

19 June 2019

Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

SSD-8707 Submission Stage One Ivanhoe Estate, Macquarie Park state significant development application

To whom it may concern

I object to this Stage One of the Ivanhoe Estate for a number of reasons as recorded below.

I note there is a comment in the *Environmental Impact Statement* (page 64) that there was a meeting attended by 32 people and no attendees lodged objections. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments but had I been there I would have lodged my objections.

I would also like to comment that this current exhibition was poorly advertised and it is only by chance I heard about it. I am sure that if more of the community were aware, they would make comments and lodge objections.

I am not opposed to providing social housing at this site, however, this needs to be appropriately designed and I am concerned the model proposed, which represents overdevelopment of the site, will lead to social problems and numerous police call outs in the future. I challenge the justification of the proposal that more housing supply is not needed in Sydney. There is currently a glut of apartments in Sydney so I do not understand why the State Government needs to spend money on building this new housing stock which represents overdevelopment of the site. The total of 3,500 new dwellings proposed for the site is excessive and most unnecessary. Why doesn't the NSW Government purchase the empty apartments which developers cannot sell. There are currently many apartments up the road from the Ivanhoe Estate at Epping which are available for sale at a greatly reduced price. Many other parts of Sydney also have numerous properties available for purchase, many of which have a 20% decrease in their value. Why not utilise them or the numerous sites which lie stagnant because the developers cannot get sufficient presales to begin their building? Surely this would be a better use of our taxes.

This State Significant Development seems to me to be **killing the goose which laid the golden egg**. Please look at why Macquarie Park has been such a successful business area for Sydney. It is because it has attractive offices with leafy areas and landscaping. This provides a good climate and a nice place for people to work. I have been proud to drive through Macquarie Park. Removing the trees, creating a heat bank and building a ghetto next to one of Australia's most lucrative business parks seems ludicrous. So, if for no other reason than economics please take this estate back to the drawing board.

More specifically my concerns and objections about Stage I (roads, tree removal and buildings A1 and C1) include:

Object to tree removal and do not agree that the mitigation and Biodiversity Offset Strategy are appropriate

Approval has already been obtained for the removal of 547 trees and now we see a further 309 trees are to be removed. Are we going to see every tree on the site removed by the time successive stages have been exhibited? Many people drive along Epping Road each day and admire these trees so their removal will affect 1000s of Sydney siders.

Looking at the figures provided in the *Environmental Impact Statement* it appears that trees will be removed to create the slip road from Epping Road which have not been included in the number of 309 trees. The correct number of trees should be recorded to make this exhibition an accurate representation. Just because the trees are on a main road does not mean they should not be recorded.

Breaks biodiversity laws: The site has 1.64 hectares of Turpentine-Ironbark open forest which is a threatened ecological community under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 1995 and other Acts. Shrimptions Creek provides a wildlife ecological corridor which the bridge connecting Lyonpark Road will destroy. As such I object to this bridge being built. The area supports Powerful Owls. The mitigation and offsets proposed are not acceptable to the local community. The trees need to remain on this location, this ecological site and landscape. This is a rare urban bushland and it needs to be protected. A few ornamental trees around the site between the concrete blocks, to replace these trees, is also not adequate.

Not maintaining character: The removal of these trees does nothing to maintain the character of the area, which is a basic urban planning requirement. The Greater Sydney Commission North District Plan stipulates to maintain the character. In addition, please do not ignore the local environment plans and development control plan which requires respect for the character of the area. As a frequent user of Epping Road, I have always enjoyed and admired seeing the trees on this site. To remove them is destroying the character of this site and area.

CLIMATE CHANGE is a scientific reality which the NSW Government should not ignore and it is an established fact that tree removal allows heat banks to develop. The removal of this large number of trees and replacing them with roads and buildings will make Macquarie Park hotter. This in turn will make it a less desirable suburb in which to live and work. We might just as well all move to Liverpool where the temperatures are already hotter and the land still marginally cheaper.

These trees should not be removed. Please redesign the roads and building locations to keep more trees.

Strongly object to slip road from Epping Road – not in original concept plan

I object to the exit road from Epping Road for reasons including: tree removal, traffic hazard, creating rat runs and most importantly because it is not needed. The current access point should be adequate especially if you decrease the size of the estate to what the land can actually accommodate. Looking at the road plan this road seems completely out of place and cannot be justified for the amount of tree removal and chaos it will create.

The road was not in the original concept plan so why has it been added? It needs to be removed.

