

## **Objection:** Trinité Lighthouse Build-to-Rent, North Ryde

As a resident of Ryde Gardens and a previous objector to this project, I am deeply disappointed to see that Stockland have made no effort to respond to the substantial number of concerns raised by the local community to their proposed project. The resubmitted plans continue, and at points compound, issues already raised.

In addition to the previously raised issues of view-sharing, and the negative impacts on privacy and natural light to existing buildings, a key concern for residents was access. As previously noted, the construction of New Link Road was an essential requirement of consent for the original subdivision of this site into Trinité Stage 1 and 2. Stockland's proposed development continues to indicate that this will become a pedestrianised area, which reneges on this commitment and original conditions of consent. It also places an unacceptable burden on Rennie Street, which will become the only point of road access for Ryde Gardens, Centrale, the proposed Trinité Development, as well as existing commercial buildings. This also presents a significant increase in risk for a childcare centre, whose outdoor play area backs onto Rennie Street. It also eliminates some of the already highly limited on-street commuter and community parking. Not only does the pedestrianisation of New Link Road contravene the existing Ryde Council LEP and original planning consent, it is also contrary to the State Government Macquarie Park TOD rezoning of this area currently under review. The rezoning plans indicate that New Link Road is a necessary through-link. The proposed development requires the pedestrianisation of New Link Road in order to meet its FSR requirements to support a building of 65 metres in height. However, it is clear that this pedestrianisation is not in accordance with either the existing planning regulations, or those of the future rezoning.

The proposed development is reliant on Clause 6.9 to permit an increase in height from 37 metres to 65 metres. However, this clause requires the project to provide substantial community and commercial benefit in order to be applicable. The amended plans propose a reduction of commercial floor area, and insufficient recreational areas. The 'increased public domain' spaces in the amended plans are primarily found in the boundaries of the site and represent a token gesture with negligible real increase to usable community space. When compared with the construction underway in the neighbouring Lachlan's Line development, which will provide thousands of new properties as well as significant community infrastructure including a school, it is clear that this Stockland development offers minimal community benefit that would justify the use of Clause 6.9.

I would also like to express my grave concerns about commercially controlled Build-to-Rent housing. Without stringent government regulation and oversight, private Build-to-Rent housing has the potential to allow corporations to gain a monopoly over this highly valuable resource and to exploit the needs of ordinary Australians for corporate profit. This is exemplified in the amended Stockland development, which substantially reduces the number of 2 bed apartments while increasing the number of 1 bed and studio apartments planned (with a minimal token increase in 3 bed apartments). 1 bed and studio apartments offer greater rental yield relative to their floor space, increasing corporate profit margins, at the expense of the growing need for more substantial, family-sized apartments. This is particularly relevant for BtR housing, which aims to provide a long-term alternative to property ownership. If the State Government wishes to encourage and incentivise an increase in population and density around transport locations, it is essential to prioritise housing that meets the needs of the population. Moreover, in their

community consultation sessions, Stockland have consistently articulated that these BtR apartments will be offered at, or above, market value, reflecting the supposed amenities and security provided. This development does not provide any meaningful assistance to the current rental crisis, but continues to put corporate profit above the needs of ordinary people.

The amended proposal also makes no effort to address the very real concerns over view-loss and reduction in natural light and privacy raised by the local community. As established by the *Tenacity Consulting vs Warringah Council* judgement, the view-loss caused by the proposed development are unreasonable both qualitatively, in that they eliminate iconic views of the city skyline including the Harbour Bridge and Opera House, and quantitatively, in that they eliminate the views from every aspect of the affected properties. In particular, it should be noted that the Ryde Gardens complex was designed with the expectation that the neighbouring site would be used for a commercial building with heights of 37 metres. Apartments on the East side of Ryde Gardens were constructed with only a single aspect and with floor to ceiling windows. Not only does the proposed increase in height to 65 metres cause unjustifiable view-loss, it will also result in a substantial loss of privacy. Residents in this proposed building would have direct and unobstructed line of sight into the entirety of my living space and bedroom. A building of this mass at such close proximity will also substantially reduce the quality of natural light I receive. These factors will render my home virtually unliveable, and I would strongly consider moving out of this area should this development be permitted to proceed in its current form. I would also like to note that the same issues will apply to the hypothetical future residents of proposed development. The issues around privacy and light quality also have an ecological concern, as they encourage residents to rely more on artificial light and heating. The design of the Trinité development is not skilful as it negatively impacts on both neighbouring and its own residents, and makes no attempt at view-sharing. The updated view-impact report shows negligible improvement on the previous submission. Local residents are amenable to a development up to 37 metres, in keeping with what was expected for this site. An increase in height to 65 metres is not only significantly detrimental to the existing local community, it will also set a precedent that may allow other development up to this height in the neighbouring blocks currently occupied by commercial buildings, which will further reduce light and views from our homes.

The amended proposal provides no increase in parking. While this is supposedly done under the guise of encouraging use of public transport, this is simply naïve when the majority of Australian households still own a, or multiple vehicles.

This site is one identified as part of the wider State Government Macquarie Park TOD rezoning, which aims to encourage an increase in density around public transport hubs. I would argue that much of this need has already been met by the existing developments of Ryde Gardens, Centrale, and Lachlan's Line, which provide thousands of homes within walking distance of the North Ryde Metro station. The North Ryde metro station would be better utilised by increasing community and commercial infrastructure in the vicinity of the station, similar to the Interchange at Chatswood. The majority of residents of North Ryde do not live within walking distance of the station, and that the provision of commuter parking as well as community infrastructure (similar to the Canopy in Lane Cove) would improve access to public transport for many more than this proposed development can. This site could be of immense value to North Ryde, but the proposed Trinité Lighthouse development simply does not meet the needs of the community.

As a local resident, the amended plans put forward by Stockland for this site have done nothing to allay my concerns, but have instead increased them. I would like to reiterate that I fully support and want to see this site developed, but it must be done so in a way that does not cause substantial detriment to existing residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reading this letter.