

Objection to Residential Development with affordable housing 11-19 Middle Harbour road Road Lindfield (SSD-82900461)

Dear Sir/Madam:

I have reviewed the public documents regarding the 11-19 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield development project (hereinafter referred to as the "Project") and believe that the Project is seriously overdeveloped. Therefore, **I object to the current design and development plan of "theProject" for the following reasons:**

1. "The Project" does not conform to the preferred alternative to TOD recently proposed (hereinafter referred to as the "Preferred Alternative") by the Ku-ring-gai Council (hereinafter referred to as the "KRG").

While the Project falls within the "Preferred Alternative" area, building heights in the area are limited to 18 meters to meet planning requirements for transitioning from a high-density to a low-density zone. However, the current design for the Project's buildings exceeds 30 meters, significantly contradicting the KRG's "Preferred Alternative" in both height and bulk.

2. "The Project" has a significant adverse impact on the adjacent Heritage Item.

The Heritage Item (9 Middle Harbour Road) is located on the western edge of "the Project". The Project's current setback does not comply with the KRG's relevant planning requirements. This creates a significant visual impact on the adjacent Heritage Item and clearly violates the relevant regulations of KCDP2024.

3. The setbacks around "the project" do not meet the relevant planning requirements, exacerbating the obstruction and privacy issues of neighboring buildings..

According to the current design of "the project", the setback of "the project" on the front (Middle Harbour Road) is only 6 meters, which is far below the minimum setback distance of 10 meters required by KRG. The eastern boundary of the project is very close to the main building of 21 Middle Harbour Road, and the side setback clearly does not meet planning requirements. Furthermore, with the project's current building height exceeding 30 meters, the resulting sun blocking and privacy infringement on surrounding residents is self-evident.

The land which "the Project" is located is higher in the north and lower in the south. Therefore, the setback on the southern boundary of "the Project" should be larger to minimize the shadowing effect on the buildings along Chelmsford Road, which are located at a lower elevation than the Project.

However, the Project does not actually follow the relevant setback rules of KCDP2024. Therefore, “the Project” will cause serious shadowing effect on the direct sunlight of the buildings along Chelmsford Road.

4. The impact of “the project” on the existing green environment

According to the proposal, the applicant will remove a significant number of mature trees. Furthermore, due to the project's underground parking exceeding the building footprint and the limited setbacks that already do not comply with current planning rules. The project's deep soil cover is very low, far below the KRG's minimum 50% requirement. This constitutes a serious violation of the deep soil zone principle and will prevent effective deep soil planting. This will further damage Middle Harbour Road's historic streetscape and beautiful green environment.

5. Impact of rainwater discharge and flood risks of "the Project"

We note that the land where "the Project" is located has a 1.83-meter-wide drainage easement. It must be pointed out that the land area where the "Project" is located is actually located within the confirmed land flood path, is the source area of Gordon Creek, and is part of the Gordon Creek riverbank. Floods flow from the northwest to the southeast of the land where the "Project" is located, passing through the above-mentioned land and flowing into Gordon Creek. As we all know, the Gordon Creek riverbank area has always been an area in Lindfield that is more susceptible to floods. Once the "Project" is completed, due to "the Project" being located in the source area of Gordon Creek, coupled with the construction of other high-density residential projects in the TOD area in the future, surface runoff may increase compared to before the construction of "the Project", which will further bring greater flood disaster risks to the above-mentioned area and is likely to disrupt the current balance of the Gordon Creek riverbank ecosystem.

6. The participation process of the "project" proposal has fundamental flaws and does not meet the statutory requirements. The lack of necessary community communication makes it impossible to achieve an effective and mutually beneficial balance between project construction and the public interests of the community.

It must be pointed out that as residents living near "the project", we have never received any introduction or consultation about "the project" from the applicant, nor any community seminars held by the applicant. We only learned from other neighbors in the community recently that "the project" has entered the public exhibition stage. The proposal was learned entirely through the community network rather than mandatory participation led by the developer.

