

Objector Submission

Speaker 1 – DAVID FRIEND

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is David Friend. I am speaking on behalf of my wife Edwina, our extended family, and the local community who will be significantly impacted by the proposed development.

My focus today will be on how our health and safety will be jeopardized due to the shortcomings in the assessment process in respect to the identified site contamination issues, and the proposed silica dust preventative measures associated with the excavation of 70,000 cubic metres of Hawkesbury Sandstone.

Starting with site contamination on 1st March we alerted Council to the presence of an historical garbage tip and incinerator that existed on the golf club site back in the early 1900's.

Following Council's request to the applicant to investigate its existence, we note the following conclusion was made in Council's Report ***"The former landfill use was not in the area where the proposed buildings are to be constructed"***.

A local historian Terry Fogarty has been documenting the locations of major contaminated sites within the West Ward of Willoughby. This includes details relating to Chatswood Golf Course. We have provided a copy of his history titled '**Dumping on West Ward**' which includes details of the location of tipping grounds on and near to the golf club land.

The applicant's EIS report states the source of the contaminants within the development footprint area is considered to be associated with fill being **historically imported on the site**.

There are significant health concerns as asbestos was discovered within the development footprint along with elevated levels of other contaminants. As only selected areas were tested the full extent of the contamination is unknown.

We therefore request a **deferral** until the following issues are determined:

- The second SCC states that in respect to the potential site contamination an **additional** ESA is required to address any data gaps identified by council.
- We therefore advocate that Willoughby Council and DPIE address the significant data gaps identified by the historical records provided in respect to the actual location of the historic garbage tip.
- The Environmental Protection Authority is notified under Section 60 of the CLM Act and ensure an independent EPA accredited site auditor is engaged to carry out the ESA.
- Ensure the following legislation as detailed in Clause 7 of SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land is adhered to. This Policy aims to promote the remediation of contaminated land for the purpose of reducing the risk of harm to human health or any other aspect of the environment especially where there is **"incomplete knowledge"**.
- There are also concerns with Council's Condition #4 that states that validation and remediation of contaminated land will only **occur after the demolition** of the structures on site.

- What will happen if significant site contamination issues are discovered and the cost associated with remediation is prohibitive. We cannot be left with the legacy of a disturbed contaminated site for future generations.

The other major concern is in respect to **Silica Dust**. The impact of the proposed excavation of 70,000 cubic metres of Hawkesbury Sandstone on our health will be catastrophic.

It is deeply concerning that Council have made the following statement: ***“Subject to conditions, the proposal does not raise concerns prior, during or after construction about unacceptable potential health and safety impacts on the residents adjoining the subject site”***.

Council must ensure **preventative measures** are in place to eliminate the dust. To only minimise or mitigate will not be an acceptable outcome for our health and safety.

As documented for the Beaches Link Tunnel project industry guidelines recommend the minimum buffer zone is 500 metres when silica dust is involved. The proposed golf club excavation is just 3 metres from our property boundary. Why has this not been questioned by Council.

At a minimum Council must engage independent dust experts to provide recommendations and monitor any excavation process

We have been in contact with **Dr Brian Plush** a Particulate Matter Scientist

He has asked me to put the following questions to the Applicant -

- 1). What is your baseline silica dust production during each construction task, for example, task to break up/cut sandstone, task to transport sandstone, etc.
- 2). How much silica dust is removed with your installed engineering controls from baseline production, that is, how efficient are your installed controls?
- 3). How do you intend to measure the efficiency of your installed controls?

In conclusion we trust the **site contamination** issues will be validated against the **factual evidence** provided, and preventative measures in respect to the **silica dust** will be adhered to.

Thank you

PPSSNH-97 - Willoughby - DA 2020/117

Objector Submission

Speaker 2 – JOHN NIEBOER

Concerns on Traffic density in Beaconsfield Road.

My name is John Nieboer and I live at 31 Colwell Crescent.

Beaconsfield Road today.

Over time Beaconsfield Road has become more crowded with on street parking making access more challenging, with many sections of the road currently being single lane capacity only. It is the sole mean of vehicular and pedestrian access for 233 established residential properties west of Dalrymple Road.

