

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

This document summarises the **78** submissions received from **77** residents and individuals in response to the exhibition of the draft Planning Proposal, draft Development Control Plan, and draft Planning Agreement for 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street and 82 Hughes Avenue, Melrose Park. Each submission has been categorised by the submitter's stance towards the proposal, as nominated in their submission: Object, Support, Neutral, or Partially-support. Each submission has been allocated a unique number according to the date the submission was received by Council. The names and street numbers of submitters have been withheld.

Submitter Number and Address	Summary of Submission
Submitter from Carlingford Submission Number 1	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter objects to the proposal, stating it is too big and too tall.</li> <li>Considers that the area near the river should be retained for the public and not full of units; that it should be green space and not developed.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 2	<b>Partially-support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter strongly objects to apartment blocks being 22 storeys high.</li> <li>Raises concerns that the proposed height of buildings will result in view loss and loss of solar access for many of the surrounding residential properties.</li> <li>Requests that Council reconsider the proposal.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 3	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers that there are already high-rise developments being built as part of the first Melrose Park development phase and Melrose Park does not need more.</li> <li>Considers that even if there will be future access to the other side of Parramatta River, there will still be major impact on Victoria Road.</li> <li>Considers that the section between Marsden Road and West Ryde shops heading towards the city is already 'a nightmare' and the extra units will make it worse.</li> <li>Suggests that two-storey townhouses would be more appropriate than high-rises and that the building of a 22-storey residence is incompatible for the small suburb of Melrose Park.</li> </ul>
Submitter from North Ryde Submission Number 4	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers that there is very limited waterfront land available in this city, and the sites should not be overdeveloped. Submitter names Meadowbank as an example of where this has happened, stating it was a missed opportunity to build something beautiful and instead looks like a ghetto.</li> <li>Suggests that something should be built on the site that is desirable for future generations instead of squeezing in as many units on a parcel of land as possible.</li> <li>Requests more public spaces, cafes, and services.</li> <li>Considers that an aesthetic village design like Breakfast Point is an example of a development where people would actually want to live.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 5	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter raises concerns that local infrastructure is not being improved as part of this development and other developments. States that it is difficult to travel out of the area as roads are gridlocked. States that there are 'huge lines' at Wharf Road at Victoria Road, and the sequencing of traffic lights at Trumper Street results in long wait times. States that the set of lights at Ermington shops are 'a disaster'. Notes that all roads</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>are one lane in and out of these areas, including the Melrose Park North precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that Ermington shops already does not have enough parking for current residents, not taking into account the current development. Considers it difficult to find parking at West Ryde shops. Considers that local train stations do not provide adequate parking for current residents.</li> <li>• Notes that in Melrose Park South there is no easy, direct transport to the train stations. Considers that light rail is an inefficient method of getting to a train station.</li> <li>• Requests that having construction for Melrose Park North, Melrose Park South, light rail, and the new bridge happen all at once should be reconsidered as it is unfair, especially for the school situated in the middle of the developments.</li> <li>• Submitter lives on the south side of Ermington and does not want to live with 'this much development'.</li> <li>• Regarding boat ramp at Ermington, submitter asks if consideration has been given to the boating community with this development, to ensure continued access and adequate parking for the boat ramp. Raises concerns that the area will be occupied by people from nearby apartments parking there in the future, with the boating community being unaccounted for.</li> <li>• Submitter does not support further overdevelopment of the Melrose Park area.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns that the development will not be free of defects, citing a case at Meadowbank, where residents are in dispute with the developer's parent company.</li> <li>• Questions what is being done about local sporting fields to accommodate increased growth in the North and South precincts. Notes that the recent rain, the George Kendall soccer fields are closed a majority of the weekends as the drainage is poor. Considers that the baseball grounds at George Kendall have worse drainage and are always underwater. Considers that these issues should be addressed before thousands of residents inhabit the area. Considers the upgrade to the Murdoch Street section of the park to be insufficient.</li> </ul>
No Address Provided Submission Number 6	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that there are too many units proposed and insufficient transport infrastructure in the area to support it.</li> <li>• Considers that new bus routes should be provided as a condition of the development.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding environmental impacts - in particular, with respect to the marshes, river, and soil erosion.</li> <li>• Considers that the development would substantially change the shoreline, and if it were to go ahead, the unit heights should be restricted to a maximum of five storeys, and the profile of the low-rise area should not be dramatically altered.</li> <li>• Considers that townhouses would be preferable.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 7	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers the overdevelopment of Meadowbank as proof that high density estates are beneficial to no one, and especially not the local community.</li> <li>• Considers that Melrose Park is already overdeveloped, with the large apartments at the top of Wharf Road, which are already causing traffic issues though not all buildings have been built.</li> <li>• Notes that only one secondary school is within reasonable distance from the site.</li> <li>• Considers that traffic cannot cope, and Victoria Road will be at a standstill 24/7.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the development will harm the environment.</li> <li>• Suggests that only the Metro should be built - more residents and more shops are not needed when even the IGA in Meadowbank is struggling to survive.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests that developments be limited to mid-rises (i.e., a maximum of 8-storeys in height).</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

