



From: 
To: Simon Truong <simon.truong@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 21/12/2010 8:23 pm
Subject: Online Submission from  ect)
Attachments: MP08_0244 objection letter 21 Dec 2010.7.pdf

Please refer attached. I do not wish to have my personal details disclosed publicly or to the proponent.

Please respond care of



Name 

Address: 

IP Address: 

Submission for Job: #2770 Site 4 - Commercial Retail Residential redevelopment
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=2770

Site: #1746 Site 4 - Lindfield Avenue SEPP 53 commercial residential development
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1746

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

Attn: Michael Woodland, Director

NSW Department of Planning

Via website submission (NSW Department of Planning)

Cc: Ku-ring-gai Council: Jennifer Anderson, Deputy Mayor janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Cr Rakesh Duncombe duncombe@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Bill Royal broyal@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Craig Wise cwise@kmc.nsw.gov.au

21 December 2010

Dear Mr Woodland,

Re: Major Project MP08_0244 Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of a Mixed Use Commercial, Retail and Residential Development at 23-37 Lindfield Avenue and 11 Havilah Avenue, Lindfield

I am writing to express **key objections regarding the above EA.**

Whilst overall it is acknowledged and welcomed that an upgrade to the commercial and retail facilities is of benefit to the broader community, **our key objections include:**

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and **leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.**
2. No consideration is given by the developers to **upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development** are required.
3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code and validity of various consultant reports provided.**
4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and **<5% three bedroom apartments is not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).

The residents I write on behalf of are representative of the prior successful developments within this immediate area.

We understand the benefits of well planned medium density residential developments, surrounding rail corridors, such as Lindfield station.

We significantly cherish the character of our environment; most of us have lived in this area for a significant portion of our lives.

Each of the key objections is elaborated further below, and should be considered together, as well as separately.

Key Objection 1.

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.

- The building on Lindfield Avenue at 7 storeys will be **out of character of the eastern side of the north shore**. There is currently no other development of this scale in a similar location apart from Chatswood. Chatswood is a mini CBD and is a significantly different suburb to Lindfield which is predominantly residential.
- The height of this development is shown by the Architectural Elevation plans to be **higher than the proposed town centre which this development will be adjacent to**. This provides further support that the height will be out of character to the environment
- The Lindfield Avenue building at 7 storeys will cast **significant shadow on the railway station (which is an open station)**, affecting a larger number of commuters as per the March, June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The Havilah Lane building at 6 storeys will cast shadows upon the opposite development on the residents at 8 Havilah Lane per the December Shadow Diagram. Whilst this is not articulated in this Diagram, if the shadows were considered at 4-5pm instead of 3pm, we expect this would represent several hours of loss of sunlight during the daylight saving period.
- The development will cast significant shadows on future open space in the proposed town centre, causing loss of amenity to the broader community, as per the June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The significant height and lack of setbacks at Lindfield Avenue causes the streetscape to be scarred next to the **adjacent heritage shopfronts** at Lindfield Avenue.
- Referring to surrounding new developments at Tryon Road, Kochia Lane, Havilah Lane and along Milray Street) this development will be 1-2 storeys higher and be **out of character of the immediate and all surrounding developments, and broader environment**.
- This development does not encompass 2 Kochia Lane (strata titled), nor the remaining two shopfronts on Lindfield Avenue. Therefore, at least 3-4 storeys will be visible to shoppers and residents surrounding the area as a large wall, leading to a very large but unsightly facade. There are no plans known or guarantees with regards to when 2 Kochia Lane, or

the two remaining Lindfield Avenue shop fronts may be similarly developed, this eyesore could be mitigated with less height.

- Importantly, 2 Kochia Lane is potentially undevelopable due to an inability to provide enough carparking for future 5-6 storey development. 2 Kochia Lane on a standalone basis, will be unattractive or undevelopable if further narrowed to allow for road widening, and incorporating appropriate lift wells and escape stairs.
- The future widening of Kochia Lane which will be required if this major project goes ahead will also be hindered due the existing position of 2 Kochia Lane, if left undeveloped.

Recommendations

a) Require the acquisition and consolidation of 2 Kochia Lane within this current major project assessment.

b) Maintain development to a maximum of 5 storeys, in line with the broader Lindfield environment.

When a) and b) are considered above, this may present feasible options to the developer.

Key Objection 2.

2. No consideration or contribution is intended to be given by the developers to upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development are required.

Key concerns:

- A. The Traffic Assessment report is flawed as it does not take into consideration the significant number of developments (several hundred apartments) already underway at Milray Street or proposed, that will be increase significantly the traffic at all intersections and roads assessed. These apartments will be occupied prior to the completion of this development.
- B. There is no proposed upgrade to the intersection of Havilah Road, Lindfield Avenue and through the Balfour Street underpass to Pacific Highway.
 - The traffic assessment presents very simplistically this intersection. A more realistic diagram would indicate that this intersection is actually two different intersections

which are adjacent, but not as one intersection. This alone, already causes significant delays at peak times.

- A significant increase in vehicles from this development will be forced to use these intersections as the proposed carpark is on Havilah Lane which is a one way street. To head north or south, all traffic (including trucks for the supermarket) from the development will mostly turn left at Havilah Lane onto Havilah Road and then wait at Lindfield Avenue. As Lindfield Avenue is a significant back road for vehicles wishing to avoid congestion on Pacific Highway, we have seen vehicles turn away at Havilah Road when trying to get to Lindfield Avenue (to head north or south) and have to take a significantly longer detour. All vehicles must turn left at Havilah Road onto Lindfield Avenue and then stop at the stop sign at the intersection of Lindfield Avenue and Balfour Street. As that turn is tight, these vehicles at the Lindfield Avenue stop sign are unable to position themselves in a straight line, and therefore often blocks traffic trying to head straight along Lindfield Avenue. The number of vehicles trying to turn into Balfour Street to access Pacific Highway north or South can be significant, the increase in vehicles doing this as a result of this development will lead to further chaos at this intersection.

