

# Submissions on MP07\_051 35 Water Street, Wahroonga

## Part B: Public Submissions

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
1	22 June 2009	Peter Berkley 12A Water St, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development will ruin the heritage gardens.</li> <li>Scale of proposed building will overwhelm heritage building.</li> <li>High density development is out of character with surrounding area.</li> <li>Subdivision of site to accommodate single dwellings should be explored.</li> <li>Potential conflict between pedestrians and large vehicles.</li> <li>Adequate provision of hospitals within the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Density</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
2	22 June 2009	Adrienne Berkley 12A Water St, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High density development out of character with the surrounding area.</li> <li>Bulk and scale not appropriate to residential area.</li> <li>Potential conflict between pedestrians and traffic.</li> <li>Subdivision of site to accommodate single dwellings should be explored.</li> <li>Adequate provision of hospitals within the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
3	24 June 2009	M B Wolley 44 Braeside St, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings are too large.</li> <li>Buildings are too tall.</li> <li>Destruction of Blue Gum High Forest through impact on ground water flow and root damage caused by excavation.</li> <li>Loss of privacy as a result of scale and height of proposal.</li> <li>Height of the development will result in overshadowing of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Additional traffic generation resulting in issues of pedestrian safety.</li> <li>Development is out of character, hospital is inappropriate to residential area.</li> <li>Property should be listed on State Heritage Register.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
4	25 June 2009	Kevin Smith 10 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing house will be dwarfed by development.</li> <li>Underground car park and buildings will stop regeneration of Blue Gum High Forest and kill trees.</li> <li>Proposed development does not take into account the 20m buffer zone around Blue Gum High Forest identified by Council experts.</li> <li>Concern over proximity of local school and potential impact of construction activities on children.</li> <li>Scale of development out of character with residential area.</li> <li>Parking provision appears inconsistent with the size of the hospital resulting in visitors parking on local streets.</li> <li>Water and Young Streets are narrow and experience traffic jams at school drop off and pick up times.</li> <li>Inappropriate location for a hospital.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>
5	25 June 2009	Tim Park 28 Trentino Road	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is surrounded by four primary schools on three of the access roads to the hospital. The other road is narrow and subject to traffic control measures.</li> <li>Surrounding lanes do not have adequate footpaths to provide for an increase in pedestrians.</li> <li>Roads are already congested and cannot accommodate ambulance traffic.</li> <li>Surrounding lanes are pot-holed, road condition will be worsened by increase in traffic and construction activity.</li> <li>Two schools immediately adjacent to the school will be negatively impacted during the construction phase and place children at risk of injury.</li> <li>Scale of the project is out of character with the surrounding suburb.</li> <li>Project is not in keeping with site's previous use.</li> <li>No ancillary services in the area to validate the use of the heritage area for the proposed purpose.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
6	25 June 2009	John G Allman 81 Boundary Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hospitals require huge staff numbers and as such have a very large parking requirement.</li> <li>The busy surrounding roads serve several schools.</li> <li>Planning an acute hospital in this area not considered wise decision.</li> <li>There is a large and expanding hospital in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>
7	29 June 2009	Dr J H Southwick 10 Billyard Ave, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal contains virtually the same coverage and height as previous development applications for the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> </ul>
8	29 June 2009	Matthew Ashes 33 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size of the proposed hospital is out of keeping with the quiet residential nature of the area.</li> <li>Roads in the area are inappropriate for the construction phase of the development.</li> <li>Height of the proposed 5 and 6 storey buildings is unacceptable in the area and will negatively impact on local residents.</li> <li>Negative impact on the Blue Gum High Forest will be unacceptable.</li> <li>The development will destroy the character of the existing heritage listed buildings.</li> <li>A number of similar applications for similar sized buildings have been previously been rejected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Height</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Previous applications</li> </ul>
8b	8 Sept 2009	Matthew Ashes 33 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young Street and Water Street unsuitable for proposed development</li> <li>traffic congestion already high.</li> <li>School children put under unreasonable risk due to increase in traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
9	29 June 2009	Margaret Bowers 51 Boundary Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development proposal is a serious overdevelopment of the site.</li> <li>Proposal will destroy the beauty and value of the existing house and land.</li> <li>Change of use of the house to cafe will not preserve the heritage value of the site.</li> <li>Proposed five or six storey hospital will not preserve the heritage value of the site.</li> <li>Access is from a narrow suburban street which will increase problems for the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Ambience of one of the best streets in Wahroonga will be destroyed.</li> <li>Proposal will destroy the heritage value of the site.</li> <li>Proposal will lead the way for further overdevelopment of the surrounding area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Overdevelopment</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Access</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
10	29 June 2009	A H Spencer 8/38a Fairfax Road, Bellevue Hill	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size of the hospital is out of keeping with the quiet residential nature of the area.</li> <li>Roads in the area are inappropriate for the construction phase of the development.</li> <li>Height of the proposed 5 and 6 storey buildings is unacceptable within this area.</li> <li>Negative impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Proposed development will destroy the character of the heritage listed site and its buildings.</li> <li>A number of similar sized applications for a retirement village have been rejected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
11	29 June 2009	John & Janet Gissing 3/55 Pentecost Avenue, Pymble	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size of the development is unsuitable.</li> <li>Limited road access in the area and existing traffic congestion would be aggravated by proposed development.</li> <li>Collection point for children from the Bush School located 50 metres from the site.</li> <li>Young Street is barely wide enough for two way traffic, its width is not adequate to permit parking and allow the flow of traffic.</li> <li>A protection order covers Blue Gum High Forest within the site.</li> <li>5 and 6 storey buildings proposed within a residential area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Height</li> </ul>
12	29 June 2009	Rachel Cook 28A water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development massively out of scale compared to existing buildings.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major direct and indirect impacts on the critically endangered Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Area will not cope with any increase in traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
13	29 June	Helen Charlton	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed buildings are far too big and inappropriate for the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
	2009	1/1 Mary Street, Beecroft		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal would endanger Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Concern over increase in traffic on narrow roads which already experience problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
14	30 June 2009	Simon & Anne Olding 16 Mona Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excessive bulk and scale</li> <li>unreasonable loss of amenity for adjoining properties</li> <li>not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood</li> <li>Loss of heritage value of the existing house and gardens</li> <li>Loss of trees</li> <li>Loss of Blue Gum High Forest</li> <li>Excess traffic generation from the end use for the condition and width of local roads</li> <li>Excess and unsafe traffic generation during construction for the condition and width of local roads.</li> <li>Traffic generation from the end use and during construction unsafe for the adjoining primary school.</li> <li>Topography not suitable without excessive modification.</li> <li>Excessive distance from public transport.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Amenity</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Trees</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Topography</li> <li>Public transport</li> </ul>
14b	30 June 2009	Simon & Anne Olding 16 Mona Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refers to Bee and Lethbridge street survey of Young and Water Streets (26 Aug 2009)(report not included).</li> <li>Road widths too narrow for ingress and egress design and traffic volumes associated with final development.</li> <li>Roads already struggle with existing traffic volumes.</li> <li>Even if widened roads will be too narrow for large scale development.</li> <li>Young Street and Water Street are remnant lanes not suburban roads.</li> <li>Traffic plan not consistent with access and egress or road widths for other Sydney hospitals.</li> <li>Any development would require upgrading of roads and extensive upgrade of footpaths, crossings and landscape strips.</li> <li>Traffic report contains numerous factual errors with reference to existing road widths, turning distances, distances to services, priority of roads and current usage patterns.</li> <li>Do not object to residential development which preserves environmental and heritage attributes of the site and locality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Access</li> <li>pedestrian safety</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>
15	30 June 2009	Susan Van Es 26 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All items of heritage significance (buildings and garden) within the site should be preserved.</li> <li>Significance of the heritage gardens has been downgraded by the proposal.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are the same as two earlier rejected proposals.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared with neighbourhood.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>20 metre buffer zone between Blue Gum High Forest and new buildings should be included.</li> <li>Areas of Blue Gum High Forest regeneration should be protected.</li> <li>Construction will involve significant movement of materials to and from the site.</li> <li>Children walking to school will be at risk from additional traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
16	30 June 2009	Brian & Ilse Hatfield 12 Alice Street, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is not the place for a hospital, there are ample alternative sites.</li> <li>Additional traffic, noise and loss of privacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>
17	1 July 2009	Marilyn & John Beard 11 Sutherland Avenue,	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enormous size and scale of the proposed buildings.</li> <li>Buildings will be 6 or 7 times higher and longer than surrounding residential homes.</li> <li>Buildings will cast shadows and block out sun for neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Existing roads are grid locked between 8-9am and 2.30-3.30pm as a result of existing school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>developments.</li> <li>Young and Water Street are narrow and extra traffic would worsen the existing traffic situation.</li> <li>Proposed development will cause damage to Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Site is unsuitable for a 129 bed hospital.</li> <li>Hospitals require a lot of parking.</li> <li>Young and Water Streets are too narrow for extra street parking.</li> <li>Community is already well served by existing hospitals in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>
18	2 July 2009	Mark Stevens 22 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with the environmental/heritage impacts on the Blue Gum High Forest on the site.</li> <li>Streets around the site will not be able to support hospital traffic.</li> <li>existing congestion is significant at peak times</li> <li>There are schools in close proximity and additional traffic will be dangerous for school children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
19	2 July 2009	FT & SA Gulson 27 Cleveland Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern end of Water Street and Young Street are narrow and the hospital would generate more traffic than a residential use.</li> <li>Proposed development will have a major and deleterious impact on the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>No buffer provided between buildings and Blue Gum Forest.</li> <li>Proposal mirrors two earlier proposals which were rejected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
20	2 July 2009	Gary T Klopfer 52 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions for the site questioned - immediate area is well served will hospitals, rooms shown on plans larger than hospital rooms.</li> <li>Concerned that application will be used as a means to convert site to residential home.</li> <li>Scale of proposed development out of keeping with neighbouring well established single dwellings.</li> <li>Proposed development appears to be taller than buildings along the Pacific Highway corridor.</li> <li>Development will generate a huge increase in traffic.</li> <li>Increased traffic will endanger the safety of children attending nearby schools.</li> <li>Massive development of style proposed will deface the historic buildings and grounds.</li> <li>Blue Gum Forest will be reduced in size and further endangered.</li> <li>20 metre buffer zone between remaining forest and development required.</li> <li>Buildings compromise privacy.</li> <li>Stormwater runoff from the site has previously caused problems on objectors property, problem likely to reoccur with proposed development due to impact on water table associated with excavations.</li> <li>Surrounding properties will be devalued.</li> <li>Development will result in heavy construction traffic and damage to surrounding streets.</li> <li>Construction traffic will endanger school children and cause noise pollution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Drainage</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
21	1 July 2009	Stephanie Vaughan 28 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will result in dramatic increase in traffic.</li> <li>Has to reverse out of driveway which will become a dangerous manoeuvre.</li> <li>Traffic report fails to adequately address vehicle generation and parking needs.</li> <li>There are serious physical constraints regarding pedestrian safety.</li> <li>General pedestrian traffic volumes are already high, even without the proposed development.</li> <li>Application fails to adequately address construction traffic issues.</li> <li>The proposal will lead to significant on-street parking.</li> <li>The proposal will result in severe levels of shadowing.</li> <li>Privacy will be severely compromised.</li> <li>Main building will block out view of sky to the south and dominate Rippon Grange.</li> <li>The proposal is not compatible with the surrounding area.</li> <li>The proposal lacks compatibility with the surrounding area.</li> <li>The proposal is not adequately setback from BGHF.</li> <li>The stables, pool, pool shed and filter room and garage should be conserved in addition to Rippon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Amenity</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Visual impacts</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Viability</li> <li>Parking</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<p>Grange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of proposed buildings will destroy relationship between existing elements on the site.</li> <li>New building will dwarf Rippon Grange and is antithesis of recommendations by experts for this historical property.</li> <li>The proposal unreasonably interferes with the heritage landscape of the site.</li> <li>The Proponent has not calculated its risk component correctly.</li> <li>Construction vehicle access is constrained in Young Street.</li> <li>Construction considerations have been inadequately addressed.</li> </ul>	
21b	2 September 2007	Stephanie Vaughan 28 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant has failed to provide any substance to considering local community's concerns on existing traffic constraints and impacts of proposed development.</li> <li>Road widths around the site range between 5.2 and 5.3 metres in Water Street and 4.0 to 5.8 metres in Young Street which is too narrow to support two-way traffic and makes parking a problem for residents.</li> <li>Access should be via Billyard Avenue but not the corner next to the intersection.</li> <li>Applicant has failed to address how impacts of proposal will be managed.</li> <li>Should be no traffic access from Water Street during or after construction.</li> <li>If access is ever permitted in Young Street, then Young Street should be widened at the intersection of Billyard Avenue to 12 metres kerb-to-kerb, Young Street and Water Street to have a minimum 10-metre road width, all vegetation and trees to be retained in Young Street, Water Street and Billyard Avenue, Young Street to be blocked at Randolph Street, traffic calming devices to be installed, no trucks with greater than 2 tonne capacity to use Young Street and Water Street, sight distance at intersection of Young Street with Billyard Avenue and Young Street with Water Street to be significantly increased.</li> <li>Footpaths to have minimum width of 2 metres.</li> <li>Footpaths to be provided on both sides of road.</li> <li>Pedestrian crossings to be provided at Young Street, Water Street and Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Construction Management Plan to be modified to restrict construction hours to 9.30am to 2.00pm week days and no weekend construction, 7 traffic wardens and 1 master traffic controller to be working at all times, all construction vehicles to be accommodated on-site at all times, and no vehicles associated with construction to transit via Water Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
22	2 July 2009	Simon Hunter 17 Bettownd Place, Pymble	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application of same bulk and scale as previous rejected proposals.</li> <li>Proposed massive buildings are out of keeping with the residential locality.</li> <li>Neighbouring dwellings would be overshadowed.</li> <li>Huge increase in traffic on already congested narrow streets.</li> <li>Increase in traffic would endanger school children.</li> <li>Heritage value of Rippon Grange and its gardens would be destroyed.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest on the site is likely to be completely destroyed.</li> <li>20m buffer between forest and development not incorporated.</li> <li>Drainage from the site will be altered and will affect neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Privacy of neighbouring properties will be lost.</li> <li>Huge amount of construction traffic and noise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Drainage</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
23	2 July 2009	GR & BG Whiffin 6 Browning Road, North Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of schools nearby</li> <li>Surrounding roads are narrow and traffic is chaotic at peak times.</li> <li>Large amount of extra traffic associated with the hospital and cafe would be dangerous for young children.</li> <li>Roads too narrow for the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspicious that the proposal only includes around 20 beds on each floor.</li> <li>Company's concern with health and ageing question.</li> <li>Number of hospitals in the area.</li> <li>Plenty of cafes in Wahroonga and the district.</li> <li>If passed, the developer should pay for widening the roads in the area.</li> </ul>	
24	2 July 2009	John Ashes 33 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The massive size of the development is out of keeping with the quiet residential nature of the area.</li> <li>The size and placement of the buildings on the site will significantly impact on heritage areas.</li> <li>Roads in the area are not appropriate for construction phase.</li> <li>Size and location of buildings will impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Height of buildings will overwhelm the existing heritage buildings and local residential properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Construction impact</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Height</li> </ul>
24b	3 Sept 2009	John Ashes 33 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Street is only 5m wide and Yong Street has widths of less than 5m in many places.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are too narrow for the construction and operational phases of the development.</li> <li>Residents require street parking for visitors and restrictions would be unacceptable.</li> <li>existing developments already place pressure on road infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
25	2 July 2009	R M Ashes 6 Collins Road, St Ives	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of this size is out of keeping with the quiet residential nature of the area.</li> <li>Development is well away from transport corridors.</li> <li>Roads in the area are inappropriate for the construction phase of the development</li> <li>Negative impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Development will destroy heritage character of existing buildings.</li> <li>Applications for similar sized buildings were rejected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
26	2 July 2009	S Carlson 23 Harcourt Street, East Killara	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of this size is out of keeping with the quiet residential nature of the area.</li> <li>Development is well away from transport corridors.</li> <li>Roads in the area are inappropriate for the construction phase of the development</li> <li>Negative impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Development will destroy heritage character of existing buildings.</li> <li>Applications for similar sized buildings were rejected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
27	2 July 2009	Denise Ferris 65 Silver Cres, Westleigh	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be detrimental to have such an overdevelopment in this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdevelopment</li> </ul>
28	2 July 2009	Douglas John Farram 23a Cleveland Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All items of heritage significance (buildings and garden) within the site should be preserved.</li> <li>Significance of the heritage gardens has been downgraded by the proposal.</li> <li>Views to and from heritage items must be maintained.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are the same as two earlier rejected proposals.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared with neighbourhood.</li> <li>Bulk of main hospital wing will dominate ridgeline and prevent view of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Developer should create residential clusters.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>20 metre buffer zone between Blue Gum High Forest and new buildings should be included.</li> <li>Areas of Blue Gum High Forest regeneration should be protected.</li> <li>Construction will involve significant movement of materials to and from the site.</li> <li>Children walking to school will be at risk from additional traffic.</li> <li>Hospital will generate much more traffic than residential use.</li> <li>Narrow laneways cannot support increase in traffic.</li> <li>Additional cars will endanger children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
29	2 July 2009	Mr & Mrs K M Yi	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings will overlook immediate neighbours.</li> <li>Proposal is the same as two earlier rejected applications.</li> <li>Proposed buildings massively out of scale compared to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Bulk of main hospital wing will dominate the ridgeline and prevent views of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Existing heritage buildings and garden should be maintained and preserved.</li> <li>Proposed development will have a major direct and indirect impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>20m buffer between development and forest has not been provided.</li> <li>Development will create traffic congestion due to construction.</li> <li>Construction vehicles will damage the road and create danger for school children.</li> <li>Hospital usage will generate heavy traffic and parking problems.</li> <li>Buildings will overlook immediate neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>
30	3 July 2009	Charles Sharpe 24 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is out of context for the area because of its size and other factors.</li> <li>Doubt state intention that this is to become a hospital.</li> <li>Destruction of the Blue Gum High Forest is an inevitable consequence given the size of the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
