

**From:** [b.turco@optusnet.com.au](mailto:b.turco@optusnet.com.au)  
**To:** [Plan Comment Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Submission for PP-2022-376  
**Date:** Sunday, 5 June 2022 6:02:44 PM  
**Attachments:** [Submission for PP-2022-376.pdf](#)

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a nearby resident making a submission for the following development currently being considered by the Sydney Central City Planning Panel:

Ref. No.: PP-2022-376

Address of proposed development: 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Rd., Carlingford NSW 2118.

Please see the attached PDF file for the details of my submission.

Regards,

Damian Turco

---

Email sent using Optus Webmail

## SUBMISSION FOR PLANNING PROPOSAL

Planning proposal Ref. No.: PP-2022-376

Address of planning proposal: 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Rd., Carlingford, NSW 2118.

Stakeholder category: Local resident at 12D Felton Rd.

Time of residency at property: Since 1993.

Position regarding planning proposal: OPPOSED UNLESS MODIFIED.

4th June, 2022.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you to comment on the above-mentioned development proposed on Pennant Hills Rd., Carlingford. I have lived at 12D Felton Rd., which is just a few houses down from the proposed development since 1993. As I have lived here for so long, I have an interest in the local area and seek to ensure that any development that occurs here is appropriate and supportive of the community's needs.

Looking at the planning documents, I wish to congratulate all involved for their work and consideration for planning a development that is sympathetic and thoughtful of its environs. There has been thought applied to the issues of traffic management, noise pollution, solar access and the types of businesses appropriate for the development and which the community needs. It is evident that consideration has been given to the residents' and the community's desire for recreation, relaxation and nature.

I believe the pedestrian thoroughfare that permits public access between Felton Rd. and Pennant Hills Rd. is a good idea. I am someone who tries to walk around the local area and that thoroughfare will make it easier to get around to the other side. It will be easier to walk to Adderton Rd., the petrol station on that corner and the rest of that area. I also believe that encouraging pedestrian activity combined with good lighting and pleasant landscaping makes people want to be in the area and therefore, improves safety and discourages vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Don't forget to add a few seats alongside the footpath or in the little alcove in-between the townhouses to encourage people to sit and read a book or chat with a friend.

I also believe that the architects have been sensible to keep the bulk of the proposed residences away from the western boundary of the site. The neighbours to this site live in townhouses and as one continues further, the properties become ordinary suburban houses. Thank you for your thought and consideration.

Concerning traffic management, I can understand the position of the RMS in wanting to minimise the number of vehicles accessing the site from Pennant Hills Rd. It does make sense to have vehicles enter and exit Pennant Hills Rd. in a more controlled manner via the proposed traffic signals at the intersection of Pennant Hills Rd. and Baker St. I expect that this would be to improve safety and to ensure traffic flow on Pennant Hills Rd. The last thing we want is someone pulling out of a driveway in front of a fully loaded semi-trailer or oil tanker and causing a collision that could result in the loss of life. While I would like to preserve the nice quiet nature of Felton Rd. when it is not being used by the schools, I can see that it would be selfish to 'dig my heels in' with a 'NIMBY' mentality.

I wish to stress that the site is classified as B2 - Local Centre and not merely R4. Due to this, I can see that the architects have made an effort to include commercially lettable floorspace of a similar

amount and similar nature to what is currently there. It looks as though there will be a childcare centre sitting above general commercially lettable floorspace in the 'podium' section at the base of the tower and a multi-level gym in the far south-west corner of the site. These are sensible inclusions but I would like to say that concerning the commercial floorspace underneath the childcare centre, you will probably need to allow for it to be divided and used by more than one tenant. You could have difficulty finding a tenant that wants the whole 520m<sup>2</sup>. If this is the case, flexibility will be necessary.

I am also very much in favour of having generously-sized rooms in the flats. I have seen many cramped and pokey flats and their rooms and they are awful. They are claustrophobic and hobble the liveability of the flat. The developer will probably find them easier to sell if they are easier to live in.

In reading the Planning Proposal prepared by Planning Direction Pty. Ltd., it mentions that as the site fronts Pennant Hills Rd. (a classified state road) the requirements of Clause 101 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) apply to this site. The first objective of Clause 101 is "to ensure that new development does not compromise the effective and ongoing operation and function of classified roads". Viewing the traffic study and proposal, I am satisfied that what is planned meets the objective of this part of Clause 101.

