

Mrs Natalie R Devlin

Objection to Application No. MP 06_0094 MOD 5, Sandon Point, NSW

I object to the density of the development which in its proposed form is out of context with existing housing within the area. The overall density of this development with primarily all attached housing with minimal private open space is more align with being Zoned R3.

The housing in the immediate area consists of single dwellings on large land lots with substantial private open space. The development is still too dense, and as it consists of only attached dwellings it will negatively impact the streetscape of the area as housing in this form is out of context and not in public interest.

It is fair to say that had NSW State Planning and the community been made aware of the land in Precinct 2 & 3 being used for another residential sub division (instead of for aged care facilities and seniors living as originally intended) then those same constraints that were placed on the residential sub division created by Stockland to both the north and the South East of this proposed development would have been implemented. Now that this is being viewed as a residential subdivision I object to this development not being made to follow those same development constraints that were placed on the surrounding residential developments. Not following these same constraints will lead to inconsistency and an unsightly, dense development which is completely out of context with the housing in both the immediate vicinity as well as those residential communities within the surrounding suburbs. This means that the subject proposal would be out of character with the existing built form surrounding the Anglicare land.

The initial approval was granted with the land being used for an entirely different purpose and as this purpose has now significantly changed it is only appropriate for the development to be viewed with its new purpose in mind. It is not in public interest to mislead the community and expect that an out of context, dense development will automatically get approval simply because the footprint from the initial aged care facility is smaller, these should not be regarded as the same and this matter should be approved based purely on the context for which the land will actually be used now.

As per Wollongong City Council's (WCC) submission, an issue was raised with regards to the proposed allotments with concerns regarding a large number having dual road frontages.

"WCC 4F - The subdivision pattern shows that a number of the proposed allotments will have a dual road frontage. A large number of the allotments will each have a road frontage to the front and the rear of the site. Consideration should be given to amending the subdivision layout to avoid high fencing to screen private open space located at the rear of the site. This will adversely impact upon the streetscape and will not be supported in any subsequent development application."

Ethos Urban provided a response to this claim which is completely false and misleading. Their response was as follows: "No dual frontage lots are proposed in the revised layout. Refer to Appendix B." In appendix B amended concept plans, specifically drawing number SK1.03, you will see that all of the lots in Precinct 2 contain dual road frontages as the rear of these properties back onto either Wilkies Street or Geraghty Street. As the recommendations from WCC have not been taken on board in this instance all of the proposed townhouses in Precinct 2 will adversely impact on the current streetscape and will be against public interest. This is out of context with existing housing in the area and will significantly impact residents in the immediate vicinity as well as local community members using Wilkies Walk to access the

local bike tracks and beach paths. I completely object the adverse impact on the local streetscape and propose that should this not be able to be avoided then the developer should be required to install perimeter landscaping such as trees and greenery to reduce the impact of high screening and fencing that will be required to provide privacy to those residents.

I object to the developer not utilising the main arterial road of Geraghty street to service their new residential development. If you refer to Appendix C SK1.06 you will note that the plans indicate that the internal road network proposed for Precinct 2 contains extremely narrow roads which are shown to be only one way traffic flow, thus resulting in all vehicular traffic from the 19 proposed attached dwellings in precinct 2 having to pass through tiny Wilkies Street in order to leave their property. This includes the traffic of residents and their visitors as even the visitors parking is shown on the internal one way road which exists out onto tiny Wilkies Street. This is an unacceptable increase to the current traffic management plan for Tiny Wilkies Street and it is beyond unreasonable that this development does not maintain their own internal road network to support the scale of the development. You can see that the developer acknowledges community concern for safety of pedestrian and cyclists using the very popular Wilkies Walk, and this is evidenced by the amendment to remove all driveways off Wilkies Street. However this acknowledgment as to the safety of the local community is then contradicted by having all traffic from the residential development go through tiny Wilkies Street in order to access the main arterial road Geraghty Street which is wider and better equipped to safely manage the added pressure from the increased road traffic.

I object to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists being compromised by the added crossovers being proposed on Wilkies Walk. This is a community asset and is very popular with local families and the cycling community as it provides the community with the only direct beach access that is safe, continual and without driveways or road crossovers. Wilkies Walk is also on a very steep decline and as such the road crossover proposed for Precinct 3 (specifically the western entrance onto Wilkies nearest to the existing Craven Street) is dangerous and places lives of cyclists at risks. This is due to the speed the cyclists will naturally be travelling on the decline of the hill, and with a sudden street crossing will not have enough time to safely stop to check for traffic. It is important to note that this cycle path is used by inexperienced young riders who frequently use this path to gain safe access to the cycle way which leads to the local government high school. With the governments push to reduce childhood obesity levels I feel it is important to support and continue to provide this amenity to the community as it allows parents the reassurance to encourage their children to ride to school knowing their main route is safe.