31	3 July 2009	Susanne McDonald 6a Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Original building and gardens are of significant heritage value to the community.</li> <li>Views to and from Rippon Grange will be severely affected by the development.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of the buildings are out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Bulk of main hospital wing dominates the ridgeline and will affect views of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Development impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Size of buildings deprives forest of sun and light.</li> <li>Road system in the area is inadequate for the construction phase.</li> <li>Hospital use will generate more traffic than residential use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
32	3 July 2009	Grainger McFarlane 62 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal the same as two previously rejected applications.</li> <li>Buildings are out of scale with the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Development will generate a significant increase in traffic during construction and once completed.</li> <li>Narrow roads in the area cannot support such an increase in traffic.</li> <li>Children's safety will be compromised.</li> <li>Development compromises the heritage of the site.</li> <li>Development will impact on the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>The height of the proposed buildings is inappropriate and overdevelopment of the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Overdevelopment</li> </ul>
33	3 July 2009	N J Baker	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is out of character with residential neighbourhood.</li> <li>Traffic generated will create traffic jams due to narrow streets.</li> <li>Development will result in irreparable damage to the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Height of the development will create overshadowing problems for adjoining properties.</li> <li>Monolithic structure will overpower the whole neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> </ul>
34	3 July 2009	Janet Thomas 40 Grosvenor Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale of the proposal are out of scale to the size of the property.</li> <li>Surrounding narrow unsuitable for construction vehicles.</li> <li>Risk to children in the area.</li> <li>Excavation will endanger the roots of the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Proposal the same as previous rejected applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
35	3 July 2009	Owen Thomas 40 Grosvenor	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is surrounded by residential homes, schools and a narrow street.</li> <li>Not practical to for construction vehicles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Street, Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Billyard Street would not be able to cope with traffic.</li> <li>74 parking spaces considered insufficient.</li> <li>Construction traffic will present risk to the safety of children in the area.</li> <li>Proposal is similar to two previously rejected applications.</li> <li>If approved, the danger of killing off the Blue Gum High Forest will be enormous.</li> <li>Shadows cast from tall hospital building would not be acceptable to neighbouring residential homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> </ul>
36	3 July 2009	Mandy Allan 14 Foxglove Road, Mount Colah	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared to those in the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Existing heritage buildings and garden will be compromised by the proposal.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major direct and indirect impacts on the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Increase in traffic will not be bearable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
37	3 July 2009	Jane Davidson 4 Albion Avenue, Pymble	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roads around the area are narrow, poorly paved and inadequately drained and would not cope with extra traffic.</li> <li>Size of the development is inappropriate for the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
38	3 July 2009	Mary Anne Wilford 57 Lawrence Street, Pennant Hills	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will compromise the existing gardens and heritage buildings.</li> <li>Roads are narrow and could not cope with the extra traffic.</li> <li>Buildings are hugely out of scale compared to those in the neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
39	3 July 2009	52 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed buildings are out of keeping with the rest of the residential locality.</li> <li>Dwellings will be overshadowed.</li> <li>Huge increase in traffic in already congested, narrow streets.</li> <li>Heritage value of Rippon Grange and gardens would be destroyed.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest likely to be completely destroyed.</li> <li>20 metre buffer zone between development and forest not incorporated.</li> <li>Drainage from the site will be altered.</li> <li>Privacy of neighbouring properties will be lost.</li> <li>Huge amount of construction traffic and noise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Drainage</li> </ul>
40	3 July 2009	Jane Klopfer 52 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 39</li> </ul>
41	3 July 2009	Jo Wood 17 Bettowind place, Pymble	Objection	SAME AS 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 39</li> </ul>
42	3 July 2009	Valerie Ramshaw 40 Alice Street, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major direct and indirect impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Existing heritage buildings and garden will be significantly compromised/</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
43	7 July 2009	Norma & Graham Hodge	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development will have a major direct impact on the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>20 metre buffer zone between development and forest should be provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>



No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		8 Angourie Close, Dural		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• developer should ensure that no ground work or underground development destroys the water table essential to the Blue Gum High Forest's survival.</li> <li>• Properties of heritage significance such as Rippon Grange must be preserved.</li> <li>• Bulk of the proposed buildings will dominate the ridgeline swamping this important historic building.</li> <li>• Surrounding streets support 4 schools.</li> <li>• Young and Water Streets are not wide enough to support the traffic generated by a hospital.</li> <li>• Development of this size is impractical and out of character for this area.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion would be extreme during construction and once completed.</li> <li>• Staff and visitor parking is not clearly allocated on the proposal.</li> <li>• Proposal is out of character with the established area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
44	7 July 2009	Margaret Sharpe 24 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a commercial area and development will change region for the worse.</li> <li>• Original use was for small number of children on long term basis.</li> <li>• Extreme height of buildings is out of proportion for the area.</li> <li>• Narrow streets would not cope with construction or additional hospital traffic.</li> <li>• Blue Gum High Forest will be damaged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Height</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Construction impacts</li> </ul>
45	7 July 2009	Joyce James 65 Billyard, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area has narrow streets and inadequate footpaths.</li> <li>• Proposal will result in danger to children walking to school.</li> <li>• Traffic in the area has increased in recent years and there will be great deal of additional traffic from the hospital.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
46	7 July 2009	Hewett Cook 28A Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal will have major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared to those in neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Heritage buildings and garden will be compromised.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Scale</li> </ul>
47	7 July 2009	Evan 7 Miriam Jones 26A Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulk and scale out of proportion with surrounding residential environment.</li> <li>• Previous application rejected because of bulk and scale.</li> <li>• Development will have a detrimental impact on Blue Gum High Forest through damage to roots, impact on water table and overshadowing.</li> <li>• Central structures will dominate the site to the detriment of heritage items.</li> <li>• Water and Young Streets are narrow and not suitable for construction vehicles or ambulances.</li> <li>• Traffic assessment is incomplete as only morning peak data is used.</li> <li>• Construction will have a negative impact on neighbouring households and school children.</li> <li>• New structure will intrude on privacy of neighbouring properties in Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>• Amenity will be compromised by visual dominance of new structure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Construction impacts</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Privacy</li> </ul>
48	7 July 2009	Hodge Family 53 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is re-hash of original application.</li> <li>• Proposed development is out of character with surrounding area and the existing buildings on the site due to height</li> <li>• Bulk and scale reminiscent of high rise town centre development.</li> <li>• Scale not appropriate to residential area.</li> <li>• Buildings will look down on properties in Billyard Avenue and invade privacy.</li> <li>• Proposed development will have major direct impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• 20m buffer between development and forest not introduced.</li> <li>• Properties of heritage significance must be preserved including buildings and gardens.</li> <li>• Bulk of proposed buildings will dominate the ridgeline and swamp historic buildings.</li> <li>• Site not ideally suited to development of size and nature proposed due to distance from public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Privacy</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Parking</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transport.</li> <li>Narrow streets not wide enough for existing traffic.</li> <li>Development will exasperate existing traffic safety issues particularly during construction.</li> <li>Parking for staff and visitors not clearly allocated on proposal.</li> <li></li> </ul>	
49	8 July 2009	G A Felton 73 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 schools within the surrounding area and road network are inadequate to cope with traffic.</li> <li>Increase in traffic from hospital will cause chaos.</li> <li>Drug and alcohol addiction treatment centre is not compatible with school children.</li> <li>Massive excavation and loss of trees will be necessary which will affect drainage.</li> <li>Removal of spoil will disrupt roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Trees</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
50	8 July 2009	Anne Felton 73 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 49	SAME AS 49
51	8 July	Amanda Muirhead 29a Young Street, Wahroonga (x2 letters)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal encroaches on BGHF, resulting in major negative impact on forest health.</li> <li>Proposal is in total conflict with policy of identifying and attempting to protect endangered ecological communities.</li> <li>Impact of construction and works along with car parks and interconnecting roads above and below ground level will have a considerable and irreparable impact on BGHF.</li> <li>Minimum of 3 metres from trunk of any tree should be provided as buffer zone.</li> <li>Unclear how site will be managed during construction, to minimise impact on BGHF.</li> <li>If proposed hospital is approved, relationship of Rippon Grange and its landscaped gardens will be lost.</li> <li>Proponent has overlooked fact that all items of heritage significance (i.e. both house and gardens) should be preserved.</li> <li>Proponent has not taken into account the heritage constraints.</li> <li>Any future new development within heritage curtilage should be single-storey plus attic in height as a maximum.</li> <li>Proposal is essentially same as previous two applications.</li> <li>Proposal is totally out of keeping with the low density area.</li> <li>Proposal will completely alter the nature of the area, streetscapes and district views.</li> <li>Main Building will dominate the ridge line.</li> <li>Disproportionally large development in middle of neighbourhood.</li> <li>Proposal will overlook objector's private recreational space and swimming pool, noting that they do not have any rear garden area and have all of their outdoor recreational activities and entertainment in the front of the house.</li> <li>Construction workers will invade privacy.</li> <li>Headlights of cars using Young Street access will interfere with the writer's amenity.</li> <li>Proposed removal of trees and addition of towering buildings will result in loss of ambience.</li> <li>Proposal will be an eyesore and will reflect negatively in the resulting value of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Wants streetscape in Young Street to remain as is, and particularly that the existing trees be retained.</li> <li>Narrow streets do not support amount of traffic that will be generated during construction or at completion.</li> <li>There will be an adverse impact on pedestrian safety and particularly the safety of children walking to school.</li> <li>Young Street entrance to development will not support size of vehicles turning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Property values</li> <li>Tree protection</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Insufficient information</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate room for garbage vehicle entrance and exit.</li> <li>Proposal will result in adverse impact on road surfaces and overhanging tree canopy.</li> <li>Proposal will result in greater congestion in an already overloaded area.</li> </ul>	
51b	3 Sept 2009	Amanda Muirhead 29a Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young Street is effectively a country lane, it does not have a kerb, guttering and the footpath is poor.</li> <li>the road is as narrow as 4m in parts, and a maximum of 4.7m at its widest point.</li> <li>traffic report does not consider implications of construction vehicles on the roads, consideration is limited to entry and exit from the site.</li> <li>No information provided about how the existing road will be upgraded.</li> <li>No solution provided to pedestrian management during or after construction stage.</li> <li>Unclear where construction traffic will park</li> <li>Traffic Impact Assessment contains a number of errors – does not recognise poor visibility and accessibility and impact of construction impact at intersections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impact</li> <li>Capacity of existing infrastructure</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction parking</li> </ul>
52	8 July	Jackson Orchard 29a Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Five schools in surrounding areas.</li> <li>Several accidents at crossroads of Young and Billyard Street over last 5 years due to poor visibility at intersection, narrow streets and volume of traffic.</li> <li>Situation will become worse if application is approved.</li> <li>Worried about amount of construction traffic in building stage.</li> <li>On completion there will be an increase in traffic.</li> <li>Huge hospital in the suburbs is out of place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Parking</li> </ul>
53	6 July 2009	Rory White 19 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enormous 6 storey buildings adjacent to heritage house.</li> <li>Neighbouring houses are only one or two storeys.</li> <li>Narrow streets cannot cope with hospital traffic.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest is critically endangered.</li> <li>Trees will be cut down and root systems damaged by building underground car park.</li> <li>Proposal is inappropriate to place, too big, too tall and streets too narrow.</li> <li>Children put at risk from traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>
54	6 July 2009	Warwick & Karen White 19 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is contrary to Land and Environment Court's deliberations on preservation of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Serious implications in relation to safety of residents during and following development.</li> <li>Doubt hospital is intended as use of finished development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
55	6 July 2009	R J McDonald Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange needs to be redeveloped but question plans and 'bona fides' of developer.</li> <li>Proposal in various guises has been rejected because of impact on local environment, infrastructure and safety.</li> <li>Less massive development with lower impact footprint is warranted.</li> <li>Question if developer really intends to develop a hospital.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>
56	6 July 2009	Jennifer Cook 28a Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of scale proposed will have major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest</li> <li>Size and scale of development is too large for unique character of the area.</li> <li>Size of proposed buildings is the same as two earlier rejected applications.</li> <li>Development will destroy unique garden character and streetscape.</li> <li>Buildings in area do not exceed 2 storeys, proposal buildings are 6.5 storeys.</li> <li>The site is one of the most significant heritage estates in Ku-ring-gai.</li> <li>Building will be surrounded by large unit blocks which are inconsistent with surrounding residences.</li> <li>Safety concerns for cars and pedestrians during construction phase.</li> <li>Narrow streets already stretched with traffic from three primary schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
57	6 July 2009	Philip & Carolyn Davis 5 Young Street, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once completed there will be more traffic.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest will be significantly affected.</li> <li>Heritage of older buildings and gardens will be affected.</li> <li>Chaos caused by increased traffic.</li> <li>Proposal of this size (5-6 storeys in height) is beyond reason in this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Height</li> </ul>
58	6 July 2009	Jonathan Brennan 19 Billyard Avenue	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believe in preservation of urban and environmental heritage.</li> <li>Rare piece of land surrounded by gardens and original views which is uncommon in Sydney.</li> <li>Important to keep the character of different suburbs.</li> <li>Character of Wahroonga is magnificent old trees, heritage homes and gardens, single and two storey homes and family living.</li> <li>Hospital buildings look the same as apartment buildings previously proposed and rejected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
59	6 July 2009	Daniel White 19 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Big traffic problem around school on Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Hospital will make traffic dangerous.</li> <li>Young and water Streets are narrow and do not have footpaths.</li> <li>Not a good place for a hospital.</li> <li>Dangerous for children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
60	6 July 2009	Desmond Catterall 30 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of proposed development is of concern,</li> <li>Proposed buildings appear out of scale when compared to neighbourhood</li> <li>Proposed buildings the same as two earlier rejected applications.</li> <li>Direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Impact proposed development will have on traffic in suburb is clear.</li> <li>Utilities such as water and roads will suffer if development occurs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Utilities</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
61	6 July 2009	Ansgar Bruell 2 Michele Place, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Massively out of scale compared to residential neighbourhood.</li> <li>Proposed buildings would dominate the whole area and change residential character.</li> <li>Proposal is same as previously rejected applications.</li> <li>Area is typical residential area and has narrow lanes.</li> <li>Laneways not suitable for hospital traffic.</li> <li>Construction and hospital traffic poses a danger to children and elderly residents.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impacts on the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>20m buffer between development and forest not included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
62	6 July 2009	Stephen Kelly 175 Macquarie Street, Sydney	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of proposal worse than previous applications.</li> <li>Drug and alcohol addiction facilities undesirable in area with high number of children.</li> <li>all heritage items should be preserved,</li> <li>significance of heritage gardens downgraded by CMP.</li> <li>Views to and from heritage items must be maintained.</li> <li>Proposal essentially the same as previous rejected proposals.</li> <li>Proposed buildings massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood</li> <li>Bulk of main hospital wing will dominate ridgeline and prevent views of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Should be a 20m buffer zone around Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Huge amounts of material transported to and from the site during construction.</li> <li>Damage to roads</li> <li>Risk to children from construction vehicles and hospital traffic.</li> <li>Hospital will generate more traffic than residential use.</li> <li>Narrow lanes cannot support increase in traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Use</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings will overlook immediate neighbours.</li> </ul>	
63	6 July 2009	Leanne Kelly 175 Macquarie Street, Sydney	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
64	6 July 2009	Elizabeth Sykes 40 Oriole Street, Glenmore Park	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
65	6 July 2009	Elizabeth Albert 18 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
66	8 July 2009	Kirsty Albert 18 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
67	8 July 2009	Andrew Dowling 18 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
68	6 July 2009	Robert Otto Albert 18 Billyard Avenue	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
69	8 July 2009	Jane Albert	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
70	8 July 2009	Andrew Fisher 8 Probate Street, Naremburn	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
71	8 July 2009	Vicki Albert 53 Benelong Road, Cremorne	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
72	6 July 2009	David Albert 53 Benelong Road, Cremorne	Objection	SAME AS 62	SAME AS 62
73	8 July 2009	Keith Dodds & Gosia Dudek 2 Barton Crescent, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is inconsistent with nature of surrounding area.</li> <li>Wahroonga is characterised by single family residences, large lots, leafy surroundings and absence of multi-storey residences.</li> <li>High rise and high traffic would damage surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Area targeted is a heritage significance area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
74	8 July 2009	Douglas Orchard 29a Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 52	SAME AS 52
75	8 July 2009	Karen White 19 Billyard	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal only slight modification from previous application.</li> <li>Proposal is for buildings 6 storey high in quiet residential area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>Neighbourhood</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Avenue, Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Away from major transport corridors.</li> <li>• Proposed development would be visible from long way off.</li> <li>• Scale of development represents overdevelopment of the site.</li> <li>• Severe overshadowing of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Devaluation of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Wahroonga is characterised by trees, heritage home and family properties.</li> <li>• Three large 6 storey buildings do not fit this context.</li> <li>• Approach roads to the site are narrow.</li> <li>• High pedestrian traffic in the area including school children.</li> <li>• Streets cannot support increased traffic.</li> <li>• Not clear how construction would be managed safely.</li> <li>• Site has significant traffic and parking issues which make it unsuitable for development of this size.</li> <li>• More than 78 car parking spaces need.</li> <li>• Public transport in this area does not exist.</li> <li>• Major direct and indirect effects on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• 20 m buffer zone between development and forest ignored.</li> <li>• Development is out of context with urban conservation area in look, scale and respect for existing heritage items on site.</li> <li>• Concerning that changes have been made to CMP by the developer.</li> <li>• Heritage gardens have been discounted.</li> <li>• Area does not need another private hospital. Adequate provision in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• character</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Overshadowing</li> <li>• Property value</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Construction impacts</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Need</li> </ul>
