

32 David Avenue

North Ryde NSW 2113

Dear Ms Flanagan, Mr Woodland,

I wish to declare my objection to the proposed residential development and basement parking at 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue by EGC Custodian Services Pty Ltd, Application No MP 10-0165.

As a resident of David Ave, along with the surrounding community, we have already been severely impacted by traffic congestion in our area. The streets are clogged with office workers from the northern side of Epping Road parking in the suburban streets. Whenever a parking ranger appears, the cars magically disappear only to return shortly after. The other day, a collision nearly occurred from a garbage truck reversing into my car as it had to reverse into a gap to allow oncoming traffic to pass through McGregor Street. Entering Lane Cove from the surrounding streets in morning peak time is a nightmare because of the queue in Paul Street. This is caused by "rat-runners" becoming impatient further south on Lane Cove Road, "hopping off" the major road and racing through the suburban streets in order to jump the queue. As a resident, I have no alternative route. In addition, what is further infuriating is the abuse hurled at residents by those impatient motorists for daring to exit or enter our driveways in a safe manner which may delay this "queue-jumping".

Surely, simple logic means the proposed development will create further chaos of the North Ryde area south of Epping Road. While it is inevitable that the land will be developed, why destroy the area with high-density housing that is out-of-character with the surrounding environment. Even the local council agrees with a limit of 2-storey dwellings. The impact of this development will not only de-value our homes, it will destroy the soul of our community. It is unfair and un-Australian to "sell-out" the North Ryde area south of Epping Road. Keep high-rised development north of Epping Road.

Therefore, I strongly oppose the development referred to above, which also conflicts directly with Ryde Council's vision of North Ryde. I ask that my views and those of many other residents be fully taken into account during the decision-making process. Please reject this application.

Yours Sincerely

Sally Morgan

Mr. Tim Nightingale
52 Parklands Road
North Ryde
NSW 2113

Application: 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue, North Ryde

10_0165

I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed development at Whiteside Street, North Ryde.

Firstly, I have read and fully support the statement of objections submitted by the Whiteside Action Group in relation to the proposed development.

Secondly, I would like to add the specific points shown below.

Impact of proposed development

The proponent wants to build an eight-storey tower adjacent to an old and well established area of North Ryde that has long been zoned R2 (zoning map LZN_005). There was never any indication that this would ever change and the overwhelming preference among local property owners and renters was that this was the preferred zoning. Anyone who purchased property in this area would have done so under the assumption that the council's zoning actually meant something and was enforceable. Those purchasing property at the north-western end of Parklands Road in the past few years would have been well aware of the presence of the vacant lot that the proponent wishes to develop but would have looked at that the council's zoning and concluded that whatever was to be built there would be no more than two storeys. Property buyers surely deserve this sort of certainty for the same reason that the purchaser of a business that sells electric appliances would for example expect that the voltage and frequency of mains electricity in Sydney is not going to suddenly be altered to something that renders those appliances less useful.

The proponent isn't asking to build three storeys, or even four. The proponent is asking for eight storeys. This is surely a massive imposition on the area and any attempts by the proponent to portray it as anything other than a massive imposition are simply disingenuous. High trees? If neighbours are to be deprived of the sight of this tower then they're to be denied sunlight in their back yards too are they not? And what of the massive profit to be realised by the proponent, who boasts of being able to have land "rezoned"? This would be a profit realised partly at the expense of the owners of neighbouring properties, who would not themselves even be permitted to submit an application for a development that exceeds two storeys. I would suggest that the profit motive here completely eclipses any claim by the proponent that they are somehow enhancing the character of this part of North Ryde that I've called home for 21 years, or indeed making Sydney a better city (a claim that I'd reject anyhow).

Residents on the north side of the north-western end of Parklands Road would be confronted with eight storeys backing onto their property. Who could possibly claim that the impact of this will be anything other than major, far-reaching and permanent?

The residents of this area of North Ryde are largely decent, law-abiding citizens and the Department of Planning and the minister should not be alienating these people by imposing a development so far outside the council's zoning restrictions.

I refer you to the SEPP 65 Documentation, which forms Appendix O of the EA. Under "Principle 2" it says:

Establishing an appropriate scale requires a considered response to the scale of existing development. In precincts undergoing a transition, proposed bulk and height needs to achieve the scale identified for the desired future character of the area.

To a lay person like myself, I can only interpret this as indicating an attitude by the proponent that the "desired future character" of my area of North Ryde is high-rise development. The architects would have prepared this documentation under instructions from the proponent would they not?

