

Paul Grimble
C/- 12 Newark Crescent
Lindfield NSW 2070

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street,
Parramatta NSW 2150

Objection lodged via Major Projects portal

RE: SSD-81623209– RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, 9-21 BEACONSFIELD PARADE, LINDFIELD

The Applicant claims that the proposal is consistent with the objects of the Act.

The aims of Chapter 5 of SEPP(Housing) 2021, related to TOD are [*that developments*]:

- (i) are well designed, and
- (ii) are of appropriate bulk and scale, and
- (iii) provide amenity and livability.

While I fully support the stated aims, in terms of increasing housing density around transport nodes I don't agree that this proposal meets the aims or objectives of the Act.

The Applicant's EIS for all its 137 pages does not once refer to Newark Crescent and it certainly does not deal with any or the many adverse impacts the proposed development will have on existing homes in Newark Crescent.

It is as if by not mentioning the word **Newark** in the EIS the resident's living there doesn't exist!

The Applicant's proposed development

I submit that the proposed development will result in an unsatisfactory built form relationship with the adjoining Newark properties, (as existing and into the future).

I understand that buildings can exist together in harmony without having the same density, scale or appearance, though as the difference in these attributes increases, harmony is harder to achieve.

The planned adjoining 10 levels of apartments, which are massed on the northern boundary of the Applicant's site, collide over a fence line with 8 single storey 1920's cottages being a height difference of 10 storeys to 1. As such, the required harmony has

been severely disrupted not just for 1 neighbour but in fact a whole side of the street being numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 Newark which are severely impacted at the fence line. Further numbers 1, 3, 20 and 22 Newark which will be severely overlooked.

Figure 1 Western Elevation of the applicant's proposed site



The Applicant's EIS discusses in detail how its proposed development is compatible with the properties on Beaconsfield Road and even discusses compatibility with properties in Frances Street (some distance away) but omits entirely to explain how the Applicant's proposed development is compatible with the properties over the fence line and overlooking Newark Crescent.

Where compatibility is to be achieved physical and visual impacts need to be considered. The most important contributor to compatibility is the relationship of built form to surrounding space, a relationship that is created by building height, setbacks and landscaping.

The Applicant's design is essentially an opportunity to include as many apartments on the site as possible and as many as possible on the northern boundary of the site. This makes a mockery of its statement in the EIS that the development is of 'appropriate bulk and scale'.

Heights, Landscape and Setbacks

The Applicant appears to have completely ignored accepted planning principles in ensuring that its proposed development includes buildings of a compatible height, setbacks and landscaping. In this instance, significant differences in height and compatibility can be achieved only when the change is gradual rather than abrupt. No attempt has been made to make transition gradual from Beaconsfield Parade to Newark. Relevantly, the topography of Beaconsfield is approximately 9 metres higher than Newark accentuating the loss of amenity and transition impacts.

The extent to which height differences are acceptable depends also on the consistency of height in the existing streetscape. When viewed from Newark Crescent it is apparent that no consideration has been given height compatibility and no effort to reduce bulk or height along the northern boundary. Statements to the contrary in the Applicant's EIS should be vigorously challenged.

Landscaping is also an important contributor to urban character and compatibility. The Applicant has allowed for the minimum of setbacks on the northern boundary. The current owner of 19a Beaconsfield removed all trees and other vegetation along the boundary of 10 and 12 Newark about a year ago, the only exception being the big tree in Photo No. 1 – which is set for removal by the developer. This tree should be saved.

Photo No 1 - 19 a Beaconsfield backing onto 10, 12 and 14 Newark



The Applicant claims to extoll the virtues of the leafy street character and 10-metre-wide street verge on either side of Beaconsfield Parade containing substantial street tree planting and to respect the site's heritage context.