76	8 July 2009	Kathryn Morgan 61 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whole character of Wahroonga will change if development proceeds.</li> <li>• Rippon Grange will be surrounded by multi-level hospital tower blocks.</li> <li>• Development is inconsistent with surrounding area.</li> <li>• No need for this type of development in a historically significant area.</li> <li>• Site contains large section of Blue Gum High Forest which will be endangered by the development.</li> <li>• Already traffic chaos due to schools.</li> <li>• Streets cannot sustain more cars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Height</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character.</li> </ul>
77	8 July 2009	Warren Cleary 26 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All items of heritage significance should be preserved.</li> <li>• Significance of heritage gardens has been downgraded.</li> <li>• Proposal is the same as two earlier rejected proposals.</li> <li>• Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• Should be a 20m buffer zone around Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• Huge amounts of material transported to and from site during construction.</li> <li>• Damage to roads during construction.</li> <li>• Risk to school children during construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Scale</li> </ul>
78	8 July 2009	Margaret Cleary 26 Water Street Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 77	SAME AS 77
79	8 July 2009	Lynne & Charles Low 22 Halcyon Avenue	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development is in the middle of a housing area.</li> <li>• No close access to trains or public buses.</li> <li>• Surrounding streets are clogged with traffic.</li> <li>• Extra traffic in the area would be dangerous.</li> <li>• No need for a 129 bed hospital in this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Need</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drug and alcohol addictions centre out of character with area.</li> <li>• All houses are 2 or 1 storey building of 5-6 storeys would dwarf anything else.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use</li> <li>• Height</li> </ul>
80	8 July 2009	Heather Low 29 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size and bulk of overall development is unsuitable for a small, quiet residential street.</li> <li>• Insufficient parking for hospital use.</li> <li>• Streets are too narrow to cater for extra parking.</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety will be compromised.</li> <li>• Site not near to public transport.</li> <li>• Commercial deliveries will add to congestion.</li> <li>• Threat to Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
81	8 July 2009	A J Tinworth 16 Grosvenor Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be a commercial development in the middle of a prime residential area.</li> <li>• Previous use as hospital for disabled children bears no relevance to proposed 129 bed hospital.</li> <li>• Scale and bulk grossly excessive.</li> <li>• Potential to cause massive drainage problems.</li> <li>• Scale does not differ from previous rejected proposals.</li> <li>• Access streets are inadequate for traffic generated by development.</li> <li>• Children attending schools on adjoining sites will be put at risk.</li> <li>• Traffic problems during construction would be horrendous.</li> <li>• Plans do not provide for adequate protection of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• Doubt over intention that the final development will be a hospital as proposed rooms are too large,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Developer intentions</li> </ul>
82	8 July 2009	Nicola Bevan 44 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings are far too large compared to neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Buildings are taller than is reasonable and will dominate the skyline.</li> <li>• Proposal will destroy the Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• High dwelling density will place unreasonable number of additional people.</li> <li>• Streets cannot cope with additional traffic.</li> <li>• Additional traffic will create safety problems for children.</li> <li>• Neighbouring properties will experience loss of privacy due to height and scale of development.</li> <li>• Proposed development will cause sun shadow across neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Development will change character of area.</li> <li>• Property should be State heritage listed to protect gardens and buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Height</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
83	10 July 2009	Stephanie Alexander 17 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No material change to prior applications.</li> <li>• Streets are already choked particularly at peak hours.</li> <li>• Construction will involve removal of 50,000 cubic metres of matter, damage to roads, risks to child safety.</li> <li>• Narrow laneways cannot support end development.</li> <li>• Additional cars will endanger children</li> <li>• Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Bulk of main hospital wing will dominate the ridge line and obstruct views of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>• Major impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• No loss of trees acceptable.</li> <li>• Property should be listed on State Heritage Register.</li> <li>• All heritage items should be preserved.</li> <li>• Inappropriate alterations to internals of heritage house.</li> <li>• Significance of heritage gardens downgraded in CMP to facilitate development.</li> <li>• Buildings will overlook immediate neighbours.</li> <li>• Buildings will cast deep shadows within the site and across neighbouring properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Height</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Privacy</li> <li>• Overshadowing</li> <li>• Views</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
84	10 July 2009	J L Vigo 57a Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed buildings are too high.</li> <li>Skyline of trees will be destroyed.</li> <li>Wahroonga's existing infrastructure cannot cope with additional demand</li> <li>Narrow streets unsuitable for construction traffic</li> <li>Proposed development would be a blight on the landscape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Infrastructure</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Built form</li> </ul>
85	10 July 2009	Marianne Campbell 11 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic is 'fiendish' during school terms.</li> <li>Hospital would create bigger burden on road system.</li> <li>Conflict between ambulances and existing traffic.</li> <li>Existing hospitals nearby.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Infrastructure</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>
86	10 July 2009	S Hewitt 9a Railway Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings are out of keeping with the residential locality.</li> <li>Local dwellings will be overshadowed by project.</li> <li>Huge increase in traffic in already congested area.</li> <li>Heritage value of Rippon Grange and gardens would be destroyed.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest likely to be completely destroyed.</li> <li>Drainage from site will be altered.</li> <li>Privacy of neighbouring properties will be lost.</li> <li>Huge amount of construction traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
87	13 July 2009	Alan Hislop (no address provided)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Young Streets very narrow.</li> <li>Development will involve removal of massive amounts of soil which will require prolonged construction activity.</li> <li>Construction will cause destruction of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Hospital will generate immense increase in traffic.</li> <li>Huge bulk of the proposal is out of proportion to surrounding homes.</li> <li>Some houses will be completely overlooked.</li> <li>Recommended 20m buffer between development and forest not provided.</li> <li>Blue gums elsewhere severely damaged by development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Overlooking</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
88	[no DoP date stamp]	Ann Thomas 17 Chilton Parade Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will result in destruction of remaining Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Local streets are too narrow for extra traffic.</li> <li>Existing streets are already extremely busy due to schools.</li> <li>Buildings are very bulky.</li> <li>Neighbours will be overshadowed.</li> <li>Little space between Rippon Grange and new buildings.</li> <li>Disturbance to neighbourhood during construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGJF</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Scale and bulk</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
89	9 July 2009	Craig Chapman 33a Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size, in particular height, is inconsistent with surrounding residences.</li> <li>Concerned about heritage significance of the site.</li> <li>Site contains sizable stand of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Seven storey building looking directly into backyard is outrageous.</li> <li>Concerned about impact on safety of young children.</li> <li>Development will result in concentration of employees, service vehicles, ambulances, patients and visitors.</li> <li>Construction will involve huge amounts of material being trucked to and from the site down narrow laneways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
90	9 July 2009	Dr R Lloyd-Williams 146 Eastern Road,	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange is a heritage property.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are narrow and not designed to cope with increases in traffic.</li> <li>Increased traffic and construction vehicles pose danger children.</li> <li>Little change to previous plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> </ul>



No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blue Gum High Forest would be put under pressure.</li> <li>Support development of villas or townhouses on the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
91	9 July 2009	Jennifer Kalaf 6 Chilton Parade, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will attract significant volume of addition traffic 24 hours a day.</li> <li>Surrounding roads already under pressure.</li> <li>Proposed multi-storey buildings out of character with surrounding residential environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Height</li> </ul>
92	9 July 2009	C J Fergusson 22 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young Street is narrow and not capable of taking increased traffic.</li> <li>Street mainly used by children.</li> <li>Children's safety endangered by increased traffic, especially construction vehicles.</li> <li>Excavation will damage Blue Gum trees.</li> <li>Development out of scale compared to existing homes and infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
93	9 July 2009	Emmanuel Morgan 61 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 76	Same as 76
94	9 July 2009	Martin Smith 3 Shand Crescent, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is the location of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Proposal does not take account of 20m buffer zone between development and forest.</li> <li>Builders in the area generally driven by financial gain and have a poor record of adhering to environmental constraints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> </ul>
95	9 July 2009	John Boswell 3 Plymouth Close, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essentially same proposal as previous rejected applications.</li> <li>Believe developers trying to obtain approval for bulk and scale of hospital and convert to retirement living project.</li> <li>No ambulance bays or emergency facilities</li> <li>Car parking inadequate.</li> <li>Hospital rooms at least twice the size of private hospital rooms.</li> <li>No operating theatres.</li> <li>No loading docks.</li> <li>No experienced hospital operator involved.</li> <li>Proposed buildings massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Buildings will overlook immediate neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Need for 20m buffer zone between development and forest ignored.</li> <li>Huge amounts of material to be trucked to and from the site causing damage to roads and risk to safety of children.</li> <li>Hospital would generate more traffic than retirement village.</li> <li>Narrow laneways cannot support increase in traffic.</li> <li>Additional cars will endanger children.</li> <li>All heritage items (buildings and gardens) should be preserved.</li> <li>Proposal would constitute over development of the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
96	[no DoP date stamp]	Gloria Boswell 3 Plymouth Close, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 95	SAME AS 95
97	[no DoP date stamp]	Kent Boswell 3 Plymouth Close,	Objection	SAME AS 95	SAME AS 95

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
98	[no DoP date stamp]	Wahroonga Amanda Boswell 3 Plymouth Close, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 95	SAME AS 95
99	14 July 2009	Rosemary Hislop [no address provided]	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Young and Water Streets are narrow.</li> <li>Aware of other developments of similar scale which have caused traffic and disruption.</li> <li>Concerned about safety of children walking to school.</li> <li>Traffic generated by hospital will pose a serious danger.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
100	[no DoP date stamp]	Elaine & Ketih Cheeseman 602/1634 Pacific Highway, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surrounding streets are narrow and Young Street has not footpath.</li> <li>Construction will make streets hazardous for children.</li> <li>Six storeys is excessive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
101	13 July 2009	E Ralston 68 Prahan Avenue, Frenchs Forest	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Massive development in the centre of a suburban neighbourhood.</li> <li>Construction vehicles will be dangerous for children attending the schools in the area.</li> <li>Ambulance traffic will make children's lives unsafe.</li> <li>Visitors will have no access to public transport.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Public transport</li> </ul>
102	13 July 2009	Nicholas Wolley 44 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk of buildings will dwarf surrounding houses.</li> <li>6-7 storey buildings will dominate the skyline.</li> <li>Proposal will destroy much of the protected Blue Gum High Forest on the site by direct and indirect impacts.</li> <li>Water Street is a small road with many driveway, hospital on this road would create problems due to increase in population and traffic.</li> <li>Surrounding roads cannot cope with increase in traffic.</li> <li>Construction traffic will put children at risk.</li> <li>Direct neighbours will suffer loss of privacy.</li> <li>Building will cast shadows over neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Development will change character and ruin streetscape.</li> <li>Existing hospitals in the area cover local need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
103	13 July 2009	Isabella Schroder 17 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Street is narrow.</li> <li>Hospital will increase traffic.</li> <li>Not the right place to build a hospital</li> <li>Already lots of cars.</li> <li>Children use surrounding streets to walk to school.</li> <li>Development will damage heritage value of the area.</li> <li>Street cannot cope with additional development, already schools and churches.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
104	13 July 2009	John Leslie 64 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size of development is massive.</li> <li>Same size as previous rejected applications.</li> <li>Former hospital was only two storeys in height.</li> <li>Overdevelopment in a residential area.</li> <li>5-6 storey blocks in a residential area is absurd.</li> <li>Unsuitable to impose a psychiatric unit on an area containing 5 schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Overdevelopment</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>
105	13 July	Mark & Suzanne	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will create increased traffic and parking issues in streets designed for residential use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
	2009	Ledger 15 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of residential atmosphere.</li> <li>Roads not wide enough for construction vehicles.</li> <li>Traffic form the development poses a risk to safety of children in the area.</li> <li>Congestion is already bad and will be made worse by proposed development.</li> <li>Size of development is out of proportion to surrounding development and will dominate landscaped area.</li> <li>Development is not sympathetic to heritage nature of the land and will adversely the heritage property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> </ul>
106	13 July 2009	Leo Tutt 29 Kintore Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grossly inappropriate overdevelopment of historic site.</li> <li>Large garden and large setbacks of Rippon Grange are integral to original design concept and Australian heritage interests.</li> <li>Inappropriate use of historic Rippon Grange as a cafe.</li> <li>Development not in keeping with existing density and street character of surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Height, bulk, scale and density of development in relation to existing heritage item is inappropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Overdevelopment</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Use</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
107	13 July 2009	Nick Sharpe 24 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is almost identical to previous rejected application.</li> <li>Buildings are massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Construction would severely impact on surrounding houses and roads, and dangerous for school children.</li> <li>Remaining Blue Gum High Forest would be destroyed,</li> <li>Heritage significance of buildings and gardens should be preserved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
108	[no DoP date stamp]	J A Hungerford 31 Grosvenor Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is bounded by narrow lanes and is unsuitable for high rise.</li> <li>Only a quarter of parking spaces needed for hospital development provided.</li> <li>Streets would be gridlocked and would be dangerous for children residents and hospital visitors.</li> <li>High rise would cause shadowing and privacy problems.</li> <li>Site contains heritage buildings which needs to be preserved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
109	13 July 2009	Jason Ferris 63 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange buildings and gardens need to be preserved.</li> <li>proposal no more sympathetic to residents than previous applications.</li> <li>Heights of buildings and use not sympathetic to scale of neighbourhood.</li> <li>Considerable number of private hospital in the area.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are narrow and some don't have footpaths.</li> <li>Roads will be heavily impacted during construction period.</li> <li>Existing drainage infrastructure is insufficient to deal with current rain fall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Use</li> <li>Need</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>
110	[no DoP date stamp]	Ben Leighton 46 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<p>WRITTEN AS A POEM NOT POSSIBLE TO DETERMINE EXACT NATURE OF POINTS OF OBJECTION:</p> <p>However,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise.</li> <li>Dust.</li> <li>Overshadowing.</li> <li>Privacy.</li> <li>Road safety.</li> <li>Tree removal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise</li> <li>Dust</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Road safety</li> <li>Tree removal</li> <li>Sleep deprivation</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
111	[no DoP date stamp]	Charley Leighton 46 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sleep deprivation.</li> <li>Buildings are far too big and noisy.</li> <li>Don't look like other houses in the area..</li> <li>Would invade privacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
112	10 July 2009	Jon Leighton 46 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk, scale and style of development is not in keeping with surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Bulk and scale similar to previous rejected application.</li> <li>Buildings will dominate the skyline.</li> <li>Proposed construction will have a major ecological impact and destroy Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Children risk being injured during the construction period.</li> <li>Building will appear 10 storeys when viewed from objector's property due to slope of the land.</li> <li>Damage to objector's property through increase in noise and loss of sunlight.</li> <li>loss of value on property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>
112 b	2 Sept 2009	Jon Leighton 46 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is landlocked</li> <li>Access may be needed from Billyard Avenue which experiences significant pedestrian movements from school children.</li> <li>Even one small parked truck on the road will create dangers for children.</li> <li>Reference to Bee &amp; Lethridge survey which shows Young Street as 4.06m kerb to kerb near Billyard Avenue and 4.7m near Water Street.</li> <li>Water Street is 5.08m wide and insufficient for two way traffic.</li> <li>No information provided about how existing roads will be upgraded</li> <li>More information needed in Construction Management Plan in respect of traffic and pedestrian management.</li> <li>Bulk, scale and style of development is not in keeping with surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Major ecological impact on rare Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Damage to neighbouring property through increase in noise, reduction in sunlight and value.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient information</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Design</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Loss of amenity</li> <li>Noise</li> </ul>
112c	10 July 2009	Jon Leighton 46 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is landlocked due to restricted narrow laneways.</li> <li>Access needs to be from Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Proponent has failed to submit plans on how existing roads will be upgraded to cater for proposal.</li> <li>CMP needs considerably more detail.</li> <li>No traffic access to the site should be provided from Water Street.</li> <li>Young Street, Water Street, Billyard Avenue must have minimum footpath widths of 2 metres on both sides.</li> <li>Pedestrian crossings and other traffic calming measures should be added on Young Street, Water Street and Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Construction hours to be limited to 9.00am to 2.30pm, Monday to Friday.</li> <li>No construction on Saturdays.</li> <li>At least 7 traffic wardens and 1 master traffic controller working at all times.</li> <li>No construction parking on Billyard Avenue, Young Street or Water Street.</li> <li>No vehicles associated with construction to transit via Water Street, instead using Billyard Avenue and only enter and exit from Eastern Road end, not Cleveland Street.</li> <li>Identifies errors and unacceptable poor design in traffic report.</li> <li>Documents widths of roads adjoining other hospitals in Ku-ring-gai and Hornsby.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient information</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Access</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
113	13 July 2009	Voni Leighton 46 Billyard	Objection	SAME AS 112	SAME AS 112

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Avenue, Wahroonga			
113 b	[no DoP date stamp]	Voni Leighton 46 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME as 112b	SAME AS 112b
114	13 July 2009	Tanya Ferris 63 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange building and gardens should be preserved.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are the same as two previously rejected applications.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Massively out of scale for this neighbourhood.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are narrow and some don't have footpaths.</li> <li>Construction and hospital traffic will be detrimental to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
115	13 July 2009	Anita Higgins 15 Chilton Parade, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All items of heritage significant should be preserved.</li> <li>Significance of heritage gardens has been downgraded in CMP.</li> <li>Views to and from heritage items must be maintained.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are same as two earlier rejected proposals.</li> <li>Proposed buildings massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Bulk of main hospital wing will dominate ridgeline and prevent views of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Should be a 20m buffer zone between development and forest,</li> <li>Huge amounts of material to be trucked to and from site during construction.</li> <li>Safety of children is paramount.</li> <li>Hospital use will generate more traffic than residential use.</li> <li>Narrow laneways will not support increase in traffic.</li> <li>Additional cars will endanger children.</li> <li>Buildings will overlook immediate neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
116	13 July 2009	Rosemary Ladd 2/16 Ray Street, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entirely inappropriate and out of all proportion to surrounding residential sites.</li> <li>Increased traffic would present a hazard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>
117	13 July 2009	Lionel & Florence Hanney 70 Billyard Ave, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Huge overdevelopment in completely residential area.</li> <li>Safety of children going to school on narrow roads should be an important consideration.</li> <li>Drug and alcohol addiction clinic undesirable in an area of young children.</li> <li>Roads are narrow and already too much traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdevelopment</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Use</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
