

6 September 2018

Joel Herbert  
Planning Officers  
NSW Department of Planning and Environment  
Email: \_Joel.herbert@planning.nsw.gov.au  
Ph: (02) 8289 6614

Your Ref: MP 07\_0166 MOD 8

Dear Mr Herbert

**Submission to Response to Submissions  
Wahroonga Estate Concept Plan (MP 07\_0166 MOD 8)**

Thank you for the notification that Ethos Urban on behalf of Capital Bluestone Pty Ltd (the Proponent) submitted a Response to Submissions (RtS) to issues raised in the exhibition of the Modification Request to modify the Concept Approval MP 07\_0166 for the Wahroonga Estate Development.

As indicated in your letter, as having previously formally submitted an objection, I have the right to submit further objection to the Proponent's RtS.

From my review of the Proponent's RtS I observe that the Proponent has offered no concessions to any of the adverse impacts outlined within the Submissions. The message is clear that the Proponent, Capital Bluestone, does not value public and community involvement in minimising the adverse environmental impacts this high-density residential development will have on the Wahroonga Estate or the surrounding community who will be affected by it.

The first objection I wish to outline in regards to the Proponent's RtS is bulk and scale. The Submissions object to the adverse impacts the development's bulk and scale will have on the Estate. The Proponent's response is to make the building roof lines 200mm higher and the foot prints larger. See **Figure 1** below:



Extract of the Concept Plan showing the Approved Envelopes (red outline) overlaid over the *Proposed* Building Envelopes (shown in purple) in Precinct B: Central Church

As you can see in Figure 1, the response from the Proponent seeks to gain Concept approval for a much larger development, not in the number of residential dwellings but in bulk and scale of the physical building. This adversely affects the Wahroonga Adventist School and the shadow cast over the school. The Proponent is seeking to make the buildings bigger and higher, which is their response to objections stating that the development is too big. A clear message that the Developer has no regard or interest in the environmental impact, or the psychosocial impact that the environmental issues will create.

**Re: 3.2 Encroachment of the Building E roof into the front boundary setback (p6 of Ethos Urban document)**

Is this level of detail required in a concept plan approval? It feels as though the Proponent is seeking approval for details that should be reviewed by Local Government. This may be viewed as an attempt to 'shore up' their legal position should the local council not approve this encroachment of boundary setback, or certainly any other minutiae detail which goes beyond a "concept plan".

Finally, I believe the Proponent should be required to conduct and submit a psychosocial and community impact assessment for a development of this size at a site where the green space is currently utilised and proven beneficial. "Terminal cancer patients show significant preferences for rooms with views of nature and showed better affective states when they had them." (Baird and Bell 1995) And further, "hospital patients even appear to experience less pain," (Diette, Lechtzin et al. 2003), "...and take less medication" (Lawson and Phiri 2003) when exposed to the sights and sounds of nature. And this, "College students whose dormitory rooms looked out onto natural landscape settings were shown to perform better on attention demanding tasks." (Tenessen, Cimprich et al. 1995) The evidence suggests building out these greenspaces could have a detrimental outcome on patient healing and student learning.

The Wahroonga Estate is an environmentally and geographically significant site, not for its potential profit, but for its potential as a much-needed centre for efficacy in healing and learning in an already busy and densely-populated city outpost.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]