

*original document
filed in P.R.
Sydney House Improvement
Committee*

19th April, 1963.

Noted *JB*

The Town Clerk,
Town Hall,
SYDNEY, N.S.W.

Dear Sir:

Reference 1100/62 - 21st March, 1963

In reply to the above, we advise that the Committee is agreeable to making available its models and plans for exhibition as desired by your Council. Mr. D. Osborne would be able to arrange details with your officers and may be contacted at 20572.

We would like to re-emphasise the main points which motivated the submission of the Committee's proposals.

Firstly, to indicate to Council that private enterprise organisations do take a strong interest in the future of the City and by this submission, showed tangible evidence of this fact. It is hoped by the Committee that Council would take heart from this gesture, which is obviously without any biased interest, and that Council would utilize this nucleus of spontaneous interest to obtain further support for citizens participation in civic matters.

Secondly, to draw the attention of Council to the possibility of overcoming one of the most difficult obstacles in the way of co-ordinated redevelopment, that is, the scattered ownership of land, by way of a land exchange body under the auspices of Council.

The selection of this particular area for the purpose of demonstrating to Council the potential of co-ordinated redevelopment lies, of course, in its position, which in effect links the Opera House precinct with The Domain redevelopment and encompasses a major

transport terminal. At no stage did the Committee hold out that its proposals were a firm plan that could be adopted as such. The plan is a sketch prepared without the benefit of co-ordination with Government authorities. It aims at high-lighting a few basic planning principles, the most important of which is the separation of pedestrian and vehicular through-traffic in the area.

The letter from the Department of Government Transport referred to concerns itself mainly with this aspect of our proposal and expresses objections from a purely public transport point of view. Whether or not either proposal is adopted is entirely a matter for Council policy.

If Council felt that some departure from the ideal was indicated under the circumstances, by allowing public vehicular transport only in the area, most objections from the Department of Government Transport would be met, yet a major improvement achieved on the currently chaotic situation.

We congratulate Council on its decision to submit these schemes to public exhibition and the Committee may feel it desirable to make further comments after it has had an opportunity to study the alternative proposals which will be exhibited.

Thanking you for your courtesy and attention,

Yours faithfully,

G. J. Dusseldorp
Chairman