118	[no DoP date stamp]	William Nixey 107/392 Jones Street, Ultimo	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal has all features of two previously rejected applications.</li> <li>Original sale documents suggested subdivision of 2 or 3 storey property was possible for the site.</li> <li>Developer has continued to press for bulky high rise development on the site.</li> <li>Proposal will have same overall height as previous proposal.</li> <li>Proposal would detrimentally affect streetscape.</li> <li>Opportunistic approach to changes in planning legislation.</li> <li>Plans show unusually large room sizes for hospital use.</li> <li>Possibility that once built it may never function as a hospital.</li> <li>North Shore area is already well served by healthcare centres.</li> <li>Traffic impact analysis is defective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
119 a	Various dates in July 2009	Contact details withheld	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion on surrounding streets would limit prompt access for emergency vehicles.</li> <li>• Car parking proposed does not meet minimum requirements of government agencies.</li> </ul> <p>Eight separate submissions, each dealing with a separate matter:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulk and scale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part 3A is an attempt to bypass Council and the Land &amp; Environment Court;</li> <li>- Proposal will tower over neighbouring properties including the protected BGHF;</li> <li>- Proposal will have a major impact on the regeneration of the BGHF;</li> <li>- From Young Street, eastern elevation represents a huge 6-7 storey block;</li> <li>- New buildings will significantly block writer's view of surrounding trees and blue sky;</li> <li>- Occupants of building would invade privacy;</li> <li>- Buildings will block late winter sun;</li> <li>- Proposal is inadequately set back from the boundary of Young Street;</li> <li>- BGHF will be destroyed by construction process and poorly positioned buildings with below-ground parking;</li> <li>- Development on-site should be restricted to 8 metres in height;</li> <li>- Scale too large and concentrated on a small area of the site;</li> <li>- Number of beds and height of building need to be reduced;</li> <li>- Proposal has excessive scale and bulk, does not protect the BGHF, increases traffic volumes, causes building shadow, creates privacy issues, damages underlying water table.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Construction issues inadequately addressed.</li> <li>• Poorly designed buildings will be eyesores.</li> <li>• Traffic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic congestion has been downplayed by the Proponent;</li> <li>- Questions data used in traffic assessment;</li> <li>- Traffic assessment fails to identify factors that impact and compound traffic in Young Street and Water Street;</li> <li>- Some school functions outside normal school hours cause Young and Water Streets to be parked out;</li> <li>- Increased traffic generation is anticipated from the Bush School;</li> <li>- Young Street and Water Street are very narrow. Young Street is a dangerous street with congested traffic during school hours;</li> <li>- Author experiences delays already when reversing out of driveway;</li> <li>- Inadequate visitor parking for proposal;</li> <li>- Existing trees obstruct sight lines;</li> <li>- Proposal creates huge bottleneck and potential black spot;</li> <li>- Needs to be multiple driveways into site to alleviate bottlenecks and concentration of traffic;</li> <li>- Billyard Avenue and Young Street intersection is already congested;</li> <li>- No public transport within 400 metres;</li> <li>- Proposal is a recipe for serious accidents;</li> <li>- School children walking along Young Street is already a dangerous exercise, to be made worse by the proposed development;</li> <li>- Air pollution will accumulate in author's front yard, creating unhealthy environment and preventing children from playing in front of house;</li> <li>- Traffic analysis flawed, with old data of questionable value, inconsistent figures, inaccurate calculations, incorrect statements and failure to account for key factors.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Compensation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal puts protection of property and life at risk;</li> <li>- Not a safe proposal and has ongoing and lasting concerns;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Construction impacts</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Developer intentions</li> <li>• Compensation</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Author wants to know how he will be compensated for property damage for decreased property value as a consequence of having hospital opposite, disturbance during construction, loss of lifestyle, loss of amenity, death and disability, ongoing increased traffic.</li> <li>• Construction issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerned at 2-3 year construction period;</li> <li>- Construction will be disruptive to local residents, school children and community;</li> <li>- Truck access from Young Street inadequate;</li> <li>- Construction workers will park in Young Street;</li> <li>- Construction-related documentation inadequate;</li> <li>- Projected noise levels are flawed and inadequate;</li> <li>- Property damage will occur through vibration and mass movement of earthworks;</li> <li>- Proposal will lead to death of trees which will then fall on properties opposite;</li> <li>- Roadways will be damaged;</li> <li>- Construction hours will be intolerable;</li> <li>- Traffic generation from proposed earthworks will be unacceptable;</li> <li>- Construction vehicles will block local roads;</li> <li>- Author's property will be inaccessible because of construction works;</li> <li>- Physical access and turning circles are inadequate;</li> <li>- Construction will lead to dust and other pollutants;</li> <li>- Construction period will be excessive;</li> <li>- Dust pollution will exacerbate adverse health issues such as asthma.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• BGHF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal will destroy BGHF, more than indicated, and prevent regeneration;</li> <li>- Basement car park will kill many more trees through removal of root systems and disruption to water table;</li> <li>- Once trees die, there is an insurmountable privacy issue;</li> <li>- BGHF will die;</li> <li>- If trees fall on property, there is potential for huge damage and loss of life;</li> <li>- South-east wing should be marked for regeneration of BGHF.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Heritage concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal will dwarf existing home with unsightly, oversized buildings, dissecting the property and diluting the site's value;</li> <li>- Proposed buildings are in conflict with heritage value;</li> <li>- As Rippon Grange and its gardens, combined with BGHF cover most of site, no room left for any development in the south-eastern section;</li> <li>- Outrageous that CMP was revised with intention to downgrade significance of heritage site;</li> <li>- Rippon Grange must be properly and fully listed under the State Registry to maintain its heritage significance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scale of development is totally out of proportion with the site and in keeping with the area;</li> <li>- No architectural blending or attempt to incorporate the style and beauty of the area;</li> <li>- Proposal totally out of place;</li> <li>- Proposal is higher than 5-storey high-rise planned for Pacific Highway;</li> <li>- Development will be a monumental eyesore;</li> <li>- Proposal will give rise to privacy and shadow concerns;</li> <li>- Proposal will lead to drop in property values;</li> <li>- Heritage values of site will be destroyed;</li> <li>- BGHF are under threat from the proposal;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal will disturb the water mains pressure impacting on the surrounding area;</li> <li>- Author concerned he will not be able to reverse out of his driveway;</li> <li>- Headlights will shine into bedroom where children sleep;</li> <li>- Garbage collection will create noise, smell, potential mess, spills and ugly view;</li> <li>- Cars will create pollution;</li> <li>- Faced with ongoing health hazard from concentrated fumes;</li> <li>- Unacceptable danger to children;</li> <li>- No need for private hospital in area.</li> <li>• Developer intentions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed design plans do not represent a working, functional hospital;</li> <li>- Inadequate hospital facilities;</li> <li>- Proposed hospital can easily be changed to become a retirement village;</li> <li>- Is proposal a nursing home?;</li> <li>- A number of issues are not covered within the proposal or any management plans (e.g. doctor's room, visiting hours, nurse access time and parking, waste disposal, deliveries, ambulance bay, noise from plant machinery operations).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
120	14 July 2009	Julie-Anne Gray 34 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed buildings are essentially the same as earlier rejected proposals.</li> <li>• Submission sets out critique of services to be provided.</li> <li>• Heritage buildings and gardens should be preserved.</li> <li>• Massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Concerned about huge traffic flow increase and associated danger to children.</li> <li>• Development will result in an onslaught of traffic on road system inadequate to accommodate such movement.</li> <li>• Hospitals generate 24 hour traffic.</li> <li>• Proposed buildings will overlook immediate neighbours and invade privacy.</li> <li>• Major impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability</li> <li>• Privacy</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Scale</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• BGHF</li> </ul>
121	14 July 2009	Elspeth Muirhead 70 Leura Crescent, north Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed buildings are so large in dimension as to alter the character of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Properties surrounding the development will be overlooked by buildings several storeys high.</li> <li>• Surrounding properties will lose their privacy.</li> <li>• Concern about effects of public safety from traffic, particularly construction traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Privacy</li> <li>• Scale</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Construction impacts</li> </ul>
122	14 July 2009	Airlie Brodie 121 Kenthurst Road, Kenthurst	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared to those in the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Existing heritage buildings and garden will be compromised if proposal is allowed.</li> <li>• Major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• Already high pedestrian activity from schools and nearby homes.</li> <li>• Area cannot cope with an increase in traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Scale</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
123	14 July 2009	Bajic family 51 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• Should be a 20m buffer zone between development and forest.</li> <li>• All heritage items, buildings and gardens, should be preserved.</li> <li>• Grossly disproportionate bulk and scale will dominate ridgeline and swamp Rippon Grange.</li> <li>• Surrounding area contains 4 schools.</li> <li>• Roads are not wide enough to support movement of heavy vehicles needed for construction.</li> <li>• Traffic mayhem as hospital operates on narrow local streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> </ul>



No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
124 a	14 July 2009	Stuart Muirhead 29a Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed buildings remove some areas of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>No buffer zone between development and forest.</li> <li>6 storey buildings are out of keeping with heritage buildings and surrounding buildings.</li> <li>patients and staff will overlook many private houses.</li> <li>Nurses home directly opposite objector's house will reduce privacy. Lack of detail on this part of proposal.</li> <li>Proposed access on Young Street is not wide enough.</li> <li>Vehicles exiting the site will be able to look into private space of objector's garden.</li> <li>Proposal may result in parking restrictions being imposed on Young Street which will adversely impact on visitors of existing residents who park there.</li> <li>Clarification of how construction traffic will access the site required.</li> <li>Local streets are unsuitable for heavy vehicles.</li> <li>Construction traffic will dramatically increase safety risk for school children.</li> <li>Proposal does not reflect a hospital and concerned use will change if approved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Overlooking</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Insufficient information</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> </ul>
124 b	15 July 2009	Stuart Muirhead Capital Insight Pty Ltd 77 Berry Street, North Sydney	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mix of services proposed will lead to significant challenges.</li> <li>Proposed staff numbers are half number anticipated for proposed patient mix.</li> <li>Larger number of staff will equate to larger parking requirement.</li> <li>Hospital rooms appear at least double size of comparative hospital rooms.</li> <li>Wards lack utility rooms.</li> <li>No equipment storage space.</li> <li>Rehabilitation therapy areas too small.</li> <li>Proposed post natal service lacks number of shared areas.</li> <li>Scheme has a number of weaknesses and health planning deficiencies and concerned proposed facility would not achieve accreditation under Australian Council on healthcare standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health planning deficiencies</li> <li>Facility accreditation</li> </ul>
125	[no DoP date stamp]	Contact details withheld	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal out of character for village atmosphere of Wahroonga and immediate surrounding streets.</li> <li>Proposed buildings will dominate the ridge line instead of Rippon Grange and its trees.</li> <li>Discrepancy between correspondence from Applicant and Traffic Impact Statement in relation to room numbers.</li> <li>No architectural blending or attempt to incorporate style and beauty of the area.</li> <li>Proposal will overshadow and overlook local houses.</li> <li>Winter sun will be blocked.</li> <li>Limited public transport access.</li> <li>Young Street inadequate for access.</li> <li>School children use Young Street to access Wahroonga Public School ("the Bush School").</li> <li>Construction vehicles will make it hazardous for pedestrian traffic.</li> <li>Proposal has excessive height.</li> <li>Young Street is too narrow.</li> <li>Trucks are unable to turn safely into or out of the site from Young Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
125 b	[no DoP date stamp]	Contact details withheld	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trade vehicles parked outside properties already cause traffic congestion.</li> <li>Traffic report fails to identify factors that impact and compound traffic in Young and Water Streets.</li> <li>Reference to Bee &amp; Lethbridge traffic survey.</li> <li>Existing footpath on Young Street is inadequate.</li> <li>Other hospitals have frontages to wider roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Insufficient information</li> </ul>
126	14 July 2009	W & J Burroughs 9 Young St,	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area is dominated by private housing.</li> <li>New proposal is on much the same footprint and scale as previously rejected application.</li> <li>Multi-storey development of height proposed will be readily visible and dominate the locality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Warrawee		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excavation will adversely impact on remnant forest.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are narrow and steep.</li> <li>Congestion would increase with greater traffic volumes and ambulances.</li> <li>Proposed hospital is not served by public transport.</li> <li>Services will be affected by heavy traffic and rupturing of water main is predictable.</li> <li>Development will increase built area and reduce capacity for ground to absorb moisture leading to build up of run-off.</li> <li>Developer has not experience of operating hospitals.</li> <li>Number of existing hospitals within the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Developer credentials</li> </ul>
127	8 July 2009	A J Tinworth	Objection	COPY OF 81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 81</li> </ul>
128	[no DoP date stamp]	Jennifer Cook 28a Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	COPY OF 56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 56</li> </ul>
129	[no DoP date stamp]	Charles Sharpe 24 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	COPY OF 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 30</li> </ul>
130	[no DoP date stamp]	R J McDonald Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	COPY OF 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 55</li> </ul>
131	7 July 2009	Mike Bosch 82 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Irreversible disruption to Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Impact to significant heritage site.</li> <li>Huge impact on traffic and increased dangers to children during construction.</li> <li>No public transport to Water Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Public transport</li> </ul>
132	13 July 2009	Patricia Moore 6 Wiltshire Pace, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed buildings are too large for the area.</li> <li>Much the same as the rejected proposal.</li> <li>Not an appropriate site for a hospital.</li> <li>No public transport service</li> <li>Hospital use would generate more traffic than residential use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>
133	14 July 2009	Ben Linworth 16 Grosvenor Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal gives not consideration to local environment or tree cover.</li> <li>Water run-off, paths and road network will affect effect native trees.</li> <li>Development will be hazardous for children.</li> <li>Staff parking necessary as no public transport.</li> <li>Rooms are as big as residential nursing home rooms.</li> <li>Developer owns and runs seniors accommodation not hospitals.</li> <li>Deliveries will cause disturbance to local houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree cover</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Noise</li> </ul>
134	[no DoP date stamp]	Jarleth White 19 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tall buildings won't look right here,</li> <li>Important to respect and preserve the environment; not many Blue Gums left.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
135	15 July 2009		Support for use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of a psychiatric and rehabilitation hospital on the site. No facility available in Ku-ring-gai.</li> <li>Hospital will treat the community in a therapeutic setting.</li> <li>Desperately need this facility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports use</li> <li>Built form</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
136	16 July 2009	Madeline Parker 49 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans need to be modified to better fit existing heritage architecture.</li> <li>Previous recommendations in respect of heritage status of the site not taken into consideration.</li> <li>Development will put the Blue Gum High Forest in danger.</li> <li>No buffer between development and forest provided.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of development is massive and unsuitable to residential area.</li> <li>Hospital will result in increase in cars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
137	16 July 2009	Cathy Wright 63A Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surrounding area already experiences high traffic volumes.</li> <li>To add further traffic to overloaded system is impractical.</li> <li>Rippon Grange should be considered as a property rather than set of individual structures or spaces.</li> <li>Preserving Blue Gum High Forest is as important as protecting Rippon Grange building.</li> <li>Building does not appear to be fit for purpose.</li> <li>Insufficient parking for staff and visitors.</li> <li>School zones in close proximity to the site.</li> <li>Scale of the development is unsuited to residential area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fit for purpose</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
138	16 July 2009	Rachel Lees Sutherland Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will seriously and negatively impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Development will have devastating impact on traffic.</li> <li>8 schools within 1km of site.</li> <li>Surrounding streets cannot support additional traffic.</li> <li>Traffic movements of staff have not been addressed in traffic report.</li> <li>Concerns for safety of school children due to nature of road</li> <li>Drug and alcohol addiction element of proposal not compatible with school children.</li> <li>Light and noise pollution will impact on surrounding area.</li> <li>No other 6.5 storey buildings in surrounding area.</li> <li>Site not serviceable by public transport.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of development identical to previous rejected applications.</li> <li>Development will overwhelm heritage listed Rippon Grange and will overshadow homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Insufficient information</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Use</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Light spill</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
139	16 July 2009	Bruce Gray 34 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is similar in size, structure and footprint to two previously ejected applications.</li> <li>Proposed use as a hospital is a ruse.</li> <li>Proposed use is inconsistent with plans.</li> <li>Increased traffic flow will cause danger for school children.</li> <li>Traffic flow would be dangerous and disruptive to residents.</li> <li>Rezoning of designated Blue Gum High Forest footprint to destroy part of forest to allow the development to occur.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
140	17 July 2009	Stuart Auld 6/358 Eastern Valley Way, Chatswood	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will lead to unacceptable destruction of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Enormous buildings splits the house and stables and destroys the heritage value and ambience of the site.</li> <li>Development is out of character with residential nature of community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
141	15 July 2009	Kathryn Wightman 7 Morris Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow lanes are already congested.</li> <li>Traffic generated by proposed facility would not be possible on current residential streets.</li> <li>Consideration must be given to primary school children's safety.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are massively out of scale compared to the surrounding residential homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
142	15 July 2009	Anne-Louise Deakin 24 Boundary Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage buildings will be damaged by the added buildings.</li> <li>Buildings will dwarf and overshadow surrounding homes.</li> <li>Traffic is already too much for narrow streets any increase would be more dangerous for school children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
143	15 July 2009	Margaret Vartuli 24 Jubilee Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage significance of buildings and gardens should be preserved.</li> <li>Concern about impacts of traffic on narrow roads and safety of children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
144	15 July 2009	Stephen & Annabel Dove 3 Sutherland Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>bulk and scale of the development is opposed to nature of surrounding streets.</li> <li>Height and size of hospital will have a detrimental impact on character of area.</li> <li>Already significant traffic problems.</li> <li>Traffic problem will be exacerbated if proposal is allowed.</li> <li>Increase in traffic will be a danger to local primary school children.</li> <li>Proposed development engulfs existing house, historical value is diminished.</li> <li>Proposed development will impact on Blue Gum High Forest and damage the water table.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
145	15 July 2009	A E & F W Liney 7 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 126</li> </ul>
146	15 July 2009	Kent Walker Lesday Pty Ltd 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, 12 Railway Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic congestion would be devastating to narrow residential streets.</li> <li>Potential road damage and pedestrian danger caused by large trucks during construction.</li> <li>Question need for development when area is already serviced by two major hospitals.</li> <li>Bulk and size of buildings would overshadow surrounding houses.</li> <li>Nature and characteristic of area would be changed forever.</li> <li>Removal of some of Blue Gum High Forest would have a devastating environment impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
147	17 July 2009	Grant McKenzie 19 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height and density of buildings is out of character for the region.</li> <li>Development will increase traffic in neighbouring streets.</li> <li>Current roads will not support increase in traffic and pose risk to school children.</li> <li>Inclusion of psychiatric hospital is concerning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Density</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