However, Clause 101 also includes a second part which aims "to prevent or reduce the potential impact of traffic noise and vehicle emission on development adjacent to classified roads". Clause 101(2)(c) states that "The consent authority must not grant consent to development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless it is satisfied that: (c) the development is of a type that is not sensitive to traffic noise or vehicle emissions, or is appropriately located and designed, or includes measures, to ameliorate potential traffic noise or vehicle emissions within the site of the development arising from the adjacent classified road". Now, according to the Planning Proposal prepared by Planning Direction Pty. Ltd., the plan to address Clause 101(2)(c) and therefore obtain approval from the relevant consent authority is the following: "In respect of clause 101(2)(c) the indicative development scheme locates non- residential uses on the ground floor level; this is also a requirement under the Harmonisation LEP. Any residential apartments will be located on the upper levels. The use of enclosed private balconies will further assist in mitigating the potential impact of road noise. A report from an appropriately qualified consultant will be submitted at the development application stage."

As a nearby resident who knows what Pennant Hills Rd. sounds and smells like at various parts of the day, I would like to say that what Planning Direction Pty. Ltd. has recommended does not sufficiently satisfy the requirements of Clause 101(2)(c). Therefore, there are insufficient grounds for the relevant consent authority to grant approval for what is proposed. Let me explain why.

Firstly, Pennant Hills Rd. is a major road, indeed a 'classified road' that is a major thoroughfare for a large number of cars, trucks and buses everyday. It is, shall we say, a 'traffic sewer'. This sewer emits noise pollution but also atmospheric pollution and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) thanks to the petrol and diesel consumed by passing vehicles. We know that the soot and filth emitted by all this traffic is harmful to our health. However, the developer and the relevant consent authority wants to make the site that fronts this sewer home to many couples and families, they want to put a childcare centre on the site and they want to have a gym in the far south-west corner for residents and the local community to exercise and reap the associated health benefits.

Clause 101(2)(c) says that the development must be "of a type that is not sensitive to traffic noise or vehicle emissions." So, how is a gym, a childcare centre and a tower of flats where families live and sleep everyday a development that is not sensitive to traffic noise or vehicle emissions? Wouldn't these things be some of the most sensitive to traffic noise and soot? What sort of air will all these people be breathing in? Do you really want to go to a gym and work up a sweat and start breathing deeply that is located on a classified road? Do you really want to deeply breathe in all those VOCs and other associated particulate matter? There is currently a gym on that site but I

would never go there because it fronts Pennant Hills Rd. I do not have confidence that the air quality inside that gym is healthy to breathe in deeply whilst exercising.

Now, obviously Clause 101(2)(c) grants developers 'wobble-room' by then saying "or is appropriately located and designed, or includes measures, to ameliorate potential traffic noise or vehicle emissions within the site of the development arising from the adjacent classified road". The developer's answer to this, via the recommendations of Planning Direction Pty. Ltd. is to locate "non-residential uses on the ground floor level" (i.e. the gym and childcare centre) and ensure "Any residential apartments will be located on the upper levels. The use of enclosed private balconies will further assist in mitigating the potential impact of road noise."

I firmly believe that the flats "on the upper levels" that face Pennant Hills Rd. will all continue to suffer from noise and soot. It is true that having private balconies enclosed as the developer plans with the use of glass louvres, sliding glass or steel shutters or some other measure will help reduce traffic noise to some degree on the balcony. How does this facilitate clean air? How does it allow people to open the windows to their bedrooms and lounge-rooms and avoid all the noise and harmful soot? What if it's a hot summer's day? This building is subject to ventilation requirements. How can those ventilation requirements be realised in real-life circumstances when people cannot open their windows due to noise and fumes? If people have to keep their balconies constantly enclosed and their windows shut, where do they get their fresh air into their homes and bodies? How is this a solution? How does the gym, childcare centre and other lettable space enjoy clean air for its occupants?

