

## **OBJECTION STATEMENT**

28 June 2012

Natasha Harras  
Contact Officer  
Planning & Government  
NSW Government

Re: Modification Request for Redevelopment of the Former Royal Rehabilitation Centre  
Sydney, Ryde (MP05\_0001 MOD 1)

Dear Ms Harras

We write to you to outline our strong objection to the proposed residential dwellings adjoining our fence shared with the Former Royal Rehabilitation Centre.

We have been living at this site since 1976. Next to our fence there has always been natural grounds filled with trees, lawns and dense shrubs in places. This corner supported the environmental eco-system that promoted birdlife, clean and fresh air and further contributed immensely to reduce carbon pollution. It has provided us with privacy and a natural outlook from our property.

Your redevelopment proposal will destroy all of the above and seriously violate our entire outlook due to every aspect of privacy, noise pollution, visual outlook, human activities, and vehicle movements.

Therefore, we strongly object to any proposed dwellings along the entire fence line up to the current Spine Care Village. Furthermore, we submit that the area concerned should be left as a natural wilderness area filled with flora and fauna.

Yours Sincerely

Meenakshi S Amin & Subhash T Amin

100 Princes Street  
Ryde NSW 2112


Diary from [REDACTED] to Natasha Harras on 22/06/2012

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #5320 MP05 0001 MOD 1 -Modification to Concept Plan

## Online Submission from [REDACTED] (object)

---

### Email Details

Received 11:15AM, Fri 22nd Jun, 12  
Status Actioned on 22/06/2012  
Time Spent 0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)  
Priority Medium   
Class Anonymous Object

### Interactions

#### Contacts (1)

Inbound email from:

[REDACTED]

#### Staff (1)

Email to:

Natasha Harras

First of all let me say that all residents living in Charles Street Ryde have my sympathy for having to live with the constant deafening noise of big machinery on this site operating from 7am until dark six days per week. Their lives must have been changed substantially being subjected to this 'legalised' form of noise pollution. I objected to original proposal on the grounds of increased local traffic congestion and if the modification request allows one additional vehicle to the original D.A. through increased development then I object most strongly to the modification request being approved. I note reports that Coalition Against Private Overdevelopment (CAPO) Chairman, Mr Rolf Clapham, has stated that local roads are already 300 per cent over RTA guidelines. I submit that the current development will substantially increase congestion on local streets and to entertain any thought of an increase in this regard will be an act of beaurocratic neglect. Frasers Property Aust. P/L should be made to comply with the original D.A.

**Amy Watson - Fwd: Re: MP05\_001 MOD1 - Royal Ryde Rehabilitation Centre, Sydney - Ryde / Proto - Submission by owner of 598 Victoria Road, Ryde (Natasha is out of the office)**

---

**From:** <santon35@iinet.net.au>  
**To:** <Amy.Watson@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** Friday, 6 July 2012 1:12 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Re: MP05\_001 MOD1 - Royal Ryde Rehabilitation Centre, Sydney - Ryde / Proto - Submission by owner of 598 Victoria Road, Ryde (Natasha is out of the office)

---

Dear Amy

I am forwarding the appended email for your attention.

Kindly forward to the right channel.

Kind regards,

Stavi Antoniou

If you are not the recipient of his email, please note, this email is confidential and for the person intended. Please notify the sender if you received this email in error and then delete the message immediately. With thanks.

----- Original Message -----

**From:**  
"Natasha Harras" <Natasha.Harras@planning.nsw.gov.au>

**To:**  
santon35@iinet.net.au  
**Cc:**

**Sent:**  
Thu, 05 Jul 2012 15:06:00 +1000  
**Subject:**  
Re: MP05\_001 MOD1 - Royal Ryde Rehabilitation Centre, Sydney - Ryde / Proto - Submission by owner of 598 Victoria Road, Ryde (Natasha is out of the office)  
I am out of the office, returning on Monday 16 July. I will respond to emails then.  
For urgent matters, please contact Amy Watson: Amy.Watson@planning.nsw.gov.au

>>> 07/05/12 15:05 >>>

Dear Natasha

I am writing to inform your department that I have not had sufficient time to investigate the proposal by Fraser Property Group currently on exhibition.

I am seeking an extension of time, although I will be visiting Sydney from 23 August 2012.

It is difficult to comprehend all the material on your website without the appreciation of the 3D built installation which is currently on exhibition at your office.

For all purposes intended, I will make a point to say, the developer be made aware of the approved Concept Plan 2005 determined by Ryde Council and to which it was purchased with full knowledge and understanding by the developer at the time.

I object to the footprint of the basement carparking exceeding the built form of the proposed high rise residential building fronting Victoria Road.