Submission Number 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter does not support high-rise buildings as this would congest the area, citing Rhodes and Wentworth Point as examples of where this has happened.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Dundas Valley Submission Number 9	<b>Partially-support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the maximum building heights are too high.</li> <li>• Submitter lived in Rhodes in the past and recommends that the maximum heights be retained as per the north side of Parramatta River at Silverwater Road at Halvorsen Park, or up to 8-10 storeys maximum.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 10	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the proposal, stating it will revitalise the area and make better use of it, while noting it would require the delivery of the light rail.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Lancaster Avenue, Melrose Park (same submitter as Submission #63) Submission Number 11	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the proposal represents overdevelopment, and the area must be retained for green open space.</li> <li>• Considers that the development is for too many residents and will change the area from the peaceful green environment it is today.</li> <li>• Adds that the road between Meadowbank Park and Lancaster Avenue is not capable of supporting this level of foot traffic. Considers that there are already too many people crossing, littering, and being unsafe with dangerous recreational vehicles.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Yeramba Place, Rydalmere Submission Number 12	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter opposes large scale development in a location near the river, viewing it as being contrary to the goals of cleaning up the river and the harbour.</li> <li>• Considers that it should not be the responsibility of Council or State Government to bear the burden of providing infrastructure and community facilities in Melrose Park South, but rather, the developer's.</li> <li>• Considers that Council and/or the State Government should not consider any approvals for Melrose Park South until full commitments for the following are met:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A high school in Melrose Park or perhaps on Winbourne Street, West Ryde, where there is already a suitable site.</li> <li>2. Enhanced public transport for the area, including light rail, pedestrian, and bus access across the river to Wentworth Point.</li> <li>3. Major traffic upgrades including improved access on and off Victoria Road, such as overpasses or underpasses with entry and exit ramps, as more traffic at existing (or new) lights will just become a significant bottleneck.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 13	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that there are already multiple thousands of units being built on Wharf Road, where there is one road in and one road out. States that there are already traffic and noise issues, despite the development not yet being completed. Considers that the area lacks the transport and infrastructure to be able to support even more high-density development.</li> <li>• Considers that there are already multiple high-rise buildings in the area.</li> <li>• Considers that the area is in need of more public space – not less – and raises concerns that not a lot of public space is depicted on the plans.</li> <li>• Considers that for residents who live on the river side of Ermington, the eastern vista towards the city, Harbour Bridge and river will be blocked if more high rises are built.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions whether the affordable housing will be social housing and raises concerns that there are already crime and social problems associated with these dwellings; asks how these will be supported.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 14	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers that for the amount of revenue that would be raised from this 'overdevelopment', there appears to be minimal requirement for the developer to contribute to the community, i.e., through provision of green open space. States that the developer continues to advertise the utilisation of existing facilities and open space while contributing very little new additions.</li> <li>Considers that the height of the proposed buildings are unacceptable and driven by developer profit.</li> <li>Considers that much of the impact associated with the proposed development has gone unidentified due to the proposal being directly on the border of both Parramatta and Ryde council areas.</li> <li>Considers that the changing face of Melrose Park as a suburb is not appreciated by the many residents already residing there, nor do they appreciate the extent of infrastructure needed to support an enormous influx of new dwellings with their associated increase in population, motor vehicles, foot traffic, parking issues, and domestic pet requirements (such as the need for more green, open space).</li> <li>Submitter states that they are not against development but considers one of this size and nature to be 'completely out of character' for the area in which it is proposed.</li> <li>Considers that it would be beneficial if Council required an 'obligatory "quality over quantity" mantra' and looked beyond financial gain, instead prioritising the living standards and wellbeing of the entire community.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submitter Number 15	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers that Melrose Park is already going to be very overcrowded with the existing PAYCE estate.</li> <li>States that the school, roads, and community are not equipped for this level of growth.</li> <li>Considers that the additional traffic generated will have negative effects in the whole communities of Ermington, Melrose Park, and Meadowbank.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submitter Number 16	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter is displeased with the increased size and height of the Melrose Park South development.</li> <li>States that there are very limited transport links, roads are congested, and delivery of the light rail is far away.</li> <li>Considers that the development will irreparably damage the current area.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submitter Number 17	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers that high density development in this area will create additional human and traffic congestion on top of the upcoming Melrose Park town centre. Considers that this will not have a positive impact on climate change.</li> <li>Considers that there is a need to maintain the current natural environment of the neighbourhood, especially along the riverside, and to preserve the natural habitat and peaceful surroundings for the community.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submitter Number 18	<p><b>Partially-support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers the number of units and the increase in height of the buildings on the western site to be excessive.</li> <li>Notes that one of the proposed buildings on Hughes Avenue appears to be the proposed 22 storeys in height. Considers that this building will overshadow private properties on Atkins Road and Trumper Street. Considers that it will also cause the area around it to become a 'sun-depleted concrete canyon'.</li> <li>Considers that access and traffic will also become major issues.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 19	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter states that the transport modelling is based on either old data or refers to uncommitted future aspirations, and that this development combined with Melrose Park North and the developments in Meadowbank and Epping will place unmanageable stress on roads and rail.</li> <li>States that Council must ensure that transport links have been built before looking to add more residential development into Melrose Park.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 20	<b>Partially-support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter would like to see the provision of more commercial shopping and retail outlets in this area.</li> <li>Considers that the suburb has limited retail areas and it is critical that this be provided, should the development proceed.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 21	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers that insufficient infrastructure planning has been undertaken for a development of this scale.</li> <li>Considers that firstly roads should be built to diversify the local traffic and support the increase of residents as part of the development.</li> <li>Notes that Andrew Street is being used as an alternative route to bypass traffic on Victoria Road.</li> <li>Raises concerns that the existing roads would not be able to support an increase in population.</li> <li>Also raises concerns regarding the development's proposed location beside the wharf, water, and park land, reducing space for public recreation.</li> <li>Raises concerns regarding a loss of views for residents on lower floors, given the proposed height of the development.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Wharf Road, Melrose Park Submission Number 22	<b>Neutral</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raises the following concerns regarding the proposed development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the development should have minimal impact on views from the west.</li> <li>That, once completed, the development should have minimal noise impacts in the evening, so that residents are able to enjoy a sense of peace.</li> <li>That the cycleways along the riverfront, which are heavily utilised, should not be negatively impacted by the development.</li> <li>That the development should provide sufficient space for parking vehicles with a boat trailer along Wharf Road as the boat ramp is well-utilised during summer and the carpark at the boat ramp quickly becomes full.</li> <li>That the development should take into account traffic impacts along Wharf Road. Specifically, that there is sufficient access to the East and West developments, so that residents are able to quickly get back on Victoria Road without having to use Wharf Road and Andrew Street. Submitter notes that the Melrose Park precinct at the top of Wharf Road has already experienced a significant increase in traffic, which is due to worsen when the next stages are completed, and which is a source of concern for Ryde Council residents living near Wharf Road at the top end.</li> <li>That there is currently little information regarding the look and impact of the light rail, and in particular, the bridge across Parramatta River providing a connection to Sydney Olympic Park that largely benefits residents of Ermington, Rydalmere, and those towards the Parramatta CBD. Considers that the current positioning of the bridge should be changed as it would require the bulldozing of houses of Ryde Council residents.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 23	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers that there is insufficient infrastructure to support this development, noting that Victoria Road is already very busy, and many people use Andrew Street to bypass this bottleneck.</li> <li>Submitter also notes that the developer has completed the first stage of development at Wharf Road and provides a shuttle bus service from the new development to Meadowbank station and wharf; however, despite the small number of apartments completed, this service is "already</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>full at all times".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that if the development is to go ahead it should include some cafes and restaurants for people to enjoy the views of the river.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that there are also a number of recreational users in the area and the space should be "made more pleasant for them as well".</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the buildings beside the river should be much lower in height, citing Meadowbank as an example, where the buildings next to the river are only four storeys in height.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that more infrastructure has been planned for the future, such as the light rail, but raises concerns that prior to this being delivered and Victoria Road being improved, at present the area cannot support the number of extra apartments being proposed.</li> </ul>
Submitter from West Ryde Submission Number 24	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter opposes the development and considers the proposed height of buildings (22 storeys) to be inappropriate for the location, in close proximity to the foreshore, and raising concerns regarding the impacts of overshadowing on existing residents and the endangered marshlands.</li> <li>• Submitter also raises concerns regarding the negative impacts that the development will have on traffic, especially on back roads and Victoria Road intersections, and neighbouring public schools and general retail.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that only 24 affordable housing units are being proposed out of the total 1,925 units, and the day care centre will only have capacity for 80 children.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that there has been little consultation regarding Melrose Park Primary school.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that developers are being prioritised over community needs.</li> </ul>
Submitter from West Ryde Submission Number 25	<p><b>Partially-support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter asks what percentage of the total dwellings will be for social housing.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 26	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter does not support the construction of buildings which are to be up to 77 metres in height, stating it is incompatible with the character of the area and will block views towards the river.</li> <li>• Considers that the allocation of only 24 units out of 1,925 units for the purpose of affordable housing does not reflect current societal needs.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that there is currently insufficient provision of facilities and infrastructure to support the increased population that an additional 1,925 dwellings will bring, such as schools (both high school and primary school), medical facilities and road and transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• Considers that a development of this magnitude cannot be of any benefit to the local community.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 27	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is concerned largely regarding traffic and public transport infrastructure, stating that the area is at capacity.</li> <li>• Comments that it should not take the community up to 30 minutes to travel from one suburb to an adjacent suburb.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding provision of and access to childcare and schooling, stating that it is already difficult to enrol in good childcare centres and schools, and this is likely to worsen with an increase in the area's population.</li> <li>• Questions what is being done to address these issues.</li> </ul>
Submitter from	<p><b>Object</b></p>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

Ermington Submission Number 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that a traffic management plan needs to be completed over a 7-day period as traffic banks up along Wharf Road and Marsden Road, making it difficult to enter and exit Winbourne Street.</li> <li>• Also notes that the intersection at Victoria, Wharf and Marsden Roads can be very slow to navigate.</li> <li>• Asks what plans are in place "for the movement of high school students", given that Marsden High School has now closed and moved to Meadowbank.</li> <li>• States that there is no other high density living in Ermington and it does not suit the area.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 29	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter states that the infrastructure around the area does not support the density of population being proposed.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposed development "fails to keep the riverscape free of high rise" and is not keeping in character with the surrounding area.</li> <li>• Considers that coupled with the PAYCE development, the proposed development "places too much pressure on the area".</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 30	<b>Partially-support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the proposed development should only be approved once the Parramatta Light Rail Stage 2 and Metro West projects are both guaranteed, stating that currently there is no guarantee Parramatta Light Rail Stage 2 will be constructed. Submitter states that without those two pieces of public transport infrastructure, this precinct and surrounding suburbs will be too congested and unable to cope with the additional population.</li> <li>• Considers that should construction of the light rail be guaranteed, higher density zoning to allow residential development would be appropriate on the northern side of Hope Street, Ermington, between Atkins Road and Hughes Avenue, noting that the southern side will likely already have considerable high-rise development opposite.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 31	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter states that the Melrose Park development already has enough residential development and there is no need for additional housing that would impact Ermington.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Sydney Olympic Park Submission Number 32	<b>Partially-support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the plan to develop the land, considering it a "good move for the community" and an appropriate location for residential use.</li> <li>• Considers that "intensive housing is needed and provides cost effective options".</li> <li>• Considers that building to the height of 40+ metres will affect the "amenity value of the entire area".</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding overshadowing of the existing boardwalk in the winter, preventing the sun reaching the mangrove and water's edge. Considers that the loss of natural sunlight to this area should be managed, and that Council should manage its environment with greater care.</li> <li>• Considers the location inappropriate for buildings over 40 metres in height and requests that Council review the District Plan and justify the change to allow for buildings of 22 storeys.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 33	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter states that the proposal is not keeping with the current housing in Melrose Park and that the proposal for the current development (on the Victoria Road side) initially included houses, which have "disappeared from plans".</li> <li>• Considers that there are already too many units, leading to an increase in traffic and making it feel unsafe for their children to play on the street side of their home.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that the new proposed development on the riverfront will add to the traffic problems and impact the existing school.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the proposed development would result in view loss for homeowners on the Ryde Council side of Melrose Park.</li> <li>• Submitter originally purchased in the area mainly due to the "village feel and the fact that it wasn't built up".</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the plans do not take the proposed light rail into account and does not acknowledge the apartments currently being built.</li> <li>• Considers that the current height control of 12 metres is the maximum height that would be compatible with the character of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Considers that Parramatta Council is only seeking financial benefits and not taking into account the extra cost and inconvenience borne by Ryde Council.</li> <li>• Considers that townhouses or duplexes would be better suited to the area.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 34	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the current height limit of 12 metres is an appropriate maximum height for the area and that an increase beyond this will block the skyline for existing residents, alter the suburb in a "highly detrimental fashion" and result in damage to the foreshore wetlands.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposed 25-77m height limit will not only alter surrounding suburbs, but it will devalue existing homes.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the increased residential capacity will have negative impacts on traffic and exacerbate the increased traffic load resulting from the current Melrose Park high-density apartments being constructed on Wharf Road.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposed development will have two unacceptable negative impacts on Melrose Park Public School: the school will not be able to cope with an increased school-aged population in the neighbourhood and the school will be unable to expand due to the surrounding development.</li> <li>• Considers that the presence of 1,925 new apartments will lead to an influx of traffic, increasing risk to children travelling to and from the school, and which will also require penitentiary style fencing around the school to ensure student safety.</li> <li>• Considers that this will adversely impact the existing school culture and current, highly-positive learning environment.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Rydalmere Submission Number 35	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that such dense housing is inappropriate for an area that is already facing traffic and transport issues, and where local schools are at capacity.</li> <li>• Considers that the foreshores should be protected from overdevelopment and the influence of developers.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 36	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal as the traffic around this area is "already bad".</li> </ul>
Submitter from West Ryde Submission Number 38	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the density of housing proposed is more than can be supported by the existing transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• Notes that there is limited public transport, meaning that most residents rely on car usage.</li> <li>• Considers that the surrounding streets leading east, west, and north are already inadequate for the current volume of traffic, which will only worsen when the proposed development is built.</li> <li>• Considers that even if the light rail is built there will be bad traffic congestion heading west onto Victoria Road and Wharf Road, James Street and east.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that situating 20+ storey residential development in such close proximity to the river will negatively impact the aesthetic</li> </ul>



## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>appeal of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns regarding negative environmental impacts caused by the development, specifically regarding the water runoff from the development into the sensitive native river wetlands and impacts on marine life habitats.</li> <li>• Considers that given the large-scale developments already taking place on Wharf Road, this proposed development places too great a strain on transport infrastructure and the environment.</li> </ul>
No Address Provided Submission Number 39	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that high rise and high-density developments should not be situated in close proximity to the river.</li> <li>• Also objects to the extent of development occurring in Wentworth Point.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 40	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, raising concerns it would adversely impact the neighbourhood feel of the area.</li> <li>• Considers that the 3D image included in the exhibition material does not accurately show the impacts on solar access.</li> <li>• Considers that the location for the proposed development is inappropriate as it is not close to a significant public transport hub and the roads are already congested. Considers that a single light rail will not ease this pressure.</li> <li>• Notes that there does not appear to be an increase in the provision of green space.</li> <li>• Notes that the nearest high school has closed, meaning an increase in traffic congestion as parents are required to drive their children to school.</li> <li>• Considers that if high-rise developments are to be built, they should be situated along the heavy rail corridor.</li> <li>• Considers that the development goes against the government policy of situating jobs in the suburbs due to the removal of factories.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 41	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter states that the only potentially positive aspect of the proposal is the provision of affordable housing - unless it is to house drug addicts, which cause great mess and disturbance.</li> <li>• Considers that traffic is already congested from Hope Street onto Wharf Road, and a roundabout should have been installed when the last upgrade was undertaken a few years ago.</li> <li>• Notes that there is already significant development occurring on the block from Victoria Road to Hope Street.</li> <li>• Considers that Meadowbank is an overdeveloped suburb, and no more is necessary.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Westmead Submission Number 42	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal due to the scale and location of the development and its impacts on the riverine corridor and Upper Parramatta river corridor.</li> <li>• Submitter highlights points from the heritage study, which outline principles to: maintain an appropriate Heritage Curtilage, ensure no adverse impacts on ecological elements, undertake further investigations on potential Indigenous archaeology in the Wetlands, and to assess the significance of the historic private wharf within the wetlands, and preserve views and vistas towards the River and Wetlands.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the development will visually dominate the river and wetlands and have significant negative visual impacts when viewed from land, and from the water.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the proposed development is more intrusive and as damaging as the Ermington naval depot redevelopment, due to its close proximity to the river and disruption to the passive recreational value/tourist value of the river journey to Parramatta.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the Melrose Park South proposal, if approved, will set a precedent for more of the same high-density and visually bulky buildings to be constructed.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that the site was selected as it is easy to convert light industrial land to mass high-rise development, leading to substantial windfall gains for all involved.</li> <li>• Considers that this comes at the cost of having a living city, as mandated under the Greater Sydney Commission's Metropolis of Three Cities, as it results in adverse visual and ecological impacts on the Parramatta River corridor.</li> <li>• Considers that the development could be modified to greatly lessen the impact, such as through the reduction to height and setbacks.</li> <li>• Considers that the existing recreation transport corridor will be negatively impacted by the scale and duration of the development as it is adjoining the site, and the associated road works will greatly decrease the safety and enjoyment of using the shared Parramatta River Cycleway. Considers that the impacts will occur not only during the construction period, but amenity will be impacted adversely with ongoing use, contrary to the studies provided.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Coogee Submission Number 43	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal to change the planning controls on the site to enable a mix of high-density residential development (up to 22 storeys), retail/commercial uses and public open space.</li> <li>• Considers that the Development Control Plan will be ineffective to enable detailed design and planning controls for the precinct, especially given the State Government's Design and Place SEPP has been withdrawn.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the proposed infrastructure per the planning agreement is insufficient and that given the housing crisis, 50% of the development should be allocated to affordable housing.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that no secondary high school is proposed and suggests that the development site should be returned to the public as open space and a high school site, as the area is "unable to cope with existing demands".</li> <li>• Considers this proposal to be poorly planned and that it does not uphold public interest.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 44	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the amount of high-rise development going into the area will limit traffic flow in and out of the area, and parking is a concern.</li> <li>• States that they already struggle to find parking in their street, Hughes Avenue, without even more people and cars being present.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Carlingford Submission Number 45	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the size and bulk of the proposal is inconsistent with the character of the area and will adversely affect the river corridor.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposal to dedicate 24 affordable housing units to Parramatta Council is inappropriate, as Council is not and should not be in the business of providing social housing. Submitter also states it is unclear whether the units will be fit for purpose or whether they will be marketable. Considers that the proposal shifts the burden onto Council to assess who should benefit from these units, and to be responsible for ongoing maintenance.</li> <li>• Considers that there is potential for corruption and/or significant administrative costs.</li> <li>• States that typically affordable housing "turns out to be low-quality units with inadequate sunlight and limited access to fresh air", and all housing should be liveable.</li> <li>• Raises concern regarding the lack of a high school for primary school children to progress to.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposal appears to be solely focused on windfall gains, without regard to provision of infrastructure.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Trumper Street, Ermington	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal and considers 77 metres to be too high.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

