

- As a resident in the area I strongly oppose Holdmarks and dept of planning's amendments primarily due to the increased number of people this will bring into the already congested Sheppards bay area.
- I believe the findings in the The Planning and Assessment Commission determination report from March 2013 should stand. This report recommended several things for the Holdmark development mainly on density, build form and open space.
- I cant believe that Holdmark are now asking for more.

### 1. Density

The PAC recommended that the density in the area should be reduced so that the development should and I quote "take account of the existing local and emerging neighbourhood character". As such the PPR reduced the dwelling cap from 2400-2800 to 2005.

- One would assume that these numbers given by the PPR were based on feasibility studies in the area. Anything higher than this would put pressure on the local infrastructure.
- And now Holdmark are asking for this cap to be increased to allow for extra dwellings for their stage A.
- Holdmark in this development even without stage A are already at 1943 dwellings and they still have at least a 10 storey building left to build. Or 15 storey if they get their way. This leaves only 62 dwellings for the remaining stage A development. I think this shows that Holdmark have had no respect for the limitations put on them by the PAC nor the well being of the area as a whole.
- How many extra dwellings is a 10 storey building going to mean for stage A anyway?
- The caps set by the commission for this development are one thing but they do not take into account all the other developments going on in this area and the influx of people combined that they will bring to Sheppards Bay. So I believe we need to keep firm on Holdmarks allowance of dwellings.

### 2. Building Height

The PAC also stated that the building height in the centre should be max 10 storeys with other buildings and I quote "where the site adjoins existing development or the river foreshore, heights should be reduced to ensure an appropriate transition and to prevent overshadowing". As a resident in the area we know that this has all gone out the window. All buildings in the Holdmark site development that are already well underway are 10 storey and these buildings are already encompassing over the existing Bay One and Meriton developments which run along side them.

*and other*

And even though they are higher than existing buildings in the area, Holdmark have the odasity to ask for 24 storeys and now 15 storeys. When will the greed stop?

- I strongly oppose any increase in building height by more than 10 storeys, even if it is built on sloping land. Not only would any extra height not visually be in keeping with the area but it also sets a precedence for future developments.
- The extra height will mean extra people and this inevitably means extra traffic, noise pollution and parking issues. Already the roads around Meadowbank are at a standstill in peak times and now also on weekends. Particularly Church Street, Constitution and Bowden.

Many take a shortcut through Meadowbank to avoid the Church Street gridlock. Adding more people to the area will only make this worse.

- We live on Thorn and the congestion on Constitution Rd and by this I mean complete stand still from the train station to Belmore Rd means that people are now taking an even further shortcuts through normally quiet residential streets including our own. I often witness frustrated drivers driving on the wrong side of the road in order to turn right to get out of the traffic. As a result these frustrated drivers are taking risks, driving way too fast and I'm concerned for the safety of my children when walking and playing in our area.
- The quality of the roads in our area is also severely being compromised. Porter Street is a prime example. This road is full of pot holes, some so large you could lose your car in them. They are so bad that very few drivers use this road and put further congestion on Belmore St. The developers create the problem but it is the residents that are left to deal with the it!

### 3. Open space

The Pac also had strong views on the open space to the area. And I quote "The Commission accepts Council's argument that existing open space areas within the surrounding neighbourhood are already at capacity". And they recommended that a minimum of 3,000m<sup>2</sup>, to Accommodate both active and passive recreational needs. And that this open space area was to be completed prior to the occupation of stage 1. Where is this open space? Why did we give occupation of stage one without it?

- I agree that there is not enough greenspace in our area. And now Holdmark want to reduce this recommended 3000m<sup>2</sup> by almost 400m<sup>2</sup>. I don't believe 3000m<sup>2</sup> is even enough to cover this number of dwellings this allows for only 1.5m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling! And now they want to reduce it further!
- I urge you to come down to the Sheppard's Bay foreshore early evening and you will see just how needed this greenspace is. There are literally hundreds of people down there walking around, exercising, eating meals etc. in the area. This in turn means excessive rubbish, shopping trolleys etc polluting the open space that we do have. We are going to need even more open space once these developments are finsiehd. We desperately need this space!
- Likewise we need the community facility on offer. This is a much needed addition to the area which would allow residents to hire it for community activities such as playgroup, sporting activity such as dancing, tae kwon do, scouts etc
- I think the fact that council will take the \$3.5mill in lieu of this community space is a joke. We need this space in the area. And if the council do greedily take this money, what guarantee that they will use it in the sheppards bay area.....none!

#### 4. School

My two children currently attend the local Meadowbank public school. We choose Meadowbank public due to the small size of it, close community spirit and also because of the large green space it has for our children to play in. In the last 3 years there has been a 75% increase in the numbers of students. Modest predictions on 2016 enrolment trends estimate that the next 3 years will be a 134% increase. Increasing the dwelling cap will blow out these figures even further. Currently the school has only 7 permanent buildings and 5 demountables with currently one being added per year. Every time one is added it takes away from the available greenspace that my children can play in. If the developer goes over this 2005 dwelling cap the school will suffer even further.

In summary I believe Holdmark should be forced to stick to the PAC restrictions put on them in 2013. The extra building heights and in turn increased dwelling numbers will put extra putting pressure on our roads, school and parklands. Asking for more is purely developer greed without consideration to the residents or the area!

Amber Ralph