I ask that the relevant consent authority consider requiring the developer to install a system to address this issue that sufficiently satisfies Clause 101(2)(c). The obvious solution to me is a 'passive house' ventilation system. Such a system would allow polluted air from outside to be purified through a filter and then distributed throughout the rooms. Old indoor air can be extracted through the kitchen and bathroom. As these two air streams come close together but never cross at the inlet/outlet site, the heat from the air exiting the building can be transferred to the cool air entering the building. This can help enormously in reducing electricity consumption and costs for heating. I am not sure if the setting can be changed for the summer but I imagine it could be modified to do so or at the very least have a 'fan' setting where there is no exchange of heat between the two air streams at all. If you are not familiar with this concept, I encourage you watch a short, 2-minute video on YouTube below:



I live in a brick-veneer house that was built in 1979 with no insulation in the walls or roof. We have installed insulation in the roof but the walls remain without it due to installation difficulties. I have no windows facing North, so I cannot benefit from the warmth of the winter sun at all. The house has an East-West aspect so, in summer afternoons, the house, from the Western-side can be turned into an oven as the blazing sun finds its way down behind the Blue Mountains. Consequently, we spend a lot of money on electricity for heating and cooling in the winter and summer because the house was designed and approved with such little consideration for year-round thermal comfort. I desperately do not want this to be the case for the residents that are going to be living in the flats planned to be built.

Considering we live in an era when there is greater concern for the environmental impact of our lifestyles, a desire to mitigate climate change and an interest in making housing more energy efficient, the installation of a passive ventilation system seems like a suitable solution. Such a system would reduce energy consumption, which is what we want the buildings being built today to do. Sustainable housing with improved real-world liveability is a goal of both City of Parramatta Council and the NSW Government. Here is the opportunity to make it happen at the time of construction rather than having residents rely on energy-hungry air-conditioners for thermal comfort and the opening of windows to allow dirty air in for ventilation. Of course, the best time to install this is when the building is being built.

I expect if the developer were reading this they would probably 'hit the roof' and worry about the cost of it all. Additionally, they would probably complain that the flats built across the road at 294-302 Pennant Hills Rd. were not required to do anything like that. This is true. However, it could be argued that those developments are going to provide a lower standard of living and welfare for their residents. Consequently, the people living in those flats are probably just living there 'because they have to' while they look for or save up for a place where they actually want to live and where their living needs are truly met. Also, I expect that the developer would be more able to attract a buyer if it has such lifestyle features. The buyer may be more likely to pay more money for the flat if properly educated by the salesman about the long-term lifestyle benefits and financial savings.

Additionally, if we are going to allow the developer of this site to really gouge the B2 zoning for maximum self-serving financial gain then there must be something to show for it. Also, I am not prepared to accept the comings and goings along my nice quiet suburban street from the proposed 300 parking spaces (as mentioned in the Urban Design Statement) of the proposed development unless I am satisfied that the people living and working there have had their needs and health given appropriate consideration from the developer.

If the consent authority and/or developer has doubts concerning the necessity of this or similar system, I would suggest that an air-quality consultant measure air-quality at the site at various times of the day and at various positions and heights. This will help us to understand what sort of air the residents and commercial tenants will be really breathing. Make sure that you receive readings from a variety of wind directions, not just when the air from Pennant Hills Rd. is blowing away from the site.

If the Planning Panel or the developer is looking for a more economical or 'low-tech' way to assess air quality, then I suggest you go to the site during the day (preferably during peak-hours), stand on the footpath on Pennant Hills Rd. and take in some lovely deep breaths. Do you feel refreshed? Does it make you feel healthy? Your answer will probably tell you everything you need to know.

I also believe that thermal comfort and insulation from noise pollution will be improved with double-glazed windows and better-than-minimum-standard wall insulation. If the developer is planning oversized flats with a better-than-minimum-standard of living for the occupants, then this would also help meet that goal.