This road breaks up a wild life corridor. In relation to this the negatives far outweigh the positives for the road (if there are any positives).

What is the benefit of putting an exit road from a major road which is already congested? It could allow for a great rat run. I can see the benefit of me driving through this estate in the morning peak hour traffic to access Lane Cover Road (also using your new bridge) so others will possibly get the same idea. Epping road traffic runs at 70kph so you will see fast moving traffic running along this road through this new neighbourhood and putting children and the elderly residents at risk. I can see those who enjoy irresponsible fast driving having a field day here especially those under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

This road seems to be in a flood zone, which doesn't seem like a good idea either.

Objections to A1 and B1

I object to the height, inadequate setbacks, design and overshadowing of these buildings.

Height not suitable: I think it has been well established that placing social housing in high rise buildings does not work. So why are you doing it here? Where is the fire evacuation assembly points and how will you ensure the safety of the elderly living in the independent living units and other vulnerable groups with special access needs living in the high-rise? Therefore, while the heights are permissible under the Ryde LEP are they morally permissible? I do not think they are.

Setbacks on Main Street is inadequate to allow the landscaping proposed: The *Environmental Impact Statement* states Main Street will have landscaping. How can you do adequate landscaping when A1 provides a setback of 3.8m or an average of 2m with Main Street. Likewise, C1 is to have a setback of 0-3.85m on Main Street which is inadequate to allow for the landscaping proposed. There needs to be a much bigger setback for these buildings to make Main Street more majestic and appealing to give people pride in their neighbourhood. The entrance to the estate needs to be a feature not a 3.8meter setback to a tall apartment tower.

My observation of social housing is that a lot of rubbish/disused housing items are left on pavements for clean up as there can be a high turn over of clients. Not providing adequate space on Main Street for the placing of these items will lead to the rubbish spilling over onto the road and this in turn could be a traffic hazard. This will also not be a good look to the gateway to your new community.

Waste management

More work needs to be done on waste management for the site. The waste management plan was last revised February 2018. This does not seem to take into account the roads proposed in this DA. This may not work so well if done in stages and just for individual buildings.

Object to A1 and C1 overshadowing of village green and other housing

The A1 building represents the gateway to the estate and is the most north/east aspect. It would be better to have a less tall building at this location which will not overshadow the whole estate, including the village green and which will create a ghetto at the entrance. The C1 building is also too tall as it will cause overshadowing of large parcels of the site from the lovely morning eastern sun and some northern sun. While you will include open spaces and play areas these will not be desirable places to use as they will lack light and sunlight.

The overshadowing by A1 for the building on 137- 143 Herring Road is not acceptable.

Need for more public open communal space for A1

Given the size of A1 it should provide ground level open communal space. A terrace for the childcare centre is not likely to be available for use by all the residents and thereby does not address the requirement for this building to provide public communal space. This means residents will have to encroach on other areas in the estate to access open communal space. Lack of providing open space for this large building, A1, does nothing to enhance the social cohesion for the significant sized population living in it. What guarantee do submitters have that adequate public open space will actually be included in subsequent stages given it is so limited in this stage? As stated above, Main Street will have insufficient setbacks to provide a landscaped and pedestrianised ground plan of any consequence.

The RE1 Public open space on the site needs to be protected and kept available for public use.

Building in a flood zone or close to it seems a strange thing for the State Government to do

It appears that the slip road from Epping Road is in a flood zone and the road structure you propose could potentially place properties very close to a flood zone. This seems to me to be making opportunities for future residents to have a class action with the State Government when the road blocks off or their homes are affected by floods. I hope no one drowns.

The proposed future building footprint is too close to Shrimptons Creek so the roads planned as part of Stage one need to be adjusted now to allow more space between buildings and the creek.

The close proximity of the roads/buildings to Shrimptons Creek does nothing to support the wildlife and biodiversity of the area.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I object to Stage one because of the destruction of local bushland, removal of Powerful Owl habitat and wildlife corridors, destruction of trees which form part of a threatened ecological community, poor urban design with overshadowing of public open spaces, lack of open spaces and overdevelopment of the site which will lead to numerous social problems. This represents further destruction of the character of this part of Sydney and will have a negative impact on the Macquarie Park businesses. It does not offer a place in which residents will be proud and happy to live. Like many other developments of Ryde, which are designed to cram people in like rats in a cage, this represents another reason for residents to want to move from Sydney.

Thanking you for your consideration of my objections.

Yours sincerely