C. Kochia Lane footpaths adjacent to retail area on Lindfield Avenue need to be widened on both sides. As noted above, the existing 2 Kochia Lane development may cause the road widening to be hampered.

- This is a busy thoroughfare for shoppers (including a high proportion of elderly residents, refer demographic details below) and rail commuters during peak hours.
- Whilst the development proposes a setback at the Kochia Lane and Lindfield Avenue corner for future road widening, we query why this is not being considered now as the development will bring significant traffic to Kochia Lane.
- Currently Kochia Lane has a stop sign which is to allow cars parked within the current development exiting out at Kochia Lane to safely exit. As the new plans do not encompass any traffic exiting onto Kochia Lane, consideration of the removal of the stop sign and possible insertion of other traffic slowing measures should be considered.

Recommendation: Revised Traffic Assessment report to consider traffic after all developments planned for Milray Street (that will be completed prior to this development) to be considered. The above issues should be specifically addressed.

Key Objection 3.

3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code, and validity of various consultant reports provided.**

There are a significant number of non-compliances with the Residential Flat Design Code as presented by Project Tourism International Architecture Pty Ltd in their SEPP 65 Summary Compliance Statement

- i. **Maximum apartment depth is exceeded** in some instances by 20% compared to the maximum of 18 metres. This hinders both sunlight and ventilation.
- ii. At approximately 15% private communal space, this represents **significant non-compliance (40% to 50%) with the communal space requirement** of 25% – 30% of the site area.
- iii. **35% of apartments have a single aspect apartment depth** of between 8m and 9m, in **excess of the maximum of 8m from a window.**
- iv. **50% of adequate storage space is not provided internally within apartments.**
- v. **The application of only 2 hour sunlight access, instead of 3 hours,** due to consideration that this is a town centre is another sign of the developer reducing amenity in this development. The town centre is not yet developed and the definition of 'urban' environment is more appropriate for suburbs such as Chatswood.
- vi. **Only 16% of kitchens have direct access to natural ventilation.**

All of the above points of non-compliance highlight that the scale and mix of these apartments is greater than that intended by the building design code.

Parking

The JBA Planning Project Application in section 6.4 acknowledges insufficient parking for the development.

Parking requirements are a minimum of 97.8 retail spaces. Including the 48 retail spaces under development, and 25 car spaces in the adjacent Council carpark, this totals 73 retail spaces which is **a shortfall of 24.8 retail parking spaces.** The adjacent 25 carpark that is cited in the report is currently in the process of being reclassified and so there are no assurances that this parking will be available in the medium to longer term, leading to a **potential shortfall of 49.8 retail spaces.** This

shortfall will lead to a long term burden to the greater community and is of significant concern. Further, allowing for visitor parking, we estimate approximately 17 – 22 apartments will have no car space (depending on whether 3 bedroom apartments have 1 or 2 car spaces). Despite the proximity to the train station, the shortage of retail spaces cited above combined with a very minimal provision of residential car spaces does not provide much confidence with regards to the amenities of this new development.

Ventilation report

The Natural Ventilation Statement by Windtech does not appear to be valid. For instance, Table 2 shows ventilation results by unit.

A.2.01 is classed as excellent, A.3.01 is classed as below average, A 4.01 is classed as good. These are identical apartments, in the same location on consecutive floors, which should only improve, not fluctuate in natural ventilation standards as the units are located higher up.

The ventilation report is only 66.7% considered effective, but the results are cast into doubt due to the oddities in the results noted above.

Further, the ventilation report does not assume that there will be any future development in the adjoining shopfronts in the future along Lindfield Avenue. If this was considered, a further 8 apartments would be adversely affected and possible overall fail to meet the required minimum.

Proposed Loading Dock

The new proposal appears inefficient in its positioning and entry/exit. This will cause greater delays in traffic and noise as a result to surrounding residents during operation. The loading dock appears too small for trucks/forklifts etc required for supermarkets and other retail (estimate at 24m x 5m). We also note that currently Havilah Lane already provides inadequate provisions for garbage along the street for the current retail.

Recommendation – rectify non-compliance by reducing the number of apartments, reducing the depth and bulky appearance of the apartments.

Increase car spaces available and increase size of loading dock. Ensure appropriate garbage amenities.

Check validity of ventilation report.

Refer also to Key Objection 1 and 3 to reduce the number of storeys and apartments.

Key Objection 4.

4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and <5% three bedroom apartments is **not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).
- The success of prior developments has been based upon larger, high quality apartments in this immediate vicinity. This is supported by the **demographic in Ku-ring-gai which has, relative to the Sydney Statistical Division:**
 - the **highest median age at 41.0 years and the 2nd highest ageing demographic** (16.2% were aged 65+) [ABS data (2005)]; and
 - the **fifth highest average wage and salary income** [ABS data (2007-08)].

Recommendation – substantially reduce the number of one bedroom apartments. With three bedroom apartments forming < 5% of the product mix, there is significant scope for this change. Larger apartments will reduce the number of apartments, and reduce the overall environmental footprint.

Should you wish to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. We urge you to strongly consider the above key objections. We otherwise look forward to a development that contributes to the communities of Lindfield and surrounding Bradfield areas.

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

19

From:
To: Simon Truong <simon.truong@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 21/12/2010 8:25 pm
Subject: Online Submission from [REDACTED]
Attachments: MP08_0244 objection letter 21 Dec 2010.8.pdf

Please refer attached. I do not wish to have my personal details disclosed publicly or to the proponent.