At certain times and in certain circumstances access along Beaconsfield Road becomes blocked. For example,

- Thursday refuse collection days when 3 different bins for refuse, green waste and recycling are collected by the council. Refuse trucks need to stop to collect and navigate narrowed laneways causing delays to traffic.
- Building works at residences has large trucks delivering materials blocking the road or making progress difficult and slow.
- 255 bus service has to carefully navigate the single lane sections as well as pick-up passengers.
- Residents from unit dwellings on the eastern side of Mowbray Road are parking at the top of Beaconsfield Road. This restricts the access to the traffic lights at the intersection of Beaconsfield Road and Mowbray Road. Traffic flow is regularly restricted.

With the addition of 106 dwellings at the end of Beaconsfield Road, it is anticipated that at key times that will make traffic progress along Beaconsfield Road more difficult and at peak times will cause it to grind to a halt.

The traffic lights at The Beaconsfield Road and Mowbray Road intersection.

- Currently there is space for 4 to 5 cars to wait to exit the road while waiting for a green light and space of 2 cars to enter Beaconsfield Road and allow traffic to keep moving. After that progress is blocked until a green light allows the 4 to 5 cars waiting to exit Beaconsfield Road.
- Increased traffic flow due to additional residents in Beaconsfield Road will exacerbate this problem for periods of time throughout the day.
- It has been witnessed that Buses have had to reverse out of Beaconsfield Road into busy Mowbray Road as access was blocked and to seek an alternative route to complete their journey down Beaconsfield Road.

Construction site access.

- At the time of seeking member approval for this development, it was suggested that some access would be via Mooney Street. It now appears that access will be via Beaconsfield Road only.
- It is of concern that during the excavation stage of the development, residents will need to manage progress with double tipper trucks lined up in the street awaiting collection of excavated materials.
- Ongoing delivery of building materials like concrete, bricks, steel etc, and collection of waste will see higher than normal large size vehicle traffic in a quiet residential street.
- That this building traffic activity will be allowed 6 days per week makes life for residents very difficult during construction.

Emergency Vehicle access.

- With increased street parking and increased local traffic it is a concern that should a bush fire occur, access for emergency vehicles may well be hampered by resident's evacuating the area leading to blocked traffic.
- Beaconsfield Road is the sole means of access and egress to the bushfire prone site intended for this development.
- *NSW Planning for Bushfire Protection* apply to this development which emphasises the importance of entry and egress to bushfire prone areas for residents and emergency vehicles.

Route 255 Bus Service.

- The current bus route 255 provides services that terminate at the intersection of Beaconsfield Road Colwell Crescent. It is likely that these bus services may increase once the development is completed and the aged care facility has residents. It is possible that we may lose this bus service if access to the route is further impaired beyond the current difficulty the bus drivers have accessing this area.

Council response to concerns.

- Council response in the report to these concerns is to advise that there is no issue and road capacity is within tolerance. This response has not been explained to residents who only see that Council supports the development and dismisses residents' concerns.
- The council report fails to give the local community confidence and assurance the inadequate width of Beaconsfield Road (less than 8.0 metre width required by Planning for Bushfire Protection) with unrestricted parking along either side of the road is safe and is capable of accommodating unrestricted traffic flows in the event of an emergency.

Hayon (John) and Jennifer Nieboer
31 Colwell Crescent
Chatswood 2067.

PPSSNH-97 – Willoughby – DA 2020/117

Objector Submission

Speaker 3 – MEREDITH FOLEY

I am a local resident representing members of the Willoughby Environmental Protection Association (WEPA) and the Chatswood West Ward Progress Association. Neither of these groups opposes the redevelopment of the golf course site but we do have concerns regarding:

- the proposed destruction of a significant wildlife corridor
- the number of trees to be removed
- the subsequent impact on biodiversity and
- the level of consideration given to these issues by Willoughby City Council as part of the approval process.

The proposed development straddles a ridge which currently provides an important wildlife corridor and habitat for a significantly biodiverse site. The area is identified as core bushland in Council's *Natural Heritage Register* and its importance noted in Council's *Urban Bushland Plan of Management*¹. The denuding of this ridge and north and south slopes will create a break in the only uninterrupted, vegetated corridor linking the high canopy of Ferndale Park and Coolaroo Reserve. It will also cut linkages to other nearby north and south reserves and to areas along the Lane Cove River and into Lane Cove National Park.

