

Sydney siders love their open space areas and it is becoming evident that there are not enough large scale open space areas such as Centennial Park, Olympic Park or Royal National Park available for everyone. This is evident by the number of times these parks are either closed on temporarily closed due to overcrowding on certain days.

All new planning and developments must be accompanied by generous open space provisions.

Agree with almost all of this but with strong reservations about results of jamming social housing into all suburbs and selling off public land. You need survey to include tackling local government abuses of their heritage listing powers to heritage list as a tactic to stop development in urban/CBD areas.

Can this survey be either added to local government websites or an alert [incl. SMS, letter, notice, advertisement] from each council sent to all residents in each locality.

Transport is the driver to achieve what we seek for our City. So we must get it right for that purpose. Not just be driven by political correctness and votes

I am really interested in seeing the Govt move forward with changes to the strata as put forward in 2.8 given that there are thousands of small walk up unit blocks that are coming to the end of their life. Opening up such areas for new development would allow for a significant increase in dwellings/units.

1. Growth at any cost will damage the urban fabric ... the social affects of development are just as important as economic growth. Thus not only should there be a range of housing types, but there should be a range of housing sizes within the same suburb to cater for different socio-economic groups and ages ... diversity is a great strength.

2. The propensity for corruption to occur in the development process has been omitted from your survey ... where are the checks and balances ... are we agreeing to a higher level of corruption than already occurs?

3. A chap called Bob Hawke promised to plant 1 billion trees ... soon forgotten, but a great idea ... should we be concentrating on increased densities before we solve environmental issues.

4. Increases in value over a baseline resulting from increasing densities should be taxed as the time of sale for redevelopment to assist in the costs of infrastructure. It is a ridiculous social policy that increases in value to privately held property resulting from the investment of public funds should accrue solely to the land owner rather than partly also to the public. Back in the early seventies there was a Land Management Tax to redress this issue which lasted about 2 years before it found itself punted in the political too hard basket.

5. Whatever happened to the idea of Sydney becoming a poly nucleated mega region?

6. Of all the wasted land for redevelopment in Sydney it is that over railway lines and roads ... for example you could envisage a redevelopment of the Spit Bridge to incorporate residential and commercial as part of the bridge structure to pay for it.

7. I sell development sites for a living ... so I am all for development ... but not at any price.

8. I have lived in Sydney for 45 years and still wonder why it compares itself to Melbourne. A film about the end of the world "On the beach" with Ava Gardner was filmed in Melbourne which is all we need to know about Melbourne! Sydney is its unbelievable harbour and thus to reinforce social cohesion it is most important to increase access to the harbour particularly for those from western Sydney ... just think of the ways Cockatoo Island could be developed to provide harbour recreation for visitors.

In order to shift jobs to the western suburbs it is necessary to reduce the supply of land for jobs near the city or established areas, because people who make the decisions as to where jobs go (ie the business owners and executives) put them near where they live.

Development should benefit the community and not developers.

Integrating high density development successfully into low density areas is critical. How will this be achieved??

Code complying development is only supported if high quality development outcomes are guaranteed. The complying code for dwellings has resulted in ugly box-like dwelling houses with inappropriate materials / finishes being constructed in established areas (perhaps OK in outer Sydney). No design rules apply. This means that a pattern book or something similar needs to be prepared before code complying development for apartments/mixed use developments can be considered. Unfortunately developers can sometimes produce ugly buildings - example - building opposite Burwood Plaza. Affordable housing provision as part of developments (minimum percentage) is mandatory in the UK. Why not here?

Re contributions- some developments have particular local impacts which they should be responsible for.

Not in favour of changes to Strata Act for obvious (equity and moral) reasons.

Amalgamation of Councils will not necessarily mean better government - probably less representative.

Large projects should not be determined by bodies that are distant from the local community.

PS In my opinion questionnaire is perhaps not altogether neutral in terms of questions asked and available responses..

Regards.

The NSW Government agencies must have the skills and capacity to control and manage the densification and new construction which is needed to cope with the increasing population in the metropolitan area. The redevelopment around priority precincts should not be managed by councils nor be bullied by developers.

Neither the NSW Government nor Councils have the skills or resolve to do this at present. The headlong rush for high rise residential development currently occurring in the absence of all the other social and community requirements will lead to a deterioration in amenity and life style let alone employment areas and recreational facilities. these are all non earners to a developer. The Urban Task Force is on the right track with this survey but needs to recommend control measures at the same time. All the best with presenting this survey response to the Politicians. Getting them to respond to this survey in an appropriate manner will be the challenge..

we need strong and pro-active planning reform to get rid of bias red tape at local council, to clear the way for development growth and certainty, otherwise we will stagnate behind other states who have proved to be more proactive.

Why would anyone be against higher taxes? They benefit everyone, including developers.

Australian people do not want to live in 25 storey tower blocks standing over railway stations. Australians want to live in villages, in suburbs, in communities, to know their neighbours, to have green space around, to see trees, to have barbecues and friends come to visit. You do not get this with vertical living - you only get disconnection and dysfunction. Please spare a thought for the people that actually have to live in these places. Yes, live. People who want to live a happy and contented life. Isn't that what you were hoping for? Or are you just interested in profit?

Whilst I am a great supporter of Urban Taskforce, some of the wording in this survey could be open to criticism from the anti-development lobby!

Many questions are of the 'do you support apple pie and motherhood' genre!!

Urban Taskforce needs to critique local council heritage listing practices. Local Councils should have all heritage powers removed in high rise/CBD areas as they are being abused willynilly as a pretext to halt higher densities in CBD areas.

your survey assumed a level of knowledge that would not be very common. A yes/no or partially yes type answers did not allow for a don't know response. This will lead to anomalous results

Numerous questions are biased towards a particular answer. For this reason the results will be open to criticism.

Establish a complying code for mid-rise apartments under 25 metres high with resident consultation not just property developers.

Ensure local communities remain intact by consulting with residents. If you do not live in the suburb don't make the decisions unilaterally.