Please respond care of

[REDACTED]

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission for Job: #2770 Site 4 - Commercial Retail Residential redevelopment
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=2770

Site: #1746 Site 4 - Lindfield Avenue SEPP 53 commercial residential development
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1746

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

Attn: Michael Woodland, Director

NSW Department of Planning

Via website submission (NSW Department of Planning)

Cc: Ku-ring-gai Council: Jennifer Anderson, Deputy Mayor janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Cr Rakesh Duncombe duncombe@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Bill Royal broyal@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Craig Wise cwise@kmc.nsw.gov.au

21 December 2010

Dear Mr Woodland,

Re: Major Project MP08_0244 Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of a Mixed Use Commercial, Retail and Residential Development at 23-37 Lindfield Avenue and 11 Havilah Avenue, Lindfield

I am writing to express **key objections regarding the above EA.**

Whilst overall it is acknowledged and welcomed that an upgrade to the commercial and retail facilities is of benefit to the broader community, **our key objections include:**

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and **leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.**
2. No consideration is given by the developers to **upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development** are required.
3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code and validity of various consultant reports provided.**
4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and **<5% three bedroom apartments is not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).

The residents I write on behalf of are representative of the prior successful developments within this immediate area.

We understand the benefits of well planned medium density residential developments, surrounding rail corridors, such as Lindfield station.

We significantly cherish the character of our environment; most of us have lived in this area for a significant portion of our lives.

Each of the key objections is elaborated further below, and should be considered together, as well as separately.

Key Objection 1.

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and **leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.**

- The building on Lindfield Avenue at 7 storeys will be **out of character of the eastern side of the north shore**. There is currently no other development of this scale in a similar location apart from Chatswood. Chatswood is a mini CBD and is a significantly different suburb to Lindfield which is predominantly residential.
- The height of this development is shown by the Architectural Elevation plans to be **higher than the proposed town centre which this development will be adjacent to**. This provides further support that the height will be out of character to the environment
- The Lindfield Avenue building at 7 storeys will cast **significant shadow on the railway station (which is an open station)**, affecting a larger number of commuters as per the March, June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The **Havilah Lane building at 6 storeys will cast shadows upon the opposite development** on the residents at 8 Havilah Lane per the December Shadow Diagram. Whilst this is not articulated in this Diagram, if the shadows were considered at 4-5pm instead of 3pm, we expect this would represent several hours of loss of sunlight during the daylight saving period.
- **The development will cast significant shadows on future open space in the proposed town centre, causing loss of amenity to the broader community**, as per the June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The significant height and lack of setbacks at Lindfield Avenue causes the streetscape to be scarred next to the **adjacent heritage shopfronts** at Lindfield Avenue.
- Referring to surrounding new developments at Tryon Road, Kochia Lane, Havilah Lane and along Milray Street) this development will be 1-2 storeys higher and be **out of character of the immediate and all surrounding developments, and broader environment**.
- This development does not encompass 2 Kochia Lane (strata titled), nor the remaining two shopfronts on Lindfield Avenue. Therefore, at least 3-4 storeys will be visible to shoppers and residents surrounding the area as a large wall, leading to a very large but unsightly facade. There are no plans known or guarantees with regards to when 2 Kochia Lane, or

the two remaining Lindfield Avenue shop fronts may be similarly developed, this eyesore could be mitigated with less height.

- Importantly, 2 Kochia Lane is potentially undevelopable due to an inability to provide enough carparking for future 5-6 storey development. 2 Kochia Lane on a standalone basis, will be unattractive or undevelopable if further narrowed to allow for road widening, and incorporating appropriate lift wells and escape stairs.
- The future widening of Kochia Lane which will be required if this major project goes ahead will also be hindered due the existing position of 2 Kochia Lane, if left undeveloped.

Recommendations

a) Require the acquisition and consolidation of 2 Kochia Lane within this current major project assessment.

b) Maintain development to a maximum of 5 storeys, in line with the broader Lindfield environment.

When a) and b) are considered above, this may present feasible options to the developer.

Key Objection 2.

2. No consideration or contribution is intended to be given by the developers to upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development are required.

Key concerns:

- A. The Traffic Assessment report is flawed as it does not take into consideration the significant number of developments (several hundred apartments) already underway at Milray Street or proposed, that will be increase significantly the traffic at all intersections and roads assessed. These apartments will be occupied prior to the completion of this development.
- B. There is no proposed upgrade to the intersection of Havilah Road, Lindfield Avenue and through the Balfour Street underpass to Pacific Highway.
 - The traffic assessment presents very simplistically this intersection. A more realistic diagram would indicate that this intersection is actually two different intersections

which are adjacent, but not as one intersection. This alone, already causes significant delays at peak times.

- A significant increase in vehicles from this development will be forced to use these intersections as the proposed carpark is on Havilah Lane which is a one way street. To head north or south, all traffic (including trucks for the supermarket) from the development will mostly turn left at Havilah Lane onto Havilah Road and then wait at Lindfield Avenue. As Lindfield Avenue is a significant back road for vehicles wishing to avoid congestion on Pacific Highway, we have seen vehicles turn away at Havilah Road when trying to get to Lindfield Avenue (to head north or south) and have to take a significantly longer detour. All vehicles must turn left at Havilah Road onto Lindfield Avenue and then stop at the stop sign at the intersection of Lindfield Avenue and Balfour Street. As that turn is tight, these vehicles at the Lindfield Avenue stop sign are unable to position themselves in a straight line, and therefore often blocks traffic trying to head straight along Lindfield Avenue. The number of vehicles trying to turn into Balfour Street to access Pacific Highway north or South can be significant, the increase in vehicles doing this as a result of this development will lead to further chaos at this intersection.

C. Kochia Lane footpaths adjacent to retail area on Lindfield Avenue need to be widened on both sides. As noted above, the existing 2 Kochia Lane development may cause the road widening to be hampered.

