

9 December 2016

Ms Lynelle Briggs AO
Planning Assessment Commission
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Commissioners,

**RE: MODIFICATION REQUEST TO CONCEPT PLAN AT SHEPHERDS BAY
FORESHORE, MEADOWBANK**

As a regular user of the Meadowbank Ferry, I daily encounter traffic problems associated with the whole Meadowbank Employment Area Complex.

When the PAC approved the Concept Plan in 2013 and imposed a 2005 dwelling, 10 storey building height and 2,976 car space limit on the Holdmark development, it did so for good reason and not by arbitrary whim. What has changed since then, other than the developer's greed?

The proposed Modification Plan 2 relies on experts and sophistry to promote the developer's ambitions. Experts notoriously write reports that support the position of those who pay for their services.

Commissioners, you are paid to appraise, approve, modify or reject this Modification Plan. Most of the people directly affected by this development are workers who have to trawl through volumes of documents, in their own time and unpaid, in order to ascertain the impact of this development on traffic, parking, environment, public infrastructure, education facilities etc. The developer has deep pockets, surrounding residents do not but have to rely on their own intelligence to analyse the impacts of the proposed development. It is an unequal process! You Commissioners alone are now in a position to protect the public interest, particularly those residents directly impacted by this development. I urge you to reject the proposed modifications and insist on the approval previously granted. The developer will not be short changed!

The real issues, emerging from this development, all emanate from this high density development area. Holdmark's 2005 dwellings, currently approved, will generate approximately 5,000 additional residents. The whole precinct population will likely be in the order of 12,000 people. Compare this spread with a town like Lithgow with a similar population. Presumably, part of this number will be children. Where do they play and exercise, other than use the already stretched ovals and facilities at Meadowbank Park and further clog the joint walkway/cycleway? Why no allowance for an oval or large green space for children to play within the development?

I attended and listened with interest to the various speakers at the public meeting held on 5.12.16. Some of the opponents had gone to great lengths to assess the impacts of the Modified Development Plan. The advocates merely stated their agreement with what

Holdmark proposed without any critical analysis. At that public meeting it was revealed that the Commissioners had inspected the area that day. If that inspection occurred other than during morning or evening peak periods, the impact of the concerns of opponents cannot be fully appreciated.

Commissioners, please consider carefully the following in your deliberations:

1. Morning and afternoon gridlock along Belmore Street, Constitution Road, Bowden Street, Railway Road, Bay Drive and Underdale Road. This gridlock is directly related to increased traffic volumes and the unregulated discharge of train commuters across the relevant roads both east and west of Meadowbank Railway Station. Traffic control lights will not fix the problem! The necessary infrastructure to overcome the problem has never been properly considered. Pedestrian overpasses or underpasses would be remedial. It is a poor argument to suggest it is too costly when a multi-billion dollar development is the root cause of the problem. The situation that has developed with traffic congestion highlights the inadequacy of planning and infrastructure to support the development.
2. Vehicular traffic impacts on the safety of nearby residents.
3. Disregard of parking space requirements will impact on street parking and thoroughfare.
4. Over stretched educational facilities at Meadowbank Primary School.
5. Loss of community facility. A proposed payment of \$3.7m-\$4.1m to Ryde Council in lieu of the community facility cannot benefit nearby residents if there is no available space to house an alternative facility.
6. Lack of green space for recreational purposes.
7. Farcical language of justification for a 24 storey Stage A “gateway” building to replace a 10 storey one, previously approved. If the architectural profession cannot create a 10 storey building with “design excellence”, then it will be a sad indictment of that profession. A 24 storey or a compromise 15 storey or any building other than the previously approved 10 storey building will be incongruous, isolated, out of scale, dominate the skyline and create a precedent for development elsewhere. There will also be shadowing and obstructed view impacts.
8. The attempt to “push the envelope” on building heights to accommodate more dwellings in disregard of previous approval.
9. Affordable housing seems to be a furphy based on my approach to the developer about unit prices.
10. Holdmark is not satisfied with the previous approval. It wants to cram more dwellings into a fairly saturated area. Most locals oppose the modifications for good reason. The developer will still reap a massive windfall from the previously approved Concept Plan. It should be made to abide by that approval. If that is the outcome then the public can have some faith in the approval process and not see previous approvals whittled down by rapacious developers.

I respectfully request the Commissioners to reject the modifications and not compromise the previous approval.

Yours faithfully