Submission Number 46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the development proposes too many dwellings in an area that is increasing quickly without consideration for traffic flow and impacts to local streets and residents.</li> <li>• Submitter lives on Trumper Street and has seen increased traffic as Victoria Road becomes congested and people divert through residential streets to Ermington, Melrose Park, and Meadowbank. Considers that these single lane roads will not be able to cope with the high-density living proposed and will cause significant delays during peak times, such as the school pick-up and drop-off, as parents travel to surrounding schools in Melrose Park and Meadowbank.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 47	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal as it includes "too many units".</li> <li>• Notes that some developments are high, which will impact privacy and solar access for residents on the other side of Atkins Road and beyond.</li> <li>• Considers that there is insufficient infrastructure in the area to cope with the number of units proposed. Notes that a new primary school is proposed but not yet approved, and the local high school has been knocked down. Considers that the proposal should not be approved until the primary school is approved and a high school accounted for.</li> <li>• Considers that improved public transport and wider roads are also needed in the area before any more units are approved.</li> <li>• Notes that there are also a number of villas in nearby surrounds.</li> <li>• Considers that the population is increasing without adequate regard for community infrastructure provision.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 48	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that the planning proposal is inconsistent with the requirements of the Southern Structure Plan.</li> <li>• Submitter outlines key principles from the Urban Design Report, including: that a human scale of generally 3-4 storeys be created at the street interface, and that the impact of buildings be reduced to by avoiding continuous walls of buildings. Submitter notes that these requirements are not met in the planning proposal, with a majority of street-interfacing buildings being 6-8 storeys high and no buildings under 4 storeys in height.</li> <li>• Submitter states that most street-facing buildings consist of unbroken walls, examples being lots S13 and S14 where the U-shaped buildings of the structure plan are replaced by buildings with nearly enclosed courtyards with narrow openings onto Wharf Road.</li> <li>• Submitter notes the plan also reduces the linear green space along Wharf Road from 20m as designated in the structure plan, to 17m. Submitter notes the effects of these changes are apparent in the East Site view (Figure 3.1 of the report), where the built form illustrates significant bulk and scale.</li> <li>• Submitter also considers that the proposal provides insufficient community benefits. Submitter notes that the Community and Place Benefits Analysis identifies the need for two playgrounds and two long day care centres (with capacity for around 162 places) within the Holdmark sites.</li> <li>• The planning proposal includes only one playground and one 80-place childcare centre.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that the proposed cycleway and pedestrian access to the riverfront replaces existing facilities.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that a new multipurpose community hub was also identified as a major opportunity, and that the proposed contributions table under the Voluntary Planning Agreement does not make any contribution to this hub unless there is approval for more than the currently proposed number of dwellings.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the developer is prescribing that any contribution is contingent on being permitted to build an even larger development.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the hub is therefore not likely to come to fruition noting that the Melrose Park North VPA makes minimal contribution and the remaining portions of Melrose Park South (i.e., those not owned by Holdmark) represent a relatively small component of the entire</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	site.
No Address Provided Submission Number 49	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter does not oppose the development, considering it necessary, but states the density is too high and the buildings too tall.</li> <li>• Submitter would prefer fewer dwellings as the roads, schools and facilities are lacking and cannot support the proposed dwelling numbers.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 50	<b>Object</b> <i>No comments provided.</i>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 51	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating that 20- and 22-storey buildings are too high</li> <li>• Considers that it would result in too many new residents to the area, in addition to the northern development. States that schools and roads are already at capacity.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Rydalmere Submission Number 52	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal due to the scale of the proposed development, stating the height is too tall and the infrastructure insufficient to accommodate the extra residents.</li> <li>• Considers that the roads, schools, and parking are congested, and this development will exacerbate this.</li> <li>• Considers it inappropriate, as a ratepayer, for Council to be contributing such a large amount of funding to this project, stating it should be the responsibility of the developer to provide all funding and green space.</li> <li>• Considers that the community "lost putt putt, so it's only right that they replace it with something for the community".</li> <li>• States that these high-rise developments will result in anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 53	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, citing environmental impacts of the development, such as potential damage to the mangroves, overshadowing and impediments to solar access for surrounding dwellings, which go against the objective of protecting the environment.</li> <li>• States there is insufficient infrastructure in place to support the additional number of cars on local roads, and there is also a need for a high school in the area to support the extra children who will reside in the area.</li> <li>• Considers that more planning and the implementation of basic services are needed before this proposal is approved.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 54	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating that the proposed buildings are too tall, resulting in adverse bulk and scale and traffic congestion, and impacts upon local character.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 55	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter raises concerns that the building heights are too high and raises concerns regarding overshadowing.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns regarding parking congestion as they live adjacent to the site and already struggle to move their car out of the driveway due to the narrow street and parked cars. The proposal will exacerbate these issues.</li> <li>• Submitter requests that Council ensures development takes place within reason and without overpopulating the area and overburdening infrastructure.</li> </ul>
Submitter from	<b>Object</b>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

Ermington Submission Number 57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter states that Ermington, Melrose Park, and Meadowbank cannot sustain that many residents, raising concerns regarding overcrowding and traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Considers that there are not enough schools locally.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposal shouldn't be approved as it will result in the removal of jobs and put small businesses out of work.</li> <li>• Considers that the area is lacking entertainment given the removal of putt putt golf.</li> <li>• Considers that if one wants to help the local area, an increase in housing should be a last resort and Council should instead listen to what locals have to say.</li> </ul>
Submitter from West Ryde Submission Number 59	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating that adding more high-density dwellings will overpopulate the area.</li> <li>• States that Wharf Road and Andrew Street and connections to Victoria Road are already busy during peak hour.</li> <li>• Considers that there is also insufficient street parking in the area. Raises concerns regarding safety as the volume of cars parked on the street reduce visibility from the driveway, potentially leading to a dangerous car accident.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 60	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating that the building heights are excessive.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding overshadowing of properties on Atkins Road, should building heights be raised from 12 metres to 68 metres.</li> <li>• Raises concern that they will no longer be able to enjoy the sunrise from their home of 21 years.</li> <li>• Raises concern that they would receive sunlight in their front yard only after 11am and be limited to three hours.</li> <li>• Considers that they should not lose their vistas.</li> <li>• Notes that many recently opened units in the Shepherd's Bay precinct are unoccupied.</li> <li>• Submitter enjoys that their local environment is quiet, with no through-traffic and no busy roads to pose a threat to children and pets.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposed development will impact privacy and that the traffic volumes will result in noise and congestion, with reduced on-street parking.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that apartment dwellings are only allocated one car space and will therefore park in Atkins Road, obstructing the roadway and creating safety hazards.</li> <li>• States that the hardcopy proposal documents provided at Ermington Library did not provide detailed information about the project, such as building heights and number of apartments proposed, making it difficult for elderly residents without internet access to make an informed response to the proposal.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that the gum trees opposite their house are home to a family of kookaburras and magpies. Raises concerns that the development proposal does not acknowledge these established trees and the wildlife they support, stating these trees should not be cut down.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ryde Submission Number 61	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the proposal, stating that appropriate transport and infrastructure should accompany the project.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 62	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating that the proposed height is too high.</li> <li>• States that there are too many dwellings compared to the provision of green space and questions how traffic congestion is being addressed, noting existing congestion will be exacerbated.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the proposal will affect the character of Melrose Park.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

<p>Submitter from Lancaster Avenue, Melrose Park (same submitter as Submission #11)</p> <p>Submission Number 63</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating they do not feel this development is in keeping with the character of the area and will impact environmental values.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding building height and the lack of green space.</li> <li>• Submitter lives on Lancaster Avenue and states they have not seen any traffic analyses undertaken for this street, noting the street is already utilised by a significant number of cyclists and pedestrians en route to Ermington Wharf and vice versa.</li> <li>• Considers that the introduction of additional residents will increase the traffic on this road, along with littering.</li> <li>• Considers the proposal to be overdevelopment, requesting Council to stay vigilant against significant commercial interest.</li> <li>• Remarks that Council should work in the community's interest and that the development doesn't align with the residents' desires for the area.</li> </ul>
<p>Submitter from Ermington</p> <p>Submission Number 64</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating that a 20-storey building in this area is excessive.</li> <li>• Considers that there is no suitable public transport, roads are already congested, and the Melrose Park North development hasn't been completed.</li> <li>• States that cars are parked everywhere on Wharf Road, making it unsafe to reverse in and out of driveways.</li> <li>• Considers that Councils should learn from the other developments in the area, highlighting Shepherds Bay, Rhodes, and Meadowbank as examples of overdevelopment resulting in traffic hazards and lack of parking.</li> <li>• Considers Melrose Park an inappropriate location for increased density as train stations are not within walking distance and bus services are irregular and too infrequent to be considered a viable transport option.</li> <li>• Submitter might be comfortable with a smaller development that provides additional parking; however, any building over 6 storeys is not supported.</li> <li>• States that this development is not what residents want.</li> </ul>
<p>Submitter from Gregory Street, Ermington</p> <p>Submission Number 65</p>	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter lives on Gregory Street beside the proposed development site and is not totally opposed to the development but has several concerns.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the proposed building heights, noting that the structure plan for the southern precinct establishes a maximum height of 58/64 metres, while this plan proposes some buildings of 77m, which is likely to pose negative impacts to solar access for existing residences around the development site.</li> <li>• Considers that developments near so many individual houses should not exceed 5 storeys in height.</li> <li>• Considers that additional transport infrastructure is required to support increased density and the level of community infrastructure to be provided is insufficient.</li> <li>• States that the local primary school is set to grow from 200 to 1,000 students due to the many developments in the area, and furthermore, there are no high schools near Ermington and no provisions have yet been made for one.</li> <li>• States that the setback from Atkins Road is insufficient.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding potential negative impacts of the development on the mangroves and Parramatta River, and the need for storm water management and other infrastructure to mitigate impacts.</li> <li>• Considers that the developer should contribute more, financially, than what has been proposed.</li> <li>• States that their home, local school, and primary aged children are all affected by the development and is not confident that the impacts have been sufficiently considered.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

