

Ms Adela Murimba  
Planner  
NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure  
Submitted via NSW Major Projects Portal

**SUBJECT: OBJECTION TO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH IN-FILL AFFORDABLE HOUSING – 1-3 REID STREET AND 2-4 WOODSIDE AVENUE, LINDFIELD, STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT SSD-79261463**

Dear Adela,

I have lived at 1 Kenilworth Road Lindfield for nearly 40 years. Our house is within 100 metres of the SSD site of Reid, Highgate, Woodside and Lindfield.

I am very familiar with the site having passed it either walking to the station, the shops or driving past through the entire period we have lived at Lindfield.

The proponent of this development, 2-4 Woodside Avenue and 1-3 Reid Street is also the proponent of 2-8 Highgate. It is cute to split the site into 2 submissions for the SSD process as it allows certain planning requirements associated with a single submission for the whole site to be avoided. This should not be allowed.

The proposed development will forever change our living conditions. I object to the following aspects of the development.

**Height:** The building is proposed to be 1.7 m higher than allowed by the TOD SEPP. I object to this proposed height increase above TOD SEPP allowances and further the submission does not consider zoning that Ku-ring-gai Council is proposing with its May 2025 TOD preferred scenario.

**Traffic:** Lindfield Avenue was originally a railway service road. It is a two-vehicle wide lane. It is narrow and unable to be widened to the west because of the railway line and blocked by private property from eastern works. There are so many aspects of traffic not dealt with – already there are major traffic issues at the roundabout at Woodside, which is built to allow buses and heavy transport to drive across it as there is not enough space to design a roundabout that would allow this type of traffic to go around it. Access to the Pacific Highway under the railway line at Balfour is a choke point – Lindfield Avenue is not wide enough to enable dual lanes to allow for a turning lane and through traffic and has another feeder street – Havilah - as a source of traffic needing to access the Pacific Highway and West Lindfield. During development the heavy transport required to move materials to and from site will exacerbate already material traffic snares. Alternate access from the site to the Pacific Highway is then via Treatts Road – which is south only access onto the Pacific Highway or Stanhope Road which gives

south and north access to the Pacific Highway. Both Treatts and Stanhope intersections with the Pacific Highway have no traffic lights.

**These issues impact both development projects for the combined site.**

**Vehicle Parking:** The car parking allowed for the site is inadequate at ~1.3 vehicles per unit plus some visitor parking. Traffic impact is played down by the applicant and avoids the incremental and accumulative impact of multiple developments that the TOD zoning will create. On street parking will be less than present as expansive ingress and egress points for the two development sites (Reid, Highgate, Woodside, Lindfield Avenue) proposed by the applicant take away street parking places. There is no parking in Lindfield Avenue alongside the site. Commuter parking in Woodside, Reid and Highgate is already at capacity.

**Mixed Use:** Potential Ku-ring-gai Council Mixed Use zoning for the site means that commercial traffic needs to be allowed for. This is not provided for by the applicant.

**Pedestrian Traffic:** The Lindfield Avenue footpath, on the eastern side, is one metre to 1.25 meters wide in width. Pedestrian Traffic access from Lindfield Avenue across Woodside in either direction on Lindfield Avenue is on an unmarked crossing that takes pedestrians through the active roundabout. The proposal inadequately addresses these issues. Pedestrian access to the Western side of Lindfield Avenue (which provides access to the Pacific Highway and Coles for example) between Woodside and Havilah is via an unmarked pedestrian crossing. The vehicle and pedestrian traffic impacts of this proposal and prospective proposals leaves these aspects materially underdone in the development proposal. In contrast to the current width Transport NSW's walking space standard sets a minimum width at 2.0 to 2.43 metres. A wheelchair needs 850 mm of width. The current width forces people onto the road to execute a pedestrian pass. It is straight out dangerous for disabled access.

**These issues impact both development projects for the combined site.**

**Deep Soil planting:** The proponent of this proposal is also the proponent of the Reid, Highgate, Woodside development. By splitting the Reid/Highgate/Woodside/Lindfield Avenue site into two developments for what is essentially a single proposal deep soil planting requirements are circumvented and existing deep soil plants removed or not replaced with conditionality that such trees must survive for 10 years.

**Rainwater and Stormwater:** The proposed site is subject to flooding in excessive rain events. There is a piped branch of Gordon creek through the site. This creek is not mentioned in the proposal and high rainfall events not addressed. An example of such an event was Tuesday 8, March 2022.

**Potable Water:** The impact on water requirements not addressed

**Sewage:** The sewage systems and piping in Lindfield are aged and much of it has not been upgraded since installation, incremental and accumulative demand increases are not considered in the two-property proposal.

**Visual Amenity:** Our back veranda faces south. The 10-story proposed development directly impacts this aspect of our property. The structure will be highly visible, imposing and remove privacy.

**Societal Infrastructure:** The impact of the TOD SEPP and this application, given it is part of an incremental and accumulative population expansion that is material is silent on major areas including public spaces, sporting ground access, new schooling infrastructure and medical facilities let alone how people might move between them. As highlighted safe and reasonable pedestrian transit is ignored.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this development proposal. The proposed development should not be approved in its submitted form.

Yours sincerely



Robert Cowley  
1 Kenilworth Road  
Lindfield NSW  
26-05-2025