

Scott Carroll

Mobile: 0400 749 683

Email: scottcarroll81@gmail.com

**Address: 29 Treatts Road
Lindfield
NSW 2070**

Re: Concerns regarding State Significant Development Submission (SSD-78493518)

I am a long-term resident and property owner in Lindfield, having been a member of the local community for 11+ years. Myself, my wife and children are active members of the community and regularly walk around the suburb, particularly between our home in north Lindfield towards the station – this is for the purposes of commuting, going to school, shopping, eating and walking the dog.

The proposed development is within 250m of our home and we walk directly past the proposed site to access the Lindfield town centre almost every day. The outcome of this development will have a significant impact on our family.

I wish to raise numerous objections to the development proposal as currently submitted. I am more than happy to engage in a conversation with NSW Planning or the Developer regarding the concerns outlined below:

- 1) **Inadequate and potentially duplicitous community engagement and consultation:** The developer of this project claims to have conducted broad community consultation, however our family has seen no evidence of this despite living in the immediate area of the project. For example, the developer claims to have delivered 1000 flyers to local residences, we have never seen this and it is a claim that the developer cannot validate because there is no audit trail of a mailbox drop. As a result of not being informed of any consultation, our family has missed the opportunity to engage earlier in the process by asking questions and providing feedback.
- 2) **Insufficient local road infrastructure to handle more residents (Transport concerns SEARs 9).** The increased number of residents the suburb will need to accommodate has not been appropriately planned for or addressed by this proposal. Traffic congestion is already a major local issue during peak periods, it is very difficult to turn right onto the Pacific Highway from Lindfield causing delays and traffic to back up, including to the intersection at Lindfield Ave and Woodside Ave which is particularly bad. No plans have been put forward to address this issue, presumably because this has been put in the too hard basket because of the bottleneck created by the single lane each way under the rail bridge which may be impossible to resolve. These choke points also create danger for local pedestrians trying to cross roads in heavy congestion, particularly school children who typically use the trains and attend school around the peak times for road use. There are currently no zebra crossings, traffic lights or other traffic management tools that would help make pedestrians

safer despite the fact that more cars will be on the road. While I understand there may be an argument that proximity to public transport negates the need to drive, this is a unrealistic claim as local rail infrastructure offers no solution for residents seeking to travel east or west from Lindfield, only north/south.

- 3) **Visual impact (SEARs 8) and Design Quality (SEARs 5):** The large size of this proposed development, both the street frontage and height, will create an eyesore in a local area currently symbolised by largely single storey homes, many built in the federation style. In addition, today nearly all residents have significant mature greenery and trees surrounding their properties or within the boundaries of their properties. There are no clear plans to plant mature or large trees within a close proximity of this development, which will simply result in a large box shape structure being erected next to some beautiful older homes – the proposal cannot be categorised as being a good design when it does not consider the existing visual aspects of the community. I note that greenery will actually be destroyed to accommodate the building. The visual site of this proposed development is therefore is not in keeping with the local area and whereas today from the back of our house looking down the hill, and when walking to the station, we will now have this box shape building blocking out our view making the suburb more resemble a concrete jungle.
- 4) **Built form and urban design (SEARs 6):** The sheer size and volume (height and street frontage) of the proposed development is not in keeping with the character of the local Lindfield area north of the station. At nine storeys, it would significantly exceed the height of existing buildings closer to the station, which are five to six storeys, and disrupt the current, and highly logical pattern, of gradually decreasing building heights moving away from the station.
- 5) **Trees and landscaping (SEARs 14):** The proposal put forward by the developer will remove mature trees, greenery and gardens, and substantially increase the proportion of land occupied by hard surfaces. It should be a requirement for the developer to not juts install a token garden on the site, but to use mature native trees that will be in keeping with what is already maintained by the hundreds of residents throughout the suburb. The developer in this instance should not be excluded from maintaining trees and landscaping that is in keeping with what is expected of other local residents.
- 6) **Water management (SEARs 11):** Storm water management towards the bottom of the hill is already grossly inadequate in north Lindfield. During heavy rain the drains on Wooside Ave are prone to flooding, covering streets with water and further limiting the areas of the road where pedestrians can cross (note previous observation about traffic and pedestrian access), particularly during periods of congestion where driver visibility is limited in wet weather and driver behaviour can deteriorate. Existing drainage arrangements are already inadequate, the addition of a very large building that will increase hard surfaces and remove greenery will serve to increase run-off directly adjacent to Woodside avenue, exacerbating existing flooding issues.
- 7) **Environmental Amenity (SEARs 7).** There is very limited open green space around the north side of Lindfield at present. The addition of Lindfield green near the station and shops is the only site within 400m of the proposed development, however this is not flat ground, has no play equipment for children and as a very small area the opportunities to use the space are

very limited. Outside of this site no other green spaces are available for public use within a long distance of the site.

- 8) **On street parking (Transport SEARs 9).** As previously noted, residents in Lindfield today rely heavily on cars for transportation. Although the train is an excellent piece of infrastructure, it travels to a very limited number of locations – particularly on weekends when families are not travelling to or through the city. On that basis, every resident will need access to a car and families will likely require two cars. I note that the proposed development only allows a single car space allocation for each unit which will be inadequate to meet the needs of new residents, particularly noting the large size of some proposed apartments where families will inevitably reside. Inadequate on-site parking will increase road congestion, thereby reducing available street parking for commuters and residents in older homes built before cars were used. Most importantly, with more cars parked on the street the risk to pedestrians crossing the road will significantly increase. I refer to my previous comments about the large number of school aged children who regularly use the route adjacent to this proposed development to access the train and Lindfield town centre/shops. The risk of danger to a child walking out onto a road between cars (particularly SUVs) is significantly higher than in circumstances where there is no vehicle blocking visibility of the curb. With no pedestrian crossings, lights or other pedestrian infrastructure in the vicinity of the proposed development, children will increasingly have to cross the road by walking out between cars which creates, in my opinion, an unacceptable and unnecessary risk that could be mitigated by requiring the developer to allocate two parking spaces per unit.