<p>Submitter from West Ryde Submission Number 66</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the proposal, stating that the change in zoning to allow building heights of 77m is a significant increase from the current maximum height of 12m and would set an undesirable precedent.</li> <li>• Considers that any height increase that more than doubles existing provisions will impact the character of the area.</li> <li>• Considers that the amount of affordable housing proposed is inadequate.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that there are 24 affordable housing units proposed, with a minimum of 34 bedrooms, meaning that more than half may be one-bedroom units.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the development will provide a windfall for developers but does not provide sufficient affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<p>Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 68</p>	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter asks what the ratio of parkland to built environment is, stating that if FSR is being increased, so should the requirements for deep soil landscaping and native plantings.</li> <li>• Questions how the development is improving the ecology of the existing area, stating that the Ecological Assessment report identifies 95 threatened species, but offers no suggestions for protection of flora and fauna other than building setbacks.</li> <li>• Asks, assuming there is an increase of recreational activities on the Parramatta River, what Council will implement to ensure the safety and cleanliness of the Parramatta River.</li> <li>• Asks, with an additional 1,500 units being introduced, how Council will ensure there are sufficient schools and childcare centres.</li> </ul>
<p>Submitter from West Pennant Hills Submission Number 70</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the development, stating that the proposed development would shade a significant part of the saltmarsh, which is an important habitat for many species of migratory shorebirds, therefore reducing the amount of foraging habitat these birds depend on.</li> <li>• States that the development will impact threatened flora and fauna.</li> <li>• States that mangroves are particularly important to a healthy ecosystem, oxygenating the water and protecting fish breeding, and they are liable to be damaged in the building and occupation of the proposed development.</li> <li>• Considers that development should not threaten remaining pockets of natural habitat, especially during this time of climate change.</li> </ul>
<p>No Address Provided Submission Number 71</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter strongly objects to the proposal's scale in its current form, stating that development should improve the area for residents and not be about a significant windfall for developers and Council.</li> <li>• Submitter does not have issues with rezoning and development in principle, but considers that the scale of the interface between the residential development on the Atkins Road and Wharf Road side has not been given due consideration. Considers that the proposal documentation does not adequately consider the Atkins Road side of the development and associated impacts.</li> <li>• Submitter states that the scale of this redevelopment is incompatible with surrounding low-density dwellings, and the proposed heights are unsympathetic.</li> <li>• Considers that the height and setbacks on Atkins Road should be reviewed, with the setback increased and height reduced to provide a more sympathetic transition and interface with the existing neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the loss of morning sun and overshadowing in winter on residences on the western side along Atkins Street and on the Wharf Road side in the afternoons.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding loss of privacy as the proposed heights will enable direct views into residents' houses and yards.</li> <li>• Considers that improved public transport infrastructure should be in place before redevelopment is considered or approved.</li> <li>• Considers the bridge across the river and additional ferry stops to be essential upgrades, in addition to the proposed light rail.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that the significant population increase across the North and South precincts will place too great a strain on public services and the existing road infrastructure in Melrose Park, which is already beyond capacity.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that this development will not be of high quality (like in Meadowbank).</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the little increase in green space and the sensitive ecosystem along the river.</li> <li>• Considers that Council should hold the developer to a higher standard regarding low-cost housing and publicly accessible and useable space compared to what has been proposed.</li> <li>• Considers it unsympathetic to existing Parramatta and Ryde ratepayers for a developer to build up to 75 metres high in an area surrounded by existing residential.</li> <li>• Cites Wentworth Point as an example of a suburb where local roads and infrastructure were not designed for the increase in population.</li> <li>• Submitter would welcome further consultation with residents.</li> </ul>
No Address Provided Submission Number 72	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter questions the validity and impartiality of the independent reports provided by the developer as part of this proposal, since Council will be using these reports in its decision making.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns on behalf of the Melrose Park Resident Action Group regarding the number of heritage-listed and other mature trees identified for removal in Melrose Park North.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns that the Ecological Assessment Report and photos for the development ignore the 12 significant and mature trees on the southern boundary adjacent to Waratah Street.</li> <li>• Submitter suggests that an independent report by suitably qualified individuals be undertaken to identify the species of significant trees on the entire site and indicate their true ecological and climate benefit to the local community and wildlife.</li> <li>• Submitter raises concerns regarding the Heritage Report, stating it is factually incorrect. Suggests that a new Heritage Report be written to accurately reflect and include the history of the original Melrose Park (Ryde LGA).</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the TMAP does not have any factual basis, given that there is already traffic congestion on local roads, particularly during peak hours, due to the increase in residents from the Victoria Road site and other drivers.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the infrastructure needs list is inadequate for both the northern and southern precincts, and it does not take into consideration the potential impacts on Ryde LGA infrastructure and residents.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the quality of the developer.</li> <li>• Considers that the community consultation phase is not a central part of the planning proposal assessment process.</li> <li>• Cites Wentworth Point as an example of poor planning outcomes and lack of infrastructure that should not be repeated.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Gregory Street, Ermington Submission Number 73	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is a local resident of Gregory Street, which is quiet, narrow, and does not facilitate high volumes of traffic. Considers that the proposed development at George Kendall Reserve will already contribute to an increase in traffic movement and activity.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding Gregory Street being extended into the proposed Melrose Park site, resulting in an increase in traffic and movement, making it a busy road, and increasing risk to children and animals in the park and contributing to noise pollution. Raises potential movement issues due to the narrow street and proximity to the edge of the water.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the proposed development's proximity to the water, raising concerns regarding pollution, water impacts, water displacement, water seepage into the site and collection of water (draining from Parramatta River).</li> <li>• Considers the proposed height of the development to be excessive given that the neighbouring and existing properties are all low-rise. States that the excessive height inhibits existing views.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the impacts of overshadowing and solar access for neighbouring streets and properties.</li> </ul>



## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the provision of low-rent housing and suggests it should be mixed, so that the issues are diluted.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the potential noise pollution and pollution to the area and into the river. Notes that existing properties should be dismantled with care to prevent further leaching into the Parramatta River, and that chemicals and toxins should be managed effectively.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the density and height of the development, and that it will include affordable housing. Considers that this poses socioeconomic issues, which will impact an already vulnerable community. Cites anti-social issues at Ermington shops and in neighbouring streets as examples of this.</li> <li>• Considers that appropriate provision of parking should be planned for so that there is no spill-over into neighbouring streets; the site should accommodate all the parking that is required. Considers that the new George Kendall upgrade will result in limited parking in neighbouring streets, which should not be responsible for accommodating the parking needed for the development site.</li> <li>• States that the concerns raised in this submission echo the concerns of other residents in Gregory Street.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Eric Street, Eastwood Submission Number 75	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers the proposed number of new residents and building heights to be inappropriate, and that the proposal should not be permitted.</li> <li>• Concerns with removal of employment opportunities, and that the number of proposed retail sites do not compensate.</li> <li>• Considers that suggesting people travel to other industrial centres instead only serves to further compound traffic problems in Sydney.</li> <li>• Notes that this proposal is in addition to many other redevelopments in Melrose Park that have increased population and resulted in cleared vegetation, and there will be further future developments.</li> <li>• Considers that proposals in general are completed in stages to avoid any consideration of cumulative impacts.</li> <li>• Considers that population density is increasing, while existing trees, natural vegetation and open space is being removed.</li> <li>• Considers there is insufficient infrastructure to support the population increase, including roads and schools (noting closure of Marsden High School).</li> <li>• Considers that the river in the south makes it difficult for people to enter and leave, which will remain an ongoing problem with the volume of people living there.</li> <li>• Considers that the development sites should instead be used for the provision of other facilities and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Considers that the site's current use has minimal impacts on the wetlands, helping to preserve the high ecological value of the area.</li> <li>• Considers that the site's current use as a light industrial area to be more beneficial for environmental conservation (providing a buffer) and provision of employment opportunities, compared to residential development.</li> <li>• Considers it unsustainable to remove sources of local employment while increasing population density in the area, which leads to increased demand on road infrastructure and additional challenges commuting to places of employment noting there are limited public transport options available.</li> <li>• Considers that the developer is seeking to make profit at the expense of residents and endangered ecological areas.</li> <li>• Considers the scale of development should be decreased and the buffer zone between the development and roads, wetlands, and other natural areas be increased.</li> <li>• Considers that inadequate consideration has been given to the negative impacts of the development on the wetlands, including the coastal saltmarsh and mangrove forest, and threatened migratory bird species.</li> <li>• Considers that inadequate consideration has been given to the development's proximity to the Newington Nature Reserve on the other side of the river.</li> <li>• Considers that the current buildings on the site are low-rise and do not pose the same negative impacts that high-rise towers would have on the waterway.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Submitter questions why such an inappropriate scale of development is permitted near the wetlands, which have been identified as being of high ecological significance. Notes that the Ecological Assessment report recommends mitigation measures of a buffer zone, which is to be replanted around the coastal saltmarsh and the Foreshore Buffer Zone, and that this recommendation appears to have been largely ignored, considering the proposal of a road extension through the buffer zone area.</li><li>• Notes that the Ecological Assessment states that the development may impact additional threatened species, which is likely given the additional infrastructure works required by increased population.</li><li>• With reference to the deferred sites in Melrose Park South, the development, being done in stages, therefore does not consider the cumulative impacts of the overall area.</li><li>• Considers the development will threaten ecosystems and lessen the enjoyment of the natural area by other residents, e.g., the Ermington Bay Nature Trail.</li><li>• Considers that the natural areas may be contaminated by toxic materials during the construction process.</li><li>• States that the ecological areas might be accidentally cleared during works. The recommendations of the Ecological Assessment have been ignored. E.g., the buffer zone is not being followed as recommended – Mary Street is proposed to go in the buffer zone instead.</li><li>• Considers that towers of 22 storeys in height will be visible and light up the area at night, disturbing adjacent ecosystems, migratory birds, and wildlife due to the artificial light/light pollution and effects on temperature and the micro-climate of the area. The buildings will overshadow the ecosystems during the day and will also reflect heat.</li><li>• Considers that the tallest towers should be situated at the back of the complex, rather than near the wetlands.</li><li>• The Mary St extension will significantly damage remaining natural vegetation, coastal saltmarsh, and Ermington Bay Nature Trail.</li><li>• Also notes that the exact position of the Mary Street road extension appears to differ across the various maps in the supplied documents. Notes that the Mary Street extension is depicted in relation to a local landmark, an electric pylon; however, this pylon is often not shown in indicative models of the proposed development, which may have associated logistical issues.</li><li>• Raises concerns that the negative impacts from the Mary Street extension will be compounded when the "deferred" site is also developed into high-density residential in the future.</li><li>• Raises concerns that there will be almost no vegetation left between the road and the Ermington Bay Natural Trail, with no appropriate buffer provided between the road extension and existing natural vegetation.</li><li>• Raises concerns, based on the road extension routes in the Planning Agreement, that the proposed roads will go through the area identified as a buffer zone in the Ecological Assessment, meaning that the coastal saltmarsh will end up directly adjacent to the proposed Mary Street and Waratah Street extensions without any buffer zone.</li><li>• Raises concerns that it appears there will be a significant clearing of natural vegetation on both proposed development sites, based on the depictions on page 80 of the Draft Planning Agreement document. Raises concerns that this will result in degradation of the local ecosystems and lessen public enjoyment of the area.</li><li>• Suggests that the Mary St extension be rerouted further north to preserve natural vegetation, and a further buffer zone be created around the saltmarsh and other vegetation. Alternatively, deleting this road extension altogether should be considered.</li><li>• States it is unclear whether the pedestrian walkway depicted in the VPA is the Ermington Bay Nature Trail – there appears to be significant vegetation clearing proposed along this walkway per the VPA.</li><li>• Raises concerns about the extent of vegetation clearing within the site, and that the proposed parks and replacement vegetation is an insufficient compromise.</li><li>• Raises concerns that the negative impacts on the Waratah Street coastal saltmarsh and other natural areas will be compounded by the light rail extension as part of the Parramatta Light Rail stage 2, while also reducing the amount of new parkland proposed.</li><li>• Recommends that the East site proposal should not be approved until more detailed plans for the light rail are available, so that the</li></ul>
--	--