Quite to the contrary, the Applicant's site will be denuded of trees, adopt minimum setbacks all round and knock down all the properties on the site that are part of the Beaconsfield HCA. Basically, the Applicant proposes to cram as many units on the site as it can get away with and bedamned with the people who will purchase or rent one of the many apartments that are denied sunlight and natural ventilation and bedamned with its many neighbours on Newark Crescent.

For context, please see the garden chairs in Photo 1 above – this will be the building line above which 10 levels of apartments and below which 2 levels of underground parking will be constructed.

The impact for Newark landowners is terrible in terms of livability, privacy and amenity not to mention land values which are already substantially reduced.

Future development of Newark

The physical impacts of the Applicant's proposal will include constraints on the development potential of surrounding sites.

The massing of apartments on the northern boundary is presumably intended to take advantage of the northerly aspect in terms of sunlight and unimpeded district views.

If in the future Newark Crescent residents are permitted to develop their land and achieve development for heights that will block sunlight or views to the residents behind, then the Newark landowners will receive objections from the Beaconsfield apartment owners and developer. To ameliorate these impacts on these future apartment owners the massing of apartments on the northern boundary of the site should be reduced.

I request that the Department take this opportunity to ensure that the massing of apartments on the site's northern boundary does not have the consequence of limiting development on the Newark Crescent side of the fence.

Personal note

The impact being felt by Newark residents is due in part to the friendships that have developed between successive generations of neighbours growing up in the same crescent, who are all now severely impacted by the Applicant's proposal. These are the same people who have for generations tended their back gardens, spent time there with their families, cooked snags on the bbq, had back yard children's birthday parties every year of life and played with and entertained friends. The Applicant's proposal does nothing to ameliorate this loss of amenity and loss of privacy.

These homes are not mansions owned by empty nesters. To the contrary these cottages are occupied by families with children at school and university, some have children and grandchildren sharing the home, while others still have adult children at home. The super-size of the applicant's proposal and its inconsiderate design will severely disrupt family life for the Newark residents.

The Applicant's development will severely impact the amenity of these properties as potentially 100's of people will be able to look into the back yards and living spaces of Newark homes. The annoying part of the Applicant's proposal is that no consideration has been given to reducing the massing of apartments or transition down to the Newark cottages.

Disruption will not only be felt through the complete loss of privacy in the back garden and living areas but also from the potential impact of noise from loud music and or parties.

To lose 169 trees including established trees on the site's northern boundary adds to the loss of amenity and privacy.

The excavation and construction will be ongoing making living in Newark Crescent a nightmare as the applicant excavates 2 storeys underground through what I understand to be sandstone before the construction phase commences.

The consequences posed by the Applicant's proposal for the Newark residents are severe with personal mental health issues, stress, anxiety combining to cause relationships to be strained due to the reality that:

- we will be 'living' adjacent to a massive construction site for years;
- we are trapped in our homes because our properties are unsaleable at any realistic value as a private dwelling, due to the Applicant's proposal over the fence;
- our properties are unsaleable to a developer as the existing planning controls make the property uneconomic for a developer to buy at a value that will allow even close to a like for like property sale and purchase;
- our properties are literally unrentable because the rent achieved would be unlikely to cover the state land tax, insurance and council rates.

Request of State Government

I request that the Minister consider the following key questions:

1. Are the proposal's physical impacts on surrounding properties acceptable?
2. Is the proposal's appearance in harmony with the buildings around it and the character of the street?

The answer to 1 above is no. We request that the Minister ensure the that the Applicant's proposal is rejected or required to amend its proposal to comply with and not flout the law.

The answer to 2 above is plainly no and we request that the Minister ensure that the Applicant's proposal is rejected or required to amend its proposal to comply with and not flout the law.

Conclusion

The Applicant's proposal seeks to convert 9 dwellings on Beaconsfield Parade into 347 apartments.

The Application should be rejected or alternatively, substantially amended given the detrimental impact on Newark Crescent properties.

Please give consideration to this objection as well as those being submitted by my friends and neighbours in Newark Crescent.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Grimble

12 and 14 Newark Crescent

Lindfield