

David Rohloff - Submission for MP10_0165 - PPR for 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue, North Ryde

From: [REDACTED]
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 5/31/2012 6:03 PM
Subject: Submission for MP10_0165 - PPR for 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue, North Ryde
CC: <david.rohloff@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: Submission - [REDACTED].pdf

To Mr Alan Bright, Director – Metropolitan & Regional Projects – South,

Re: Submission for MP10_0165 – PPR for 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue, North Ryde

I would like to submit our **objection** to the above project. See email below and signed, scanned copy attached to this email.

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Application name and number: Preferred Project Report for proposed residential development with basement parking - 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue, North Ryde (10_0165)

Reasons for objection:

1. It is not in the public interest to approve the proposed development because it would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Ryde Local Environmental Plan 2010 and would adversely impact on the orderly development of land in the City of Ryde.
2. The proposed development would be incompatible with the Ryde Local Environmental Plan 2010 R2 low density residential zone objectives and out of character with the surrounding residential area.
3. The proposed development would give rise to significant traffic generation and access constraints that would detrimentally impact on existing and future residents, and the local road network.
4. The proposed development would adversely impact on the amenities of residents by way of noise and disturbance, traffic, overlooking and visual intrusion.
5. The above reasons 1 to 4 were provided on 3 May 2012 by the Planning Assessment Commission for the Allengrove proposal (MP10_0037).
 I believe that the same reasons for refusal apply to the PPR for MP10_0165 (Whiteside) and request that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure refuse the Whiteside proposal in a manner consistent with the PAC determination of the Allengrove proposal.
6. Contrary to the claims by EGC, the PPR has not adequately addressed the issues raised by the community. Items 1 to 4 above represent serious issues that have not been addressed by the PPR.
7. I support the Objection to the PPR that was lodged by Gail Veness on behalf of the Whiteside Action Group.

Yours sincerely,

██████████ (I also declare that I have NOT made any donation to any political party in the last two years)

NOTE – We do not want our names published or made available to the proponent.