The removal of a total of 238 mature trees, as well as native grass and understorey, from the site will remove the route used by local wildlife to move from one reserve to another. In particular, the removal of trees from the southern side of the slope outside the building footprint, in order to provide a bushfire protection zone, could lead to erosion and further damage to the natural bushland in this area.

The proposed planting of replacement tube stock elsewhere on the course fails to address this problem. They will not reinstate the corridor, will take 15-20 years to attain any useful height and they can take up to 150 years to provide hollows. There are also questions about when the plantings will be completed as stockpiling is to be carried out on the site and further changes are planned for the course itself.

The problems outlined could be addressed if the proponents were directed to consider a more constrained building footprint.

We also believe that many of these concerns could have been addressed earlier if Willoughby City Council had given greater consideration to existing state legislation and policy as well as its own environmental planning instruments. The 3 major planning and

¹ 'Chatswood West and Lane Cove North', Willoughby City Council, [Natural Heritage Register](#) (2016); Willoughby City Council, [Urban Bushland Plan of Management](#) (2014).

environmental Acts² all propose that we should be favouring developments which are ecologically sustainable and - in doing this - “conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity should be a **fundamental consideration**”.

The protection and enhancement of what we have left, in terms of biodiversity and urban bushland, is a recurring theme in a wide range of State policies, strategies and guideline documents³ and in Council documents such as its LEP; Tree and Vegetation Preservation Clauses in the LEP and DCP; Urban Bushland Plan of Management; Natural Heritage Register; and Green City Plan.⁴. We would argue that, in the case of this proposed development, Council has not given proper consideration to its own environmental planning documents and has therefore failed to correctly identify the importance of maintaining this wildlife corridor and the biodiversity it supports for future generations.

Dr Meredith Foley
29 Greville Street
Chatswood NSW 2067

² NSW *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* 1979; the *Protection of the Environment Administration Act* 1991 and the *Biodiversity and Conservation Act* 2016

³ Objective 27, **Greater Sydney Regional Plan 2018 –A Metropolis of Three Cities** (GSC 2018); Objective 27, Objective 30, ‘North District Plan’, **GSC** 2018; Schedule 1, SEPP 19 Bushland in Urban Areas.

⁴ 13.1 & 13.2 WCC, **Local Strategic Planning Statement** (2020); p.20 **Our Green City Plan 2028**; s5.5, s6.2.4, s6.2.7 WCC Urban Bushland Plan of Management (2014); Tree and Vegetation Preservation Clause 5.9(2) under the WLEP 2012 and WDCP C9.

PPSSNH-97 – Willoughby – DA 2020/117

Objector Submission

Speaker 4 – DOUGLAS LATTO

Height, Bulk & Scale

Introduction

I live at 29 Colwell Cres. We enjoy mostly unfettered views across the golf course towards Mowbray and Lane Cove National Parks. We see some beautiful mature trees and enjoy the sound and sight of the active birdlife.

The proposed development will see us completely overlapping with the northern units and partially with the clubhouse.

E4 Zoning

Our land, as with other Colwell Cres residents, is on the eastern boundary of the Golf Club and has an E4 Zoning. The protections afforded by this are:

- To provide for low-impact residential development in areas with special ecological or aesthetic values
- To ensure that development preserves and enhances the natural features and bushland within the immediate locality
- Retain and enhance residential amenities such as views and landscape quality

We chose to live here believing that these protections would preserve, or close to, what we currently enjoy.

First Approaches

- By CGC and Watermark in 2016
- The Watermark representatives explained to me that they intended to build 60 to 80 ILUs. The height would be such that we may see the roofline above the car park level
- This was born out in the Golf Club Newsletter of 16/5/16 which quoted, "Depending on DA approval Watermark will seek to incorporate 60-80 apartments on the land"

Consultation

I was a representative of the affected residents in regular meetings that we had with Watermark between 2017 and 2019. At no stage did they inform us that they intended to build higher and increase the number of units.

The first that we knew was when the SCC was issued in July 19 allowing up to 106 units. This provided a shock to us all. Why did they not tell us this in advance?