The "project" webpage is neither promoted nor accessible through standard

searches, which violates Section 2.23 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2021 and Section 3.9 of the New South Wales Community Engagement Plan. This clause requires "active and easy-to-communicate consultations with directly affected residents".

It is obvious that the applicant does not seem to want to involve the Aboriginal residents living around the "project" in the collection of opinions on the development and construction of the "project". The applicant has no real intention to work with local residents or respect their concerns. Since this is an SSD project, such a major decision must reflect the opinions of the groups most affected (i.e. the indigenous residents of the communities surrounding the project) - however, we clearly feel that the community's objections are being ignored or ignored.

7. Local infrastructure is seriously overloaded, with serious traffic and safety impacts

Currently, there are four large-scale residential redevelopment project proposals within a 300-meter-long section on both sides of Middle Harbour Road west of Trafalgar Ave, and two large-scale residential redevelopment project proposals on Russell Ave and Trafalgar Ave within a 200-meter radius of "the project". If all are approved, about 900 apartment houses will be added to this area alone, and the new population will exceed 3,000. Such a large number of new residents and vehicles will seriously aggravate local traffic congestion and bring dangers to pedestrians, cyclists and children. At the same time, the simultaneous development of these projects will also cause noise and danger that will last for many years, seriously damaging the daily convenience and safety of existing residents.

It must be pointed out in particular that Lindfield's schools, medical services, parks and public transportation systems are already overwhelmed. If these projects are approved, key infrastructure will be far beyond its capacity, affecting the quality of education, health care and public facilities. Such highly intensive construction is completely irresponsible and unsustainable without a large amount of upfront infrastructure investment.

Conclusion:

Overall, I believe that the size and height of the Project as currently designed does not meet planning requirements.

I have serious questions about the so-called "state importance" of SSD-82548708: Developments are considered state important based on their economic, environmental or social importance to the state, and typically include educational facilities, hospitals, manufacturing facilities, tourism facilities, mining operations, infrastructure such as port facilities, waste management facilities and energy facilities. It does not include standalone residential developments.

The proposed "project" does not meet any reasonable assessment of "significance" at all. The purpose of becoming an SSD project is only to bypass the planning of the KRG Council and the democratic consultation of the community, circumvent the existing planned building area and height restrictions, and pursue a larger-scale development project to obtain maximum profits. The "project" is actually impossible to meet real social or community needs. The real beneficiaries are only developers and a very small number of owners who have obtained excess returns through land sales, not low- and middle-income workers in key positions or the community itself, or even the state government that proposed the TOD plan. The huge profits of the above-mentioned few people are based on the complete destruction of HCAs in the east of Lindfield, the beautiful and quiet green environment, and the legitimate rights and interests of the original Lindfield community residents. This is extremely unfair! ! It is absolutely not in line with the original intention and original intention of the state government to establish an SSD project approval mechanism.

In fact, the SSDA projects under the TOD plan currently publicly displayed on the official website of the state government are random, messy, and completely uncoordinated independent development projects. These development projects are like ugly patches on a beautiful dress, scattered all over the quiet suburban backstreets of Roseville, Lindfield, Killara, Gordon, and even brazenly standing in the center of HCAs surrounded by Heritage Items. Leading to the complete destruction of local HCAs. Under the TOD plan, the specific location of the development project will depend more on the opportunism of the developer (that is, the developer finds enough adjacent properties, is not hindered by any historical sites, and has willing and/or forced sellers), rather than on respect for the community and the conditions for truly meeting affordable housing construction.

The "Preferred Alternative" responded to the NSW Government's low- and medium-rise housing reforms and proposed a controlled growth plan that was consistent with local infrastructure capacity, heritage protection and community expectations. The applicant's use of the policy window when the State Government and KRG Council had not yet agreed on the "preferred option" to expedite the application of the "project" undermined the democratic planning process and procedural fairness, and represented an unacceptable disregard for local governance.

I therefore believe that the existing architectural design for the Project must be opposed before the Preferred Scheme is approved to protect the beautiful traditional area of Lindfield East from destructive development without detailed planning.

I write hereby and sincerely hope that you will pay attention to the above situation. Thank you!

Regards