

**SUBMISSION RELATED TO Residential development with in-fill affordable housing, 2-6
Conway Avenue, 15-15A Fernleigh Avenue & 38-40 Carlisle Street, Rose Bay**

I am objecting to the planned development on 2-6 Conway Avenue, 15-15A Fernleigh Avenue & 38-40 Carlisle Street, Rose Bay for the following reasons:

- Overall building height of 8 storeys is greater than that allowed within the NSW Govt Low and Mid-Rise (LMR) Housing Policy
- The sheer size of the building is so out of proportion and out of character for the proposed area, also considering it is at the top of a high point in the area, and is currently made up of low rise apartments, that are no more than 3 storeys or low-rise town houses.
- Considering the 15% affordability housing – who will be this affordable to? Not those that really need housing in Rose Bay where median the median price for a 1 bedroom apartment is approximately \$850,000 to \$880,000, far greater than other areas where high rise buildings would be more within character.
- This development and others already planned will cumulatively impact the look and feel of the Rose Bay area, known for its coastal atmosphere and leafy residential environment, especially since all of these developments are either 6 storeys or over. They will become an eyesore on the local area noting that some developments will look higher than the defined storeys due to ground level differences.
- What supporting infrastructure will be upgraded in parallel to the number of people moving into the area – including waste services, utilities, pedestrian safety , stormwater management, traffic management, additional transport and local street parking which is already at capacity.
- An additional 130 cars will be added to the adjacent road network which when considering the numerous other proposed developments in the area including:
 - 41 Spencer Street - DA460/2025
 - 28-32 Dover Road - DA456/2025
 - 10 Wilberforce Ave - DA476/2025
 - 574-576 Old South Head Road - DA452/2025
 - 12-18 Wilberforce Ave - DA449/2025
 - 1 Richmond Road - DA487/2025
 - 13-15 Carlisle Street - DA473/2025
 - 2A Spencer Street - DA459/2025

will mean further congestion on local and arterial roads which are already jammed full of traffic unless you travel before 7am or after 7pm. This includes local roads around the McAuley Primary school which already causes very heavy traffic in the area from 7.45am to 9am, and again from 2.30pm till 3.30pm from the roundabout on Dover Road to Hamilton Street! Other things to note are:

- The impact to the already jammed exit and entry to Dover Road, where the traffic is often banked up in peak times for up to 10 minutes trying to turn onto the major arterial roads - New South Head Road and Old South Head Road.
- The existing traffic jam all the way through to Edgecliff at school pick drop offs and pick up. With no opportunity to widen the roads heading in or out of the city, we are already living in an area that has shocking traffic jams

I have some specific issues with a number of the EIS Exhibition documents. These are:

- Appendix O. Dian, Rose Bay Transport and Accessibility Impact Statement:

- Section 8.3 states: *The distribution of traffic generated by the development travelling north along Fernleigh and Chamberlain Ave would likely be minimal given that key destinations including Rose Bay, Bondi Junction and the Sydney CBD are located to the south of the site.*

This statement fails to identify that the main junctions leading on to Old and New South Head Road to the south are very busy and blocked and so the side streets noted will be used as a 'rat run'. With the increased traffic these will be even busier!

- Section 8.3 - *Carlisle Street is a local street, suggesting minimal traffic volumes during the morning and evening peak periods;*

No mention of the McAuley Catholic Primary School on Carlisle Street where traffic at school drop off and pick up is very busy with traffic queuing in all directions. This would clash with part of morning peak.

No mention of the cumulative impact from other planned developments when one expects some assessment to be made.

Generally, some huge assumptions made on vehicles in and out during peak etc. Where is the evidence?

- Section 8.3 - *A review of publicly available crash data over a five year period (2020-2024) confirms there have been no recorded crashes at intersections adjacent to the subject site*

Correct but this has the potential to change with all the increased traffic, not just from here but all the other developments planned.

- Appendix AEa. Dian, Rose Bay Visual Impact Assessment report:

- Section 2.1 states: *The immediate surroundings of the site feature a diverse range of residential options, including terrace houses, apartments within residential complexes, and standalone dwellings. These buildings showcase a blend of architectural styles, encompassing both traditional and contemporary designs. The area's development history spans different eras, leading to a mixture of construction materials and finishes. As a result, the buildings exhibit varying setbacks from the public domain, contributing to the overall eclectic character of the neighbourhood. The locality has a residential, leafy character characterised by a streetscape quality of side setbacks and predominant landscape. The building heights reinforce the existing cityscape in response to the undulating character of the area.*

No mention that storeys are no greater than 3 levels

- Section 2.7. Desired Future Character states: *This area of Rose Bay is currently transitioning, in relation to its urban density, in response to the recently amended planning controls around Rose Bay Town Centre. It is, therefore, important to assess*

views within the context of the area's desired future character - being 6 to 8 storey developments, consistent with the Housing SEPP controls.

Desired by whom – certainly not the residents

General – 8 storeys – nothing in the area is more than 3 and this is totally out of character to anything in the local area. Also with a roof top communal space, there will be potentially more significant noise across the whole area noting this is at a relatively high spot on Carlisle Street and so sound will travel a long distance

- Appendix AEb. Dian, Rose Bay Visual Impact App A:
 - Visualisation about being totally out of keeping is supported in the Large format photomontages – specifically page 5 where the structure looks huge on the horizon, reaching far higher than anything else. Also Page 25, 26, 29 and 30 where the sheer size can now be seen. Page 31, 32, 33 and 34 cannot even fit the full structure height in!
- Appendix AEa. Dian, Rose Bay Visual Impact:
 - There are statements related to the photos stating *“The visual impact of the new proposal, from this location, is assessed as Severe”*
 - There is also the statement - *However, within the context of the LMR provisions, the impact is contextually appropriate and will diminish over time, as further developments are approved.* This will not be the case for those directly affected since a huge building is all they will see.
 - Additionally these views are all from street level and so do not effectively reflect views that residents from around the area will see the huge structure
 - The Summary in Section 4 states: *This Visual Impact Assessment has undertaken a review of the proposal, within its future setting and concludes that, although there are locations within the neighbouring properties that are impacted by the new development, the relevant views, as selected within the report, are all observed from public viewpoints, within an 800m curtilage of the subject site.*
 - Note the word “public” and so those walking around the streets. Nothing is said about the local residents and their impact!
- Appendix AC. Dian, Rose Bay Stakeholder Engagement
 - Tier 1 stakeholders – due to the nature of the development including size and look, why were others not just directly in the area included in this. 8 storeys can be seen and heard from a greater area than noted in Figure 3.
 - Tier 2 statement - *This group is less likely to be directly affected by any specific aspect of the proposal but may be indirectly affected in various ways.* Since some Tier 2 stakeholders should have been in Tier 1, I would disagree with this statement.

- Section 2.3.2 - *While specific engagement was not targeted with these groups or the broader Rose Bay local community, a scan of groups determined that development information was distributed on some of these pages.* Why were they not engaged. Is it because they knew they would get negative and honest feedback from people who actually care about where they live!