Height, Bulk and Scale

As residents we endeavoured to understand the impact on us. We requested of Council height poles on 3 different occasions and were refused each time. Why?

Photomontages were requested of Watermark. It required multiple attempts to get something close. In my case 4, others up to 8.

Though not shown in the DA drawings I have been informed by Council that the roofline of the units (north) would be 2.73m above the car park level. We are higher up so, by looking down we expect to see the top 2 of the 5 levels, plus the roofline. This will impact our current view.

The clubhouse partially aligns with our property and rises to 4m above the car park level. Though one less level than the units, it is higher. Some of this has to do with an upward sweeping roof which seems only to serve aesthetic purposes, not necessary ones.

The Council's Recommendation Report states that our roof levels are above those of the development. We don't live on our roofs, and view from a lower level.

Our views are obtained by looking down not looking out straight, as assumed by all reports that I have seen so far. By looking straight, we see mostly sky. If this development proceeds as is, then by looking down, our first sight will be of units and a clubhouse. The direct view of parkland will be significantly reduced.

On a more general note, the development is of such a size that it will dominate the landscape from many different angles (despite efforts to minimise the effect) and will change the whole nature of the area.

Summary

In summary:

- We have to believe that E4 Zoning can provide the protection that it is meant to, otherwise it has no meaning
- Pre-SCC consultation should have been more transparent, especially re the bulk and size of the development
- The assessment of views needs to be more realistic in allowing for where we actually look from (not our rooftops) and the downward direction that we look in
- We believe that the development is too large and not in keeping with the area

We would request that a more appropriate development is considered which is in keeping with the area and respects the rights of bordering neighbours.

Douglas Latto
29 Colwell Cres
Chatswood

PPSSNH-97 – Willoughby – DA 2020/117

Objector Submission

Speaker 5 – LEE HUGHES

Dear Panel,

As a resident of No. 25 Colwell Cres immediately adjoining the proposed development, I would like to raise several issues of concern. Whilst I am generally supportive of the development, I believe there are some elements that require adjustment and/or resolution.

We recognise that there was an error in the originally lodged plans positioning the development approximately 5m west of the current plans. We request the original position is reverted to, to enhance development separation from its neighbours.

Indeed by siting the development a further 10m westward, it would be possible to retain more of the remnant treeline along the ridge behind the existing carpark,

It would also minimise the extent of rock excavation required, reduce the impact of noise & vibration on neighbours and reduce the threat of structural damage to properties near the 2-3 storey basement excavation,

We believe the roofline is still too dominant and should be further reduced in height to minimise its impact. Moving the development westward would also permit the development to be sited lower in the topography thereby reducing the impact of the proposed roofline.

Roof elements will be highly visible by adjoining properties. The plans and elevations are extremely vague in respect to roof structures and levels.

There are no details on Air-conditioning plant, acoustic enclosure or visual screening, The acoustic report is also deficient in nominating acoustic controls effecting the plant.

There are no details regarding the solar panels and if they sit flush with the roof or not.

We believe this lack of detail is misleading, disingenuous and unacceptable. Any consent should impose a maximum height permissible for plant and equipment including enclosures. Particularly for such a visually sensitive environment.

Carpark exhaust details are also extremely lacking. It is not shown on the architectural drawings, nor is it mentioned in any reports we have reviewed. Indeed, the image of the clubhouse on the cover of the Statement of Environmental Effects clearly shows 3 'exhaust stacks', but they are not represented in the architectural documentation and don't show on the Elevation of the Clubhouse. There is no mention of Kitchen or garbage room exhaust either.

These elements must be clarified and the impact scrutinised. Carpark exhaust should not be permitted along the eastern boundary in the landscape and should be restricted to being enclosed in the envelope of the proposed buildings.

Landscaping light spill should also be restricted to prevent unwanted floodlighting affecting neighbouring properties. All landscape lighting should be low level and NO up-lighting of trees should be permitted.

In conclusion I wish to again state our general support the development but request strong consideration is given to:

1. Moving the Development westward by approximately 10m and siting it lower in the topography,
2. More comprehensive controls on roof elements and treatment,
3. Further scrutiny of carpark, kitchen and garbage exhaust
4. Restriction of light spill from external lighting.

We trust you understand our concerns and will support the measures proposed by this submission .

