

11 December 2019

Department of Planning and Environment  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

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

To whom it may concern

I acknowledge there have been a number of improvements to this SSD since the last exhibition stage. The removal of the deceleration lane from Epping Road and the maintaining of the wildlife corridor from Herring Road to Shrimpton Creek are great improvements. However, I continue to object to the number of trees being removed - 796 in total. The development needs to be designed in a manner that requires less trees to be removed. I do not agree that the removal of the trees is unavoidable as alleged. Everything is possible.

Sydney is facing challenging times with heatwaves and high levels of air pollution. Temperatures over 40degrees Celcius can kill vulnerable members of the population such as will be housed in this estate. This makes the trees valuable assets for countering the urban heat bank effect, temperature cooling and air cleansing. More trees should therefore be preserved for the health of the residents and residents in surrounding suburbs.

The footprint of Building D4 needs to be decreased so it encroaches less on the wildlife corridor along Epping Road and the Shrimpton Creek Riparian zone.

The *Response to the Submissions Report and Amended Proposal* records a total of 16 ecosystem credits are required to offset the 1.68 hectares of unavoidable impacts of the project. Whereas the *Biodiversity Assessment Report and Offset Strategy* October 2019 records that 16 eco credits are required for 2.24 hectares of native vegetation removed. I am therefore not sure if 1.68 or 2.24 hectares will be permanently removed, however, whichever figure it is represents too many indigenous trees being removed.

The SSC continues to break biodiversity laws: The site has STIF and Smooth-Barked Apple Turpentine Blackbutt forests which is a threatened ecological community under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 1995 and other Acts. Shrimpton Creek provides a wildlife ecological corridor which the bridge connecting Lyonpark Road will destroy. I therefore continue to object to this bridge being built or suggest that it is designed in such a way as to minimise its impact on this wildlife corridor.

The area supports Powerful Owls. The use of eco credits as proposed are therefore 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 no substitute.

Re building A1, I continue to object to the height, inadequate setbacks, design and overshadowing of other 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.

The A1 setbacks on Main Street are inadequate to allow the landscaping proposed: The various new reports state 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. 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.

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 morning easterly 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 have limited solar access.

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

Thanking you for your consideration of my concerns.

Yours sincerely