Further in the SEPP 65 documentation, I refer you to Page 3, under "Principle 4: Density":

The proposed density has been accommodated on the site in a manner that does not compromise the amenity of adjacent occupants particularly in respect of solar access, cross ventilation, privacy considerations and relative to the RFDC principals.

I totally reject the suggestion that the proposed density of the development "does not compromise the amenity of adjacent occupants...". In particular the northern side of the street comprises families and older couples who spend a lot of their leisure time in their back yards and to suggest that their amenity will not be compromised by the presence of the proposed development, with its scale and close proximity in my opinion undermines the proponent's credibility.

Traffic and public transport

In Appendix I of the EA, in Section 5.3, the proponent claims:

"...it is expected that a significant proportion of residents will work within Macquarie Park (including the University) and this is expected to be a major component of the marketing strategy."

Again, the proponent has a credibility problem here. How can they possibly exert any influence, least of all in the longer term, on where the residents of this development will choose to work? If they are typical of the residents of Sydney then surely most of them will be using their cars to get to work. Yes, this area of North Ryde offers excellent public transport for anyone wishing to get to the city, or to Chatswood, Epping or North Sydney. I would suggest that these locations will account for at best half of the workplaces of the residents, and that in any case many of these residents will still drive to work. Those working in places such as Parramatta or Seven Hills will still most likely take their cars and here lies the problem: for anyone leaving for work in their cars from our area of North Ryde after about 7:30 a.m., there is already a high level of vehicle traffic attempting to enter Lane Cove and Epping Roads.

I would totally reject any suggestion that the presence of the proposed development, along with the proponent's other proposed development at Allengrove Crescent, would not significantly impact on an already serious traffic problem that develops within this area of North Ryde every working day morning. I remain totally unconvinced by the proponent's traffic report (Appendix L of the EA).

Comments on Appendix P of EA (Visual Analysis)

On Page 6 of Appendix P, I refer you to "View 1 – After" which shows a row of trees on the south side of Epping Road that appear to provide a screen almost totally blocking out the view of the 8-storey tower from the road. Even assuming that the RTA consents to these trees being planted on their land, how many years is it going to take for even the fastest-growing trees to reach the height of an 8-storey tower? I would suggest a minimum of 15 years.

On Page 7 of the same appendix, I refer you to "View 2 – after", which shows what presumably is the 8-storey section of the building almost up against the merging lane onto Epping Road, suggesting that it's to be built on RTA land. I would suggest that not only is the 8-storey section shown much too far to the north, but the photomontage greatly understates the actual height of the building and as a result greatly understates its visual impact.

This concludes my objection.

Tim Nightingale

Jane Flanagan - Proposed Residential Development 5 Whiteside Street/14-16 David Avenue (10-10165(major projects .planning nsw.gov.au))

From: "Wheels" <wheelsp@optusnet.com.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 9/9/2011 9:30 AM
Subject: Proposed Residential Development 5 Whiteside Street/14-16 David Avenue (10-10165 (major projects .planning nsw.gov.au))

Mr. & Mrs Paul Wheelhouse
69 Parklands Road
North Ryde. NSW 2113.

We are members of the Whiteside Action Group and fully support the submissions sent to your Department.

On our own personal circumstances, we live on the corner of Whiteside Street and Parklands Road North Ryde. We are concerned about the proposed traffic and street alterations on and off Epping Road at Whiteside Street. Even though Whiteside Street has no exit onto Epping Road, the rat runners still exit illegally Whiteside Street onto Epping Road. Other traffic matters that concern us, are people at Macquarie Park Business Region parking on Epping Road from 10am till 3pm weekdays and then move their cars onto our local street further congesting our local streets.

North Ryde is an area that is effected by high condensation and mould and houses behind the proposed development would further be affected by lack of sunshine if passed by your Department. It is interesting to note in the Daily Telegraph 2nd September 2011 - article Cop Crook housed, the illnesses of people living with mould problems.

We have always been assured by Ryde Council that southside of Epping Highway was to be low-rise residential housing due to the development of Macquarie Park Industrial Area. We are not against development, but feel any development should be in accordance with the Council requirements which we all have to abide by. Army, Navy and Housing Commission dwellings have been in the North Ryde area for years and have integrated with the houses around them. The opportunity for public housing has been lost with developers buying up our local land and houses to put up multi-storey complexes to cash in on the lack of accommodation for students at Macquarie University.

We have lived in this house for over 40 years and many neighbours have lived in the area for over 50 years. We have seen many developments around us that we have not been able to have a say in, but, we have been given a chance to have our say in this matter and we strongly oppose this development.

We have not donated or contributed to any political party.

Yours faithfully,

Paul and Diane Wheelhouse