Yours sincerely,

Lee Hughes

No 25 Colwell Crescent Chatswood NSW

PPSSNH-97 – Willoughby – DA 2020/117

Objector's Submission

Speaker 6 – ANNETTE BOWDEN

I have read Council's Assessment Report and Supplementary Assessment Report and raised the following concerns.

The Report identifies the site as Bushfire Prone Land and therefore requires NSW Rural Fire Service approval.

Page 6 of the Report states.

238 trees are proposed to be removed from the subject site in order to accommodate the works and the Asset Protection Zone.

The report fails to mention.

The required Asset Protection Zone falls outside the boundaries of the Site Compatibility Certificate

54 trees to be removed with an additional 15 trees affected by the Asset Protection Zone. The applicant's Tree Assessment Report refers to these trees as being visually prominent and visually significant to the area, which justifies these trees being listed in Council's Natural Heritage Register as having local significance as remnant Sydney Sandstone Forest Community. (Page 25 of the Assessment Report, dismisses Council's Natural Heritage Register as having no significance in this assessment process).

The report fails to refer to and ignores the basic planning principals required under Planning for Bushfire Protection 2019, such as,

APZs on environmentally protected land,

APZs on slopes over 18 degrees,

APZs on adjoining land, and

Larger APZs are required, due to this type of development.

The area of the required Asset Protection Zone extends up to 69 meters beyond the boundaries of the Site Compatibility Certificate.

Trees affected by the Asset Protection Zone form part of an established wildlife corridor connecting two adjacent bushland reserves.

To justify the location of the APZ and required tree loss, Page 22 of the Report under the heading of *Loss of Vegetation*, Council states.

The proposal has a bigger impact on trees than initially estimated. The majority of the tree loss is driven by the Rural Fire Service bushfire management requirements, due to the proposed use of the development.

To be clear, the NSW Rural Fire Service response is based on the building design submitted to them as part of the Integrated Development assessment process. The RFS is not an agency concerned about the preservation of the natural landscape or indigenous flora. In fact, the RFS takes no issue with tree and under storey removal.

This is an impact that must be balanced against the desired future character of the Willoughby Local Environmental Plan (WLEP) 2012, and Council's own Urban Bushland Plan of Management Volumes 1 & 2, which are adopted policies focused on tree preservation. The objectives of these adopted policies have been ignored in this Assessment Report.

To demonstrate Council's inconsistent assessment of this application, Council in 2013 when granting approval to rezone Golf Course land to E4 Environmental Living zone land (which forms part of this application), acknowledge the significance of the special ecological values this site and adjoining lands have, in contributing to the overall amenity and visual significance of the locality by imposing a Site Specific Provision in the Willoughby Development Control Plan for this particular, yet to be created allotment and imposed the following controls;

Clause D.1.17 states - Compliance with the requirements of the NSW Rural Fire Service. Council will not approve any part of the Asset Protection Zone to be located outside the subject site.

The significance of this bushland area was further articulated in detail in Council's correspondence dated 18 August 2017, addressed to the then Sydney Region West Planning Service of the Department of Planning and Environment.

Page 66 of the Report under the heading *Subdivision* further states.

The subdivided E4 zoned lot will remain free of buildings, cross easements are proposed for any Drainage / Asset Protection Zone requirements.

The stated intended use of E4 Environmental Living zone allotment as part of the required Asset Protection Zone is contrary to the objectives of the E4 zone, which has a primary objective under the Willoughby LEP, **to ensure that development preserves and enhances the natural features and bushland within the immediate locality**, not to act or to be used as an ancillary use for the benefit of an adjoining development located on a separate allotment of land.

The applicant has chosen to utilize the entire length of the site as described in the Site Compatibility Certificate, with no consideration of locating the required Asset Protection Zone within the defined boundaries. To benefit from this decision, the design relies upon the adjoining environmental sensitive land and the removal of locally significant trees to achieve their objective.

This approach is contrary to the objectives of the Willoughby Urban Bushland Plan of Management and Council's Natural Heritage Register.

To off-set the intended tree loss, the buying of Biodiversity credits to compensate for the destruction of the natural environment, in lieu of developing an overall building design which compliments and co-exists with both the surrounding natural and built environments, should not be considered as acceptable to the Panel.

