

14 April 2026

Simon Rachowski
Unit 1304, 280-288 Burns Bay Road
Lane Cove, NSW 2066
simon.rachowski@gmail.com
0438 285195

Mr Gabriel Kim
Department of Planning
Housing and Infrastructure

Dear Mr Kim,

Re: Objection to NSW HDA Housing SSD-87925706 – Demolition of existing structures and construction of 3 X RFBs at 300 Burns Bay Road, Lane Cove

I am a retiree living in one of the units at 280-288 Burns Bay Road, Lane Cove, and I wish to submit my objection to the overdevelopment proposed for the old SAS building site at 300 Burns Bay Road.

The proposed plan to build multiple towers of up to 7–15 storeys high and approx. 225 dwellings with 226 car spaces will cause unacceptable impacts on traffic, parking, and surrounding property values. Furthermore, the development fails to meet basic sustainability needs.

My objection is based on the following key concerns that will affect me personally, and which have not been addressed by the developer in the EIS documentation that is currently on public display.

Traffic and road safety

- Developer's own traffic assessment notes that the minor legs (northwest and southeast) within the Burns Bay Road and Waterview Drive intersection at the roundabout already operate at or beyond capacity in peak periods; adding several hundred vehicles will worsen congestion, increase travel times, and elevate crash risk for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.
- Construction traffic will further strain local streets and reduce safety for schoolchildren and residents during AM and PM peak periods. No credible traffic modelling or mitigation plan has been provided that demonstrates safe ingress/egress or acceptable peak-hour performance.

Parking and local amenity

- The precinct suffers from limited on-street parking evenings and weekends. Even with "approximately 226 onsite spaces", the scale of new occupancy will spill onto surrounding streets, intensifying conflict for existing residents and emergency vehicle access.
- The planned parking provisions, especially the low car parking rates for one-bed and two-bed units, will not meet real needs. Many households in the Hughes Park district have more than one car, and the rate of visitor spaces is as much as 4 times lower than in some of the neighbouring buildings. Without firm controls, street parking will get worse and enforcement will become more difficult.

Loss of surrounding property value

- Many apartments in existing buildings carry premiums based on outlooks, sunlight and privacy. Covering views and causing overshadowing will materially reduce amenity and market value for

these properties. This loss is a direct community harm that has not been mitigated or compensated in the proposal.

- Significant overshadowing, loss of privacy and loss of views for multiple neighbouring buildings are likely, given the proposed heights up to ~51.5 m; these will further harm amenity and community cohesion.

Lack of sustainability infrastructure

- The proposal lacks commitments to essential low-carbon and future-proof infrastructure:
 - No comprehensive electric vehicle (EV) charging strategy or minimum dedicated EV parking is specified to meet current and near-term uptake. The National Construction Code (NCC) mandates that all new Class 2 Buildings must be capable of charging EVs in all parking spots.
 - No binding measures for on-site renewable generation (solar), low-energy building standards, or verified energy-use reductions are provided.
 - Stormwater management, rainwater harvesting, permeable surfaces and tree retention are only suggested, not guaranteed by enforceable design conditions.
- Approving large-scale housing without these provisions places retrofit burdens on the community, locks in increased grid demand, and worsens local electricity reliability risks.

Requested outcome

The desired outcome of this submission is to refuse approval of the SSDA in its present form, or impose conditions that require:

1. A substantial reduction in height and density to align with existing 6–7 storey precinct scale.
2. Rigorous, independent traffic and parking impact assessment with enforceable mitigation (including staged construction traffic management).
3. Mandatory sustainability requirements: minimum % of parking with active EV chargers, passive EV-ready provision for all remaining spaces, on-site solar, verified energy efficiency targets, and certified stormwater management and tree retention measures.
4. An expanded, meaningful community consultation period and publication of full project details before any rezoning or height increases are considered.

This proposal, as presented, is a gross overdevelopment that will degrade traffic safety, parking availability, property values and fails to provide essential sustainability infrastructure. It should not proceed without the changes above.

I ask that these concerns be given full weight in the SSDA assessment and that affected residents be afforded meaningful consultation and sufficient time to review any amended proposal.

Yours truly,



Simon Rachowski