable in our suburb.
- The study says it is a qualitative and quantitative assessment but apart from the various documents that have been summarised, what methods were used? These are not described so it is impossible for the reader to determine the comprehensiveness of the content. Were there interviews with residents? Feedback from those who run businesses in Carrington Rd? If not, this is a summary of a bunch of council and planning documents, some history and a few photos from surrounding streets only. If this is an analysis on which the future hinges (page 4) then it needs to be rigorous and the methods transparent.

### Questions raised by community

- Why is a London based document being used to help decide questions of our heritage? Is there not a Sydney or Australia based benchmark?
- Many statements in the document are lifted from the IWC 2018 community strategic plan but **how will these things be achieved** on this site? Eg: “.....a place of excellence for creative industries....”; “.....high standard of planning, urban design and development that supports urban centres will further establish creative communities and a strong economy in IW....”; and “...facilitating the availability of affordable spaces for creative industries...”. How will this be achieved?