148	15 July 2009	Neil & Tanya Whiteing 18 young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic will go beyond that considered appropriate for a residential area.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are not suited to heavier traffic loads.</li> <li>Development poses safety concerns for pedestrians and children walking to school.</li> <li>No buildings of this height and density in the surrounding area.</li> <li>This type of development should be close to mass transportation and other amenities not in residential neighbourhoods.</li> <li>Wahroonga is residential not a place of business.</li> <li>Heritage buildings and gardens must be preserved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
149	15 July 2009	John Muirhead 79 Leura Crescent, north Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Value of property in the neighbourhood would be significantly reduced.</li> <li>Concerns about effects on public safety from traffic.</li> <li>Young Street is narrow and inappropriate for heavy traffic.</li> <li>Width of existing right-of-way not sufficient to accommodate any widening over most of its length without destroying Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Construction will generate unusually heavy traffic.</li> <li>Construction of basements will interrupt and alter natural drainage and lead to changes in soil moisture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property values</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Access</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>levels to detriment of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Plans need amendment to address privacy.</li> <li>Access should be moved to Water Street which has two footpaths.</li> </ul>	
150	15 July 2009	Alex Morris 55A Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hospital will create extra traffic.</li> <li>Narrow streets cannot support additional traffic.</li> <li>Water Street experiences heavy traffic and lack of parking.</li> <li>Construction would increase the problem and create a dangerous environment for school children.</li> <li>Damage to Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
151	[no DoP date stamp]	Elizabeth Parker (no address details provided)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are narrow and already busy due to schools.</li> <li>Not possible to support additional traffic that hospital would create.</li> <li>Development will cause parking problems for residents.</li> <li>Children walking to school would be at risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
152	[no DoP date stamp]	21 Redleaf Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic will be dangerous to children.</li> <li>Will affect Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
153	15 July 2009	Yuka Hayashida 18 Railway Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too big</li> <li>Dangerous for children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
154	15 July 2009	John Hegarty 37 Westbrook Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is the same as previously rejected proposals.</li> <li>Proposed building is massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Bulk of main hospital wing will dominate the ridgeline and prevent views 'in the round' of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Construction traffic will endanger children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
155	15 July 2009	Harry Vaughan 28 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on trees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
156	15 July 2009	50/30 Tennyson Street, Dulwich Hill	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streets are too narrow.</li> <li>Property does not have a good alternative access.</li> <li>Dangerous to public particularly children</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest would be damaged or destroyed by the proposal.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of building is out of keeping with the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Access</li> </ul>
157	15 July 2009	Jessica Parker 49 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New building will destroy gum trees and historic home.</li> <li>Out of character for Wahroonga.</li> <li>Too many cars will make walk to school dangerous and unpleasant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
158	15 July 2009	Mary & Derek Lore Richmond, Tasmania	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Storey building will overshadow heritage building.</li> <li>New building will not complement the architecture of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest endangered by building works and excavation.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of development is unsuitable in a residential area.</li> <li>Development will overshadow many properties and deprive them of privacy.</li> <li>Hospital of this size will create big increase in cars and commercial vehicles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Built form</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streets are narrow and traffic is already a big problem.</li> <li>Safety of school children is a concern.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
159	15 July 2009	John & Trina Payton 27 Tamar place, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale of proposal the same as previously rejected applications.</li> <li>Development massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest must be protected.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major direct and indirect impact on the forest.</li> <li>Should be a 20m buffer zone.</li> <li>Hospital will generate huge amounts of traffic.</li> <li>Development will endanger school children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
160	15 July 2009	Marianne Moreau 16 Holt Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rise would change character of community.</li> <li>Already have hospital in Wahroonga</li> <li>Narrow streets that could not cope with extra traffic from hospital development.</li> <li>Development is out of character with surrounding properties.</li> <li>Historic site should be preserved for future generations.</li> <li>Development will destroy the Blue Gum High Forest on the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
161	15 July 2009	Pamela Hitchcock 17 Holt Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed hospital grossly inappropriate due to damage to heritage building.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of proposed buildings the same as earlier rejected proposals.</li> <li>Proposed buildings massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Hospital will generate huge amounts of traffic.</li> <li>Narrow streets cannot cope with additional traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
162	15 July 2009	Sydney Hemdley 2/16 Railway Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Damage to Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
163	15 July 2009	Cathy Vaughan 28 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building would be too big.</li> <li>No-one would be able to explore the gardens.</li> <li>Big building next to old heritage house will make the house look silly.</li> <li>Hospital will make walk to school more dangerous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
164	15 July 2009	Peter Shashkof Denistone East	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building of this size will produce enormous amounts of traffic.</li> <li>need to park outside properties for work (gardening).</li> <li>Streets would be filled with staff cars.</li> <li>No need for this sort of facility, area is adequately serviced by two major hospitals.</li> <li>Dangerous for local school children to walk past the property.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest would be damaged or destroyed by the proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Need</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
165	15 July 2009	Lawrence Taylor 7 Euroka Road, Westleigh	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will have a profound impact in terms of traffic and off street parking.</li> <li>No need for another large hospital.</li> <li>Proposal will have a significant impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>
166	15 July 2009	A Brandon 7 Woodville Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage estate would be destroyed by inappropriate development</li> <li>Property lies within proposed Urban Conservation Area and is a one of the key estates remaining.</li> <li>Streets would be filled with cars from staff.</li> <li>Two major hospitals and smaller private hospitals service the area.</li> <li>Significant impact on Blue Gum High Forest if hospital proceeds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>
167	15 July	Matthew	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streets are narrow.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
	2009	Vaughan 28 Water Street, Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More traffic would make it dangerous for children walking to school.</li> <li>No information on plans showing where people will park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
168	15 July 2009	Derek Hill 8 Kintore Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same arguments in respect of original retirement village proposal remain.</li> <li>Congestion on narrow lanes.</li> <li>Even more trees will be removed and Blue Gum High Forest will be decimated.</li> <li>No consideration of likely effect on proposal of expansion of Adventist Hospital and large housing facilities.</li> <li>Potential conversion of hospital to seniors living if hospital is not viable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Cumulative impacts</li> </ul>
169	15 July 2009	Peter Castine 40 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formerly quiet heritage lane experiences heavy traffic because of school activity.</li> <li>Illegal parking common place.</li> <li>Proposed development would have massive consequences to road safety.</li> <li>Additional driveway should be included off Water Street.</li> <li>Young Street access is dangerous because of sharp hill drop off.</li> <li>Although previously a hospital never intended to be for development on such a grand scale.</li> <li>Towering buildings will destroy scenic outlook of area.</li> <li>Dwellings do not comply with residential requirements.</li> <li>Not appropriate for this unique part of Wahroonga.</li> <li>Smaller, less obtrusive project is recommended.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest must be preserved.</li> <li>Other vegetation on site should also be preserved.</li> <li>Bus service required to service hospital and parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Tree protection</li> <li>Public transport</li> </ul>
170	9 July 2009	Vaughan Blackwood 104 Kissing Point Road, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>invasion of privacy</li> <li>Massive change in character of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Irreversible disruption to Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Impact to a significant heritage site.</li> <li>Huge traffic impact and increased danger to children during construction.</li> <li>No public transport.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Public transport</li> </ul>
171	15 July 2009	Catherine Wollley 44 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal downgrades heritage gardens.</li> <li>All heritage items including buildings and gardens should be preserved.</li> <li>Six storey buildings would have a serious and detrimental impact on streetscape.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest threatened by proposal.</li> <li>Traffic impacts during construction and operation.</li> <li>Small scale streets.</li> <li>Huge child safety risks associated with increased traffic near schools.</li> <li>Privacy of immediate neighbours will be impacted on by massive buildings.</li> <li>Shadows cast from high buildings will affect dwellings.</li> <li>Wahroonga characterised by separate stand alone dwellings and leafy green environment.</li> <li>Hospital development ignores character in it large, bulky and modern design.</li> <li>Existing hospital provision in the area covers local health needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>
172	16 July 2009	Lilian McBride 19 Chilton Parade, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale same as two earlier rejected proposals.</li> <li>Massively out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Heritage buildings and gardens should be preserved.</li> <li>Significance of gardens has been downgraded in CMP to facilitated development.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest will be impacted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of traffic is a major concern.</li> <li>Construction activity will cause damage to roads and create safety risks for children.</li> <li>Development will generate more traffic than should occur in a residential area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
173	10 July 2009	Deborah Lee (no address provided)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is a heritage site and significant to the history and amenity of the area.</li> <li>Transport to the area is limited.</li> <li>Narrow streets does not permit safe entry and exit for increased traffic.</li> <li>Safety of busy corridor for children.</li> <li>Not within North Shore development corridor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
174	15 July 2009	Craig Parker 42 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is inconsistent with surrounding streetscape.</li> <li>Proposed development fails to take account of narrow streets in the area and will have a negative impact on traffic flow.</li> <li>Does not take into account full impact of the development on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Amenity currently enjoyed by residents will be significantly curtailed.</li> <li>Case of inappropriate zoning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood streetscape</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>
175	[no DoP date stamp]	Claudine Parr 42 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application similar in bulk and size to previous applications.</li> <li>No need for a new hospital in Wahroonga, already hospitals, psychiatric unit and nursing homes for the dementia patients.</li> <li>Ambit to circumvent previous rejects and build huge retirement village.</li> <li>Bulk, scale and density of proposal out of scale with residential neighbourhood.</li> <li>Rippon Grange house and gardens should be preserved.</li> <li>Stables would be demolished thereby losing heritage value and significance.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest cannot survive in shadow of huge buildings proposed.</li> <li>Loss of amenities for adjacent properties has not been considered.</li> <li>Total loss of privacy, overshadowing caused by massive bulk of buildings would have direct negative impact on properties.</li> <li>Traffic impact study is deficient – reference to Billyard ‘Street’ should be ‘Avenue.’</li> <li>Traffic congestion on surrounding streets would prevent ambulances getting through in an emergency.</li> <li>Water Street entrance location on top of two steep hills with poor vision.</li> <li>Young Street footpaths are poorly formed.</li> <li>Study does not consider impact on adjacent streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Amenity</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Access</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
176	[no DoP date stamp]	Alicia Broadbent (no address provided)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inevitable destruction of Blue Gum High Forest due to current layout of proposed buildings and construction of underground car park.</li> <li>Huge, unsympathetic monolith style building divides the heritage listed house and stables.</li> <li>Proposal more disruptive to ecological and heritage value of site than previous rejected applications.</li> <li>Hospital definition is a cover up; no operating theatre, large room sizes.</li> <li>Not enough parking for staff and patients.</li> <li>Application pays no attention to Ecologically Sustainable Development.</li> <li>Development is out of character with residential nature of community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Fit for purpose</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>ESD</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
177	17 July 2009	R J Gowing 29 Illoura Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streets surrounding the proposed development are narrow.</li> <li>Not sufficient on-site parking for staff.</li> <li>No public transport.</li> <li>Proposal will contribute to congestion.</li> <li>Potential to destroy some Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Development on scale proposed does not site well in middle of streets of single houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Public transport</li> </ul>
178	[no DoP date]	BA & PM Pointon	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No less impact than previously rejected application.</li> <li>Bulk and scale too much for residential area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Neighbourhood</li> </ul>



No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
	stamp]	45 Braeside Street, Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blue Gum High Forest will be adversely impacted.</li> <li>Surrounding streets incapable of bearing traffic load.</li> <li>Type of development is appropriate to town centres not residential areas.</li> <li>Waterbrook proved inability to work with local communities at Greenwich.</li> <li>Hospital will have even greater impact than retirement village.</li> <li>Conversion of existing hospital building to cafe will destroy heritage</li> </ul>	character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer reputation</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
179	[no DoP date stamp]	Christine Berlioz 17 Torres Place, St Ives	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current proposal obliterates significant parts of garden.</li> <li>Bulk, scale and height of proposed buildings will dominate heritage item and neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Underground parking and buildings will destroy existing Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>20 metre buffer zone between development and forest not included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
180	16 July 2009	Peter Nixey 2 Young Street, Warrawee	Objection	SAME AS 118	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 118</li> </ul>
181	[no DoP date stamp]	Dr Zeny Edwards Architectural historian 32A Warrangi Street, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage issues remain same as previous applications because bulk and scale remain dominant.</li> <li>Impacts on neighbourhood character and streetscape exacerbated by noise and traffic increases.</li> <li>Development not acceptable in heart of quiet neighbourhood.</li> <li>No acceptable solutions to traffic problems to be generated provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
182	[no DoP date stamp]	Alan Parr 42 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is almost identical in terms of building form and bulk and scale to previous retirement village proposals. As previous proposals were found to be unacceptable, so should new proposal.</li> <li>Unacceptable impact on BGHF.</li> <li>Applicant has refused access to the site from residents' experts and Council's experts.</li> <li>There should be a 20-metre buffer zone between any development or excavation activities and the BGHF.</li> <li>True extent of BGHF is considerably larger than was determined in the original LEC hearing.</li> <li>Excavation will cause disturbance to hydrology of site.</li> <li>Already traffic congestion on Water Street, Young Street and Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>No road widening should be undertaken in Water Street because it is part of a proposed urban conservation area.</li> <li>Widening of Water Street would remove BGHF.</li> <li>Dangers from increased traffic to school children.</li> <li>Any reliance on on-street parking is totally impractical.</li> <li>Proposal significantly impacts on the heritage significance of the house, its gardens and associated buildings.</li> <li>Proposed main building will block off views between heritage item and the stables.</li> <li>Rippon Grange is an item of State significance and should be listed as such.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are considerably more substantial in bulk and scale than buildings permissible along the Pacific Highway and railway corridor in LEP 194.</li> <li>Such large buildings completely inappropriate within suburban residential areas.</li> <li>Area is identified by National Trust as a proposed urban conservation area.</li> <li>New CMP has no foundation.</li> <li>Proposal does not properly respect the significance and relationship of heritage elements on the site.</li> <li>As an example of a "great estate", the property should remain intact.</li> <li>Proposal is a ploy to obtain approval for a retirement village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Hydrology</li> <li>Traffic and parking</li> <li>Heritage and heritage curtilage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
183	15 July	Mary Brosset	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is a ruse to gain approval for previously rejected application for aged health facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
	2009	7 Redleaf Avenue, Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blue Gum High Forest on property must be protected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> </ul>
184	15 July 2009	Kirsty Wright 63A Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange should be considered as a single property not individual structures or spaces.</li> <li>Proposed development will seriously impact gardens and surrounds and devalue heritage value of property.</li> <li>Development does not have sufficient parking resulting in high on-street parking and unacceptable safety risk to school children.</li> <li>Proposal cannot be progressed without adversely impacting Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Size and scale of development unsuited to residential area.</li> <li>Area surrounding development is subject to high volumes of traffic.</li> <li>Proposal will add to already high volumes of traffic which local streets cannot support,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
185	15 July 2009	Janice Smead 3 Chilton Parade, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal inappropriate due to narrow streets adjacent.</li> <li>Nowhere near public transport.</li> <li>Site is home of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Rippon Grange bequeathed to State Government for public health not private profit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
186	15 July 2009	Dr Rodney Kirsop Suite 605, SAN Clinic 185 Fox Valley Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic associated with development would pose risk to children.</li> <li>Lead to dangerous traffic congestion.</li> <li>Devastating impact on heritage listed Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Development is out of keeping with character of Wahroonga which is renowned for its gardens.</li> <li>Question need for post-natal beds in area.</li> <li>No readily accessible by public transport.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
187		National Trust		REFER TO AGENCY SUMMARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
188	[no DoP date stamp]	Friends of Ku-ring-gai Environment	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major direct and indirect impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Buffer zone between Blue Gum High Forest and development should be provided.</li> <li>Significance of Rippon Grange relates to the house and gardens.</li> <li>Overall scale of the proposed development has a major impact on the garden.</li> <li>All items of heritage should be preserved.</li> <li>Site lies within National Trust Urban conservation Area 27, proposal is alien to valued context.</li> <li>Unacceptable bulk and scale of development for the context.</li> <li>Narrow suburban streets servicing the site are inadequate.</li> <li>Laneways will not support increase in traffic.</li> <li>Real safety issues due to considerable pedestrian traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
189	[no DoP date stamp]	Stephanie & Peter Daly 33 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screening tree on western boundary to be removed; objector's property will face 20m wall.</li> <li>20-25 years for trees to grow to sufficient height to provide effective screening.</li> <li>Main visitor entrance and car park within 3 metres of objector's property boundary.</li> <li>24 hour operation will result in noise nuisance. Three metre landscape buffer zone is unacceptable.</li> <li>Any development should be low rise (2 storey) and moved further from western boundary.</li> <li>Scale of development out of context with heritage and landscape.</li> <li>Little regard for heritage significance of surrounding gardens and buildings.</li> <li>Proposed development encroaches into areas of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Extensive basement may impact on water table.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Screening</li> <li>Siting</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Hydrology</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
190	[no DoP date stamp]	D F Brew 86 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-storey commercial proposal is inconsistent and inappropriate for narrow country lanes within residential context.</li> <li>No recognition of development impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Damaging impacts of intrusive and inappropriate high-rise buildings in heritage cartilage of Rippon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood context</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grange is unacceptable.</li> <li>Construction phase of project would destroy gardens.</li> <li>Bulk and scale contradicts Town centre plans which focus development near public transport nodes.</li> <li>Out of character with Rippon Grange and heritage residential precinct of typically one and two storey homes.</li> <li>Unacceptable traffic impacts.</li> <li>Without adequate construction traffic management plan construction would be dangerous.</li> <li>traffic plan for each phase of the development process required.</li> <li>Application is stepping stone for luxury apartments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> </ul>
