

# **ATTACHMENT 3**

**From:** Robert Lee |  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 November 2012 11:57:33 PM  
**To:** Strathfield Municipal Council  
**Subject:** DA2012/124

Dear Sir/Madam,

I, Robert Lee owner of Albert Rd Strathfield NSW 2135, wish to raise the following objections to the development application DA2012/124:

1) Impact on sun quality to residents living directly across the proposed development.

- a large number of Regal Court apartments facing directly opposite the proposed development are one bedroom apartments. These apartments only have windows facing the proposed development. If DA2012/124 were to be approved this will impact the only source of sunlight for these apartments.

2) Impact on air quality to residents living directly across the proposed development.

- a large number of Regal Court apartments facing directly opposite the proposed development are one bedroom apartments. These apartments only have windows facing the proposed development. If DA2012/124 were to be approved this will impact the air quality for these apartments.

3) Traffic and parking around Albert Rd and Raw Square

- Traffic congestion around Albert Rd and Raw Square is currently already very bad. This DA proposal will make the traffic situation even worse. Currently on the weekend it can take up to 20 mins to do one loop around the block on land where the Regal Apartments sits on. I.e. block of land enclosed by Albert Rd, Churchill Ave and Raw Square.

4) Pollution and noise caused by the construction of DA2012/124

- The amount of dust and pollution due to the motor traffic around Raw Square and Albert Rd is already very bad. If the development application were to be approved this will greatly increase the amount of pollution to residents living nearby.

5) Impact to property value and resident health in relation to Objections 1, 2, 3 and 4.

6) DA architecture and building colour does not fit and complement the Sandalwood and Regal Court Apartments.

- This may impact the aesthetics of the suburb's main and most desirable street.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Lee

From: jacky Hong  
Sent: Thursday, 15 November 2012 11:44:12 PM  
To: Strathfield Municipal Council  
Subject: Objection of development application No 2012/124

To: Strathfield Council

Development Application No. 2012/124  
38-40 Albert Rd, Strathfield

Dear Sir/ Madam

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit comments regarding the above applications. The proposals involve the redevelopment (in conjunction with the neighbouring) of the 11-storey building apartment and (may containing a restaurant on further).

Interest and general line of person making representation:

We write in connection with the above planning application. We have examined the plans and we know the site well. We strongly object to this application to the development of these houses in this location.

The proposed siting of the development is particularly ill-considered: it is on a small area site used by many local area resident and elder people for recreation and walking dogs, and building here would both diminish the striking view into the centre of the this area be prominent from most angles within the Strathfield suburb. The chalet style design is out of keeping with the Strathfield village's strong historic character - no other dwelling in the village has a small land to built height building, for instance. While design issues might be solved by conditions or revised proposals, these could not remedy the siting problem.

- \* Historic objections, including a loss of character, site and setting
- \* Overlooked windows
- \* The building height results in an unacceptable shadow impact on surrounding properties.
- \* The building represents a significant and unacceptable overdevelopment of the site - significantly greater than is acceptable in the current Town Planning Scheme.
- Increased traffic
- \* Private water supply damage
- \* The building causes significant loss of amenity to surrounding buildings.
- \* Buildings still serve a functional purpose (unnecessary development)
- \* Environmental Habitats and Impact
- \* The building bulk significantly exceeds acceptable plot ratio limits.
- \* Noise impact still unacceptable and does not satisfy the relevant noise standards
- \* The building height, mass and proportion is excessive.
- \* The development does not complement or enhance the character of the local area.
- \* Our expectations are that buildings above 3-storeys are not acceptable in this location and are in conflict with the current Town Planning Scheme.
- \* The development causes significant loss of privacy and visual amenity to surrounding properties.
- \* Our expectations are that buildings above 3 storeys are not acceptable in this location and are in conflict with the current Town Planning Scheme.

If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I would like to speak at the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Also, That development area have a small land so how can you approve to built up 11- storey? This is unacceptable and total ridiculous of that development planning.

We strongly object to the application and ask the committee to refuse the plans and only approve up to 3-storey. or There is a minimal reduction in floor area in the new proposal

Signature:

Yours faithfully,

Jackv Hona

Albert Rd,  
Strathfield NSW 2135

From: Benjamin Ho  
Sent: Saturday, 20 October 2012 8:13:33 AM  
To: Strathfield Municipal Council  
Subject: DA No 2012/124

To the General Manager

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing about the Development Application No 2012/124, for 38-40 Albert Rd Strathfield.

I oppose the proposed development.

To create an 11 storey structure in that location will only increase the already heavy road traffic and congestion around the Strathfield Square area. During peak hour, Albert Rd, Raw Square, Churchill Ave and the Boulevard already resemble a parking lot, with heavy pedestrian traffic at pedestrian crossings and too many cars posing ever increasing safety risks. Unless work is done to reduce and redirect traffic - both motor and pedestrian - away from the Strathfield Square area, a serious accident is inevitable. I hope the Council will act to reduce the safety risks before such a tragic event occurs.

This development will only exacerbate the existing congestion problems, and increase the safety risks. I ask that the proposed development be disapproved until such concerns can first be addressed.

