

Stoking politics of envy no answer to overdevelopment

SMH 14 January 2019
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR



Can Hunters Hill fit anything else in, or has it given the city enough of itself?

CREDIT: ANTHONY JOHNSON

Michael Daley cites Hunters Hill as a prime example of what's wrong with the GSC's plans because, he says, Hunters Hill is not taking its fair share of Sydney's proposed population growth.

Based on raw figures only, this is an easy assertion to make, but raw figures do not tell the whole story.

Hunters Hill is by far the smallest local government area in NSW. However, much of its tiny 5.7 square kilometre area is zoned "conservation" and it contains a large number of heritage-listed houses, buildings and other items, including the extensive grounds of the former Gladesville Hospital (now subject to a state government development proposal).

Hunters Hill also has a long perimeter of foreshore land, much of which is exempt from development and adds significantly to the character of Sydney's waterways.

Hunters Hill was saved from over-development 50 years ago and is now an enclave of wealth and privilege, making it an easy target for politicians. However, the logic of Daley's argument is we should destroy its special character because it is not taking its fair share of Sydney's continuously growing population.

Tony Coote, Hunters Hill (former president of The Hunters Hill Trust)

The solution to overdevelopment is not to shift the imposition of high-density from one suburb to another but to abandon this disastrous policy altogether (“Labor vow to redraw ‘unfair’ city plans”, January 12-13).

Pitting one community section against another is not the answer. As more and more high-rises are jammed into suburbs eventually everyone will suffer from increased congestion.

Other modes of more sustainable and acceptable planning should be considered such as in the large low-density cities of the southern US.

Tony Recsei, Warrawee

NSW Labor leader Michael Daley’s vow to democratise development targets across suburbs ignores an important fact; not all housing stock is created equal.

In stoking the politics of envy, he completely ignores contrasting suburb size (Hunters Hill v Canterbury-Bankstown, seriously?), heritage and, most importantly, the incalculable element of beauty.

Though not a resident, this Labor voter would fight hard to preserve Sydney Harbour’s “Jacaranda and Federation belt”, it’s rare charm, invested in by generations.

Walter Salmon, Clovelly

So Labor would bring the Liberal’s architectural and environmental wildness of the west to some of our un-degraded inner suburbs. A plague on both your houses.

Jon Bunyan, Campbelltown