- This is a busy thoroughfare for shoppers (including a high proportion of elderly residents, refer demographic details below) and rail commuters during peak hours.
- Whilst the development proposes a setback at the Kochia Lane and Lindfield Avenue corner for future road widening, we query why this is not being considered now as the development will bring significant traffic to Kochia Lane.
- Currently Kochia Lane has a stop sign which is to allow cars parked within the current development exiting out at Kochia Lane to safely exit. As the new plans do not encompass any traffic exiting onto Kochia Lane, consideration of the removal of the stop sign and possible insertion of other traffic slowing measures should be considered.

Recommendation: Revised Traffic Assessment report to consider traffic after all developments planned for Milray Street (that will be completed prior to this development) to be considered. The above issues should be specifically addressed.

Key Objection 3.

3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code, and validity of various consultant reports provided.**

There are a significant number of non-compliances with the Residential Flat Design Code as presented by Project Tourism International Architecture Pty Ltd in their SEPP 65 Summary Compliance Statement

- i. **Maximum apartment depth is exceeded** in some instances by 20% compared to the maximum of 18 metres. This hinders both sunlight and ventilation.
- ii. At approximately 15% private communal space, this represents **significant non-compliance (40% to 50%) with the communal space requirement** of 25% – 30% of the site area.
- iii. **35% of apartments have a single aspect apartment** depth of between 8m and 9m, in **excess of the maximum of 8m from a window.**
- iv. **50% of adequate storage space is not provided internally within apartments.**
- v. **The application of only 2 hour sunlight access, instead of 3 hours,** due to consideration that this is a town centre is another sign of the developer reducing amenity in this development. The town centre is not yet developed and the definition of 'urban' environment is more appropriate for suburbs such as Chatswood.
- vi. **Only 16% of kitchens have direct access to natural ventilation.**

All of the above points of non-compliance highlight that the scale and mix of these apartments is greater than that intended by the building design code.

Parking

The JBA Planning Project Application in section 6.4 acknowledges insufficient parking for the development.

Parking requirements are a minimum of 97.8 retail spaces. Including the 48 retail spaces under development, and 25 car spaces in the adjacent Council carpark, this totals 73 retail spaces which is **a shortfall of 24.8 retail parking spaces.** The adjacent 25 carpark that is cited in the report is currently in the process of being reclassified and so there are no assurances that this parking will be available in the medium to longer term, **leading to a potential shortfall of 49.8 retail spaces.** This

shortfall will lead to a long term burden to the greater community and is of significant concern. Further, allowing for visitor parking, we estimate approximately **17 – 22 apartments** will have no car space (depending on whether 3 bedroom apartments have 1 or 2 car spaces). Despite the proximity to the train station, the shortage of retail spaces cited above combined with a very minimal provision of residential car spaces does not provide much confidence with regards to the amenities of this new development.

Ventilation report

The Natural Ventilation Statement by Windtech does not appear to be valid. For instance, Table 2 shows ventilation results by unit.

A.2.01 is classed as excellent, A.3.01 is classed as below average, A 4.01 is classed as good. These are identical apartments, in the same location on consecutive floors, which should only improve, not fluctuate in natural ventilation standards as the units are located higher up.

The ventilation report is only 66.7% considered effective, but the results are cast into doubt due to the oddities in the results noted above.

Further, the ventilation report does not assume that there will be any future development in the adjoining shopfronts in the future along Lindfield Avenue. If this was considered, a further 8 apartments would be adversely affected and possible overall fail to meet the required minimum.

Proposed Loading Dock

The new proposal appears inefficient in its positioning and entry/exit. This will cause greater delays in traffic and noise as a result to surrounding residents during operation. The loading dock appears too small for trucks/forklifts etc required for supermarkets and other retail (estimate at 24m x 5m). We also note that currently Havilah Lane already provides inadequate provisions for garbage along the street for the current retail.

Recommendation – rectify non-compliance by reducing the number of apartments, reducing the depth and bulky appearance of the apartments.

Increase car spaces available and increase size of loading dock. Ensure appropriate garbage amenities.

Check validity of ventilation report.

Refer also to Key Objection 1 and 3 to reduce the number of storeys and apartments.

Key Objection 4.

4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and <5% three bedroom apartments is **not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).
- The success of prior developments has been based upon larger, high quality apartments in this immediate vicinity. This is supported by the **demographic in Ku-ring-gai which has, relative to the Sydney Statistical Division:**
 - the **highest median age at 41.0 years and the 2nd highest ageing demographic** (16.2% were aged 65+) [ABS data (2005)]; and
 - the **fifth highest average wage and salary income** [ABS data (2007-08)].

Recommendation – substantially reduce the number of one bedroom apartments. With three bedroom apartments forming < 5% of the product mix, there is significant scope for this change. Larger apartments will reduce the number of apartments, and reduce the overall environmental footprint.

Should you wish to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. We urge you to strongly consider the above key objections. We otherwise look forward to a development that contributes to the communities of Lindfield and surrounding Bradfield areas.

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

20

From:
To: Simon Truong <simon.truong@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 21/12/2010 8:28 pm
Subject: Online Submission from Arthur & Elfreda Marshall (object)
Attachments: MP08_0244 objection letter 21 Dec 2010.9.pdf

Please refer attached. I do not wish to have my personal details disclosed publicly or to the proponent.

