

INDEX

Introduction	2
General	2
Specific Impact on our family home	3
Reports and Documentation.....	3
Published Reports Section: below	3
Overall Objection Section: below	3
Published Reports	4
App 3 Statutory Compliance TABLE	4
App 18 Arboricultural Report.....	5
App 25 Construction Noise and Vibration Management plan	6
App 26 Traffic Impact Assessment Ref SSD-82548708	6
Section 3.10 Summary Extract	6
Non Published Reports	7
Ku-ring-gai Development Control / Statutory Compliance TABLE	7
Variation Requests.....	7
Increased Traffic Noise	7
Heritage Zone	7
Overall Objection Points.....	7
Overdevelopment and Density	7
Loss of Suburban Character	7
Privacy and Overshadowing.....	7
Environmental Concerns.....	7
Traffic and Safety	8
SUMMATION.....	8

Introduction

General

John Stewart and Liya Wang are owners of property 23 Middle Harbour Road.

- two properties down from the above proposed development.

The proposal is for a **10 Level, 33+ Metres High, 173 Apartments, 259 Car spaces Apartment Block**

- Proposal identifies 9 floors, thereby 10 levels including ground level

We are vigorously opposed to the Development, points outlined below:

South east of the Lindfield Station, there is currently only a few apartment blocks above 3 levels.

The location for the above proposal is approximately **300 Metres** south of the Linfield station then **280 metres** down Middle Harbour Road.

- A 10 Level, 33+ Metres complex sitting up way down Middle Harbour Road..
- This alone should be objection enough and submission filed away as ridiculous.

For at least 5 years a large vacant large block (ex Doctors premises) 150 Metres south of Lindfield Station with no indication of being developed.

- This property has not been maintained, and an eye saw to this beautiful tree lined suburb.
- Common sense would suggest a **staged approach** to development locations be most appropriate

Commencing with close to the Lindfield Station and railway line be

- completed and
- impact assessed

BEFORE proposing 10 levels **STICKING UP** way down Middle Harbour Road .

[Specific Impact on our family home](#)

The detrimental impact on our home environment cannot be understated.

Apart from all points identified throughout this Objection:

- The eastern end of the above proposed development is two properties higher up the street from us, again at a height of **33+ Metres**
- The ground level proposed development is significantly elevated from the ground level of our single level dwelling.

The 10-level development would descend down sharply on our home.

- Notwithstanding obvious traffic issues, the detrimental impact for us will include the significantly reduced Privacy

We will vigorously further oppose this development getting any further consideration through all avenues.

[Reports and Documentation](#)

Several Reports and Documents for the proposal have been commissioned by developer.

The NSW Government Department of Planning website includes 35 Attachments.

The Developer produced publications seem to be **churned out** on a much-used template for such applications.

[Published Reports Section: below](#)

Our comments and observations are included in this section.

[Overall Objection Section: below](#)

We have spoken to many people within the Lindfield community about the development plan

100% response being disbelief NSW Planning could be considering this monstrosity of a Development in this position.

It would be a disastrous legacy for years and generations.

Overall points reflecting community sentiment are included in Overall Objection Section below.

Published Reports

Firstly, many of the 35 attachments on website are identified by an acronym only in their title.

- Content of the attachments is not clear.
- We need to open the file to see its title making the submission response process cumbersome, confusing and inefficient.
 - Example: **Appendix 12 – PSI** is Preliminary Site Investigation..

This Section identifies / highlights some of the concerns identified within the Website published Reports and documents.

App 3 Statutory Compliance TABLE

We do not understand why the height of building and floorspace are deemed **N/A re compliance**

- The proposal refers to a SEPP document therefore N/A..

We need further understanding re this SEPP..

4.3 Height of buildings	(2) The height of a building on any land is not to exceed the maximum height shown for the land on the Height of Buildings Map . 9.5m	The proposal seeks to apply the base building height permitted under Chapter 5 of the Housing SEPP.	N/A
4.4 Floor Space Ratio	(2) The maximum floor space ratio for a building on any land is not to exceed the floor space ratio shown for the land on the Floor Space Ratio Map . 0.3:1	The proposal seeks to apply the base FSR permitted under Chapter 5 of the Housing SEPP.	N/A

App 18 Arboricultural Report

At least 37 beautiful mature trees will be cut down for this development

- Up to the proposal being provided, there has been an exhaustive and expensive process for homeowners to remove or significantly trim a single nuisance tree.

This proposal simply cuts away all these established trees with token new plantings offered...