191	[no DoP date stamp]	Barry Clibborn 24 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rise development is inappropriate for residential area.</li> <li>Six storey development will tower over northern boundaries.</li> <li>Development is not close to a town centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
192	17 July 2009	Michael Davis 12 Warrawee Avenue, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Warrawee Avenue is a narrow streets and heavy traffic already a problem, especially for school children accessing Knox Grammar School.</li> <li>Additional traffic will adversely affect already overcrowded and dangerous streets including Warrawee Avenue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
193	16 July 2009	Richard Watters 25 Bangalla Street, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a 'pretend' hospital.</li> <li>Want reassurances that hospital will provide adequate clearways for ambulances, emergency section providing 24 hour facilities, operating theatres, radiography facilities, consulting rooms, medical staff rooms, on-site parking, adequate reception facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Fit for purpose</li> </ul>
194	16 July 2009	Wahroonga Public School 71 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about impact and welfare of school children attending Wahroonga Public School.</li> <li>Hospital will bring many more vehicles to immediate school vicinity.</li> <li>Currently inadequate street parking for school communities needs.</li> <li>If approved development adequate traffic constraints and pedestrian safety measures should be put in place to ensure safety of school children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
195	[no DoP date stamp]	Nicole Harris 5 Plymouth Close, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Main and west wings will look down on objector's property.</li> <li>No trees or privacy screens would improve the situation due to height of proposed buildings.</li> <li>West wing will affect access to direct sunlight resulting in impact on objector's solar panels.</li> <li>West wing will block views.</li> <li>Proposed buildings will produce significant noise from lift, parking, services.</li> <li>Screening will not reduce noise to previous levels.</li> <li>Surrounding streets already experience dangerous mix of speeding cars, poor visibility and, at times, one lane traffic.</li> <li>Development will significantly increase traffic and on-street parking.</li> <li>Traffic report does not include St Lucy School and should be redone.</li> <li>Buildings will detract from character of neighbouring houses and surrounding suburbs.</li> <li>Size and scale, landscaping, architectural character and overuse of hard surfaces is out of character with surrounding area.</li> <li>Demolition of well-established trees will affect drainage.</li> <li>Need for Species Impact Study as per LEC decision for previous applications.</li> <li>Development will cast shadow over objector's house and gardens resulting in loss of amenity.</li> <li>Construction will generate large amounts of dust.</li> <li>Geological investigations restricted to west wing.</li> <li>Full geological investigations required to examine potential for land slip or erosion.</li> <li>10 metre set back on western boundary will appear much closer. Objector's property is built close to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Overlooking</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Daylight access</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Amenity</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Insufficient information</li> <li>Loss of trees</li> <li>Drainage</li> <li>Flora and fauna/BGHH</li> <li>Geology</li> <li>Siting</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
196	[no DoP date stamp]	Ainslie Mills 5 Plymouth Close, Wahroonga	Objection	<p>the boundary resulting in oppressive outlook.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main and west wings will infringe personal visual privacy and amenity.</li> <li>• Main and west wings will look directly into objector's property.</li> <li>• West wing will cut out direct sunlight resulting in impact on objector's solar panels.</li> <li>• Shadow plans show objector's house and garden in complete shade.</li> <li>• West wing will block views.</li> <li>• Proposed buildings will produce significant noise from lift, parking, services.</li> <li>• Screening will not reduce noise to previous levels.</li> <li>• Surrounding streets already experience dangerous mix of speeding cars, poor visibility and, at times, one lane traffic.</li> <li>• Development will significantly increase traffic and on-street parking.</li> <li>• Development will impact on local environment resulting in loss of well established trees which in turn will affect drainage and destroy homes of breeding birds.</li> <li>• Buildings will detract from character of neighbouring houses and surrounding suburbs.</li> <li>• Objector's property is built close to the boundary resulting in oppressive outlook from proposed buildings built close to boundary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overshadowing</li> <li>• Amenity</li> <li>• Privacy</li> <li>• Daylight access</li> <li>• Flora and fauna</li> <li>• Drainage</li> <li>• Loss of trees</li> <li>• Siting</li> <li>• Height</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
197 a	17 July 2009	John Williams Neighbourhood Group	Objection	<p>Submission comprises a cover letter and 4 reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ingham Planning submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal does not respond to context and constraints of site;</li> <li>- Bulk and scale and height of buildings are not compatible with low density residential character;</li> <li>- Proposal will have adverse impacts on heritage values of Rippon Grange and on BGHF;</li> <li>- Proposal provides inadequate parking, will adversely impact on several adjoining residential properties;</li> <li>- Buildings should be of a scale and height more in keeping with existing built form in locality;</li> <li>- Rippon Grange should continue to be dominant built form;</li> <li>- Should be a maximum of 3 storeys;</li> <li>- Long buildings should be divided into smaller forms;</li> <li>- Should be a more limited building footprint and development scale;</li> <li>- Dominating scale of the western building should be moderated by limiting building height to 2 storeys;</li> <li>- Western building should be broken to create 2 separate, smaller buildings;</li> <li>- Although main building is not as readily seen from residential properties as western wing, nevertheless, its height and scale are not compatible with neighbourhood character;</li> <li>- Main building should be divided into 2 separate structures;</li> <li>- SIS is deficient. Adequate buffers should be provided to the BGHF;</li> <li>- Primary heritage significance of Rippon Grange, being dominance of its setting, will be totally compromised;</li> <li>- Car parking provision is inadequate and should be increased to at least 111 spaces;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Blake Dawson submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal does not properly address the concerns of the Land and Environment Court;</li> <li>- Proposal seeks to dismiss or contradict the Court's findings and approach;</li> <li>- Applicant's design statement does not respond to all aspects of the Court's judgement;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• BGHF</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed buildings are not in any way subservient to Rippon Grange and its gardens; Proposal is merely an attempt to mitigate to a limited extent the impacts of buildings which are not subservient.</li> <li>- Proposal does not address the concerns of the Commissioners of the Land and Environment Court;</li> <li>- Proposal does not address the fundamental problem that the development is not subservient to the heritage values of the place;</li> <li>- Proponent should have paid less for the property, rather than seek to gain approval of an inappropriate development by threatening not to maintain the property;</li> <li>• Robert A Moore Pty Ltd submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Heritage Council has no statutory role in the application and its opinion remains advisory only;</li> <li>- There is a disconnect between the exhortations and affirmations of the CMP and the plans for the proposal now before the Minister, and the Heritage Impact Statement which supports the development;</li> <li>- Although HIS states that proposal meets requirements of CMP, this is highly interpretable and a matter of degree and opinion;</li> <li>- HIS contains no honest consideration of how development will, if approved, impact its setting and locality;</li> <li>- Findings of HIS are questionable;</li> <li>- Other areas exist within near vicinity of site which are appropriately zoned and which are more capable of carrying a hospital development of the kind proposed without the impacts that will occur on the subject site;</li> <li>- Proposed use is not a reasonable continuation of an established non-conforming use.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Gingra Ecological Surveys <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SIS is deficient;</li> <li>- SIS does not adequately deal with Director-General's Requirements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
197 b	22 July 2009	Cameron Harris 5 Plymouth Close, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings are essentially same as those previously rejected by Land and Environment Court.</li> <li>• The SIS is deficient.</li> <li>• Proponent has not addressed the major platforms of the LEC Decision.</li> <li>• From evidence, it would appear that developer does not have access to funding required.</li> <li>• Lack of knowledge appears to inform the mix of services to be provided (e.g. no nursery in maternity unit).</li> <li>• Construction program inappropriate.</li> <li>• Height, density, bulk and scale are out of proportion to the surrounding development landscape and topography.</li> <li>• Proposal will have adverse amenity impacts on neighbours.</li> <li>• Car parking is inadequate. Water Street and Young Street are too narrow.</li> <li>• Children will be put at risk by the proposal.</li> <li>• Bushfire risk assessment inadequately considered.</li> <li>• SIS is defective.</li> <li>• Construction and operational impacts have been inadequately considered.</li> <li>• No detail is provided where topsoil will be stored.</li> <li>• Inadequate consideration given to urban services.</li> <li>• No evidence of consultation with Federal Department of Environment.</li> <li>• No evidence of consultation with Sydney Water.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Bulk and scale</li> <li>• Amenity</li> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Hospital services</li> <li>• Public interest</li> <li>• LEC judgements</li> <li>• Bushfire risk</li> <li>• Construction impacts</li> <li>• Traffic and transport impacts</li> <li>• Car parking</li> <li>• Urban services</li> <li>• Consultation</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
197c	1 Sept 2009	Cameron Harris 5 Plymouth Close, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site can be defined as landlocked on Young and Water Streets.</li> <li>Alternative access could be from Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Other hospitals have wider entrance roads.</li> <li>Survey demonstrates that Young Street and Water Street are relatively narrow.</li> <li>No details provided of how roads are to be upgraded to cater for development.</li> <li>Construction Management Plan requires more detail.</li> <li>Various errors and unacceptable poor design in traffic report.</li> <li>Young Street should be widened to 12-metre kerb-to-kerb at the intersection of Billyard.</li> <li>Young Street and Water Street need a minimum of 10 metres, ideally 12 metres kerb-to-kerb.</li> <li>All existing vegetation and trees to be retained on Young Street, Water Street and Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Traffic needs to be restricted from going north up Young Street into Water Street.</li> <li>Sight distance at intersection of Billyard Avenue and Young Street needs to be significantly increased by street widening without loss of trees.</li> <li>Traffic access into site endangers heritage trees.</li> <li>Young Street, Water Street and Billyard Avenue must all have minimum footpath width of 2 metres with footpaths on both sides of the road.</li> <li>Additional pedestrian crossings should be provided in vicinity of proposed development.</li> <li>Internal access driveways are inadequate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
198	[no DoP date stamp]	John & Sally Asnicar 14 Kintore Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End result of proposal is completely inappropriate development for the area.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are extremely narrow.</li> <li>Roads are full of schoolchildren for several hours each day.</li> <li>Roads unsuitable for construction vehicles.</li> <li>Damage or removal of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Rippon Grange and surrounding streets dwarfed by multi-storey units that cast permanent shadows.</li> <li>Streetscape ruined.</li> <li>Heritage gardens gone and replaced by 'soft scaping'</li> <li>Hospital will increase traffic dramatically and create hazards for pedestrians especially children.</li> <li>No nearby bus services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
199	[no DoP date stamp]	Sarah Dreverman 2A Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rise development of this type should be concentrated on highways and not domestic back streets.</li> <li>Proposal is back door application for high density development.</li> <li>Proposal is to provide housing for wealthy individuals.</li> <li>Bulk and scale is inconsistent with surrounding residences.</li> <li>Important to maintain heritage value of site.</li> <li>Water and Young Streets are extremely narrow, no way of widening them without encroaching on heritage building.</li> <li>Development has serious (traffic) safety issues.</li> <li>Inadequate setback from Young Street making it out of character with neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Pathway slope is extremely steep and not suitable for elderly patients or wheelchair users</li> <li>Safety of school children ignored.</li> <li>Site located 1km from Wahroonga village.</li> <li>Delivery trucks cannot be supported in this area.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest will be adversely impacted.</li> <li>Current owners have allowed heritage items to decay indicating disrespect for heritage.</li> <li>Rockbreaker will cause vibrations during exaction.</li> <li>Driveway ingress and egress is major concern.</li> <li>Development is out of character with surrounding development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Density</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Noise and vibration</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Access</li> <li>Siting</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage significance lost because of bulk of proposed multi-level buildings.</li> <li>Request noise report prior to any development taking place and that noise levels are monitored.</li> <li>require air pollution controls to be put in place.</li> <li>Require geotechnic report to be made available and use of rockbreakers prevented.</li> <li>Details of how car park will be vented to be provided.</li> <li>Setback must align with other properties on road.</li> <li>No regular bus service.</li> <li>Traffic report should be carried out during school hours.</li> </ul>	
200	21 July 2009	DECC		REFER TO PUBLIC AGENCY SUMMARY	•
201	17 July 2009	WR & CF Spain 50 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale same as previously rejected application.</li> <li>Development is inappropriate to residential area with narrow streets.</li> <li>Residential streets are already subject to high traffic volumes.</li> <li>Traffic volumes during construction phase and when development is completed represents major danger to children.</li> <li>Development will encroach on privacy of surrounding residences.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
202	17 July 2009	Dan & Sandra Candotti 4 Chunooma Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drug and rehabilitation facility in family area is unreasonable.</li> <li>Development will bring traffic.</li> <li>Roads are already congested.</li> <li>Irresponsible to safety of children.</li> <li>Better places for this development elsewhere away from high traffic and school areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Alternative location</li> </ul>
203	17 July 2009	John Barnes 11 Barton Crescent, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hospital for people with alcohol and drug problems is totally out of character and inconsistent with family homes.</li> <li>Request that high rise blocks are not built</li> <li>Residential heritage site not a hospital development area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Land use</li> </ul>
204	17 July 2009	K Overton 8 Wilbhere Place, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size of proposed buildings is too large for a residential area.</li> <li>Rear neighbours will be overlooked and lose privacy.</li> <li>Proposed development will impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Increase in traffic will be too great for surrounding narrow roads.</li> <li>Construction vehicles will damage the road and could cause accidents.</li> <li>Heritage aspects of buildings and gardens should be preserved by the developers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Overlooking</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
205	17 July 2009	Annabel Mackenzie 19 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about safety of psychiatric facility given schools in immediate area.</li> <li>Area already stained by traffic flow.</li> <li>School zones for almost entire span of Water and Young Streets, causing conflict with ambulances. Streets are narrow which restricts residents and visitors parking.</li> <li>Hospital will result in increased on-street parking.</li> <li>Any parking restrictions introduced would further impact on residents and their visitors.</li> <li>Allowing such a large and tall building in a peaceful, leafy and quiet suburb is unethical.</li> <li>Already surrounded by hospitals close by. No demonstrated need for new hospital.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> </ul>
206	20 July 2009	Dr Wendy King 17 Sutherland Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surrounding streets are too narrow to support construction traffic and hospital traffic.</li> <li>Virtually no room to widen the streets.</li> <li>Hospital would create more congestion in an area with 4 schools.</li> <li>Hospital would cause late night and early morning traffic inappropriate in an urban area.</li> <li>Unique quality of residential precinct would be ruined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
207	17 July 2009	Dr Michael & Elizabeth Moor 34 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need for another private hospital in the area, already well served.</li> <li>Concerned with the safety of road users with increased traffic.</li> <li>Blind, narrow slope and crest adjacent to Rippon Grange on Water Street is dangerous.</li> <li>Ludicrous that something of this size is considered for 35 Water Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Scale</li> </ul>
208	20 July 2009	Suzanne Thomas 27 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barely reworked version of two previously rejected applications.</li> <li>massively out of scale for neighbourhood</li> <li>Destructive to native Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>damaging to heritage buildings and gardens</li> <li>Destructive to privacy of residents in immediate proximity.</li> <li>Poses potential traffic nightmare.</li> <li>Poses danger to children who walk narrow streets to schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
209	21 July 2009	Simon Maxwell 10A Water Street 7 49 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A zoning anomaly is being abused by the Applicant and the Minister should rezone the site now.</li> <li>The site is effectively landlocked, needing all traffic access from Billyard Avenue, not Young or Water Street.</li> <li>Very excessive height (5-6 storeys in a 1-2 storey residential area).</li> <li>Very excessive density (very high density, bulk and scale in an area with detached dwellings).</li> <li>Very significant impact on the neighbourhood character, streetscape and amenity.</li> <li>Very significant impact on heritage item (crowding Rippon Grange with 5-6 storey mega-structures).</li> <li>Very significant traffic, pedestrian, accessibility impacts (narrow streets in "billygoats" country).</li> <li>Flora impact (magnified with huge underground excavation).</li> <li>Unsuitability of site for high density, high rise development due to topography and above items.</li> <li>No consideration of alternatives (e.g. low density retirement village, townhouses or houses).</li> <li>Not a publicly acceptable outcome.</li> <li>L&amp;E Court, Council and Planning Panel have refused similar scale developments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Amenity/privacy</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
209 b	1 Sept 2009	Simon Maxwell 10A Water Street 7 49 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	AS PER 197c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AS PER 197c</li> </ul>
210	17 July 2009	David Morrow & Louise Everitt 20 Halycon Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major overdevelopment as site is among residential streets away from designated high rise corridors and town centres.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are narrow and not suitable for increased traffic.</li> <li>Site would require bus service.</li> <li>Section of proposal affects Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are completely out of scale to heritage buildings.</li> <li>Already two existing hospitals within 5km.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
211	17 July 2009	Walter Brabant 6/128 Eastern Road, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size and nature of application would become a major issue to the area because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>traffic, parking roads,</li> <li>OHS regulations,</li> <li>environmental issues,</li> <li>community welfare and safety,</li> <li>credibility of directors,</li> <li>transparency of DA.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Health and safety</li> </ul>
212	17 July 2009	Gabrielle Smith 10 Young Street,	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poses danger for school children</li> <li>Development will cause damage and harm Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>



No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing building is of historical significance and its importance will be greatly diminished by the proposed development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
213	17 July 2009	Robert & Frances Fletcher 47 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-6 storey buildings are out of keeping with environment on Water Street and general neighbourhood.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest will be affected.</li> <li>Wahroonga area has an abundance of hospitals already.</li> <li>Streets around Water Street are narrow and have trouble accommodating traffic volumes.</li> <li>Not designed for hospital traffic.</li> <li>Buildings will tower over Rippon Grange building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Height</li> </ul>
214	17 July 2009	Graham White 2/93 Pentecost Avenue, Pymble	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entire area would be despoiled by such a huge high building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> </ul>
215	17 July 2009	Natalie Webber 48 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic during construction and once development is completed.</li> <li>Road will be damaged during construction.</li> <li>Children will be endangered.</li> <li>The proposed building will overlook immediate neighbours.</li> <li>Buildings and gardens should be taken into consideration and preserved.</li> <li>Gardens have been downgraded in CMP preventing Rippon Grange from being viewed in its entirety.</li> <li>Proposed buildings out of scale compared to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Main hospital wing will dominate Rippon Grange</li> <li>Development will have huge impacts on Blue Gum Hill Forest.</li> <li>No buffer zone has been allowed for.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Overlooking</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
216	17 July 2009	Christine Shale 11 Chilton parade, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow streets adjacent to infant and primary school where traffic should be kept to a minimum.</li> <li>No public transport near to hospital site</li> <li>Site is home to rare Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Rippon Grange bequeathed to State Government for public health not private profit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
217	17 July 2009	Vern & Julie Howland 5 Davidson Avenue, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Psychiatric hospital poses dangers especially to children.</li> <li>Drug addiction facility poses threat to children and disruption to residents.</li> <li>Large number of existing public and private medical facilities in the immediate area.</li> <li>Likely that developer will not be able to find an operator for the hospital and seek change of use to residential units.</li> <li>Increased flood risk with removal of trees.</li> <li>increased traffic impact in the area,</li> <li>Risk of injuring children.</li> <li>Parking spaces insufficient for size of facility.</li> <li>No public transport.</li> <li>Allowing high density facility such as this in low density area would set precedent for similar developers elsewhere.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Viability</li> <li>Flood risk</li> <li>Parking pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Precedent.</li> </ul>