Please respond care of

Name: _____

Address: _____

IP Address: - _____

Submission for Job: #2770 Site 4 - Commercial Retail Residential redevelopment
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=2770

Site: #1746 Site 4 - Lindfield Avenue SEPP 53 commercial residential development
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1746

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

Attn: Michael Woodland, Director

NSW Department of Planning

Via website submission (NSW Department of Planning)

Cc: Ku-ring-gai Council: Jennifer Anderson, Deputy Mayor janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Cr Rakesh Duncombe duncombe@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Bill Royal broyal@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Craig Wise cwise@kmc.nsw.gov.au

21 December 2010

Dear Mr Woodland,

Re: Major Project MP08_0244 Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of a Mixed Use Commercial, Retail and Residential Development at 23-37 Lindfield Avenue and 11 Havilah Avenue, Lindfield

I am writing to express **key objections regarding the above EA.**

Whilst overall it is acknowledged and welcomed that an upgrade to the commercial and retail facilities is of benefit to the broader community, **our key objections include:**

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and **leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.**
2. No consideration is given by the developers to **upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development** are required.
3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code and validity of various consultant reports provided.**
4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and **<5% three bedroom apartments is not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).

The residents I write on behalf of are representative of the prior successful developments within this immediate area.

We understand the benefits of well planned medium density residential developments, surrounding rail corridors, such as Lindfield station.

We significantly cherish the character of our environment; most of us have lived in this area for a significant portion of our lives.

Each of the key objections is elaborated further below, and should be considered together, as well as separately.

Key Objection 1.

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.

- The building on Lindfield Avenue at 7 storeys will be **out of character of the eastern side of the north shore**. There is currently no other development of this scale in a similar location apart from Chatswood. Chatswood is a mini CBD and is a significantly different suburb to Lindfield which is predominantly residential.
- The height of this development is shown by the Architectural Elevation plans to be **higher than the proposed town centre which this development will be adjacent to**. This provides further support that the height will be out of character to the environment
- The Lindfield Avenue building at 7 storeys will cast **significant shadow on the railway station (which is an open station)**, affecting a larger number of commuters as per the March, June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The **Havilah Lane building at 6 storeys will cast shadows upon the opposite development** on the residents at 8 Havilah Lane per the December Shadow Diagram. Whilst this is not articulated in this Diagram, if the shadows were considered at 4-5pm instead of 3pm, we expect this would represent several hours of loss of sunlight during the daylight saving period.
- **The development will cast significant shadows on future open space in the proposed town centre, causing loss of amenity to the broader community**, as per the June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The significant height and lack of setbacks at Lindfield Avenue causes the streetscape to be scarred next to the **adjacent heritage shopfronts** at Lindfield Avenue.
- Referring to surrounding new developments at Tryon Road, Kochia Lane, Havilah Lane and along Milray Street) this development will be 1-2 storeys higher and be **out of character of the immediate and all surrounding developments, and broader environment**.
- This development does not encompass 2 Kochia Lane (strata titled), nor the remaining two shopfronts on Lindfield Avenue. Therefore, at least 3-4 storeys will be visible to shoppers and residents surrounding the area as a large wall, leading to a very large but unsightly facade. There are no plans known or guarantees with regards to when 2 Kochia Lane, or

the two remaining Lindfield Avenue shop fronts may be similarly developed, this eyesore could be mitigated with less height.

- Importantly, 2 Kochia Lane is potentially undevelopable due to an inability to provide enough carparking for future 5-6 storey development. 2 Kochia Lane on a standalone basis, will be unattractive or undevelopable if further narrowed to allow for road widening, and incorporating appropriate lift wells and escape stairs.
- The future widening of Kochia Lane which will be required if this major project goes ahead will also be hindered due the existing position of 2 Kochia Lane, if left undeveloped.

Recommendations

a) Require the acquisition and consolidation of 2 Kochia Lane within this current major project assessment.

b) Maintain development to a maximum of 5 storeys, in line with the broader Lindfield environment.

When a) and b) are considered above, this may present feasible options to the developer.

Key Objection 2.

2. No consideration or contribution is intended to be given by the developers to upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development are required.

Key concerns:

- A. The Traffic Assessment report is flawed as it does not take into consideration the significant number of developments (several hundred apartments) already underway at Milray Street or proposed, that will be increase significantly the traffic at all intersections and roads assessed. These apartments will be occupied prior to the completion of this development.
- B. There is no proposed upgrade to the intersection of Havilah Road, Lindfield Avenue and through the Balfour Street underpass to Pacific Highway.
 - The traffic assessment presents very simplistically this intersection. A more realistic diagram would indicate that this intersection is actually two different intersections

which are adjacent, but not as one intersection. This alone, already causes significant delays at peak times.

- A significant increase in vehicles from this development will be forced to use these intersections as the proposed carpark is on Havilah Lane which is a one way street. To head north or south, all traffic (including trucks for the supermarket) from the development will mostly turn left at Havilah Lane onto Havilah Road and then wait at Lindfield Avenue. As Lindfield Avenue is a significant back road for vehicles wishing to avoid congestion on Pacific Highway, we have seen vehicles turn away at Havilah Road when trying to get to Lindfield Avenue (to head north or south) and have to take a significantly longer detour. All vehicles must turn left at Havilah Road onto Lindfield Avenue and then stop at the stop sign at the intersection of Lindfield Avenue and Balfour Street. As that turn is tight, these vehicles at the Lindfield Avenue stop sign are unable to position themselves in a straight line, and therefore often blocks traffic trying to head straight along Lindfield Avenue. The number of vehicles trying to turn into Balfour Street to access Pacific Highway north or South can be significant, the increase in vehicles doing this as a result of this development will lead to further chaos at this intersection.

C. Kochia Lane footpaths adjacent to retail area on Lindfield Avenue need to be widened on both sides. As noted above, the existing 2 Kochia Lane development may cause the road widening to be hampered.

- This is a busy thoroughfare for shoppers (including a high proportion of elderly residents, refer demographic details below) and rail commuters during peak hours.
- Whilst the development proposes a setback at the Kochia Lane and Lindfield Avenue corner for future road widening, we query why this is not being considered now as the development will bring significant traffic to Kochia Lane.
- Currently Kochia Lane has a stop sign which is to allow cars parked within the current development exiting out at Kochia Lane to safely exit. As the new plans do not encompass any traffic exiting onto Kochia Lane, consideration of the removal of the stop sign and possible insertion of other traffic slowing measures should be considered.

