

Dear Minister,

OBJECTION RE BURGOYNE LANE / STREET, PEARSON AVENUE, GORDON DEVELOPMENT – SSD 82395459

I have reviewed the exhibition documents pertaining to the proposed development at Burgoyne Lane / Street, Pearson Avenue Gordon (SSD – 82395459) and hereby enclose my **strong objection** to this application.

The proposal warrants **immediate rejection by the State**. We should not waste taxpayer funds on review of a proposal that is so short-sighted and has ill regard to proper planning considerations.

Gordon is an area underpinned by critical environmental and heritage considerations which a blanket planning approach does not cater for.

If the State is going to properly plan for the housing it requires, it should have due regard to critical planning considerations and support Ku-ring-gai Council's Preferred Alternative Scenario, which provides for significantly greater housing compared to TOD outcomes, and which is underpinned by 7 key planning principles.

A comprehensive review of the EIS on exhibition illustrates a grossly misleading and unethical submission, angled at emotionally targeting the State's housing supply and affordability imperative, when what is proposed, only provides for the minimum 2% of GFA as affordable homes, with the majority to remain unaffordable.

Further, this proposal will **inflict irreversible environmental devastation (>50% of trees on site (62 in number) to be destroyed, including mature and exotic species dating back to Federation) along with significant impacts to the surrounding heritage listed properties and Gordondale HCA**, these critical issues seemingly totally disregarded by the Developer, yet underpinned the Council's explicit direction for this area to be preserved following the application of fundamental planning criteria (refer below).

The application is further undermined by its lack of attention to detail – the document is littered with typos, let alone unsupported generalisations and **misleading methodologies** to conclude key assessments in favour of the developer. For example, but not limited to:

- Assumed development up to 22m high within the surrounding Gordondale HCA. Any TOD development is subject to review by Council as confirmed by the State, which has called for this site and the surrounding HCA to be “fully protected” (refer below)
- Visual privacy conclusions based on “proposed vegetation” and only 7 images incorrectly assessed at low vantage points of surrounding properties, ignoring elevation of homes along Park Avenue and therefore significant visual disruption (e.g. elevation of home at 16 Park Avenue ignored, along with artist impressions distorted to downplay impact)
- Overshadowing assessments claiming implications at specific time periods (e.g. 3pm), versus duration of overshadowing impacts (i.e. 3pm onwards), or worse, claiming surrounding homes impacted by shadowing is a “good outcome” given they would be otherwise subject to the sun for the duration of the day (refer 16 Park Avenue)
- Heritage assessments concluding reasonableness based on “deep set-backs, tennis courts, and vegetation”. This is appalling
- Disregards Council's Preferred Alternative Scenario given it is “yet to be finalised” yet has now been approved, with timeframe for approval clearly available to public, yet ignored. Council's assessment for exclusion of this site given the transition impacts on surrounding high concentration of heritage homes and environmental concerns also not acknowledged in reports

- Community engagement and consultation entirely inappropriate for a development of this magnitude (breaching DPHI requirements) – no community webinars, no community briefings, email requests for information ignored, no phone line provided for queries
- Option analysis blatantly disregarded in relation to alternative sites (contravening regulation), yet Council's scenario delivers greater housing and affordability for this suburb, overlaying critical planning considerations to ensure the heritage context and the surrounding environment is properly respected and preserved

Gordon, and Ku-ring-gai clearly deserve far better than this. I should hope the State holds the Developer accountable for essentially wasting taxpayer funds, calling for a review of a highly deceptive, misleading, and unethical application.

Regards,

Jan Nelson

Extract from Council's Preferred Alternative Scenario and justification for Exclusion of Site Area

Location	Site Refer Figure #	Description	Property Included in TOD	Property Included in Preferred Scenario	Reason for Exclusion and Detail Plan
Gordon	1	Portion of Burgoyne Street - Pearson Avenue	Yes	No	<p>This block consists of seven properties (3A, 3B, 5A, 7 Burgoyne Street, 1 & 3 Pearson Avenue, and 4 Burgoyne Lane). These properties are located on the edge of the revised TOD boundary neighbouring low density housing to their north and C12 Gordondale Estate Conservation Area to their east and south.</p> <p>There is a high concentration of Heritage Items adjoining this block which would likely limit its development potential. Furthermore, one of the properties (3A Burgoyne Street) contains biodiversity that supports core biodiversity land.</p> <p>Unlike TOD, the Preferred Scenario excludes these seven properties from high density development. This is to avoid interface impacts on the adjoining Heritage Items and C12 Conservation Area which is proposed to be fully protected. This is consistent with Principle 1 - Avoid Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Principle 2 - Minimise Impact on Heritage Items, Principle 3 - Preserve Heritage Conservation Areas, and Principle 5 - Manage transition impacts.</p> 