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>cumulative impacts on the area can be better known. Notes that the NSW Government has stated that the Parramatta Light Rail stage 2 Environmental Impact Statement should be completed by the end of 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that the proposal does not consider the possible routes for Parramatta Light Rail stage 2, also raising concerns that the light rail and redevelopment can both be accommodated by the Melrose Park area without additional negative impacts. Considers that the area south of the East site should be reserved for light rail, rather than for the proposed residential towers to avoid land needing to be claimed from elsewhere, destroying natural vegetation, parks, or other houses in the process.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the impacts of the light rail on the wetlands and remaining park near Ermington Wharf.</li> <li>• Suggests that the East site be used instead for the light rail or as green space adjacent to it. Raises concerns regarding the interface of the East site with the light rail, specifically how the light rail will be accessed.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the public will not be able to access the shared cycleway along Waratah Street during the construction period, and that the area will be less pedestrian and cyclist-friendly once the development is built, due to cars entering and leaving the residential complexes and compounded by the light rail, which is also proposed to go along Waratah Street. Considers these pedestrian walkways to be essential, providing access to public transport services at Meadowbank. The walkways could be damaged during construction.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that no provisions have been made to require developers to protect the natural vegetation during and after construction.</li> <li>• Suggests the decision be deferred until any impacts associated with the light rail extension along Waratah St is better known.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Ermington Submission Number 76	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is a resident in Ermington and does not support this proposal.</li> <li>• Considers that the area does not need apartments of this size since there is insufficient infrastructure in the area to support it.</li> <li>• Considers that the roads will become congested and raises concerns regarding overshadowing of houses in the local area.</li> <li>• Considers that most people will likely drive instead of taking public transport, resulting in more parked cars and more traffic.</li> <li>• Considers that there does not seem to be any plans for commercial facilities, which the area needs, such as cafes, restaurants, and shops, rather than high rise apartments (like in Meadowbank).</li> <li>• Considers that there should be greater housing diversity so that there are a mix of terraces and units, rather than all units.</li> <li>• Considers that the area is near the river and has significant potential.</li> <li>• Considers that this proposal would impact the character of the area.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 77	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter comments that a reply was not received to their submission relating to DA/261/2022, and therefore has little confidence in the consultation process.</li> <li>• Comments that the Proposal and draft DCP highlight issues in several of the independent reports and that the effect these inaccuracies is that the history, identity, and residential locale of the original Melrose Park is being overlooked and the presence of significant local and mature trees ignored.</li> </ul> <p><u>Ecological Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that the Ecological Report and photos ignore the stand of significant and mature trees on the southern boundary adjacent to Waratah Street. States that the trees are a significant source of nectar for native fauna and for the continuum of the green corridor down Wharf Road. States they have formed part of the local landscape for over 40 years.</li> <li>• Considers that the removal of these trees in combination with those removed in the northern precinct will impact on nectar sources and aesthetic disruption. Trees of this size play an important role in carbon absorption and are inconsistent with efforts to minimise climate</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that an independent arborist/botanist/apiarist report be prepared to identify significant tree species on the site and their ecological and climate benefit.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers the Heritage Impact Assessment to be factually incorrect and that it attempts to overlay the history of the original Melrose Park with that of the new Melrose Park.</li> <li>Notes that the report incorrectly states that the Samuel Marsden Estate on the western side of Wharf Road was part of Melrose Park and not Ermington in 1792-1892 despite the suburb's boundary expansion not occurring until 2005.</li> <li>Considers that the report should be updated to reference the correct suburb. Claims the error is misleading and non-compliant with the Geographical Names Board's policy.</li> </ul> <p><u>Community and Public Benefit Analysis Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers the statement within the report identifying the location of the precinct to be incorrect and that it damages the original Melrose Park from 1928 suburb and its residents.</li> <li>Considers that the report should be updated to reference the correct suburb and its history. Claims the error is non-compliant with the Geographical Names Board's policy.</li> </ul> <p><u>Environmental and Aesthetic Disruption</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments that fully matured trees provide essential nectar and pollen sources for bees and other wildlife. Removal and disruption of the corridor will have a devastating, if not fatal, impact on bees and wildlife that has become dependent on these food sources.</li> <li>Considers the concept of replacing these trees with newly planted 'mature' trees is not a worthy compromise.</li> <li>Comments that the plight of bees is internationally known and the impact of the decline and diversity in bee populations places food security at risk and that the destruction of natural habitats is contributing to the declining numbers and diversity of bees.</li> <li>Comments that it has been confirmed that many of the trees proposed to be removed are important and relied upon nectar or pollen sources for bees. The replacement trees will not compensate for this loss.</li> <li>Comments that the removal of the trees disrupts the aesthetic appearance of Wharf Road and Waratah Street.</li> <li>Considers that all mature trees be identified and preserved by realigning internal road and other infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><u>TMAP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that all community credibility for the TMAP is lost by claiming that the additional traffic demands as a result of the redevelopment on the surrounding road network fall within acceptable capacity thresholds.</li> <li>Comments that long-term residents in the area consider the traffic to the east of the subject site to be currently over capacity. States that at 6.30am on weekdays it can take four (4) sets of traffic lights to enter Victoria Road turning right from Adelaide Street or Wharf Road, and this is similar on weekends between Victoria Road and Wharf Road and the West Ryde shops.</li> <li>States that advice received from the NSW Traffic Management Centre (TMC) is that this section of Victoria Road has the most concentrated number of traffic signals along Victoria Road. This is not mentioned in the TMAP.</li> <li>Considers that the TMAP be rewritten to include a more objective and actual observation of the traffic issue that currently exist east of the subject site.</li> <li>Considers that solutions be identified that will specifically address both current and future demands.</li> </ul>
--	--