Recommendation: Revised Traffic Assessment report to consider traffic after all developments planned for Milray Street (that will be completed prior to this development) to be considered. The above issues should be specifically addressed.

Key Objection 3.

3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code, and validity of various consultant reports provided.**

There are a significant number of non-compliances with the Residential Flat Design Code as presented by Project Tourism International Architecture Pty Ltd in their SEPP 65 Summary Compliance Statement

- i. **Maximum apartment depth is exceeded** in some instances by 20% compared to the maximum of 18 metres. This hinders both sunlight and ventilation.
- ii. At approximately 15% private communal space, this represents **significant non-compliance (40% to 50%) with the communal space requirement** of 25% – 30% of the site area.
- iii. **35% of apartments have a single aspect apartment depth** of between 8m and 9m, in **excess of the maximum of 8m from a window.**
- iv. **50% of adequate storage space is not provided internally within apartments.**
- v. **The application of only 2 hour sunlight access, instead of 3 hours,** due to consideration that this is a town centre is another sign of the developer reducing amenity in this development. The town centre is not yet developed and the definition of 'urban' environment is more appropriate for suburbs such as Chatswood.
- vi. **Only 16% of kitchens have direct access to natural ventilation.**

All of the above points of non-compliance highlight that the scale and mix of these apartments is greater than that intended by the building design code.

Parking

The JBA Planning Project Application in section 6.4 acknowledges insufficient parking for the development.

Parking requirements are a minimum of 97.8 retail spaces. Including the 48 retail spaces under development, and 25 car spaces in the adjacent Council carpark, this totals 73 retail spaces which is a **shortfall of 24.8 retail parking spaces.** The adjacent 25 carpark that is cited in the report is currently in the process of being reclassified and so there are no assurances that this parking will be available in the medium to longer term, leading to a **potential shortfall of 49.8 retail spaces.** This

shortfall will lead to a long term burden to the greater community and is of significant concern. Further, allowing for visitor parking, we estimate approximately 17 – 22 apartments will have no car space (depending on whether 3 bedroom apartments have 1 or 2 car spaces). Despite the proximity to the train station, the shortage of retail spaces cited above combined with a very minimal provision of residential car spaces does not provide much confidence with regards to the amenities of this new development.

Ventilation report

The Natural Ventilation Statement by Windtech does not appear to be valid. For instance, Table 2 shows ventilation results by unit.

A.2.01 is classed as excellent, A.3.01 is classed as below average, A 4.01 is classed as good. These are identical apartments, in the same location on consecutive floors, which should only improve, not fluctuate in natural ventilation standards as the units are located higher up.

The ventilation report is only 66.7% considered effective, but the results are cast into doubt due to the oddities in the results noted above.

Further, the ventilation report does not assume that there will be any future development in the adjoining shopfronts in the future along Lindfield Avenue. If this was considered, a further 8 apartments would be adversely affected and possible overall fail to meet the required minimum.

Proposed Loading Dock

The new proposal appears inefficient in its positioning and entry/exit. This will cause greater delays in traffic and noise as a result to surrounding residents during operation. The loading dock appears too small for trucks/forklifts etc required for supermarkets and other retail (estimate at 24m x 5m). We also note that currently Havilah Lane already provides inadequate provisions for garbage along the street for the current retail.

<p>Recommendation – rectify non-compliance by reducing the number of apartments, reducing the depth and bulky appearance of the apartments.</p> <p>Increase car spaces available and increase size of loading dock. Ensure appropriate garbage amenities.</p>

Check validity of ventilation report.

Refer also to Key Objection 1 and 3 to reduce the number of storeys and apartments.

Key Objection 4.

4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and <5% three bedroom apartments is **not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).
- The success of prior developments has been based upon larger, high quality apartments in this immediate vicinity. This is supported by **the demographic in Ku-ring-gai which has, relative to the Sydney Statistical Division:**
 - the **highest median age at 41.0 years and the 2nd highest ageing demographic** (16.2% were aged 65+) [ABS data (2005)]; and
 - the **fifth highest average wage and salary income** [ABS data (2007-08)].

Recommendation – substantially reduce the number of one bedroom apartments. With three bedroom apartments forming < 5% of the product mix, there is significant scope for this change. Larger apartments will reduce the number of apartments, and reduce the overall environmental footprint.

Should you wish to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. We urge you to strongly consider the above key objections. We otherwise look forward to a development that contributes to the communities of Lindfield and surrounding Bradfield areas.

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

From:
To: Simon Truong <simon.truong@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 21/12/2010 8:45 pm
Subject: Online Submission from (object)
Attachments: MP08_0244 objection letter 21 Dec 2010.10.pdf

Please refer attached. I do not wish to have my personal details disclosed publicly or to the proponent.

Please respond care of

Name:

Address:

IP Address:

Submission for Job: #2770 Site 4 - Commercial Retail Residential redevelopment
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=2770

Site: #1746 Site 4 - Lindfield Avenue SEPP 53 commercial residential development
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1746

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

Attn: Michael Woodland, Director

NSW Department of Planning

Via website submission (NSW Department of Planning)

Cc: Ku-ring-gai Council: Jennifer Anderson, Deputy Mayor janderson@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Cr Rakesh Duncombe duncombe@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Bill Royal broyal@kmc.nsw.gov.au; Craig Wise cwise@kmc.nsw.gov.au

21 December 2010

Dear Mr Woodland,

Re: Major Project MP08_0244 Environmental Assessment (EA) for Construction of a Mixed Use Commercial, Retail and Residential Development at 23-37 Lindfield Avenue and 11 Havilah Avenue, Lindfield

I am writing to express **key objections regarding the above EA.**

Whilst overall it is acknowledged and welcomed that an upgrade to the commercial and retail facilities is of benefit to the broader community, **our key objections include:**

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and **leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.**
2. No consideration is given by the developers to **upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development** are required.
3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code and validity of various consultant reports provided.**
4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and **<5% three bedroom apartments is not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).