218	17 July 2009	Cradock family 59 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga (6 separate letters)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to lack of details in respect of 64 Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Request that surrounding residents are kept informed about any changes to the development.</li> <li>Incremental traffic during and after construction will exacerbate traffic risk to residents.</li> <li>Increased traffic volume on narrow laneways will put children's lives at risk.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of hospital is completely out of character compared to surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest needs to be protected.</li> <li>All heritage items (buildings and garden) should be preserved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient information</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will only partially preserve the heritage items.</li> <li>Scale and scope of development will detract from Rippon Grange.</li> </ul>	
219	17 July 2009	Ingham Planning on behalf of John Williams Neighbourhood Group	Objection	SAME AS 197a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 197a</li> </ul>
220	[no DoP date stamp]	Karen & Stephen Jenkins 53 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal ignores zoning requirements of the land</li> <li>5 to 7 storey building does not fit with objectives of current zoning for the site.</li> <li>No licence to operate the proposed development as a hospital has been made.</li> <li>No detailed information has been provided as to how safety and protection of patients and residents will be dealt with.</li> <li>Species Impact Statement and Vegetation Management Plan have not been provided.</li> <li>No quantitative analysis as to need for services.</li> <li>Traffic assessment does not address safety of young children, need for additional traffic management infrastructure e.g. pedestrian crossings, traffic lights, need for road widening, additional parking required during peak times.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Viability</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Health and safety</li> <li>Insufficient information</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
221	16 July 2009	Kevin Thomas 17 Chilton Parade, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development in unsympathetic to Rippon Grange and associated buildings.</li> <li>Development will impose an unsustainable load on the local roads and drainage infrastructure.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests and areas of potential regeneration will be adversely impacted.</li> <li>The low key ambience that has characterised the locality will be lost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
222	20 July 2009	John Broadbent 51 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development ignores the significance of the site in relation to Rippon Grange and it's gardens.</li> <li>The importance of the Blue Gum forest ecological community is ignored.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of the building remains inimical to the residential neighbourhood around it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Bulk and Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
223	20 July 2009	Marinela Mendes 57 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic congestion will result in a dangerous environment for school children and other pedestrians.</li> <li>Motorist safety is also at risk due to narrow streets and steep hills.</li> <li>High rise buildings will hide Rippon Range and make a mockery of the Heritage status.</li> <li>Overshadowing will occur as a result of the six storey buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> </ul>
224	16 July 2009	Eva Browne 14 Illoura Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diminution of an important part of Sydney's heritage.</li> <li>Even greater traffic congestion will result on completion of development.</li> <li>Additional traffic will endanger pedestrians, especially school children in the area.</li> <li>Residential amenity will be lost.</li> <li>Development will destroy yet another part of the Blue Gum forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
225	17 July 2009	Joanne Cradock 59 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No detail is provided in regards to the proposed development in Lot 1 in DP 726091 (64 Billyard Avenue) as this is currently zoned residential.</li> <li>Incremental traffic both during and after construction will exacerbate the risk to the residents.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of the development is out of character compared to the surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Blue Gun forests and regenerative seed banks need to be protected.</li> <li>Proposed building will detract from Rippon Grange and a number of heritage buildings will only be partially preserved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
226	17 July 2009	Caitlyn Cradock 59 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 225	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 225</li> </ul>
227	17 July 2009	Tony Combe 22 Bareena Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The significance of the heritage gardens and buildings has been degraded in the Conservation Management Plan to facilitate development.</li> <li>Views both to and from heritage items must be maintained.</li> <li>Proposed development is out of scale with both the neighbourhood and the scale planned for the Pacific Highway corridor.</li> <li>The main hospital wing will dominate the ridgeline and prevent views to and from Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests will be directly impacted on if the recommended 20 meter buffer zone is not respected.</li> <li>Large amounts of material will need to be trucked to and from the site damaging the roads.</li> <li>Even greater traffic congestion will result on completion of development.</li> <li>Additional traffic will endanger pedestrians.</li> <li>Buildings will overlook the immediate neighbours minimising privacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian access</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>
228	20 July 2009	Helen Campbell 11 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion would result in a dangerous environment for school children and other pedestrians within the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
228 b	2 Sept 2009	Helen Campbell 11 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion</li> <li>Bushfire danger to patients using the hospital because of large trees</li> <li>environmental incompatibility</li> <li>Traffic is already a major problem because of existing schools.</li> <li>Water Street would need to be widened.</li> <li>Safety of children is an import</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bushfire</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
229	20 July 2009	R & R Kelly 1 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is out of scale with both the neighbourhood and the scale planned for the Pacific Highway corridor.</li> <li>The main hospital wing will dominate the ridgeline and prevent views to and from Rippon Grange.</li> <li>The significance of the heritage gardens and buildings has been degraded in the Conservation Management Plan to facilitate development.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests will be directly impacted on if the recommended 20 meter buffer zone is not respected.</li> <li>Large amounts of material will need to be trucked to and from the site damaging the roads.</li> <li>Even greater traffic congestion will result on completion of development.</li> <li>Additional traffic will endanger pedestrians</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction</li> </ul>
230	20 July 2009	Stuart Vaughan 28 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is out of character with existing heritage elements of the property and all of surrounding residential area.</li> <li>The proposed development completely overwhelms Rippon Grange.</li> <li>The enormous bulk of proposed built form is located within close proximity to Rippon Grange and in full view of Water Street and author's residence.</li> <li>Historic property will have appearance of being over-developed and out of character with neighbourhood.</li> <li>Development for high-rise buildings is contrary to the zoning, scale, character, height and parking requirements within the area.</li> <li>Heritage and importance and value of Rippon Grange is being eroded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Privacy/amenity</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Underground parking will affect the water table on the southern half of the property and pose risk to existing garden and trees.</li> <li>Top floors of proposed building will look into author's front yard and significantly impact on their privacy.</li> <li>People waiting around in front of Rippon Grange will look into their driveway, impacting on their privacy.</li> <li>Headlights will impact on property at night.</li> <li>Bulk and height of main building should be reduced to 2 storeys.</li> <li>Amount of car parking should be reduced and evenly spread over the site.</li> <li>Service vehicles should have a separate access point off a road that is larger than Water Street.</li> <li>Water Street too narrow for regular daily heavy vehicle use.</li> <li>Proposal will give rise to excessive traffic generation.</li> <li>Residents and pedestrians will be placed at significantly higher risk when they walk along Water Street.</li> <li>Service vehicles should be kept away from car traffic.</li> <li>7 metre wide access point off Water Street is out of character with heritage and nature of Rippon Grange residence.</li> </ul>	
230 b	7 Sept 2009	Stuart Vaughan 28 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides independent survey to demonstrate Proponent's Traffic Impact Assessment is wrong in relation to widths of roads.</li> <li>Concerned about how traffic generation will be handled in a safe and appropriate manner.</li> <li>Local roads not suitable for commercial development and resulting traffic generation.</li> <li>Various road safety issues arise.</li> <li>Applicant has disregarded Ku-ring-gai Council Traffic and Transport Policy dated March 2009 and RTA Design Guidelines.</li> <li>Raises concerns with driver visibility, speed limits, traffic calming, traffic facilities, on-street parking, pedestrian safety, school safety, road safety promotion and cyclists.</li> <li>Access point in Water Street is dangerous.</li> <li>Alternative access should be provided for service vehicles, ambulances, staff and visitor parking, or the size and capacity of Water Street should be increased.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
231	20 July 2009	Joan Cam 8 Mona Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion will be dramatically increased not only during construction but also on completion.</li> <li>Traffic congestion will create a dangerous environment for school children within the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
232	20 July 2009	Pamela Rossa 18 Tennyson Avenue, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion will be dramatically increased.</li> <li>Development is not sympathetic to the sustainability of the Blue Gum forests.</li> <li>Size and scale of the development does not fit in with the quiet, suburban area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Size and scale</li> </ul>
233	20 July 2009	Ewa & Bogdan Hajduk 2 Chifley Close, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height and scale is unsuitable for the surroundings characterised by single family residences.</li> <li>The development will diminish the overall value and demeanour of the suburb.</li> <li>Construction will create extensive noise and could result in major damage to surrounding roads due to the transportation of excess spoil.</li> <li>Blue Gums could be damaged or destroyed by the development.</li> <li>Traffic congestion will be increased beyond the capabilities of the suburb.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
234	20 July 2009	Piper Laykosi 66 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hospitals scope and size will detrimentally impact on a vast range of safety related matter.</li> <li>Road safety will be an issue for children around the schools.</li> <li>Serious traffic congestion will occur.</li> <li>Trucks entering the area will severely impact road safety.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
235	20 July 2009	Alex Lykoski 66 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 234	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 234</li> </ul>
236	20 July 2009	Jo Haikim 57 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is out of scale with both the neighbourhood and the scale planned for the Pacific Highway corridor.</li> <li>The main hospital wing will dominate the ridgeline and prevent views to and from Rippon Grange.</li> <li>The significance of the heritage gardens and buildings has been degraded in the Conservation Management Plan to facilitate development.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests will be directly impacted on if the recommended 20 meter buffer zone is not respected.</li> <li>Large amounts of material will need to be trucked to and from the site damaging the roads.</li> <li>Even greater traffic congestion will result on completion of development.</li> <li>Additional traffic will endanger pedestrians</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction</li> </ul>
237	20 July 2009	Regina Mackenzie 24 Boundary Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More cars will further endanger school children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
238	20 July 2009	WS & YE Cloros 21 Braeside Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is out of character with the residential area.</li> <li>Roads are not wide enough to service the extra traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
239	20 July 2009	Manning Laykoski 66 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 234	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 234</li> </ul>
240	20 July 2009	Kathleen Sutherland 43 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will have devastating effects on the heritage house and land due to the likely bulk, height, scale and density.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Density</li> </ul>
241	20 July 2009	Christine Easton 22 Glendale Road, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small suburban streets cannot accommodate an increase in traffic.</li> <li>There is inadequate visitor parking in the planned development and the surrounding streets will not cope with an increase in demand.</li> <li>Schools generate a lot of pedestrian traffic; therefore increasing street traffic would prove dangerous.</li> <li>Proposed development does not mesh with the ambiance of the area.</li> <li>No public transport close therefore for development will be isolated as a public amenity,</li> <li>Destruction of the remaining Blue Gum forest is strongly opposed.</li> <li>The development is out of keeping wit the original ethos of the John Williams property.</li> <li>A six storey building is a travesty and a disgrace to urban planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Location</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
242	20 July 2009	John & Penny Carr 20 Bangalla Street, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is realistically too small for a 129 bed hospital.</li> <li>Inappropriate to build a hospital amongst long established homes.</li> <li>Large trucks would not be able to pass each other on the narrow access roads.</li> <li>Roads will be unable to cope with any excess traffic.</li> <li>There is a serious lack of parking near Wahroonga railway Station meaning commuters would have to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>park on side streets which are not available.</li> <li>Hospitals are not quiet places meaning vehicles and people would be coming and going 24 hours a day.</li> <li>There is not need for a hospital in the area as it is already well serviced.</li> </ul>	
243	20 July 2009	Jan Klockmann 10A Wairoonga Avenue, Wairoonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of the building is very different from the mainly residential housing within the area.</li> <li>Not good to have a hospital treating drug and alcohol related issues next to schools.</li> <li>Not safe to have an increased amount of traffic in a predominantly residential area with many school children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Land Use</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
244	[no DoP date stamp]	David & Edna Thomas 27 Water Street, Wairoonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is scarcely distinguishable from the two previously submitted development proposals for this site, which have both been rejected.</li> <li>Out of scale for the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Destructive to the native Blue Gum forests.</li> <li>Damaging to the heritage buildings are gardens.</li> <li>Destructive to the privacy of the resident in immediate proximity.</li> <li>Posing a potential traffic nightmare in Water and Young Streets.</li> <li>Posing a danger to the children who walk to and from school.</li> <li>Development will cause irretrievable damage to the quiet family neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
245	20 July 2009	Anne Seage 104 Boundary Street	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development in out of context to the surrounding homes.</li> <li>Immediate residents, as well as other residents due to the height of the building; will lose their privacy in their backyards.</li> <li>Introducing more cars into the area will only make it more dangerous.</li> <li>Increased traffic will decrease pedestrian safety.</li> <li>The development will further endanger the Blue Gum forest.</li> <li>Rippon Grange will be overshadowed by the development.</li> <li>A similar development has already been rejected by the council and the Land and Environment Court.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian Safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
246	20 July 2009	Laureen & Steven Michael 24 Halycon Avenue, Wairoonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is out of character with the rest of the area.</li> <li>Development is on top of a ridge line meaning the development will appear to be higher further impacting on privacy levels.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests will be directly impacted on if the recommended 20 meter buffer zone is not respected.</li> <li>All heritage properties, such as Rippon Grange, must be preserved. This includes both the buildings and the surrounding gardens.</li> <li>Neighbourhood is over 1 kilometre from the rail line and the Pacific Highway, therefore is not ideally situated for a development of this size and nature.</li> <li>Traffic and safety concerns are of extreme significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Location</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
247	20 July 2009	MJ & E McCarthy 45 Burns Road, Wairoonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The immediate streets surrounding the development will not be able to support excessive traffic volumes.</li> <li>Congestion, noise and safety will have a major negative impact on the local area.</li> <li>Proposed level of on site parking will not be able to accommodate the volume of traffic.</li> <li>Preservation of Rippon Grange will not occur if the proposed development is to occur.</li> <li>Views both too and from each heritage item should also be maintained.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests would be destroyed as plans do not allow for a 20 meter buffer zone to be implemented.</li> <li>Seed banks may exist and any regeneration areas need to be protected.</li> <li>Developments of similar nature have already been rejected.</li> <li>The bulk and scale of the proposed hospital development is massive and is totally incompatible with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Parking</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Views</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<p>the prevailing built form of this residential neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The high structures will overlook neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of privacy.</li> <li>Overshadowing effects will be significant.</li> <li>Development will have a material adverse impact on the streetscape and is incompatible with the residential character of the area.</li> </ul>	
248	20 July 2009	Nico Van Der Merwe	Objection	SAME AS 245	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 245</li> </ul>
249	20 July 2009	E Browne 14 Illoura Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 224	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 224</li> </ul>
250	20 July 2009	Ragni Van Der Merwe 21 Young Street, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 249	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 249</li> </ul>
251	[no DoP date stamp]	Brent & Michael Pearson 1 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange and it's gardens have enormous heritage significance which should not be lost.</li> <li>Proposal is out of scale with the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Bulk of building will prevent views both from and to Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests would be destroyed as plans do not allow for a 20 meter buffer zone to be implemented.</li> <li>Materials trucked too and from the site during construction will damage the roads.</li> <li>School children and their parents will be seriously at risk from the extra traffic generated on completion of the development.</li> <li>Privacy will become an issue to immediate neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Vehicles</li> <li>Construction</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>
252	20 July 2009	Denny Nolan 66 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 234	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 234</li> </ul>
253	20 July 2009	Sarah Sullivan 31 Lochville, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature of such a development will impact on the quiet suburb.</li> <li>Increased traffic flow will endanger pedestrians.</li> <li>Heavy trucks bringing supplies to the site will destroy the roads.</li> <li>Existing roads can not accommodate the increased supply of traffic.</li> <li>Rippon Grange will be lost amongst five to six storey buildings.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests will be compromised.</li> <li>Residential privacy will be compromised.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>
254	20 July 2009	June Andersson 84 Lucinda Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is out of keeping with the residential locality and all residents would be overshadowed by the project.</li> <li>An increase in traffic congestion on already narrow streets would endanger pedestrians.</li> <li>Heritage value of Rippon Grange would be destroyed.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests would be destroyed as plans do not allow for a 20 meter buffer zone to be implemented.</li> <li>Drainage from the site will affect neighbouring properties and the water table.</li> <li>Privacy of neighbouring properties will be lost.</li> <li>Construction noise and traffic will exist for up to two years, congesting streets and endangering lives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Construction</li> </ul>
255	20 July 2009	Philip Easton 22 Glendale	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small suburban streets cannot accommodate an increase in traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Road, Turramurra		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is inadequate visitor parking in the planned development and the surrounding streets will not cope with an increase in demand.</li> <li>Schools generate a lot of pedestrian traffic; therefore increasing street traffic would prove dangerous.</li> <li>Proposed development does not mesh with the ambiance of the area.</li> <li>No public transport close therefore for development will be isolated as a public amenity,</li> <li>Destruction of the remaining Blue Gum forest is strongly opposed.</li> <li>The development is out of keeping with the original ethos of the John Williams property.</li> <li>A six storey building is a travesty and a disgrace to urban planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Location</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>
256	20 July 2009	Donald McBain 8 Biara Place, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic will place school children at risk.</li> <li>Parking needs required by the proposed development cannot be currently accommodated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Parking</li> </ul>
257	20 July 2009	Ron & Ngaire Young 1/115 Eastern Road, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Street is very narrow and will not be able to accommodate increased traffic flow.</li> <li>Current parking will not be adequate and the development is quite a distance from the nearest railway station and bus services poor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Parking</li> </ul>
258	20 July 2009	Lilian McBride 19 Chilton Parade, Warrawee	Objection	COPY OF 172	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAME AS 172</li> </ul>
259	20 July 2009	Sally Fewtrell 30 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All items of heritage significance should be preserved. The significance of the gardens has been downgraded in the Conservation Management Plan to facilitate development.</li> <li>Views to and from heritage items should be maintained.</li> <li>Buildings are massively out of scale compared to the neighbourhood and scale planned for the Pacific Highway corridor.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are essentially the same as two earlier proposals which were rejected.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major impacts in the Blue Gum forest and a 20 meter buffer zone should be enforced.</li> <li>Materials trucked to and from the site during construction will damage the roads.</li> <li>School children and their parents will be seriously at risk from the extra traffic generated on completion of the development.</li> <li>Buildings of this size will overlook the immediate neighbours creating privacy issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Views</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Road damage</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Privacy</li> </ul>