- There is no priority and of preserving the mature vegetation in a suburb proudly referred to as leafy.

Photo below goes back over 110 years. The Middle Harbour Road traditional reputation as a classic leafy suburb with the **beautiful heritage architecture** has been retained though all this time.

- This value of this should not be lost to mass apartment construction in such a unique suburb.



Figure 12. Photograph from 1908 entitled Middle Harbour Rd, Lindfield (Source: Ku-ring-gai Library Council Library, Record Number: 299967, accessed 23 April 2025).

App 25 Construction Noise and Vibration Management plan

This Appendix is **43 Pages** of expectations and risk mitigations that will be implemented.

This **glowing...** 43 page report, **does not** readily acknowledge civil industry acceptances that:

- *The use of excavation equipment will generate vibration and could possibly cause damage to nearby structures and inground services and effect the comfort of building inhabitants:*
- *Excavations and excavation retention systems, especially along boundaries where excessive deformation or failure can cause damage to nearby buildings*

App 26 Traffic Impact Assessment Ref SSD-82548708

Section 3.10 Summary Extract

Traffic modelling states:

- The intersections will experience **no** material change in performance or average delays for drivers when compared to current conditions.
- traffic impacts of the proposal are considered **acceptable** with no further analysis or mitigation measures required

We have seen 2 x Reports by JMT consulting re Traffic Impact on Middle Harbour Road (there may be more)

- 24-28 Middle Harbour Road
JMT: Additional 196 Car space Apartment block will have minimal effect ..???
- 11-19 Middle Harbour Road
JMT: Additional 259 Car space Apartment block will have minimal effect ..???

The JMT Traffic impact Report for this development proposal addresses:

- the impact on traffic flow of **this proposal only (in isolation)**.
JMT 35-page report does not address that **this is the second JMT** report for Middle Harbour Road proposals to date (that we know of)
Total of their two Reports amount to 455 car spaces:
 - **JMT assessment being minimal impact..**

Non Published Reports

35 Attachments have been provided on the NSW Government Department of Planning website

We were unable to identify a few documents that we were expected on website (listed below).

Such documents may exist and if so, we ask you confirm and allow us 72 hours to provide response

[Ku-ring-gai Development Control / Statutory Compliance TABLE](#)

This document typically addresses compliance re:

- The Building Setback requirement of 10 M
- KDCP maximum site coverage requirement of 30%,
- deep soil landscaping area of 50%
- top storey set back a minimum of 2.4m from the outer face of the floors below on all sides
- maximum floor space ratio..

[Variation Requests](#)

- if applicable

[Increased Traffic Noise](#)

- This document address increase in road traffic noise measured in dB (given additional 455 car spaces in the 2 recent development proposals)

[Heritage Zone](#)

Several Heritage Listed homes close to the above proposed development are

- within the designated NSW Gov Development Zone

Although the Site for this proposal **is not** heritage Listed

- **The proposal pushes ALL boundaries**

Overall Objection Points

Overall points that reflect overall community sentiment are included in Overall Objection Section below.

[Overdevelopment and Density](#)

The proposal will clearly increase population density in a suburb.

There will be inevitable infrastructure strain, including:

- traffic congestion, parking shortages, and pressure on schools, parks, and public transport.

[Loss of Suburban Character](#)

The Proposal will erode the established identity of our community.

[Privacy and Overshadowing](#)

The proposal will directly overlook adjoining properties, compromising the privacy of nearby residents.

The height of the development will cause overshadowing and reduced natural light of surrounding homes.

[Environmental Concerns](#)

Removing well established rare trees and vegetation is particularly concerning

Traffic and Safety

An influx of residents and vehicles could pose a safety risk, particularly in this with Middle Harbour Road being narrow and accommodating an established bus route.

- Impact on access to and from Pacific has clearly not been addressed in the Developer Commissioned Reports.
 - o Lindfield residents have raised concerns about access for years, particularly the Balfour Street Railway underpass to Pacific Highway.

SUMMATION

I strongly urge the council to reject this proposal or request a significant redesign that better respects the existing character, scale, and infrastructure of the area.

The proposal is clearly not in harmony with the surrounding neighbourhood

Points identified above:

- are not just views of our family, they are the views of ALL Lindfield residents we have spoken with.
- contribute to demonstrating how ridiculous the proposal is.

Common sense on NSW Planning should deem the proposal totally unacceptable

Again, We will vigorously further oppose this development getting any further consideration through all avenues.