The residents I write on behalf of are representative of the prior successful developments within this immediate area.

We understand the benefits of well planned medium density residential developments, surrounding rail corridors, such as Lindfield station.

We significantly cherish the character of our environment; most of us have lived in this area for a significant portion of our lives.

Each of the key objections is elaborated further below, and should be considered together, as well as separately.

Key Objection 1.

1. The development is **excessive in height** (2 buildings of 7 and 6 storeys each) and leaves 2 Kochia Lane virtually unfeasible for residential development.

- The building on Lindfield Avenue at 7 storeys will be **out of character of the eastern side of the north shore**. There is currently no other development of this scale in a similar location apart from Chatswood. Chatswood is a mini CBD and is a significantly different suburb to Lindfield which is predominantly residential.
- The height of this development is shown by the Architectural Elevation plans to be **higher than the proposed town centre which this development will be adjacent to**. This provides further support that the height will be out of character to the environment
- The Lindfield Avenue building at 7 storeys will cast **significant shadow on the railway station (which is an open station)**, affecting a larger number of commuters as per the March, June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The Havilah Lane building at 6 storeys will cast shadows upon the opposite development on the residents at 8 Havilah Lane per the December Shadow Diagram. Whilst this is not articulated in this Diagram, if the shadows were considered at 4-5pm instead of 3pm, we expect this would represent several hours of loss of sunlight during the daylight saving period.
- The development will cast **significant shadows on future open space in the proposed town centre, causing loss of amenity to the broader community**, as per the June and September Shadow Diagrams.
- The significant height and lack of setbacks at Lindfield Avenue causes the streetscape to be scarred next to the **adjacent heritage shopfronts** at Lindfield Avenue.
- Referring to surrounding new developments at Tryon Road, Kochia Lane, Havilah Lane and along Milray Street) this development will be 1-2 storeys higher and be **out of character of the immediate and all surrounding developments, and broader environment**.
- This development does not encompass 2 Kochia Lane (strata titled), nor the remaining two shopfronts on Lindfield Avenue. Therefore, at least 3-4 storeys will be visible to shoppers and residents surrounding the area as a large wall, leading to a very large but unsightly facade. There are no plans known or guarantees with regards to when 2 Kochia Lane, or

the two remaining Lindfield Avenue shop fronts may be similarly developed, this eyesore could be mitigated with less height.

- Importantly, 2 Kochia Lane is potentially undevelopable due to an inability to provide enough carparking for future 5-6 storey development. 2 Kochia Lane on a standalone basis, will be unattractive or undevelopable if further narrowed to allow for road widening, and incorporating appropriate lift wells and escape stairs.
- The future widening of Kochia Lane which will be required if this major project goes ahead will also be hindered due the existing position of 2 Kochia Lane, if left undeveloped.

Recommendations

a) Require the acquisition and consolidation of 2 Kochia Lane within this current major project assessment.

b) Maintain development to a maximum of 5 storeys, in line with the broader Lindfield environment.

When a) and b) are considered above, this may present feasible options to the developer.

Key Objection 2.

2. No consideration or contribution is intended to be given by the developers to upgrades of one way roads and intersections surrounding this development are required.

Key concerns:

- A. The Traffic Assessment report is flawed as it does not take into consideration the significant number of developments (several hundred apartments) already underway at Milray Street or proposed, that will be increase significantly the traffic at all intersections and roads assessed. These apartments will be occupied prior to the completion of this development.
- B. There is no proposed upgrade to the intersection of Havilah Road, Lindfield Avenue and through the Balfour Street underpass to Pacific Highway.
 - The traffic assessment presents very simplistically this intersection. A more realistic diagram would indicate that this intersection is actually two different intersections

which are adjacent, but not as one intersection. This alone, already causes significant delays at peak times.

- A significant increase in vehicles from this development will be forced to use these intersections as the proposed carpark is on Havilah Lane which is a one way street. To head north or south, all traffic (including trucks for the supermarket) from the development will mostly turn left at Havilah Lane onto Havilah Road and then wait at Lindfield Avenue. As Lindfield Avenue is a significant back road for vehicles wishing to avoid congestion on Pacific Highway, we have seen vehicles turn away at Havilah Road when trying to get to Lindfield Avenue (to head north or south) and have to take a significantly longer detour. All vehicles must turn left at Havilah Road onto Lindfield Avenue and then stop at the stop sign at the intersection of Lindfield Avenue and Balfour Street. As that turn is tight, these vehicles at the Lindfield Avenue stop sign are unable to position themselves in a straight line, and therefore often blocks traffic trying to head straight along Lindfield Avenue. The number of vehicles trying to turn into Balfour Street to access Pacific Highway north or South can be significant, the increase in vehicles doing this as a result of this development will lead to further chaos at this intersection.

C. Kochia Lane footpaths adjacent to retail area on Lindfield Avenue need to be widened on both sides. As noted above, the existing 2 Kochia Lane development may cause the road widening to be hampered.

- This is a busy thoroughfare for shoppers (including a high proportion of elderly residents, refer demographic details below) and rail commuters during peak hours.
- Whilst the development proposes a setback at the Kochia Lane and Lindfield Avenue corner for future road widening, we query why this is not being considered now as the development will bring significant traffic to Kochia Lane.
- Currently Kochia Lane has a stop sign which is to allow cars parked within the current development exiting out at Kochia Lane to safely exit. As the new plans do not encompass any traffic exiting onto Kochia Lane, consideration of the removal of the stop sign and possible insertion of other traffic slowing measures should be considered.