The Concept Plan 2005 has an approved 19 metre setback from the Victoria Road frontage and the setback from the eastern boundary line was determined by the residents of Ryde and Council's administrative processes. The planning code should be upheld. Notwithstanding that it is in the hands of the Ministerial division the consideration of processes have been previously determined and with respect should not be overruled. After all, what is the purpose of Local Council's planning codes when future amendments are solely for the purpose to suit the bottom dollar of the developer. Is this what town planning is about?

With the current proposal, I object to the decreasing of the setback to a minimum of 10 metres from the Victoria Road frontage as this compromises the visual aspect from Victoria Road, the historical significance of the site (retaining the Palm Trees boulevard and circular driveway), the streetscape, the natural appeal of vegetation, the privacy and overshadowing of the built form to the adjoining properties. All built form should be in keeping with the approvals upheld by Ryde Council, this being, on the western side of the internal road network ingressing from Victoria Road.

The land facing the Victoria Road side has the greatest height of the topography of the land. With this fact, any increase to the height of the built form will create an unsightly construction on the crest of the hill and subsequently compromise the nestled appeal which was the principal ideology at the time of the determination of the DA, with the public consultation.

Under no circumstances should the Ministerial governance change the premise of the original DA as its history dictates the DA had undergone considerable amendments and sequence of DA approvals to reach an amicable and acceptable set of town planning.

The current public political view is to have the bulk of the high rise residential construction on Victoria Road and all the traffic ingressing and egressing from Victoria Road. All this being persuaded by the small community of Putney whom have a biased perspective of the overall development of the 18 hectare land. It is unethical and lacks the ethos of fair play should your governing body not understand that political agenda of a few does not make good planning for the many.

The Concept Plan 2005 did not permit built form on the eastern side of the internal road network for the protection of amenities to those adjoining properties. All built form should be maintained on the western side of the internal road network as was in the original Concept Plan 2005 and approved by Council. The RTA has on numerous occasions determined and object to traffic lights at the Victoria Road ingress. This is strictly prohibited and the consultation being influenced by Fraser Group Property is unethical and self promoting. The Victoria Road strip between Charles Street and Blaxland Road intersections is 'black listed' and dangerous.

Will your governing body provide an indemnity to the people of Ryde? Traffic lights at Irvine Crescent is dangerous.

The proposed height of the high rise residential built form fronting Victoria Road is grossly over the top in bulk and height in comparison to other buildings situated along Victoria Road the State arterial road. The aesthetics of such bulk and height is not in keeping with the surrounding single dwelling character homes. The design and type of construction should reflect a conservative approach to bulk and height theme that is historically defined and acceptable to the neighbourhood.

The historical frontage of the Royal Rehabilitation Centre, Ryde has a boulevard like no other and significant to the community of Ryde should it be worth losing this forever more.

For your information, I have not been receiving any newsletters from the Royal Rehabilitation Centre, Ryde or Fraser Property Group.

I await your response to my question.

Feel free to contact me on 0424254301 to discuss the contents of my email.

Kind regards,

Stavi Antoniou

If you are not the recipient of this email, please note, this email is confidential and for the person intended. Please notify the sender if you received this email in error and then delete the message immediately. With thanks.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Natasha Harras"

To:

Cc:

Sent: Wed, 13 Jun 2012 10:46:25 +1000

Subject: Re: MP05\_001 MOD1 - Royal Ryde Rehabilitation Centre, Sydney - Ryde

Thanks for the email. The modifications are proposed in accordance with s75W of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act. SEPP 1 is not applicable. The modifications include a change to the layout of the site, including a change to the location and envelopes of the residential flat buildings on that part of the site closest to Victoria Road. They are best understood by viewing the plans and report on the Departments website at [http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view\\_job&job\\_id=5320](http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=5320) [1].

NATASHA HARRAS

TOWN PLANNER

METROPOLITAN & REGIONAL PROJECTS SOUTH

NSW DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & INFRASTRUCTURE

GPO BOX 39 | SYDNEY NSW 2001

T 02 9228 6332

>>> 6/13/2012 10:32 am >>>

Hello Natasha@iinet.net.au>

I am a key stakeholder the owner of 598 Victoria Road Ryde the adjoining property of the subject site. I am currently residing in Perth Western Australia and therefore cannot get to view the development's progress.

I am interested in the residential component located on the Victoria Road frontage whereby any amendments I would be keen to know about so I may provide input in the submission.

Under what SEPP is the proposed amendment applicable? (SEPP no 1?)

What are the amendments i.e. boundary, density, FSR, access ingress, traffic controls, etc. Would you be in the position to comment what these amendments are in brief.

Your assistance would be most appreciated.

Please feel free to contact me on 0424254301.

Kind regards,

Stavi Antoniou

----- Original Message -----

From: "Natasha Harras" @planning.nsw.gov.au>

To:

Cc:

Sent: Wed, 13 Jun 2012 09:04:09 +1000

Subject: Re: MP05\_001 MOD1 - Royal Ryde Rehabilitation Centre, Sydney -