

Nenad Miletich

NORMANHURST 2076

8th March 8, 2021

APPLICATION NO: SSD-8996

LOCATION NOS. 4, 6, 14, 16, 30-62, 24-28 MOUNT PLEASANT AVENUE, 89 AND 91-93 PENNANT HILLS ROAD, NORMANHURST

APPLICANT: LORETO NORMANHURST LIMITED

COUNCIL AREA: HORNSBY SHIRE

CONSENT AUTHORITY: MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND PUBLIC SPACES OR INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

I object to the currently proposed development for the reasons outlined below:

1. The addition of a carpark on Mt Pleasant Ave, will create light pollution, interrupt sleep due carpark fluorescent lights shining in the resident's windows all night. This is unacceptable to documented health impacts of fluorescent lighting.
2. The increasing of the car park by 433 spaces, is obviously allowing for increased inexperienced drivers accessing the school via the surrounding streets where primary school aged students are walking to Normanhurst Primary School (not to mention Loretto students themselves).
3. This will funnel traffic through Mount Pleasant Ave, which doesn't have traffic lights at the intersection of Pennant Hills Road. Increased traffic loads are already expected due to the applicant's building of a long daycare facility for 80 children in Mount Pleasant Avenue.
4. The traffic impact on intersection of Mount Pleasant Avenue and Pennant Hills Road will be significant. The performance of the intersection of Mount Pleasant Avenue and Pennant Hills Road is rated 'F', the worst possible rating, and it will only get worse with increased traffic loads.
5. The Southern parts of Mount Pleasant Avenue are assessed as high risk Bushfire zones as there is only 1 road in or out. The bushfire assessment which was submitted for this development doesn't take into account the impact the development will have on the bushfire response capability for the surrounding area. Parts of Mount Pleasant avenue are narrow and can only accommodate 1 car at a time in either direction. In the event of a bushfire (or other emergency requiring evacuation) the ability of emergency vehicles to access the Southern parts of Mount Pleasant Avenue (where the nursing home is situated) will be severely limited. This would hamper or prevent the evacuation of residents and rescue vehicles such as fire brigade, ambulance service and police. Panicked family members and friends of Mount Pleasant Avenue residents and parents of Loreto Students, and family of the elderly residents from the Aged Care Center coming to help their loved ones would only exacerbate the situation making the road impassable for emergency services.

6. Loreto already cause a flood of traffic which blocks driveways and access for existing residents. Saturdays are particularly bad, because of weekend sport and the subsequent traffic generated due to parents and spectators attending the matches.
7. Loretto had already trialed allowing traffic to enter via Osborn Avenue, to drive across the Loretto oval, and to exit via Mount Pleasant Avenue. This trial caused traffic chaos (photographic evidence can be submitted on request). Cars trying to exit Mount Pleasant Avenue were backed up more than 20 cars long, and residents were prevented from entering or exiting their driveways, and cars trying to enter Mount Pleasant Avenue were blocked due to the narrowness of the street. For this reason alone, a link road should be dismissed.
8. During the discussions around the ELC Development, the residents suggested that access to the ELC be via the Loretto grounds, thereby removing traffic impacts to Osborn Road and Mount Pleasant Avenue. This suggestion was dismissed by Loretto due to “the unacceptable risk to the students that would be created due to the additional traffic generated by parents driving through the school grounds”. Despite that objection (and acceptance by the Planning Commission), Loretto is now proposing a Link Road which will generate far more through traffic than what the ELC would have done. In addition, it would be not only parents but school students with limited driving experience. I submit that the risk to Loretto students (not to mention other children walking to school) is unacceptably high. If it was previously a reason to dismiss access to the ELC via the school grounds, then it is now a compelling reason to dismiss the current proposal of a link road through the school grounds that is contained within the current proposal.

Your Faithfully

Nenad Miletich