## Subject: Objection to CPDM Proposal at 3-9 Park Avenue (SSD - 78775458)

Dear Minister,

I note my **strong objection** to CPDM's development proposal at 3-9 Park Avenue, Gordon (SSD - 78775458), which prioritises development returns over the preservation of historical assets.

The nine-story complex is disproportionate to its existing historical residential context, which the State Government has stated must be preserved and excluded from development.

The Developer's argument for justification of its approval is centred upon it's biased view of 'future context', having **no regard** to the importance of the areas existing heritage character.

CPDM's consideration of adjacent heritage properties is insufficient, as the impact on <a href="https://example.com/heritage-listed">heritage-listed</a> <a href="https://example.com/dwellings and the Gordondale HCA, located directly opposite the site">heritage-listed</a> <a href="https://example.com/dwellings and the Gordondale HCA, located directly opposite the site">heritage-listed</a> <a href="https://example.com/dwellings-listed">dwellings and the Gordondale HCA, located directly opposite the site</a>, is not adequately addressed, rather <a href="https://example.com/states

Put simplistically, this proposal essentially punishes private owners of surrounding heritage-listed properties who are conserving and preserving Sydney's historic significance for future generations. How a basic set of excessive and overbearing high-rise apartments can be representative of "State significance" is highly questionable.

Central issues include:

**Towering Structure:** The proposed height at over 31 metres is unsympathetic, abrupt, and an insult on the historic streetscape and local context which is to remain.

**Flawed Design:** The uninspired box-shaped architecture contrasts sharply and excessively with the traditional heritage of the adjacent and opposite heritage listed homes and HCA, contracting NSW Heritage requirements relating to context, streetscape, and visual setting.

**Heritage Disrespect:** The proposal adopts a minimalistic stance on acknowledging the historical value and significance of the area, dating back to the 1830s and representative of one of the earliest Ku-ring-gah Municipalities. Some recognition is provided to properties adjacent the proposed development, however the strategic importance and impact of the development on heritage-listed dwellings and the Gordondale HCA immediately opposite the site have been ignored.

**Council Strategy Misalignment:** It conflicts with community-focused planning developed by Ku-ringgai Council, contradicting heritage preservation directives established through local participation, calling for greater protection measures and application of critical planning principles<sup>1</sup>. The Developer acknowledges Ku-ring-gai Council's Preferred Scenario would more "appropriately manage local character and transitions in scale".

**Community Sentiment Neglect:** There's a noticeable gap in adequately integrating substantial community feedback into anticipated social impacts, particularly around heritage preservation, impact on local character, and traffic intensification.

**Traffic Intensification:** With the expansion to include 100 apartments, the development exacerbates traffic congestion, conflicting with community safety concerns consistent through Council findings<sup>1</sup>.

**Environmental Detriment:** Over three dozen trees are at risk, dismantling nuanced ecological balances critical to maintaining local biodiversity and community charm.

**Missing Communal Value:** The proposal appears devoid of tangible benefits for community members, threatening the obliteration of Gordon's rich cultural and environmental landscape.

^	) i ir	hictory	docorvos	hottor	recognition	ı
L	Jui	HISTOLA	ueserves	beller	recounition	ı

Kate

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Taverner Research Group TOD Alternative Preferred Scenario - Community Survey (representative of 2,516 respondents).