

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed residential development at 59–63 Trafalgar Avenue and 1A & 1B Valley Road, Lindfield. As a resident who lives nearby, I have deep concerns about the scale, location, and potential impacts of this project on our community and local environment. While I acknowledge the importance of increasing access to affordable housing, this particular development, as currently proposed, is inappropriate and poses significant risks to the quality of life and character of the area.

The most immediate and troubling aspect of the proposal is its sheer size. The development seeks to introduce approximately 220 residential units across buildings exceeding 9 storeys in height — rising up to 33 metres, which is well above the height limits specified in existing local planning controls. This kind of density and building bulk is entirely out of character with the surrounding area, which is predominantly composed of low-rise, detached homes. The stark contrast between the proposed high-rise structure and the existing built environment will be visually intrusive and disruptive to the established neighbourhood. What makes this especially concerning is that the proposed site sits beyond the official boundary of the council's designated transport-oriented development (TOD) zone. Justifying such a large-scale project based on proximity to transport infrastructure, when the site falls outside the designated area, sets a concerning precedent and undermines careful, strategic planning.

In addition to the overall height and density, the development lacks a sensible and respectful transition to nearby low-density housing. There is no buffer or gradual scale shift between the proposed apartment blocks and adjacent homes, which creates a jarring urban form and reduces residential amenity. Many residents in the area, including myself, will be directly affected by the visual dominance of the structure, as well as the loss of outlook and natural light. The buildings will likely overshadow neighbouring properties, limiting access to sunlight and impacting solar access for existing homes and gardens. Moreover, upper-level apartments would overlook private yards and living areas, leading to serious privacy concerns for residents who never expected to find themselves living next to high-rise apartments.

Another pressing concern is traffic and parking. The introduction of over 200 new dwellings would add a significant number of cars to our local streets, most of which are narrow and not designed to handle high traffic volumes. This will exacerbate congestion, particularly during peak hours and school drop-off times. Many children attend schools in the area and regularly walk or cycle through the neighbourhood. Increased traffic presents safety risks to these students and disrupts the sense of peace and security that residents currently enjoy. In addition, the development will create pressure on limited parking availability, not only for future residents but for the wider community.

There are also critical environmental implications to consider. The proposal will result in the removal of mature trees and a substantial reduction in local tree canopy, which plays an important role in cooling the urban environment, managing stormwater, and supporting birdlife and other species. The loss of greenery is not only environmentally harmful but detracts from the area's leafy character, which is one of the reasons people choose to live here in the first

place. These trees take decades to grow and cannot simply be replaced through replanting on rooftops or balconies.

It is also important to highlight the proximity of the site to a recognised Heritage Conservation Area. A development of this scale would undermine the integrity of the surrounding historic streetscape, clashing with the architectural character and aesthetic of heritage homes. The proposal appears to give little consideration to the cultural and historical significance of the area, and approval in its current form would mark a regrettable loss of local identity.

During construction, there will inevitably be significant disruption caused by noise, heavy machinery, dust, and road closures. These disruptions will not only impact residents' day-to-day lives but will also affect students studying at home or attending nearby schools. In an era when many children continue to rely on quiet, stable learning environments, such disruptions are unacceptable and could negatively impact their education and wellbeing.

Beyond the construction phase, the long-term increase in population density will place considerable strain on public infrastructure and services. Schools, transport systems, waste collection, water services, and community facilities are already operating near capacity. There has been no clear demonstration that local infrastructure can accommodate the sudden and significant growth this development would bring. Without major upgrades to support such a population increase, existing residents and future occupants of the development will both suffer the consequences of overstretched services.

Finally, the overall design and intent of this development appear inconsistent with the established character and social fabric of the neighbourhood. Lindfield is known for its quiet, residential charm, leafy streets, and sense of community. Introducing a high-rise, high-density complex into this context represents a fundamental shift that many in the community do not support. While infill housing is a valid planning approach, it must be applied carefully and in appropriate locations — not at the edge of designated TOD areas, and certainly not in places where it threatens to overwhelm and permanently alter long-standing communities.

For all of these reasons, I respectfully request that this proposal be refused in its current form. Should a new proposal be submitted, I urge that it reflect a more modest, sensitive approach that respects existing planning controls, maintains the character of the area, protects the environment, and ensures that any increase in housing is well supported by infrastructure and services.

Thank you for considering this submission.