PPSSNH-97 - Willoughby - DA2020/117

Objector Submission

Speaker 7 – STEFAN STRANO

Thank you Chair and good afternoon Panel members,

As residents of 23 Colwell Crescent, we are immediately adjoining and therefore considerably impacted by the proposed development.

We are generally supportive of the development but want to reiterate matters which we drew to the attention of council in our letter dated 15 July 2020 that we do not believe have been adequately addressed in the Council Assessment Report dated 24 May 2021.

Our concerns relate to two matters concerning construction of the new development – the health and safety of the families of local residents and the potential for structural damage to our properties.

Health and safety impact

The plans indicate that very significant excavation and building work will be undertaken on the immediate border of our property.

We have sought assurance that there will be no danger to the health of our family and neighbours due to dust or prolonged periods of vibration and noise.

According to the cancer council website silica dust is 100 times smaller than a grain of sand, so you can be breathing it without knowing - with exposure potentially leading to lung cancer and other diseases. There appears significant risk that freshly crushed sandstone dust may be spread during excavation as well as if large mounds of building waste are left exposed.

We are very concerned over the health risks to young children and vulnerable people. We request that proper dust control measures be implemented, and monitoring stations established to ensure we are not put at risk. We are also concerned about the ongoing uncertainty which excavating a historical rubbish tip (which has been highlighted as containing asbestos in the Council Assessment Report) right next to our property boundary may raise.

This report does not address or recommend noise or dust control measures to be implemented during the excavation period. We also have seen no mention of where the carpark exhaust will be located. We request that this item is clarified as the impact of exhaust fumes or any ongoing noise has not been made clear.

Structural damage / property impact

As detailed in the applicant's Geotechnical Report, the proposed 16m deep carpark excavation extending up to the common allotment boundaries will encounter hard rock, requiring the use of rock hammers. This report also confirms the rock excavation will have a direct transmission of ground vibrations to nearby (neighbouring) structures.

As it appears that there will be excavation performed right up to the immediate border of our property, we also seek reassurance that there will not be damage to the structure of our backyard or our newly renovated home.

Finally, We believe the development will make a material impact on the natural environment and impact our views. We have significant concern that drawings provided to date are not accurate based on other residents' experience and we have had no reassurance from council about the impact on views or the local wildlife or how that is proposed to be managed.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these matters.

Objector’s Submission

Speaker 8 – DANIEL FANG

Privacy, Noise, Security, and Infrastructure Concerns

As adjoining neighbors to the proposed Seniors Living and associated carpark development, we feel disappointed that the concerns raised by Colwell Crescent neighbors group have been dismissed in the Council’s Assessment Report. These issues have been left to members of the local community, not Council to identify deficiencies in the application. We would like to take the opportunity to raise our concerns about ongoing privacy, noise, security and infrastructure again.

Ongoing Privacy

1. New footpath: pedestrian can see through living room windows (only 1m lower in southern end)
2. New open grassed area: people constantly pass through, sit and talk
3. New bi-directional road: cut back 5m of dense green space currently acting as natural screening
4. New semi uphill turning circle: exiting vehicles head lights towards main residential windows



Current outlook



Simulated view based on DA plan at same position

Ongoing Noise

1. Increased club house operations and guest activities especially at night (e.g. music)
2. Unclear location of required exhaust vents servicing the basement carpark
3. Ongoing vibration and humming from air-conditioning outlets and exhaust/ventilation
4. Early morning chatters from new footpath and club house entrance along western boundary
5. Vehicle noise (e.g. acceleration when exiting uphill), speed hump in front of bedrooms & family rooms
6. Stormwater plan locates mechanical exhaust vent about 3m of an adjoining residential boundary.