I object the current internal road network being within the 6m defendable zone for the protected and heritage listed turpentine forest. Please refer to Appendix B SK1.05. I also object the proposed boundaries of some residential lots being within the 6m defendable zone. This is completely unacceptable and needs urgent rectification to ensure these critical 6m defendable zones are being maintained.

The Townhouse development in Precinct 2 which backs Geraghty Street would be better suited to having driveway access on Geraghty Street. This is because this side of Geraghty street is currently not in use and as such the community have not developed pedestrian and cyclist habits for utilising this route. As opposed to Wilkies Walk which has been a community asset for many years and will cause more disruption to the local community not to mention impact on the safety of users of Wilkes Walk. If the driveways for these lots were placed on Geraghty St, the townhouses on Wilkies Street could then use the proposed narrow road in a one way direction heading south toward Geraghty street instead of out onto tiny Wilkies Street. This would alleviate the pressure on tiny Wilkies Street and the safety concerns of many residents, pedestrians and cyclists.

I object to the developer still remaining vague as to the future use of the land. The architectural design concepts precinct 2 & 3 indicate a 2 storey construction which is not feasible for seniors living. Single storey construction with an adaptable layout plan would be preferable for seniors living.

I object to the proposal being a departure to the existing building types and forms. Most of the land within the initial development application has been developed in accordance with the approved Concept Plan. Single residential dwellings and dual occupancy development of one and two stories are the only building types and forms. The subject proposal is a departure from this and the multi dwelling housing, ILU and RACF in the manner proposed would not be consistent with the character and scale of existing or development expected by the community. This is mostly evident in the proposed floor areas and heights as compared to the two storey height and floor space approved thus far. Although Urban Ethos argues that this height overall size is reduced compared to the initial proposed Aged Care Facility, I feel it is inappropriate to compare the two when they are serving completely different purposes. It is not appropriate to mislead the community by obtaining approval on the land under the guise of providing for the aged care sector but then expect to drastically change the main use for the land whilst still maintaining the initial approvals.

I object to the reduced buffer protection zone for Heritage listed Turpentine Forest. The 2006 approved Concept Plan provided for a 20m buffer zone to protect the Heritage listed remnant Turpentine Forest which is currently encircled by Anglicare's proposed 51 townhouses. Anglicare's proposal reduces this buffer zone to only 6 m. In Ethos Urban Proposed Amendments to Statement of Commitments dated 31.5.2019, point 17, they have deleted the provision of 20 metre setbacks from the forest for development. However, in point 18, they 'will ensure that a 20 metre wide riparian corridor is incorporated on either side of the centreline of Cooksons Creek'. This surely is evidence that a buffer zone of no less than 20 metres is imperative to protect the flora and fauna around Cooksons Creek and evidence that a 20 metre buffer zone is imperative to protect the Heritage listed turpentine forest. As the Turpentine Forest is actually heritage listed, I feel this holds greater importance of the 20m buffer zone than that which they will provide to Cookson creek. It is illogical to me that the Heritage listed site is being given such little regard.

I object to Urban Ethos's response to concerns regarding the width of Wilkies Street and its inability to with stand the additional traffic as this street was never intended to be used as a main arterial road and was instead designed as a linkage road as part of the Stocklands development. Urban Ethos have offensively stated "Wilkies Street is not within the subject site". I am concerned by the blatant disregard for the concerns of residents. Although Wilkies Street may not be contained within the Anglicare development site it is imperative that the feasibility of Wilkies Street be assessed as part of any traffic management assessment considering that the development proposes to solely use **Wilkies Street for access from every single one of the proposed townhouses.** Wilkies Street is not wide enough to cope with servicing 51 townhouses.

I object to the Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by TTPA and the statement that "On balance, the reduced development yield will result in reduced traffic generation outcome, thus lower traffic impact on the road network". I feel it is crucial that the use of land is carefully considered when making these claims as the previous figures provided for the Traffic Assessment would have been based off land that's sole purpose was for seniors and aged care residents, many of which lead sedentary lifestyles and would have a reduced traffic impact on the community.

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Natalie Devlin', with a small 'X' mark above the end of the signature.

Natalie Devlin