

I object to the proposal put forward for the development of 100 Edinburgh Rd Castlecrag.

While my main objection is to the impact on the heritage values of the Castlecrag precinct, I have outlined other factors below.

To reiterate, although 100 Edinburgh Rd is not technically in the Castlecrag heritage precinct, it is right on the border. In fact it is the entry to the heritage precinct. Castlecrag is important not only for local, state and national heritage, but in my opinion this area has international significance having been designed by Walter and Marion Burley Griffin, two highly important and famous architects. Their goal was the development of an idyllic community with a consistent architectural feel and bushland setting. The design of this mixed use development is in total contrast to these goals. It does not reflect the architecture nor the aim of "sitting comfortably within a bushland setting". The scale and mass of this proposal completely dominates the heritage precinct and does not support any of its values.

The Griffin goal of a community in a bushland setting would be totally lost if this development is allowed to continue. 22 trees are planned to be removed from this site in contravention of the DA that currently exists. These include eight highly valued canopy trees. Willoughby Council is striving to increase canopy cover for our LGA and this development will cause significant loss of canopy.

Not only are trees planned to be removed, but there is limited capacity for any meaningful canopy replacement since deep soil zones are planned to be reduced. A tree management plan has not been presented to show how the limited number of retained trees are to be preserved.

Castlecrag has a low-rise village atmosphere and Willoughby Council controls reflect that. This proposal is for a high-rise building totally out of character with that concept. Castlecrag is explicitly a non-growth heritage-sensitive area which this proposal flagrantly ignores. This proposal does not contribute to or maintain the traditional community hub function of Castlecrag.

Castlecrag is not in a transport oriented development (TOD) zone. There is no rail or metro service, and the bus service is very limited particularly outside of weekday peak hours, making public transport impractical for daily commuting. The nearest railway station is at least 3km away. So this proposal fails the TOD principle of locating density near transport hubs. In fact, the traffic generated from these proposed dwellings would cause further congestion to a road network that is already congested with extensive peak queues. This could be catastrophic if there were to be a need to evacuate the peninsula. There will be a significant increase in traffic with parking increasing from 163 to 376 spaces. Despite increased density, the assessment claims reduced traffic impacts, contradicting logical expectations and previous modelling.

Another objection is the excessive overshadowing to southern properties. This proposal does not meet planning requirements for winter solar access. Southern neighbours are likely to lose meaningful sunlight for extended periods, potentially up to six months of the year. These impacts have not been properly modelled.

Although the proposal includes some 'affordable' housing, the number proposed does not comply with policy. It is also unlikely that low-medium income earners will be able to afford likely rental costs, even at a discount. So this proposal does nothing to address the housing shortage. This proposal is a predominantly high-end development, that will not contribute to solving the shortage of housing options available to first home buyers or those seeking affordable rental accommodation.

The public meeting that I attended was crowded and although people voiced their objections, there was no indication that the developer had any intention of listening to the objections. The 'consultation' was a complete farce.

Finally, there are frequent references in the EIS to the proposed development being a modification of DA-2024/13). Given that the SSD application is supported by a rezoning application to significantly increase the building height and Floor Space Ration (FSR) development standards, this should be considered a new development. The SSD application also relies on some past reports specific to DA-2024/13. This application must surely be supported by studies specific to the new proposed development.