Recommendation: Revised Traffic Assessment report to consider traffic after all developments planned for Milray Street (that will be completed prior to this development) to be considered. The above issues should be specifically addressed.

Key Objection 3.

3. We detail concerns regarding **inadequate parking provisions, non-conformance to the Residential Flat Design Code, and validity of various consultant reports provided.**

There are a significant number of non-compliances with the Residential Flat Design Code as presented by Project Tourism International Architecture Pty Ltd in their SEPP 65 Summary Compliance Statement

- i. **Maximum apartment depth is exceeded** in some instances by 20% compared to the maximum of 18 metres. This hinders both sunlight and ventilation.
- ii. At approximately 15% private communal space, this represents **significant non-compliance (40% to 50%) with the communal space requirement** of 25% – 30% of the site area.
- iii. **35% of apartments have a single aspect apartment depth** of between 8m and 9m, in **excess of the maximum of 8m from a window.**
- iv. **50% of adequate storage space is not provided internally within apartments.**
- v. **The application of only 2 hour sunlight access, instead of 3 hours,** due to consideration that this is a town centre is another sign of the developer reducing amenity in this development. The town centre is not yet developed and the definition of 'urban' environment is more appropriate for suburbs such as Chatswood.
- vi. **Only 16% of kitchens have direct access to natural ventilation.**

All of the above points of non-compliance highlight that the scale and mix of these apartments is greater than that intended by the building design code.

Parking

The JBA Planning Project Application in section 6.4 acknowledges insufficient parking for the development.

Parking requirements are a minimum of 97.8 retail spaces. Including the 48 retail spaces under development, and 25 car spaces in the adjacent Council carpark, this totals 73 retail spaces which is a **shortfall of 24.8 retail parking spaces.** The adjacent 25 carpark that is cited in the report is currently in the process of being reclassified and so there are no assurances that this parking will be available in the medium to longer term, leading to a **potential shortfall of 49.8 retail spaces.** This

shortfall will lead to a long term burden to the greater community and is of significant concern. Further, allowing for visitor parking, we estimate approximately 17 – 22 apartments will have no car space (depending on whether 3 bedroom apartments have 1 or 2 car spaces). Despite the proximity to the train station, the shortage of retail spaces cited above combined with a very minimal provision of residential car spaces does not provide much confidence with regards to the amenities of this new development.

Ventilation report

The Natural Ventilation Statement by Windtech does not appear to be valid. For instance, Table 2 shows ventilation results by unit.

A.2.01 is classed as excellent, A.3.01 is classed as below average, A 4.01 is classed as good. These are identical apartments, in the same location on consecutive floors, which should only improve, not fluctuate in natural ventilation standards as the units are located higher up.

The ventilation report is only 66.7% considered effective, but the results are cast into doubt due to the oddities in the results noted above.

Further, the ventilation report does not assume that there will be any future development in the adjoining shopfronts in the future along Lindfield Avenue. If this was considered, a further 8 apartments would be adversely affected and possible overall fail to meet the required minimum.

Proposed Loading Dock

The new proposal appears inefficient in its positioning and entry/exit. This will cause greater delays in traffic and noise as a result to surrounding residents during operation. The loading dock appears too small for trucks/forklifts etc required for supermarkets and other retail (estimate at 24m x 5m). We also note that currently Havilah Lane already provides inadequate provisions for garbage along the street for the current retail.

Recommendation – rectify non-compliance by reducing the number of apartments, reducing the depth and bulky appearance of the apartments.

Increase car spaces available and increase size of loading dock. Ensure appropriate garbage amenities.

Check validity of ventilation report.

Refer also to Key Objection 1 and 3 to reduce the number of storeys and apartments.

Key Objection 4.

4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and <5% three bedroom apartments is **not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).
- The success of prior developments has been based upon larger, high quality apartments in this immediate vicinity. This is supported by the **demographic in Ku-ring-gai which has, relative to the Sydney Statistical Division:**
 - the **highest median age at 41.0 years and the 2nd highest ageing demographic** (16.2% were aged 65+) [ABS data (2005)]; and
 - the **fifth highest average wage and salary income** [ABS data (2007-08)].

Recommendation – substantially reduce the number of one bedroom apartments. With three bedroom apartments forming < 5% of the product mix, there is significant scope for this change. Larger apartments will reduce the number of apartments, and reduce the overall environmental footprint.

Should you wish to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. We urge you to strongly consider the above key objections. We otherwise look forward to a development that contributes to the communities of Lindfield and surrounding Bradfield areas.

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.

Check validity of ventilation report.

Refer also to Key Objection 1 and 3 to reduce the number of storeys and apartments.

Key Objection 4.

4. The **proposed mix of > 50% one bedrooms** (relative to total apartment numbers) and <5% three bedroom apartments is **not supported by the demographic of the area** or strong demand for prior successful developments in the immediate vicinity (which have been focussed upon larger apartments for downsizers because of the ageing demographic, and are of a superior quality).
- The success of prior developments has been based upon larger, high quality apartments in this immediate vicinity. This is supported by **the demographic in Ku-ring-gai which has, relative to the Sydney Statistical Division:**
 - the **highest median age at 41.0 years** and the **2nd highest ageing demographic** (16.2% were aged 65+) [ABS data (2005)]; and
 - the **fifth highest average wage and salary income** [ABS data (2007-08)].

Recommendation – substantially reduce the number of one bedroom apartments. With three bedroom apartments forming < 5% of the product mix, there is significant scope for this change. Larger apartments will reduce the number of apartments, and reduce the overall environmental footprint.

Should you wish to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. We urge you to strongly consider the above key objections. We otherwise look forward to a development that contributes to the communities of Lindfield and surrounding Bradfield areas.

Note that we do NOT consent to the publication in any format (website or otherwise) of our personal details, nor do we consent to the provision of such details to the submission proponent.