

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title

[REDACTED]

First Name

[REDACTED]

Family name

[REDACTED]



Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/ Town

Chatswood

I have made a reportable political donation

No



I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

I object to the planning proposal for any affordable housing in this area, regardless of whether it is 10% or 7%. There is already a critical level of overcrowding and traffic congestion in the area, making it difficult for existing residents like me and my family to even drive a short distance to the shops and medical appointments, particularly for older family members who cannot easily walk to those places. The proposed developments at 3 McIntosh St, 2 Day st and 40-42 Anderson St will exceed the capacity of existing roads and infrastructure. Even worse, the inclusion of Affordable Housing will result in the risk of increasing crime, social issues like substance abuse and domestic violence in this traditionally family-friendly and safe neighbourhood. The Affordable Housing inclusion must be scrapped entirely and the proposed high-rise developments must be curtailed substantially. The NSW Government needs to find more sustainable ways of solving the housing crisis such as building new housing in undeveloped areas and improving transport infrastructure. Allowing ever-increasing high rise developments and Affordable Housing in established areas is NOT really a genuine effort in trying to solve housing shortages. As substantial tax and rate payers to both NSW and Federal Governments, we should be given stronger preference and our views need to be given stronger weight in these planning proposals.

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title

[REDACTED]

First Name

[REDACTED]

Family name

[REDACTED]

☐

Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/ Town

Chatswood2067

I have made a reportable political donation

No

☒

I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

Please see my submission letter dd 27 March 2025 by post sent to The Planning Panels Team at 4 Paramatta Square , 12 Darcy street, Paramatta nsw2150. I am a senior 80 plus and illiterate on computer. Kindly put in my above letter as my objections to the proposal. Thanks. from [REDACTED]



Re: Ref: Notice of Exhibition - Planning Proposal (PP-2022-4316) 3 McIntosh St Day St and 40-42 Anderson St. Chatswood

From DPHI Planning Proposal Authority Mailbox <planningproposalauthority@dphi.nsw.gov.au>

Date Thu 27/03/2025 3:05 PM

To [REDACTED]

Hi Soo Kiu,

Thank you for contacting us regarding the Public Exhibition of the planning proposal for 3 McIntosh St, Day St and 40-42 Anderson St, Chatswood (PP-2022-4316).

To ensure your feedback is formally recorded and given due consideration as part of the planning assessment process, we kindly request that you lodge your objection through our online planning portal (see link below).

Link to Planning Portal: <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/ppr/under-exhibition/3-mcintosh-street-2-day-street-40-42-anderson-street-chatswood>

Kind regards,

Planning Proposal Authority Team

Planning, Land Use Strategy, Housing, and Infrastructure | Planning Group

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, 27 March 2025 12:03 PM

To: planningproposalauthority@dph.nsw.gov.au <planningproposalauthority@dph.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Ref: Notice of Exhibition - Planning Proposal (PP-2022-4316) 3 McIntosh St Day St and 40-42 Anderson St. Chatswood

Dear Sir

Whenever I receive such a Notice or Development proposal from your Dept or Willoughby Council, I cannot hide my feeling that what is the use of my objections when your Planning Panel, Willoughby Council already have a preconception of approving such proposed developments, wasting mine and your time as most of these proposals were subsequently approved despite many objections by nearby residents.

One very bad example of the Dept or Council is to allow the word "Affordable" Housing Map on be used to mislead its readers that such housing would be Affordable when such units very near Chatswood CBD, Train Station were and are never cheap or Affordable. It is very unprofessional for the Dept or Council to

use such a word as a pretext to justify the Dept or Council's subsequent approval that the new units when later built would be Affordable. The word used is dishonesty.

I hereby list 5 items of my objection and feeling as follows :-

1) Governance

The Planning keeps tearing down building ceiling heights imposed by past Planning Dept. It is very unfair to existing residents who bought their houses or units near the proposed sites that there would be no high rise buildings to infringe their privacy when highrise units can peep into their home privacy. Of course the Planning Dept has the power to do so but is it morally fair to existing residents?

Chatswood CBD and its nearby areas are already infested with so many new high rise residential buildings, causing heavy traffic congestions, safety to pedestrians, and students, inadequate sunlight for healthy bodies.

Above all, if Chatswood CBD and surrounding areas become a concrete high rise building jungle, such further new high rise buildings will rob the beauty of Chatswood CBD from its low and lovely shopping buildings. Where in the world when a city or town with a concrete high rise buildings concrete jungle is loved by people, visitors and tourists?

2) Environment

Chatswood streets are well planted with nice trees, plants and gardens. We have vast vacant lands in our National Park e.g. Lane Park and forest areas which can be converted into mini satellite town earmarked for high rise low cost residential units. The Planning Dept / Council have done a very good job to allow very nice new double storey individual housing lots to be built at the junction of Archer St n Boundary St. Also highly commended is a long line of 4 storey nice residential units along Boundary just opposite end of Archer St. Will comment and suggest an idea in the following paragraph.

The Planning Dept should instead consider allowing new 5 or 6 storey residential buildings be built on the proposed development in McIntosh St. Day St and Anderson St. same as those along Boundary St just at end of Archer St.

No more high rise buildings in and around Chatswood CBD will boost cleanliness of air flows and keep residents healthy with fresh air, no wind tunnels in between tall buildings.

3) Social

As said before, high rise buildings infringe the privacy of existing units. How do members of your Dept and approving authority feel when privilege of privacy of their living units are compromised. The existing residents do not expect such proposed developments to happen to spoil their existing environment.

4) Ensure Honesty and professional integrity are kept at arm's length with developers. This must be safe

guarded at all time.

5) The Planning Dept and Government should seriously consider establishing a statutory Body e.g. a Govt Housing Board to build low cost high rising building units for the benefits of our low income citizens so that people know such units would be low cost and affordable. Such cluster of high rise low cost buildings should be built by Govt contractors by tenders on free and vacant park lane or forest areas as mentioned above.

Such an endeavour will win the hearts of our citizens that our Govt is taking care of our low income citizens.

Suggest the Planning Dept and Govt to study how Singapore Govt took and takes good care of its citizens by the Housing Board. Your proposed developments by private developers are profit motivated and can never be cheap and affordable.

Additionally, the suggested Govt Housing Board should allocate such low cost units only across all the spectrum of different religions. Their immediate neighbours should be of different religion so that they can have more understanding of their different culture and live friendly with each other cementing racial and National harmony and unity. No concentration of one single religious residents is allowed as to cause conflicts/ fighting/ protests/ unruly demonstrations and hatred against each other.

For the above reasons, I hereby strongly object to this proposed developments and any further high rise buildings in and around Chatswood especially near train station, schools and CBD areas. You should consider item 5 above very seriously.

Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Title**First Name****Family name**☐

Name withheld

Please tick this box if you do not want your name published in the list of submitters on the department's website

Email**Suburb/ Town**

ROSEVILLE

I have made a reportable political donation

No

☒

I agree to the Privacy statement

submission

The merit of a planning proposal should be determined on the basis of its planning merit. The supposed merit argument put forward by the proponent is made out on the basis of administrative process, not planning merit. It is clear that more affordable housing is required, in the Chatswood area and elsewhere, and no planning-based argument has been advanced to the contrary. Accordingly, it can be determined that the proposal has no planning merit and should be disallowed.

It might or might not be that there is an administrative argument that the change to the affordable housing contribution should be allowed. However, it seems that this is an administrative question, not a planning one and so should not be determined through the mechanism of a planning proposal.