

From:

Marthinus Janse van Rensburg
6 Newark Crescent
Lindfield NSW 2070

Elizabeth Anne Gilfillan
4 Newark Crescent
Lindfield NSW 2070

Numbers 4 and 6 Newark Crescent, Lindfield **which is directly bordering SSD-81623209.**

To:

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

It really saddens me to have to write this email to the Department, but there is so much negativity towards the massive building applicant intends to erect directly behind my backyard that I am imploring you to please give it more careful consideration.

SSD is supposed to stand for 'state significant development' the applicant's proposal takes all the advantages offered by the TOD legislation in terms of height, FST and affordable housing then maximises profit at the expense of good design and due to the over density of the design has turned the opportunity for world class design into a profit grab and inevitably a different SSD being a 'state shabby development'.

My neighbour in No 4 Newark Crescent leads a busy life spending a considerable amount of time with her adult children and grandchildren who often stay in the house and spend hours using the back garden. I also believe my neighbour and her husband moved into No 4 Newark Crescent in 1983 (the family bought the place in 1924) and along with No 10 Newark Crescent are two of the longest residents in the Crescent. Other residents have been living in the crescent for over 40 years and many 30 years.

I am a relative newcomer having lived in Newark Crescent for 19 years.

I also spend a lot of time in my backyard. I have large shade house there where I grow a lot of vegetables. Also, all my washing is hung in the backyard. When I have friends over, we spend most of the time sitting in the backyard garden.

Now the thought of having a 10-storey building 6m from my backyard where there are going to be a lot of flats (and therefore many pairs of eyes) directly looking at every activity I do, scares the daylight out of me. Note that it is going to be higher than 10 storeys because there is already a 3m difference between the ground levels of my house and the intended development.

Also, any parties that these apartments will have, will have the noise thumping down on my backyard.

Just on the other side and along the border (but within the intended development site) there are lots of very beautiful tall trees (some more than 4 storeys high). To think that all these trees will have to be taken down is unnecessary and these trees must be protected not only to protect the trees but also to preserve some privacy. The same issue applies at no 4 where the rear of the property has large trees on the Beaconsfield Parade side which should be preserved to allow some privacy.

It will be impossible to live in my house for 2 years – during the development. They intend to excavate 2 storeys deep before they start building. Imagine the massive noise the drilling will cause and the dust. There is no way that I will be able to live here for those 2 years.

What comes to mind is like having one's house in the middle of the CBD and not to being able to sell it or to build higher. If I want to sell it, it will be a giveaway, I will basically have to sell it for the same price that a flat will be going in the intended development. So, I do not even have the option of getting out of here now – Lindfield has become a prison for me.

Then the council intends to have a park here directly in Newark Crescent, but it appears to be just for the show, because if the people living in the intended development wants to visit the park (or even just want to buy stuff from Coles) they will have to walk a massive detour to get there.

I am very concerned that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure will approve this development without significant changes thereby denying the people living in Newark Crescent any semblance of the privacy and amenity they previously enjoyed.

I implore you to please consider the people having single storey houses here.

I agree with the objections made by some of my neighbours when they say that the applicant has completely ignored aims of legislation which I understand is contained partly in Chapter 5 of SEPP(Housing) 2021, related to TOD requiring that TOD developments:

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

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

The Applicant's EIS is as expected is a self-serving misleading document that for all its 126 pages does not deal in any way with the environmental impacts on the residents of Newark Crescent in terms of loss of amenity and privacy. This is shameful and presumably not consistent with the ethical standards of the town planner who has signed off on the report who is presumably just a gun for hire. I would have thought that a proper analysis of the environmental impacts of the applicant's site on Newark Crescent residents would have required many pages. However, it appears that the topic was simply impossible to deal with and the easy road was taken to ignore the Newark Crescent problem completely hoping it will be overlooked by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and simply evaporate.

It is as if by not dealing with the environmental impacts on Newark Crescent or mentioning the word Newark in the EIS the resident's living there doesn't exist!

The applicant's proposed development

I agree with my neighbours when they say that the proposed development will result in unnecessary massing of apartment on the applicant's northern boundary creating terrible 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 destroyed.

I submit that when 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 single storey 1920's cottages being a difference of 10 storeys to one, the required harmony has been severely disrupted not just for 1 neighbour but in

fact a whole side of the street being my neighbours at numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 Newark which are severely impacted at the fence line but also for numbers 1, 3, 18, 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 apartment properties on Beaconsfield Parade, it briefly mentions its relationship to 25 Beaconsfield next door and even discusses compatibility with properties in Frances Street (some distance away) but omits entirely to explain in its EIS how the applicant's proposed development is compatible with the properties over the fence line to the north 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, making 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 ignored accepted planning principles in ensuring that its proposed development includes buildings of a compatible height, setbacks and landscaping, where there are significant differences in height, compatibility can be achieved when the change is gradual rather than abrupt. No attempt has been made to make transition gradual from Beaconsfield Parade to Newark. We note that 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 to height compatibility and no effort to reduce bulk or height along the northern boundary. Any statements to the contrary in the applicant's EIS should be vigorously challenged.

Photo from Newark 4 showing height difference with Beaconsfield



It is noted that the open space on the applicant's design creates space which will be shaded for most of the day and long corridors that will operate as wind a funnel when the breeze and storms from the south arrive.

Landscaping is also an important contributor to urban character and compatibility. The applicant has allowed for the minimum of setbacks on the northern boundary,

In addition over my back fence a number of large trees are located on the applicants site close to the boundary. These trees must also be saved to protect the trees themselves but also the amenity for myself and No 4.

Photo of trees at the rear of No 4 and 6 Newark

Photo at the back of 4 Newark of a tree on SSD site that will be taken down.



If I am correct, I understand that the applicant states that 19% of the site will be 'deep soil'. We request the Department to look carefully at the possibility of saving these trees as well as other trees in the middle of the site so that these trees may also be preserved even at the expensive of carparks below which I also understand are above the required minimum.

The applicant extolls the virtues of the leafy street character and 10-metre-wide street verge on either side of Beaconsfield containing substantial street tree planting while respecting the site's heritage context.

However the the applicant's site does not apply these same standards, quite to the contrary the applicant's site will be denuded of trees, adopt minimum setbacks all round, knock down all the properties on the site that are part of the Beaconsfield HCA and basically cram as many units on the space as it can get away with and bedamned with its many neighbours on Newark Crescent.

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

Photo at the back of Newark 4 where private family gatherings will become public spectacles:



We request that Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure to consider the following key questions:

1. Are the proposal's physical impacts on surrounding development acceptable?
2. Do the physical impacts include constraints on the development potential of surrounding sites.
3. 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 and not by a long way for the reasons stated above.

The answer to 3 above is no and not by a long way for the reasons stated above.

The answer to 2 above is Yes.

Future development of Newark

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 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 significantly reduced.

Personal note

The applicant's development will severely impact the amenity of Newark 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.

Too lose 169 trees including established trees on the 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 of underground carparking through what I understand to be sandstone before the construction phase commences.

I understand that already the impacts on the Newark residents are severe with personal mental health issues, stress and anxiety being caused by the prospect of living with the applicants proposal these are combining to cause relationships to be strained due to the reality that:

- You will be 'living' adjacent to a massive construction site for years;
- You are trapped in your home because its unsaleable at any realistic value as a private dwelling, due to the applicants proposal over the fence;
- Your property is 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 sell and buy;
- Your property is literally unrentable because the rent achieved would be unlikely to cover the state land tax, insurance and council rates;

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

Yours faithfully,

Marthinus Janse van Rensburg & Anne Gilfillan