Considering the proposed development has no vehicular access to Pennant Hills Rd., I wonder if this would be a problem for emergency vehicles. Felton Rd. and Baker St. is a total gridlocked mess in the times before and after school (there are three schools: Cumberland High, James Ruse Agricultural High and Carlingford West Public with a combined student body of appx. 3416 students) and while it is true that one can hope for improved traffic flow when traffic signals are constructed at the intersection of Pennant Hills Rd. and Baker St., I wonder how much of an improvement we will actually see. There are simply so many vehicles in the vicinity at those times. If your father lived on the 12th floor and was having a heart-attack at those peak times, how long would it take the ambulance to reach the area from the ambulance station, go the long way around via Baker St., crawl through the school traffic, reach the bottom of the proposed development and then reach your father on the 12th floor? What if there was a fire? I wonder if it would be helpful to design space for a drop-off/standing-area for one or two vehicles on the Pennant Hills Rd. frontage of the property. They did this in a very clever way for the flats that they built at 774-778 Pennant Hills Rd., Carlingford. Sadly, they did not complete the driveway and modify the guttering, so the bay cannot be utilised. Have a look on Google Street View if you're interested. Something like this may be helpful for emergency vehicles yet keep the RMS happy by having most vehicles use Felton Rd.

Finally, on the subject of car-parking. The Urban Design Statement proposes appx. 300 car spaces in a basement carpark. All of these vehicles will be using Felton Rd. Considering a key argument for increasing the building height restrictions for this site is its proximity to public transport and shopping facilities, I do believe efforts should be employed to encourage building users to choose public transport and walking/cycling over private cars. However, I acknowledge that planners have to be realistic of what they expect from residents and commercial tenants. Having little to no parking for patrons of commercial tenants could hobble the commercial viability of those spaces. If a physiotherapist or a solicitor's chamber leases the space, they will be serving patrons that come from beyond the immediate area. Those patrons are most likely to access the site by private car as they could be coming from places where public transport services do not provide competitive levels of convenience or service as a private vehicle. What would you do if you lived nearby in say, North Rocks or Dundas Valley and needed to visit a physiotherapist, solicitor or real estate agent there? Unfortunately, people are reluctant to surrender the convenience of a private vehicle and spend more time in their day being on public transport and walking to a bus stop or using active transport. It's just so easy and is more congruent with our 'time-poor' style of living.

Consideration must also be given to the residents that are going to live there. What are they going to do when they go grocery shopping? There is quite a hill to walk up between the site and Carlingford Court, the local shopping centre. This is so whether you walk up Pennant Hills Rd. or use back-streets such as Post Office St. or Shirley St. to avoid the fumes on Pennant Hills Rd. If you lived in one of these flats with your spouse and possibly children, would you or other family members walk to and from Carlingford Court with all your shopping bags or a 'granny-trolley' full of heavy groceries? If yes, then how long would you be able to keep it up? I believe the likely answer is no. You would probably drive a car there. This is the case with my household and all my neighbours who live just a couple of doors down from the site.

I suspect that residents of the proposed flats will probably use public transport if their place of work is easy to get to on public transport (e.g. Parramatta CBD). They will probably insist on having a car for grocery shopping, shopping for bulky specialty items (e.g. a printer or furniture), for visiting people and places in the Greater Sydney Area (e.g. visiting a friend for dinner at Gladesville or a relative on Sunday at Turrumurra for lunch) or they want to travel somewhere outside of Sydney. Wouldn't you do the same? Considering car ownership is so accessible, I consider it unlikely that people will allow 'their wings to be clipped' and restrict their life and movements according to public transport services. I leave it to town-planning professionals and government planning authorities to do their research to strike the right balance between encouraging public transport use and catering for expected private car use in relation to this planned development. I simply do not have enough specialist knowledge on the matter. I have confidence that such people have the capacity to come

up with a good solution. They've been to all the right schools and are paid much more than me to think about this.

In conclusion, while I would prefer this site were not developed according to the plans proposed and disrupt our nice quiet life in Felton Rd., I can see that such a position is not realistic. The Parramatta LGA does have to meet its quota of catering for Greater Sydney's population growth and that includes more development in Carlingford. The site in question is very close to the new tram stop and other facilities. The RMS want to maintain the safety and flow of a classified road by having traffic use Felton Rd. and Baker St. This view is understandable. However, I do strongly believe that adjustments to the proposal be made to secure acceptable levels of liveability, health and comfort to all people that use the building for work or housing. I believe that greater effort and consideration must be given to the air-quality and noise pollution concerns relating to this site. Clause 101 of the SEPP requires it. Further studies may need to be conducted to determine the precise nature of the problem and to ensure that the solution can fulfil its goals.

I wish the developer, the professional consultants and the Planning Panel every success in their endeavours in creating a development that is right for the site and the people that will use it. I look forward to a site that will add to the amenity and liveability of the local area.

Yours sincerely,

Damian Turco

**Sharon Edwards**

---

**From:** Ian Moore <harley98b@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, 30 May 2022 1:38 PM  
**To:** Plan Comment Mailbox  
**Cc:** Unit 4 - Kristine Tan; Unit 2 - Neeta Prabhu  
**Subject:** Planning Proposal: 2020CCI004 - City of Parramatta - PP-2022-376 - 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Road Carlingford - to allow a mix of commercial and residential development  
**Attachments:** Ian Moore Objection.docx

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find below (and attached my objections) to the above-mentioned Planning Proposal.

<b>Name:</b>	Mr Ian Moore
<b>Address:</b>	Unit 3 / 10 Felton Rd Carlingford
<b>Email:</b>	harley98b@hotmail.com
<b>Mobile:</b>	0423 217 411
<b>Political Donations (previous 2 yrs):</b>	Nil

**Subject: Planning Proposal: 2020CCI004 - City of Parramatta - PP-2022-376 - 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Road Carlingford - to allow a mix of commercial and residential development**

I would like to lodge the following objections / observations to the above-mentioned Planning Proposal:

**1. Proposed Height - I object to the proposed height**

The heights mentioned in the proposal are totally out of character with the area from Jenkins Rd towards Parramatta. It is unfair to compare the existing buildings in James Street and Jenkins Rd to the development proposal as those sites are at least 10 metres lower than the proposed development site.

I also note that the building opposite the proposed development is limited to approximately 13 metres at the street level. I further note that the new Baptist age care facility 150 metres down the road appears to be limited to 21 metres at street level and the land it is built on is several metres lower than the proposed development. The proposal itself also states that buildings under construction in Adderton Road and Pennant Hills Rd are all on to a height of roughly 17 metres.

Based on the above, the height should be limited to a maximum of 17 metres.

Furthermore, the proposed heights mentioned in the proposal will cast shadows, result in the loss of sunlight and cause a general darkness over my property.



**Summary of impacts:** Inappropriate building not fitting in with the landscape. Shadows, loss of sunlight and a general darkness over my property.

**2. Traffic - I object to allowing traffic access to / from the proposed site via Felton Rd**

If the traffic figures detailed in the proposal are accurate then I propose that no traffic access to or from the proposed site is allowed from Felton Rd. Felton Rd is already extremely busy during the start / end of school hours with pedestrians, cars and buses using it to access both James Ruse High and also Carlingford West Primary School. Given the proposal claims that there are only 8 additional trips then why increase traffic at all. It would be far better just to have all access to and from the property via Pennant Hills Rd. Therefore, I would propose that no access to or from the proposed site be possible via Felton Rd. Any argument to this would simply imply that the claimed figures are incorrect. It should also be noted that when the site was under the control of the previous owner the gates were locked with no through traffic access between Felton Rd and Pennants Hills Rd being possible and since then pedestrian usage of Felton Rd has increased immensely (as a direct result of the residents of the James and Thallon St's areas children attending Carlingford West Primary School).

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

**3. Restriction of Traffic related to the building of any approved development - I object to having any construction related vehicles utilise Felton Rd during the construction phase of any proposed development**

As previously mentioned, Felton Rd is already extremely busy during the start / end of school hours with pedestrians, cars and buses using it in relation to both James Ruse high and also Carlingford West Primary School. Should any proposal be approved, I believe that any traffic relating to the construction of any approved development should be banned from Felton Rd (and be via Pennant Hills Rd) to ensure the existing quietness during school hours, the safety of the pedestrians / residents and well as not restricting the flow of cars and school buses on Felton Rd.

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

**4. Insufficient parking available in the proposed development leading to degradation of parking availability on Felton Rd and a flow on impact to traffic in Felton Road - I object to the number of parking spaces currently provisioned for in the proposal**

The proposal does not state details in relation to catering for parking within the proposed development. You only have to drive down James and Thallon St's to see how many cars are parked on the streets and all of those buildings have off street parking for residents (but it is never sufficient). Any approved development proposal needs to cater for at least 3 cars per unit approved otherwise there will be a significant impact on parking availability and the flow on impact to traffic in Felton Rd

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

**5. Difficulties in existing Baker St at Pennant Hills Rd – if additional traffic is allowed on Felton Rd**

Even if traffic lights are installed at the corner of Baker St and Pennant Hills Rd, there will be significant impacts to the traffic flows as Baker St is predominately one lane leading up to Pennant Hills Rd. To ensure that there is no impact from exiting Baker St onto Pennant Hills Rd, I believe that Baker St needs to be widened by an additional lane between Felton Rd and Pennant Hills Rd. There is sufficient footpath to cater for this and the developer of the proposed development should be responsible for this cost (as well as the installation of Traffic Lights at the intersection of Baker St and Pennant Hills Rd).

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd and Baker St resulting in a reduction of traffic flow which will then impact on the ability to exit Baker St onto Pennant Hills Rd.

**6. Impacts on Carlingford West Primary School are not catered for in the proposal**

Carlingford West Primary School is currently nearing an enrolment of 2000 pupils. I note that the proposal does not delve into the associated impacts and costs of which will be caused by the proposed 135 dwellings. As such it also does not disclose how it will provide funding to expand the school to cater for the additional students which will naturally come with the 135 dwellings.

**Summary of impacts:** Increase in the number of pupils at Carlingford West Primary School resulting in further taxpayer expenses to expand the school.

Regards

Ian Moore

Mobile 0423 217 411

<b>Name:</b>	Mr Ian Moore
<b>Address:</b>	Unit 3 / 10 Felton Rd Carlingford
<b>Email:</b>	harley98b@hotmail.com
<b>Mobile:</b>	0423 217 411
<b>Political Donations (previous 2 yrs):</b>	Nil

**Subject: Planning Proposal: 2020CCI004 - City of Parramatta - PP-2022-376 - 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Road Carlingford - to allow a mix of commercial and residential development**

I would like to lodge the following objections / observations to the above mentioned Planning Proposal:

**1. Proposed Height - I object to the proposed height**

The heights mentioned in the proposal are totally out of character with the area from Jenkins Rd towards Parramatta. It is unfair to compare the existing buildings in James Street and Jenkins Rd to the development proposal as those sites are at least 10 metres lower than the proposed development site.

I also note that the building opposite the proposed development is limited to approximately 13 metres at the street level. I further note that the new Baptist age care facility 150 metres down the road appears to be limited to 21 metres at street level and the land it is built on is several metres lower than the proposed development. The proposal itself also states that buildings under construction in Adderton Road and Pennant Hills Rd are all on to a height of roughly 17 metres. Based on the above, the height should be limited to a maximum of 17 metres.

Furthermore, the proposed heights mentioned in the proposal will cast shadows, result in the loss of sunlight and cause a general darkness over my property.

**Summary of impacts:** Inappropriate building not fitting in with the landscape. Shadows, loss of sunlight and a general darkness over my property.

**2. Traffic - I object to allowing traffic access to / from the proposed site via Felton Rd**

If the traffic figures detailed in the proposal are accurate then I propose that no traffic access to or from the proposed site is allowed from Felton Rd. Felton Rd is already extremely busy during the start / end of school hours with pedestrians, cars and buses using it to access both James Ruse High and also Carlingford West Primary School. Given the proposal claims that there are only 8 additional trips then why increase traffic at all. It would be far better just to have all access to and from the property via Pennant Hills Rd. Therefore, I would propose that no access to or from the

proposed site be possible via Felton Rd. Any argument to this would simply imply that the claimed figures are incorrect. It should also be noted that when the site was under the control of the previous owner the gates were locked with no through traffic access between Felton Rd and Pennants Hills Rd being possible and since then pedestrian usage of Felton Rd has increased immensely (as a direct result of the residents of the James and Thallon St's areas children attending Carlingford West Primary School).

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

**3. Restriction of Traffic related to the building of any approved development - I object to having any construction related vehicles utilise Felton Rd during the construction phase of any proposed development**

As previously mentioned, Felton Rd is already extremely busy during the start / end of school hours with pedestrians, cars and buses using it in relation to both James Ruse high and also Carlingford West Primary School. Should any proposal be approved, I believe that any traffic relating to the construction of any approved development should be banned from Felton Rd (and be via Pennant Hills Rd) to ensure the existing quietness during school hours, the safety of the pedestrians / residents and well as not restricting the flow of cars and school buses on Felton Rd.

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

**4. Insufficient parking available in the proposed development leading to degradation of parking availability on Felton Rd and a flow on impact to traffic in Felton Road - I object to the number of parking spaces currently provisioned for in the proposal**

The proposal does not state details in relation to catering for parking within the proposed development. You only have to drive down James and Thallon St's to see how many cars are parked on the streets and all of those buildings have off street parking for residents (but it is never sufficient). Any approved development proposal needs to cater for at least 3 cars per unit approved otherwise there will be a significant impact on parking availability and the flow on impact to traffic in Felton Rd

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

**5. Difficulties in existing Baker St at Pennant Hills Rd – if additional traffic is allowed on Felton Rd**

Even if traffic lights are installed at the corner of Baker St and Pennant Hills Rd, there will be significant impacts to the traffic flows as Baker St is predominately one lane leading up to Pennant Hills Rd. To ensure that there is no impact from exiting Baker St onto Pennant Hills Rd, I believe

that Baker St needs to be widened by an additional lane between Felton Rd and Pennant Hills Rd. There is sufficient footpath to cater for this and the developer of the proposed development should be responsible for this cost (as well as the installation of Traffic Lights at the intersection of Baker St and Pennant Hills Rd).

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd and Baker St resulting in a reduction of traffic flow which will then impact on the ability to exit Baker St onto Pennant Hills Rd.

#### **6. Impacts on Carlingford West Primary School are not catered for in the proposal**

Carlingford West Primary School is currently nearing an enrolment of 2000 pupils. I note that the proposal does not delve into the associated impacts and costs of which will be caused by the proposed 135 dwellings. As such it also does not disclose how it will provide funding to expand the school to cater for the additional students which will naturally come with the 135 dwellings.

**Summary of impacts:** Increase in the number of pupils at Carlingford West Primary School resulting in further taxpayer expenses to expand the school.

**Sharon Edwards**

---

**From:** Ngoc Chia <bn\_doan@yahoo.com.au>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 5 June 2022 11:32 PM  
**To:** Plan Comment Mailbox  
**Subject:** Subject: Planning Proposal: 2020CCI004 - City of Parramatta - PP-2022-376 - 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Road Carlingford - to allow a mix of commercial and residential development

- **Subject: Planning Proposal: 2020CCI004 - City of Parramatta - PP-2022-376 - 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Road Carlingford - to allow a mix of commercial and residential development**

- Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find below my objections to the Planning Proposal. Our reasons which are outlined in this email, have been copied from our neighbour (with permission), as I strongly share the same views in objecting the Planning Proposal.

Our property is a standard two-storey dwelling with a granny flat (8 Felton Road). We are deeply concerned that the new residential proposal would definitely cast a shadow over our property, not giving us enough sunlight.

We live in a residential street (Felton Road), essentially a 'No Through Road' which runs parallel to the busy Pennant Hills Road. Felton Road gets extremely congested as we have traffic from 2 schools which are located on the same road (James Ruse High School and Carlingford West Public) and a third school, Cumberland High School which is another street away. We definitely do not need extra traffic on what is already a very busy residential area. We am sure that Parramatta Council will collect and analyse data of the traffic flow on our street and will definitely come to a conclusion that the residential proposal will have a negative impact on our residential street's flow of traffic.

<b>Name:</b>	Mrs Ngoc Chia and Mr James Chia
<b>Address:</b>	8 Felton Rd Carlingford
<b>Email:</b>	bn_doan@yahoo.com.au
<b>Mobile:</b>	0404 375 123
<b>Political Donations (previous 2 yrs):</b>	Nil

**Subject: Planning Proposal: 2020CCI004 - City of Parramatta - PP-2022-376 - 241 - 245 Pennant Hills Road Carlingford - to allow a mix of commercial and residential development**

I would like to lodge the following objections / observations to the above-mentioned Planning Proposal:

**1. Proposed Height - I object to the proposed height**

The heights mentioned in the proposal are totally out of character with the area from Jenkins Rd towards Parramatta. It is unfair to compare the existing buildings in James Street and Jenkins Rd to the development proposal as those sites are at least 10 metres lower than the proposed development site.