260	20 July 2009	Carol Shaw 21 Chilton Parade, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings are massively out of scale compared to the neighbourhood and scale planned for the Pacific Highway corridor.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are essentially the same as two earlier proposals which were rejected.</li> <li>The end product would generate more traffic endangering pedestrians.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
261	20 July 2009	Debbie & Graham Dunn 12 Raymond Avenue, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is grossly out of proportion to the surrounding residential areas.</li> <li>Area is a showpiece of what Sydney used to be, merging with our famous pre-existing bushland.</li> <li>Location is inappropriate so far from public transport.</li> <li>Narrow streets will not cope with increased levels of traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Location</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
262	20 July 2009	John & Paulette Hardy 82A Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will destroy the heritage value of the site.</li> <li>Similar development has already been rejected. Area should remain residential.</li> <li>Development will have adverse effects on the Blue Gum forest.</li> <li>Surrounding streets are not suitable to accommodate the increased traffic flow.</li> <li>It is already signposted as a "High Pedestrian Area"; further traffic will put pedestrians in danger.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian Safety</li> <li>Neighbourhood</li> </ul>



No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
263	15 July 2009	G Hungerford 26 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village atmosphere that exists in Wahroonga will be lost.</li> <li>Heritage significance has been downgraded in the proposal and should be preserved as part of any proposal.</li> <li>Proposed buildings are out of scale compared to the neighbourhood and similar proposals have been rejected.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major impacts in the Blue Gum forest and a 20 meter buffer zone should be enforced.</li> <li>Materials trucked too and from the site during construction will damage the roads.</li> <li>School children and their parents will be seriously at risk from the extra traffic generated on completion of the development.</li> <li>Development is out of character with the neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Road Damage</li> <li>Pedestrian safely</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
264	15 July 2009	Helen Malonas 8 Redleaf Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Blue Gum Forests</li> <li>Child Safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian Safety</li> </ul>
265	20 July 2009	Jennifer Leslie 64 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange is a beautiful old property which should not be lost.</li> <li>The bulk and scale is no different from the previous development applications which have been rejected.</li> <li>Blue Gum trees will be destroyed.</li> <li>Questioning the eventual use of the site as a hospital as there are no operating theatres.</li> <li>Five schools exist in the area which means increased traffic will affect young pedestrians.</li> <li>Increased amounts of traffic, particularly heavy vehicles, will damage the roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Land use</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
266	17 July 2009	J White Pymble	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is out of scale with existing homes and infrastructure in the area.</li> <li>Excavation will affect the water table.</li> <li>Blue Gum forests will be affected during construction.</li> <li>Traffic will increase around the schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Water table</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
267	[no DoP date stamp]	Darlene Whitby (no address provided)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child safety will be decreased due to increased traffic.</li> <li>Parking will become an even larger issue than it already is now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian safely</li> <li>Parking</li> </ul>
268	21 July 2009	Tony Davidson Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A six storey development adjacent to suburban homes will diminish the lifestyle and reduce the value to homes in the immediate area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property value</li> </ul>
269	[no DoP date stamp]	Chris Harrington (no address provided)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate parking does not exist.</li> <li>Development may result in an increase of storm water run-off on the eastern side, across Croudace Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking</li> <li>Drainage</li> </ul>
270	9 July 2009	Derek Evans 23 Gibraltar Road, Bowral	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is inappropriate for the site as it is purely residential.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> </ul>
271	10 July 2009	Marilyn Rockard Director of Community Relations Ravenswood, 1B Cecil Street, Gordon	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land and Environment Court have already rejected a similar proposal for the site.</li> <li>Hospital is not needed as two others exist within close proximity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>
272	9 July 2009	Sue Fiedlaender 2 Berrillee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is already overdeveloped and cannot cope with more traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Street, Turramurra			
273	10 July 2009	Richard Church (no address provided)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development will change the character of the locality.</li> <li>Traffic congestion within the area will be increased.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
274	10 July 2009	Marjorie Binns 178 Riverview Road, Avalon	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a greater need for hospitals on the northern beaches compared to the North Shore of Sydney which already has four major hospitals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> </ul>
275	21 July 2009	Desiree Maxwell 10A Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High rise and very high density hospital is inappropriate for the site.</li> <li>Bulk of the development is inappropriate for a residential area and will cause overshadowing.</li> <li>Rippon Grange will be overpowered.</li> <li>Blue Gum forest will be destroyed.</li> <li>Traffic will increase making it more dangerous for pedestrians and cars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density</li> <li>Bulk</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
276	23 July 2009	Moya & Rob Adams 3 Hastings Road, Warrawee	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange has been nominated for State Heritage Listing by the National Trust.</li> <li>Proposed building are out of scale with the surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Proposed development will have a major impact on the Blue Gum forest.</li> <li>Development will generate more traffic than is appropriate.</li> <li>Traffic will endanger children's safety.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian Safety</li> </ul>
277	24 July 2009	Urusla Bayliss 81 Nicholson Avenue, Thornleigh	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rippon Grange and surrounding gardens are heritage listed and therefore should be left alone.</li> <li>Development will further endanger the Blue Gum forest.</li> <li>Bulk and scale of the development is massive and unsuitable in a residential area.</li> <li>The current width of both Water and Young Streets could not cope with the traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Traffic</li> </ul>
278	[no DoP date stamp]	Kerri Quaife 1 Randolph Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of the buildings are out of step with the immediate neighbourhood and similar development applications have previously been rejected by Council.</li> <li>Heritage value of the site has been "conveniently" downgraded.</li> <li>The Blue Gum forest will be severely impacted on.</li> <li>Increased traffic will lead to reduced amenity for local residents and potentially injure pedestrians.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
279	[no DoP date stamp]	Hon Kristina Keneally MP on behalf of ...	Objection on behalf of local residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area is already well serviced by other hospitals therefore another is not needed.</li> <li>Height and coverage of the building is substantially the same as previously rejected development applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> <li>Height and coverage</li> </ul>
280	10 August 2009	Various – no details	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size and scale of the development are entirely inappropriate and do not take into account the true slope of the land.</li> <li>Development will impact on the regeneration of Blue Gum forests the currently exist.</li> <li>Overshadowing will occur due to the height of development.</li> <li>Loss of privacy will occur due to height and scale of the buildings.</li> <li>Traffic volumes will be too large.</li> <li>Pedestrian safety will become an issue as a result of increased traffic flow.</li> <li>Damage to the underlying water table.</li> <li>Height and scale of the building will cause an eyesore impacting on the environment surrounding Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Construction issues relating to trucks and trade vehicles, property damage, damage to existing roads, hours of operation, removal of earthworks, inaccessibility, physical access and turning circles, dust and pollution, duration and health issues.</li> <li>Nature of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size and scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Water table</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Construction Impacts</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
281	27 July 2009	Sydney Water	Comments	REFER TO PUBLIC AGENCY COMMENTS	•
282	[no DoP date stamp]	DoP Heritage Branch	Comments	REFER TO PUBLIC AGENCY COMMENTS	•
283	15 July 2009	Warren Sly 1 Morona Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed building in massively out of scale compared to the local neighbourhood.</li> <li>There is no need for another hospital in this area.</li> <li>Narrow streets can not accommodate additional traffic.</li> <li>Destruction of heritage buildings.</li> <li>Destruction of Blue Gum forests will not only further endanger these trees but also the wildlife that lives within them.</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF and Wildlife</li> </ul>
284	21 July 2009	Vince Fusca 15 Saddington Street, Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height of the proposed dwelling is not compatible with surrounding homes.</li> <li>Building will be an eyesore ruining Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Narrow streets can not accommodate any additional traffic.</li> <li>Destruction of the Blue Gum forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
285	21 July 2009	Michele & John Mackrell	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic multiplying beyond the areas capacity.</li> <li>Dangerous and unnecessary traffic conditions resulting in a dangerous pedestrian environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian Safety</li> </ul>
286				•	•
287	24 Aug 2009	Conrad Ramakers 61 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-storey development out of scale and context with residential neighbourhood.</li> <li>Appearance of proposed development is more consistent with developments on Pacific Highway and unsuited to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Height and scale of development will result in loss of privacy to adjoining neighbours, screen planting will not be effective for many years.</li> <li>Proposed development will cast shadows onto adjoining properties.</li> <li>Increased traffic volumes on Water and Young Street and Billyard Avenue.</li> <li>Construction of underground car park will have a detrimental effect on root system of Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Little acknowledgement of form, scale, materials of existing heritage building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Design</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
288	31 Aug 2009	Robin & Julie Maxam 75 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale is out of character with neighbourhood.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Construction traffic will create hazards for children and disruption to neighbourhood.</li> <li>Hospital will generate more traffic than residential use.</li> <li>Narrow lanes cannot support increase in traffic.</li> <li>Visibility at intersection of Billyard Avenue and Young Street is poor and a number of accidents have occurred as a consequence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
289	31 Aug 2009	TM Rhall 12 Mona Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale inappropriate to area surrounding the site.</li> <li>Nothing above two storeys in surrounding area.</li> <li>Concerned about traffic on Mona Street.</li> <li>Construction traffic around school will be dangerous.</li> <li>Impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Impact on heritage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> </ul>
290	21 Aug 2009	JR Cloros Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage buildings and gardens should be preserved as part of redevelopment of the site.</li> <li>Significance of heritage gardens has been downgraded by the CMP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		resident		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views to and from heritage items should be maintained.</li> <li>Proposed buildings out of scale with neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Bulk of main hospital wing will dominate ridgeline and prevent views of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>Proposed development will have major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>There should be a buffer zone between forest and development.</li> <li>Concern about construction impacts on children.</li> <li>Construction impacts on roads.</li> <li>Hospital will generation more traffic than residential use.</li> <li>Narrow lanes cannot support increase in traffic</li> <li>Additional cars will endanger children.</li> <li>Buildings will overlook immediate neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
291	21 Aug 2009	Susan Maxton 32 Grosvenor Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale of development</li> <li>Long term community damage and disruption</li> <li>Damage to Blue Gum High Forest and associated impacts on native wildlife,</li> <li>Roads surrounding the development are narrow and difficult to navigate, cannot accommodate increased traffic</li> <li>Children at risk from traffic associated with new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of existing infrastructure</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Flora and fauna</li> </ul>
292	21 Aug 2009	Neville Saville 3 Larbert Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of this scale will not fit within area too big for such a confined location</li> <li>Traffic and people moved will be unmanageable,</li> <li>Rezoning to residential use should be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Use</li> </ul>
293	21 Aug 2009	Karen & David Peaston 10 Kintore Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk and scale of development out of character with surrounding suburb.</li> <li>Impact on Blue Gum High Forest</li> <li>Large development around heritage items would diminish appearance and cultural and iconic status.</li> <li>Increased traffic during construction and operation would be dangerous.</li> <li>Damage to road surfaces because of construction vehicles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>
294	19 Aug 2009	Jon Pickford 48 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic on already burdened local streets.</li> <li>Danger to pedestrians including school children.</li> <li>High risk from drug, alcohol and mental health patients in close proximity to families and schools.</li> <li>No provision for safety and security that may be required for homes and schools.</li> <li>Massive development with substantial height is not in keeping with neighbourhood and surrounding architecture.</li> <li>Area already well serviced by medical facilities and hospital.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Need</li> </ul>
295	17 Aug 2009	Cedric & Annette Shorey 25 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic already reaching crisis point during peak hours.</li> <li>Parked cars result in traffic becoming single lane.</li> <li>Young and Water Streets are very narrow and designed only for local traffic.</li> <li>No room to widen streets,</li> <li>Several accidents in recent times at junction of Billyard Avenue and Young Street.</li> <li>Patients with drug and alcohol problems pose danger to primary school children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Use</li> </ul>
296	17 Aug 2009	James Cleary 3 Station Street, Naremburn	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All items of heritage significance should be preserved as part of redevelopment of the site.</li> <li>Significance of heritage gardens has been downgraded by CMP</li> <li>Proposed building out of scale with neighbourhood.</li> <li>Major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>BGHF</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buffer zone between forest and development needed.</li> <li>• Damage caused by extensive construction vehicle movements.</li> <li>• Traffic poses risk to pedestrians including school children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts</li> </ul>
297	17 Aug 2009	Ian Pont 72 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed development massively out of scale with neighbourhood</li> <li>• Construction vehicles will bring huge amounts of material to and from the site.</li> <li>• Water and Young Streets are narrow and cannot support traffic of this kind.</li> <li>• Children will be in danger, particularly during construction, as there is no footpath on northern side of Water Street.</li> <li>• Major direct and indirect impacts on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• Buffer of 20m between development and forest required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> <li>• BGJF</li> </ul>
298	17 Aug 2009	Michelle Pont 72 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	SAME AS 297	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAME AS 297</li> </ul>
299	4 Sept 2009	John & Helen Garrett 4 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing infrastructure not designed to accommodate proposed building.</li> <li>• Too large for the area</li> <li>• Roads already gridlocked and in need of repair.</li> <li>• Existing shortage of water without increase in population.</li> <li>• Question whether sufficient electricity with an increase in population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of services</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Scale</li> </ul>
300	4 Sept 2009	Alfred James 35 Billyard Avenue, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density is higher than any other part of Wahroonga or Warrawee which will cause pressure on local infrastructure.</li> <li>• Potential damage to water table as a result of three levels of underground parking.</li> <li>• Buildings will cast shadows in a residential area.</li> <li>• Blue Gum High Forest trees to be removed.</li> <li>• Construction work will cause enormous disruption to residents.</li> <li>• No public transport available to serve the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Overshadowing</li> <li>• Overdevelopment</li> <li>• Impact on water table</li> </ul>
301	4 Sept 2009	Stephen Cook 28a Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is a ruse - no provision for operating theatre and limited bed spaces.</li> <li>• Size and scale of development is too large for unique character of the area.</li> <li>• Enormous buildings to be introduced to the site will destroy the heritage value of the area.</li> <li>• Narrow streets surrounding the site are already stretched with traffic generated by existing schools.</li> <li>• Construction traffic poses danger to cars and pedestrians.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer intentions</li> <li>• Scale</li> <li>• Height</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Construction impacts</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety</li> </ul>
302	[No DoP date stamp]	Natalie Cronin 55 Miowera Road, North Turramurra	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height and style of buildings will destroy heritage setting of Rippon Grange.</li> <li>• Development will loom over surrounding homes and will be alien to area</li> <li>• Negative impact on Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>• 20m buffer zone around forest should be required.</li> <li>• Site is a long way from railway line or major transport route.</li> <li>• Narrow access roads are unsuitable for increase in traffic</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood character</li> <li>• Height</li> <li>• Design</li> <li>• BGHF</li> <li>• Heritage</li> <li>• Traffic</li> </ul>
303	28 Aug 2009	Mr & Mrs G Lauridsen 3/2 Burns Road, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area not suitable for a building of this magnitude as road infrastructure not available.</li> <li>• Wahroonga already lacks parking</li> <li>• Existing facility in Wahroonga that deals with drug and alcohol additions, this type of facility would lower the tone of the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Traffic</li> </ul>
304	7 Sept 2009	Joel & Sheila Suntup 7 Randolph	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gross overdevelopment of the site</li> <li>• Leafy village like atmosphere of the area would be destroyed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overdevelopment</li> <li>• Height</li> </ul>

No.	Date Received	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
		Street, Wahroonga		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Street is already congested and the development would exacerbate the problem.</li> <li>Facility catering for drug and alcohol additions near primary schools is not acceptable</li> <li>Existing traffic problems will be exacerbated.</li> <li>Surrounding streets would become overflow for parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Use</li> <li>Construction impacts</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>Parking</li> </ul>
305	7 Sept 2009	Jan Langley 17 Churchill Road, Killara	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate acute and regular car hospital facilities in the area.</li> <li>Bulk, height and scale of the proposal provides scope for development to be converted to retirement village.</li> <li>Footprint would be detrimental to Blue Gum High Forest.</li> <li>Construction and operational vehicles will pose a danger to pedestrians.</li> <li>Proposal is inappropriate to residential zoning of surrounding area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Developer intentions</li> </ul>
306	7 Sept 2009	Bronwyn Ludowici 23 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hospital will access opposite a primary school is dangerous.</li> <li>Small residential street not appropriate to have a large scale development.</li> <li>Blue Gum High Forest will not survive such a massive development.</li> <li>No need for another hospital, the area is already adequately served.</li> <li>Blind spot on crest of hill in Water Street at entrance to proposed hospital already subject to accidents.</li> <li>Concern about drug and alcohol addicts in close proximity to schools and homes.</li> <li>Developer has no experience of running hospitals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer intentions</li> <li>Access</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Pedestrian safety</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Need</li> <li>Use</li> </ul>
307	7 Sept 2009	David Ludowici 23 Water Street, Wahroonga	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size and intrusiveness of buildings is inappropriate in residential street.</li> <li>Previous hospital provided low level care and was completely different to proposed hospital.</li> <li>Deficiencies with proposed range of facilities and services offered.</li> <li>Area already well serviced by existing medical and hospital facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need</li> <li>Use</li> <li>Adequacy of facilities</li> <li>Scale</li> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> </ul>
308	8 Sept 2009	Ken Pilley 37/157 Marconi Road, Bonnells Bay	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal will result in significant change to tree lined, low density character of the site. Change is not commensurate with residential character of site's context. And not consistent with Ku-ring-gai LEP 194 or North Draft Subregional Strategy.</li> <li>Site is not well located to complement health related land uses established in the area.</li> <li>Site is not suited to accommodate nature and scale of proposal.</li> <li>Proposal impinges on heritage cartilage of buildings and gardens.</li> <li>Buffer zone around Blue Gum High Forest insufficient.</li> <li>Proposal has an unacceptable impact in relation to bulk, scale, overshadowing, visual impact and privacy.</li> <li>Site is not well located in relation to public transport.</li> <li>Proposal does not provide high level of amenity for future occupants</li> <li>Proposal will not be a major employer during construction and operational phases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood character</li> <li>Bulk and scale</li> <li>Use</li> <li>Height</li> <li>Privacy</li> <li>Overshadowing</li> <li>BGHF</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>Amenity for building users</li> </ul>