Yours faithfully

Benjamin Ho  
Albert Rd  
Strathfield NSW 2135



Sophie Olsen  
Planning Officer  
Strathfield Council

83 signatories of  
this pro-forma letter

30 November 2012

**Objection to Development Application 2012/124 | 38-40 Albert Road, Strathfield**

Dear Sophie,

I write to you as Strata Managing Agent of Regal Court Apartments, 20-34 Albert Road Strathfield, with the Owners Corporations objection to the proposed development.

We believe the proposed development falls outside the Strathfield Council Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2011 controls for the following reasons:

- Minimum allotment under size in zone B4 Mixed Use
- Street setbacks undersized

**Minimum allotment size in zone B4 Mixed Use**

The parcel of land comprising 38-40 Albert Road is 847.8sqm, short of the 1,000sqm required under clause 4.1B(2) of the LEP to build a residential flat building on land zoned B4 mixed use. The land size is too small to build a development up to 35 meters. We believe it is not in the public interest to have a high density development built on such a small parcel of land.

**Street Setbacks**

There are no street setbacks proposed on the Albert Road and Raw Square frontages, and a gradual setback from 0.0 meters to 3.0 meters on the Western boundary of the land. This is not consistent with the LEP which states a 4 meter setback shall be provided on each side. The footpath is only 1.2 meters wide at present. We have concerns about the amount of public open space, the increased pedestrian traffic on a narrow footpath, and pedestrian safety if they are forced to spill on to the road.

**Environmental impact on Regal Court Apartments, 20-34 Albert Road Strathfield**

- Driveway – The driveway of the proposed development is located on the Albert Road frontage. Vehicles already bank up on Albert Road to enter the Council Carpark and the driveway of Regal Court Apartments impeding access. We have concerns that Albert Road cannot accommodate another driveway and increased traffic congestion.

- Parking – The proposed development does not meet car space ratios with respect to the residential dwellings. There is a 39% shortage of car spaces for residential dwellings, no parking for commercial visitors to the professional consulting rooms, and a lack of employee parking for the professional consulting rooms as it is likely that greater than two employees will be employed.

Regal Court comprises a public access car park for the use of visitors to the commercial lots within Regal Court, and the general public. This public access car park is already high use, not time restricted or patrolled by Council. The parking shortage in the proposed development will place a greater demand on parking within Regal Court and further burden the Owners Corporation in the following ways:

- i) wear and tear to the common property;
- ii) increased traffic on private land; and
- iii) increased cost in building security and management to control the parking

A number of aspects of the proposed development fall outside the LEP controls; minimum allotment size in zone B4, floor space ratios, car space ratios, and street setbacks. Under clause 4.6(3), we ask if the developer of 38-40 Albert Road has provided a written request seeking justification of the contravention to the development standard. If so, we ask that a copy of this request be provided to us.

The Owners Corporation of 20-34 Albert Road wishes to demonstrate that the proposed development is not in the public interest due to the impact on pedestrian pathways, Albert Road Traffic, and on an existing development like Regal Court.

We appeal to Council that the development standards contained in the LEP be upheld regardless of any exemptions that exist. If the proposed development proceeds in its current format it would set precedent for the impact from high-rise development built on a small parcels of land.

We trust that Strathfield Council looks favorably on our concerns.

Yours faithfully,  
**BRIGHT & DUGGAN PTY LIMITED**

**Ben Cabello**  
Strata Manager  
on behalf of Owners Corporation Strata Plan 60199

Name

Lot

/ 20-34 Albert Road  
Strathfield NSW 2135

D:

9 Signatories of  
this Proforma letter

13 Nov, 2012

To Strathfield Council

File No: DA2012/1

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I (We), \_\_\_\_\_ the owner(s)

of Unit \_\_\_\_\_ Albert Rd, Strathfield strongly object the  
Development Application No. 2012/124, for the following reasons:

1. This development will make this area unnecessarily crowded to live in. Strathfield, currently a desirable place to live, will become overpopulated and people in this area would become dissatisfied with the changes in the area.
2. It would start a cycle where the quality of buildings in the area becomes unacceptable as developers value quantity over quality. It is important that Strathfield is maintained as an area of high standards of living, which is not densely populated.
3. As a result of more people, traffic congestion, which is already a huge problem in this area particularly in peak hours, will be exacerbated. A huge influx of pedestrians and cars will put unnecessary strain on an already busy intersection.
4. As a lot located just a few metres from the intersection, the safety of pedestrians is placed under risk as cars exiting from the building could potentially injure many people walking in the area. This is especially pressing for parents as it is imperative that the safety of children in the area, such as students who attend local schools, is maintained.
5. More people and cars will also result in increased noise, air and waste pollution which affects the quality of living for all residents in the area. Fresh air is already becoming scarce in this busy area, and such a large increase in numbers would cause this to worsen. Pollution has many negative impacts on health, environment and the community.
6. The building will also detriment the aesthetics of the area, as it disturbs the otherwise relatively even leveling of the buildings on the side of Albert Rd towards Homebush.
7. It also disturbs the view of people living in existing high-rises such as that of Sandalwood, where many people have paid large amounts of money to secure a beautiful view from their balcony, which would be disrupted by this new plan.



As residents of Strathfield, a place we call home, we do not wish for the peace of our neighbourhood, nor the quality of our surroundings to be diminished. Thus, we object to the new development plan.

Thank you for your consideration. We urge you to make the right decision for the existing community in this area, and also for the future of Strathfield.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely