

Minister for Planning & Public Spaces
SSD - 82395459
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street
Parramatta
NSW 2150

OBJECTION TO DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL: (SSD - 82395459)

7th June 2025

To whom it may concern,

I hereby note my strong objection to the proposed development by Develotek Property Group (Developer / Applicant) at Burgoyne Lane, Pearson Avenue, and Burgoyne Street Gordon (SSD - 82395459).

This proposal represents a short-sighted view to planning, in an area which requires a far more considered planning approach given the rich heritage and environmental landscape of this location.

The community must be respected. The TOD scenario represents undemocratic planning, with no community input considered into its one-sized fits all approach.

Simplistically nothing in this proposal warrants acceptance. It is a basic attempt at leveraging TOD planning legislation to rush through a development which will only serve to destroy the natural and built environment, with both forms dating back to Federation.

Per Council's Scenario, this area is to be spared of development, to ensure the heritage and environmental significance of this location is properly preserved, respected, and valued. There are plentiful other locations better suited to a development of this scale, which I note the Developer has failed to consider.

Further, it is concerning to read an application which is entirely misleading with its sweeping generalisations and flawed analysis:

- Justification it is "suitable" yet contradicts Council's Scenario which fully protects this area (violating 4 critical planning considerations)
- Visual privacy seemingly reasonable based on "proposed vegetation" and distorted artist impressions
- Transition impacts seemingly negligible based on "deep back yards, tennis courts, back fences, vegetation"
- Minimum 6m set-backs "sympathetic", yet built form rises to 26m, breaching TOD height limits
- Overshadowing a "good outcome" in an area otherwise mostly in sunshine
- Environmental impacts deemed as "minimal" yet 62 trees (>50% of on-site trees) set to be destroyed (including many exotic, mature, established dating back to Federation, contributing to tree-canopy, green-web)
- Traffic impacts seemingly "minimal" despite daily congestion in immediate vicinity
- Consultation with the community "comprehensive" yet no webinars or community briefings (breaching DPHI requirements)

The least we can do here is respect an extensive process by Council to develop a scenario which properly plans, delivers, and exceeds TOD outcomes, having due regard to critical heritage and environmental planning considerations.

Given the above, I should expect the proposal be swiftly rejected by the State.

Regards,
Adam