

## Bradley James

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 14 November 2019 3:30 PM  
**To:** IPCN Enquiries Mailbox  
**Subject:** FW: Wahroonga Estate - Modification Assessment Report MP\_0166 MOD 8

As I am not sure to which authority my submission objecting to the above Modification Assessment Report was sent, I am now forwarding it to the IPCN.

Regards

Avona Butterfield

---

**From:** [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 22 October 2019 2:30 PM  
**To:** 'Ellen.Sessini@planning.nsw.gov.au'  
**Subject:** Wahroonga Estate - Modification Assessment Report MP\_0166 MOD 8

For Attention – Anthony Witherdin, Director Regional Assessments

Dear Sir

I am objecting to the Modification Assessment Report, noted above, which examines further amendments and modifications requested by the Seventh-day Adventist Church to its contentious PartA Concept Plan on the following grounds:

- The current plan for the residential neighbourhood is so far removed from the plan that was originally approved that it is no longer valid. The key to the acceptance of this part of the plan was that there would be no individual car ownership. The documentation stated that residents would not have to purchase, maintain or garage a vehicle. Cars would be provided on a share basis. Public transport and infrastructure would be improved to overcome the problem that the development was not a town centre or a transport hub. The Church and its proponent, Capital Bluestone, have not honoured even one of these commitments, which were key to the acceptance of the Concept Plan.

The fact that these original promised undertakings were a con is proved by the current request to remove the requirement to provide the miniscule vestige of one of these key provisions – the car-share spaces. How can a key factor in the original approval of such a contentious plan be ignored once approval has been granted?

- Two other amendments reflect the same contempt for both the original plan and the amenity of the area. Adding extra residential car spaces will doubtless increase the commercial value of the units, but will mean more vehicles on an already-congested road. Reducing visitor parking from 50 to 30 spaces will provide the additional space for the extra residential spaces and will be doubly profitable for the Church as the proponent states that visitors can use the hospital car park without acknowledging that it is a paid-by-the-hour facility owned by the Church. Visitors choosing not to pay to visit friends will resort to on-street parking, further exacerbating the major parking problems endured by long-suffering residents in neighbouring streets.
- While traffic reports may show that the extra vehicles generated by the proposed amendments would have no appreciable impact on Fox Valley Road, they do not - as an earlier IHAP report concluded should occur – take into account the effect on traffic of the already-approved and planned developments on Fox Valley Road, several of which are also on sites owned by the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

- All the amendments seem to have one thing in common – greed. While curvilinear blocks would be more elegant and reduce the visual impact, it is obviously much cheaper to build long, bulky, Soviet-era rectangular blocks. Removing Block D might perhaps be a good public relations exercise, but it does not reduce the number of units and provides only an extra bit of land for the school across an access road, not the sweeping, open, green vistas where students and their minds can run free.
- Allowing Blocks A and C to creep closer to the back boundary of the school is unacceptable. Already the school is squeezed as close as legally permitted to busy Fox Valley Road and its grounds are rigidly defined, confined, regimented and closed in. There is no sense of freedom and space in the outside areas. WAS could have been a glorious school where the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of the students could flourish in idyllic surroundings, but it sadly is not. Every subsequent amendment has further restricted its access to the vast area of land beyond its back boundary, and financial considerations have been allowed to over-ride the values of the Church which parents were encouraged and entitled to believe came with the school.
- Why was a signalised intersection approved to allow permanent access to the WAS? What other public or private school has been afforded this facility? Why do four blocks of units warrant such a facility? Have these access roads been gazetted as actual roads? Do they have names? They are really just private, unnamed, dead-end, wide lanes. This new set of lights, so close to the existing set for the SAN, will impact adversely on all those who live on or travel along Fox Valley Road. The same applies to the removal of 17 on-street parking spaces to allow improved visibility of cars already exiting the Church offices. The streets to the south of the Fox Valley Road/Comenarra Parkway intersection are already parked out every week day by SAN workers and visitors who do not wish to pay to park. The quality of life of these residents, not just their exiting visibility, has been irreparably damaged and the amenity of the area has been destroyed.
- While the RFS is diligent in enforcing bush fire buffer zones, the proponent seems to have given no consideration to how this residential neighbourhood would be evacuated in the event of a major bush fire. Those of us who have seen the speed with which fire races through tree canopies know just how quickly and devastatingly fire can spread. Already fires have encroached upon local built areas – Monteith Street in Turramurra, and the area just south of the Fox Valley Road/Comenarra Parkway intersection. The later fire, in 2006, burnt right to the rear boundaries of houses in Seymour Close and the resulting chaos as panicked residents, children and pets tried to exit through that one intersection, which serves more than 350 households in the peninsula, showed just how vulnerable this area with its magnificent, towering trees really is. Every new development in the Fox Valley Road area increases the evacuation risks for every resident.

Did the Church learn nothing from the Camp Fire which wiped out about 90% of Paradise, California, almost a year ago? Its church, school, and most of its huge hospital complex were destroyed and 86 residents lost their lives. Many more were injured. The evacuation plan there – such as it was – had a crucial vulnerability: it did not envisage the panicked evacuation of the entire town at once. How does the proponent envisage the residents of that crowded residential neighbourhood could escape with only one narrow access road and an already choked Fox Valley Road in a similar crises? It is too late after such a tragedy to address such a possibility, sadly increasingly likely with record-breaking summers and tinder-dry bushland.

All these almost-DA submissions by the proponent have been characterised by the same cavalier response to Council or resident objections: 'It's in the Concept Plan.' 'It's not in the Concept Plan.' with the proponent choosing to honour only those conditions of the Concept Plan that are most profitable. True community consultations have been non-existent, mere exercises in window-dressing. The Church is bulldozing its way through this lovely, low-rise, low-density residential area and in doing so is destroying the amenity of a cherished, tranquil part of Ku-ring-gai. Why is this allowed to happen?

Avona Butterfield