I also note that the building opposite the proposed development is limited to approximatively 13 metres at the street level. I further note that the new Baptist age care facility 150 metres down the road appears to be limited to 21 metres at street level and the land it is built on is several metres lower than the proposed development. The proposal itself also states that buildings under construction in Adderton Road and Pennant Hills Rd are all on to a height of roughly 17 metres.

Based on the above, the height should be limited to a maximum of 17 metres.

Furthermore, the proposed heights mentioned in the proposal will cast shadows, result in the loss of sunlight and cause a general darkness over my property.

**Summary of impacts:** Inappropriate building not fitting in with the landscape. Shadows, loss of sunlight and a general darkness over my property.

**2. Traffic - I object to allowing traffic access to / from the proposed site via Felton Rd**

If the traffic figures detailed in the proposal are accurate then I propose that no traffic access to or from the proposed site is allowed from Felton Rd. Felton Rd is already extremely busy during the start / end of school hours with pedestrians, cars and buses using it to access both James Ruse High and also Carlingford West Primary School. Given the proposal claims that there are only 8 additional trips then why increase traffic at all. It would be far better just to have all access to and from the property via Pennant Hills Rd. Therefore, I would propose that no access to or from the proposed site be possible via Felton Rd. Any argument to this would simply imply that the claimed figures are incorrect. It should also be noted that when the site was under the control of the previous owner the gates were locked with no through traffic access between Felton Rd and Pennants Hills Rd being possible and since then pedestrian usage of Felton Rd has increased immensely (as a direct result of the residents of the James and Thallon

St's areas children attending Carlingford West Primary School).

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

3. **Restriction of Traffic related to the building of any approved development - I object to having any construction related vehicles utilise Felton Rd during the construction phase of any proposed development**

As previously mentioned, Felton Rd is already extremely busy during the start / end of school hours with pedestrians, cars and buses using it in relation to both James Ruse high and also Carlingford West Primary School. Should any proposal be approved, I believe that any traffic relating to the construction of any approved development should be banned from Felton Rd (and be via Pennant Hills Rd) to ensure the existing quietness during school hours, the safety of the pedestrians / residents and well as not restricting the flow of cars and school buses on Felton Rd.

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

4. **Insufficient parking available in the proposed development leading to degradation of parking availability on Felton Rd and a flow on impact to traffic in Felton Road - I object to the number of parking spaces currently provisioned for in the proposal**

The proposal does not state details in relation to catering for parking within the proposed development. You only have to drive down James and Thallon St's to see how many cars are parked on the streets and all of those buildings have off street parking for residents (but it is never sufficient). Any approved development proposal needs to cater for at least 3 cars per unit approved otherwise there will be a significant impact on parking availability and the flow on impact to traffic in Felton Rd

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd resulting in a danger to pedestrian's, reduction of traffic flow, street noise impacting on James Ruse High.

5. **Difficulties in existing Baker St at Pennant Hills Rd – if additional traffic is allowed on Felton Rd**

Even if traffic lights are installed at the corner of Baker St and Pennant Hills Rd, there will be significant impacts to the traffic flows as Baker St is predominately one lane leading up to Pennant Hills Rd. To ensure that there is no impact from exiting Baker St onto Pennant Hills Rd, I believe that Baker St needs to be widened by an additional lane between Felton Rd and Pennant Hills Rd. There is sufficient footpath to cater for this and the developer of the proposed development should



be responsible for this cost (as well as the installation of Traffic Lights at the intersection of Baker St and Pennant Hills Rd).

**Summary of impacts:** Increased traffic on Felton Rd and Baker St resulting in a reduction of traffic flow which will then impact on the ability to exit Baker St onto Pennant Hills Rd.

6. **Impacts on Carlingford West Primary School are not catered for in the proposal**

Carlingford West Primary School is currently nearing an enrolment of 2000 pupils. I note that the proposal does not delve into the associated impacts and costs of which will be caused by the proposed 135 dwellings. As such it also does not disclose how it will provide funding to expand the school to cater for the additional students which will naturally come with the 135 dwellings.

**Summary of impacts:** Increase in the number of pupils at Carlingford West Primary School resulting in further taxpayer expenses to expand the school.

Regards,

Ngoc and James Chia