Ongoing Security

1. Increased risk of cul-de-sac in the end of Beaconsfield road
2. Increased risk profile of surrounding neighborhood due to dramatically increased population density (golf club had broken-in in 2020)
3. Natural or human-caused disasters (Aug 2017, bush fire due to cigarette butts, 000 called twice)
4. No longer family friendly E4 zone (e.g. CGC guests leaving alcohol bottles behind)

Infrastructure Support

1. Fragile water and sewer pipes (4-5 major repairs in the last 5 years). One repair still in progress for the past 6 weeks unfinished. (see below)
2. Various condemned power line posts in the end of Beaconsfield road
3. Damaged footpath and insufficient lightings along the end of road
4. Great impact to Internet speed due to NBN HFC setup



Last power pole in front of CGC



Right in front of CGC entrance footpath

It is important to note the new extensive development is in E4 Environment Living zoning. As required by Council's various planning control in this special zone, all neighboring residential development have complied with these requirements, such as greater boundary set-backs, greater landscape areas. The benefit of these controls is to preserve and enhance the natural features and bushland within the immediate locality, to retain and enhance residential amenity, including views, aural/visual privacy and landscape quality.

We found the overbearing design of the development by virtue of its extended building footprint is not only harmful to the natural environment but also disrespectful to the stated objectives of the adjoining E4 zoned allotments.

Daniel F

125 Beaconsfield Rd, Chatswood

PPSSNH-97 – Willoughby – DA 2020/117

Objector's Submission

Speaker 9 – TOM BOWDEN

The application before the Panel is a once in a lifetime opportunity to develop this unique site, not only for future social needs, but also to protect and enhance the identified environmental values and local heritage significance of this site for future generations, as required by various planning instruments and Council adopted policies (**see Attachment 1- Town Planning Report, prepared by EConPlan dated July 2021**), which have not been considered.

As reported, it is proposed to re-develop this Golf Course site in various stages.

Unfortunately, the assessment of this significant development has been undertaken in isolation, no Master Plan for the overall re-development of this site has been presented to the community, to demonstrate how all stages will integrate, together with a timeline for overall completion. An example of Council's uncoordinated assessment is to impose Consent Condition 26, which requires off-set landscape planting within the Golf Course. The re-development of the land containing the golf course is to be redesigned and reconfigured as a separate stage, subject to members approval in the future, therefore imposing such a condition is pointless.

It has been clearly demonstrated by the previous speakers, little to no consideration has been given during the design and assessment process of retaining and incorporating the natural attributes of this remanent bushland community and dominant sandstone ridge site into the final design, which would not only retain the scenic qualities of the site but would also be consistent with the zoning objectives of the neighbouring, E4 Environmental Living allotments.

To enable a proper visual appreciation of the proposed building's overall height, scale and potential view loss, the community on several occasions requested the erection of building height poles. These requests were dismissed by Council.

It was therefore left to individual community members, not Council Officers to identify misleading information in the applicant's submission.

The local significance of the unique site is well documented, particularly when Council imposed an unprecedented Site-Specific condition in the Willoughby DCP, (**see Attachment 2 - Clause D.1.17 of Willoughby Development Control Plan**) relating to the redevelopment of the E4 rezoned lot, which forms part of this application, with the aim of protecting the natural attributes of this sensitive site.

Council again in August 2017, confirmed the significance of this site in its letter to the then Sydney Region West Planning Service (**see Attachment 3 – Willoughby Council to the then Sydney Region West Planning Service, dated 18 August 2017**)

Compliance with the recommendations made in this correspondence were formally agreed to by both the Chatswood Golf Club and Developer in their correspondence addressed to the then Sydney Region East Team, dated 24 August 2018 (**see Attachment 4 – Chatswood Golf Club correspondence to the then Sydney Region East Team dated 24 August 2018**).

Clause 2.2 c) of the heading Officer's Recommendation, states.

The proposal is found to be compatible with the surrounding natural and built environment, including with the adjacent E4 zoned residential properties.

Based on the submissions to the Panel, it is the communities opinion due to the extent of excavation, overall bulk, scale, and onsite location to accommodate this development, the design has failed to recognize and incorporate the desirable bushland elements and character of this unique sites location, but has adopted a design which will visually dominate this landscape by removing and disturbing remanent bushland which provides an ecological linkage between two adjoining bushland reserves, contrary to the objective of local planning controls, which were put in place to protect and enhance the remanent bushland character of this site, which contributes to the quality and identity of this Chatswood West area.

Therefore, the Council's Officers statement that this proposal is compatible with the surrounding natural and built environments should be dismissed by the Panel members.

Thank you.

Tom Bowden

126 Beaconsfield Road, Chatswood