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p><u>Infrastructure Needs List Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions why there is no allocation of the total infrastructure amount to Melrose Park east of the subject site.</li> <li>Considers that the Infrastructure Needs List budget needs to be revised to adequately provide financial allocation for infrastructure needs with the Ryde LGA.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comparison with neighbouring areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The identified 11,000 new dwellings and over 25,000 people is more residents than the 2114 postcode areas, which includes West Ryde, Meadowbank, Denistone, and Melrose Park, however the requisite sized infrastructure such as schools and shopping areas to accommodate the population are not provided.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Wharf Road, Melrose Park Submission Number 78	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers the infrastructure needs list to be inadequate for the North and South precincts, given that there could be 25,000+ new residents on local streets.</li> <li>Considers that the infrastructure identified also ignores the impacts on Ryde LGA's infrastructure and residents.</li> <li>States that the TMAP appears to be based on assumptions with no factual foundation, considering there are already traffic problems on local roads, especially during peak times, due to the increase in residents from the Victoria Road site and other drivers.</li> <li>Raises concerns regarding the number of heritage-listed and other mature trees identified for removal in Melrose Park North.</li> <li>States that the Ecological Report and images for the development ignore the 12 significant and mature trees on the southern boundary adjacent to Waratah Street. Requests an independent report be produced by suitably qualified arborists, botanists, or apiarists, who are engaged to identify the specifics of significant trees on the proposed development site and assess their true ecological and climate benefit to the local community and wildlife.</li> <li>Submitter would like to see the plans of the proposed light rail in conjunction with the development plans and the planned bridge, to understand how it would impact current residents of Melrose Park.</li> </ul>
No Address Provided Submission Number 79	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter considers the proposed height of 22 storeys to be inappropriate.</li> <li>States that the marshland habitat and waterways should be considered.</li> <li>States that the roads are already congested and the drive to get from Ermington to West Ryde is set to worsen with an additional 5,000 cars on the road.</li> <li>Notes that some bus routes to the city were cut, so public transport already takes longer.</li> <li>Raises concerns around logistics for accommodating and transporting an additional 5,000 people.</li> <li>Raises concerns regarding school infrastructure, specifically regards to location of the high school and primary school and the capacity. Submitter also raises the overhead bridge for children to safely cross Victoria Road, which they thought was meant to have already been delivered.</li> <li>Submitter questions whether consideration has been given to medical services, such as GP clinics, to help service the increase in population. States that wait times for an appointment in the area is already a week or more.</li> <li>Hopes the facade will be nicer than the existing ones on Victoria Road. Suggests that consideration be given to how it fits into the landscape and suggests use of sandstone.</li> <li>Suggests that parks should incorporate elements for all ages, such as water play, shading, tables, trees, toilets, bike lanes for children and adults, and perhaps a dog park.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

<p>Submitter from Cobham Avenue, Melrose Park Submission Number 80</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter raises concerns regarding the 12 heritage listed trees identified for removal, stating these were not accounted for in the Ecological Assessment Report.</li> <li>• Considers that there is no real infrastructure to address traffic volume or pollution in Melrose Park or surrounding suburbs.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that there is no guarantee that Parramatta Light Rail Stage 2 will be realised.</li> <li>• Considers that neither Parramatta nor Ryde Council want to admit liability in creating pollution and traffic volume in surrounding suburbs.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposal demonstrates no care for fauna and birds.</li> <li>• Considers high rise development of 22-25 storeys to be inappropriate.</li> </ul>
<p>Submitters from Wharf Road, Melrose Park Submission Number 81</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters support and echo the concerns of the Melrose Park Residents Action Group and other community members.</li> <li>• Submitters have little confidence in the public consultation process.</li> <li>• Submitters state that there are issues in several of the independent reports relied on by Council in assessing the proposal, which have resulted in the history, identity and residential locale of the original Melrose Park being overlooked.</li> <li>• Submitters raise concerns regarding the 12 significant and mature trees on the southern boundary adjacent to Waratah Street, noting they appear to not have been identified in the Ecological Assessment Report. Submitters consider these trees to be an important food source for native insects, birds and bees and state that trees of this size are consistent with climate change minimisation efforts. Submitters recommend an independent report be undertaken by suitably qualified individuals to ascertain the trees' ecological and climate benefit.</li> <li>• Submitters consider the Heritage Report to be incorrect regarding the historical boundaries of Melrose Park. Submitters recommend the Heritage Report be rewritten to reflect and include the history of the original Melrose Park (Ryde LGA) circa 1928.</li> <li>• Submitters raise concerns regarding the Executive Summary of the Community and Public Benefit Analysis Report, recommending it be rewritten to reflect and include the history of the original Melrose Park (Ryde LGA) circa 1928.</li> <li>• Submitters against replacing trees with newly planted mature trees and instead recommend all significant mature trees be identified and preserved by realigning internal roads and other infrastructure.</li> <li>• Submitters raise concerns with the TMAP, specifically regarding the statement that additional traffic demands resulting from development on the surrounding local road network fall within acceptable capacity thresholds. Identifies that traffic is already congested when entering Victoria Road from Adelaide Street or Wharf Road, and on Saturday mornings there are similar traffic issues on Victoria Road between Wharf Road and West Ryde shops. Notes that traffic is also congested when there are major sporting events at Meadowbank Park. Submitters recommend the TMAP be rewritten to include more objective and accurate observations of the traffic issues that currently exist east of the development site, along with solutions that will address current and future traffic demands to the east.</li> <li>• Submitters recommend that the Infrastructure Needs List budget be revised to adequately provide for infrastructure needs to the east of the development site.</li> <li>• Submitters consider that the new development will account for an additional 25,000+ residents; however, the requisite infrastructure to support such a population, e.g., schools and shopping areas, are not being provided.</li> </ul>
<p>Submitter from Cobham Avenue, Melrose Park Submission Number 82</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter states that the Holdmark East component of the Draft Planning Proposal for the Melrose Park South Precinct, the Draft Site-Specific Development Control Plan and the Draft Planning Agreement should be deferred until the planning process for Parramatta Light Rail Stage 2 has been completed.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the lack of sufficient commercial floor space to compensate for the loss of employment lands.</li> <li>• Raises issues associated with the Transport Assessment Report submitted with the Planning Proposal, which relies on the TMAP, stating it is</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>a document whose transport modelling was based on a different transport and road network scenario than what is now proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the Planning Proposal does not comply with a number of requirements specified in the DPE's "Guide to preparing planning proposals".</li> <li>• States that the minimum amount of non-residential floor space of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> proposed in the Planning Proposal is inadequate and needs to be significantly increased.</li> <li>• States that pubs and small bars should not be permitted on the land to which the Planning Proposal applies.</li> <li>• States that the 17m-wide proposed RE1 Public Recreation zone along the Wharf Road frontage of the Holdmark East site should be increased to 20m to be consistent with the Gateway Determination.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the proposed RE1 Public Recreation zone along the Wharf Road and Waratah Street frontages on the Holdmark East site, for the area south of the "Andrews Street view corridor".</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the "Andrews Street view corridor", stating the trees should be preserved.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the location of Proposed Road NSR3B/Waratah Street and suggests an alternative location option for that road.</li> <li>• States that the land proposed to be zoned RE1 Public Recreation in the Holdmark West site should extend to Atkins Road and include land in the southwestern portion of the site.</li> <li>• States there are issues associated with Proposed Road EWR10 in the Holdmark West site.</li> <li>• States that the Proposed Road EWR8 in the Holdmark West site should be relocated further to the north to ensure the retention of significant trees.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the road corridor width of Mary Street does not support having one lane of traffic in each direction.</li> <li>• States that the density and scale of development proposed, specifically the proposed floor space ratios of 2.74:1 for the Holdmark East site and 2.46:1 for the Holdmark West site, are too high given the context in which the sites are located.</li> <li>• States that the Height of Building (HOB) controls proposed are excessive and inappropriate for the sites immediately adjoined by low density residential development to the east (the Holdmark East site) and to the west (the Holdmark West site).</li> <li>• States that the amount of Residential Gross Floor Area proposed is excessive and does not comply with the respective FSR development standard proposed for the Holdmark East site and the Holdmark West site.</li> <li>• Recommends provisions be included in the PLEP 2011 to ensure that the dwelling thresholds and dwelling caps identified within the TMAP aligns with the delivery of required infrastructure.</li> <li>• Raises concerns relating to the provision of affordable housing in the precinct, including the planning mechanism proposed to be used and the amount of affordable rental housing proposed.</li> <li>• Raises concerns that the <i>City of Parramatta (Outside CBD) Development Contributions Plan 2021</i> would not apply to the subject site(s).</li> <li>• States that in exercising its functions under the Local Government Act, a Council is required to act "fairly, ethically and without bias in the interests of the local community". Contends that by endorsing the Council Officers' recommendation to give delegation to the CEO to draft the Planning Agreement, Council would not be exercising its functions under the Local Government Act or in accordance with Council's current development contributions policy.</li> <li>• States that the community should be entitled to a much greater share of the increased value of the land resulting from the zoning uplift than what is proposed in the draft Planning Agreement on exhibition.</li> <li>• Raises issues relating to Section 7(a) and Section 8 of the Draft Planning Agreement.</li> </ul>
<p>Submitter from Taylor Avenue, Melrose Park Submission Number 83</p>	<p><b>Object</b> <u>Consultation process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of residents within the affected area were not notified.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The consultation process is not a fundamental part of the detailed assessment.</li><li>• Little regard to the impacts these developments will have on the adjoining communities.</li><li>• 7 Taylor Avenue did not receive a notification.</li><li>• No reply to submission on DA/261/2022 means there's little confidence in public consultation.</li><li>• PP and DCP highlight issues of the independent reports that are relied upon in making a true and accurate assessment of the application.</li><li>• Considers the history, identity, and residential locale of the "original" Melrose Park c 1928 is being overlooked and the presence of significant local and mature trees being ignored.</li><li>• Requests that the process be halted, and a public meeting held with all affected residents on both sides of the development.</li></ul> <p><u>Ecological Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ecological report and photos within ignore the stand of significant and mature trees on the southern boundary adjacent to Waratah St, and other mature trees notes as being "low constraint".</li><li>• Senversa report's aerial images indicate these trees are 40+ years old.</li><li>• Consider trees could be retained with proper engineering and aboricultural ameliorations.</li><li>• Proposed native tree replacements will take 40 years to reach the size of the existing trees.</li><li>• Removal of trees plus those in the northern precinct will make nectar sources scarce and remove the buffer between the residents and development.</li><li>• These trees play a role in absorbing carbon and their removal is inconsistent with efforts to minimise climate change.</li></ul> <p><u>Andrew Street view corridor</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Looking west from Andrew St towards the view corridor through the site. These trees are not considered in the ecological report but are an important part of the local environment and the view corridor. Contribute toward the character and urban tree canopy.</li><li>• Council officers did not support the built form outcome of Holdmark's proposed density increase on the East Site as part of the Structure Plan as it would compromise the view corridor.</li><li>• The trees should be retained to preserve the amenity of the area to protect the biodiversity value of trees as per the aims of Biodiversity SEPP.</li><li>• Recommends an independent report be prepared to identify significant trees on the site and their true ecological, aesthetic and climate value.</li></ul> <p><u>TMAP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Flawed and outdated document.</li><li>• Uses same vague assumptions and one-line assessments of the effect these developments will have on the community.</li><li>• City of Ryde Traffic Committee and staff consider the TMAP does not adequately assess the impacts these developments will have on the local communities.</li><li>• Shortcomings:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Proposed dwelling yield and population will dwarf the existing Melrose Park suburb (approx. 1,500 residents) and is more than the 2114 postcode area (Melrose Park, West Ryde, Meadowbank, and Denistone).</li><li>○ Required school and retail infrastructure to support the population is not provided.</li><li>○ TMAP was paid for by the developers.</li></ul></li></ul>
--	--



## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ TMAP was not peer reviewed but was overseen by a project reference group, which did not include local residents or representatives from Ryde Council.</li> <li>○ Uses questionable assumptions such as doubling the rate on non-car travel and fundamental shifts in predominant directions of travel.</li> <li>○ Pays little attention to existing Melrose Park suburb within the Ryde LGA road infrastructure beyond blanket assurances that the scale of development presents ‘significant but manageable challenges’ with additional traffic demand seen as falling within ‘acceptable capacity thresholds’.</li> <li>○ Makes assumptions on the provision of additional on and off-street parking spaces. Will result in an undersupply within the development and put pressure on existing local streets surrounding the precinct.</li> <li>○ Ryde Council has disputed the assertions, stating that there will be significant increases in traffic volume on Andrew Street, Wharf Road, and Constitution Road. Has also expressed major concern regarding serious adverse effects on the amount of traffic flowing unto the low-density area as the result of rat-runs, on Taylor and Cobham Avenues.</li> <li>○ Identified need for new bridge to Wentworth Point but did not provide any details about the location of the bridge, land take and impacts on existing dwellings.</li> <li>○ Modelling of the traffic and transport impacts don’t relate to the current development scenario i.e., school, playing field, changes to non-residential component and road network.</li> <li>○ No mention of the timing of construction of the Kissing Point Road/Victoria Road intersection.</li> <li>○ Shortcoming of process and assumptions have resulted in a very limited and inadequate set of recommended transport improvements. The only new public transport link will be the light rail (or equivalent) which has no detailed funding commitment for construction.</li> </ul> <p><u>Transport Assessment – light rail bridge location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document relies on assumptions and inconsistencies of the TMAP and makes broad assumptions on the effect the development will have on the adjoining Melrose Park community.</li> <li>• <i>Given that the TMAP determined that the trip generation of the Holdmark Sites (and broader Melrose Park) could – further to the works and strategies identified in the TMAP Implementation Plan – be appropriately accommodated by the future road network, it is therefore inherently the case that the Planning Proposal can be supported in consideration of traffic conditions.</i> – What about the existing residential road network? No mention in the document of that apart from listing what road designation some of them are.</li> <li>• <i>Parking across the Holdmark Sites will be provided in accordance with the maximum parking rate recommendations detailed in the TMAP; while noting the parking may be provided at higher (average) rates in the short term, the maximum parking further to the completion of development will not exceed 1,514 parking spaces.</i> – How is this calculated and how do they come to this conclusion when we already see overflow on street parking on Wharf Road from the completed unit blocks close to Victoria Road?</li> <li>• <i>Given that the TMAP determined that the trip generation of the Holdmark Sites (and broader Melrose Park) could – further to the works and strategies identified in the TMAP Implementation Plan – be appropriately accommodated by the future road network, it is therefore inherently the case that the Planning Proposal can be supported in consideration of traffic conditions.</i> – These are again only assumptions with no justification or evidence to support such claims. Concerns that there was no consultation with the City of Ryde Traffic Department.</li> </ul>
--	--

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no mention in the document of traffic issues on Cobham, Taylor and Lancaster Aves or rest of the Melrose Park area. It should not be assumed that people will not drive through these streets to access the Melrose Park South development.</li> <li>Process should be halted until Ryde Council and local residents are fully informed of the traffic implications and allowed to make comment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Light rail bridge location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about the location of the proposed bridge and effects on local community.</li> <li>Concerns have been raised by the community and Federal MP Jerome Laxale. A recent letter to Geoff Lee MP raised these concerns:</li> <li>Potential for compulsory acquisition of residential properties on Wharf Road.</li> <li>Unreasonable to displace residents who have invested significant funds to make their homes wheelchair accessible.</li> <li>No formal notification or consultation has been given to affected owners.</li> <li>Submitter states that no alternate location has been explored because this will impact profits and the level of development contributions received by Council.</li> <li>HV power lines should be undergrounded at the developer's expense.</li> <li>Removal of transmission towers at Louise Sauvage pathway and adjacent to the boat ramp and undergrounding of high voltage power lines would provide more options in relation to the location of the bridge and help address the community's concerns.</li> <li>If high voltage power lines are not undergrounded, then the existing 132kv electricity tower adjacent to the boat ramp should be relocated.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not one point from previous submissions has led to amendment to the various proposals. Flagrant disregard for the concerns of the community. Asserts that the points in this submission will be ignored for the sake of expediency and agreement with the developers.</li> <li>Will turn this area into a high-rise infrastructure deficient development with antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>Existing residents don't matter, and money Council will collect outweighs the community's concerns. Exacerbated because the majority of affected residents don't live within Parramatta LGA.</li> <li>Residents have lost faith in the impartiality and transparency of the approval process for these developments. Lack of genuine consideration to concerns by Council.</li> </ul>
Submitter from Melrose Park Submission Number 84	<p><b>Object</b> <u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers the proposal to have major ramifications for current residents in the area.</li> <li>Comments that it needs to be acknowledged that the detail of the Proposal is complicated for the general public unless they have qualification/experience in Town Planning/development.</li> <li>Notes the submission made by two other residents and that the issues raised in these submissions are supported.</li> <li>Notes that many within the Melrose Park Community are questioning the value of commenting on these proposals based on the lack of consideration given to community concerns over the Melrose Park North Development.</li> <li>Concern is expressed that the commitment given by Parramatta Council to residents within the area as many residents did not receive notification of this Proposal, or it arrived late and therefore did not give sufficient time for people to provide feedback. Considers it</li> </ul>

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>disappointing that individuals had to apply for an extension when a better solution would have been for Council to honour its commitment to notify all residents, and simply extend the consultation period.</p> <p><u>Destruction of trees</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions why there is no mention of the stand of 12 significant and mature trees on the southern boundary adjacent to Waratah Street.</li> <li>• Raises concern about the removal of these trees, in addition to those proposed in the north, and impacts on fauna, carbon uptake and the local landscape.</li> <li>• Considers planting seedling and mature trees will negate environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Considers that an independent report should be prepared (not funded by developers) to identify the species of significant trees on the site and indicate their true ecological and climate benefit to the local community and wildlife.</li> </ul> <p><u>Scale of development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments that no funding has been given to Ryde Council to provide infrastructure in the Ryde LGA that will be used by Melrose Park residents.</li> <li>• Considers that before any more apartments are built in both North and South, a firm financial commitment (along with timelines that must be adhered to) should be established for appropriate infrastructure.</li> <li>• Considers it imperative that a repeat of Wentworth Point's inadequate infrastructure does not occur as a result of Melrose Park/Ermington developments.</li> </ul> <p><u>Community and Public Benefit Analysis Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the statement within the report identifying the location of the precinct to be incorrect and misleading and that it damages the original Melrose Park from 1928 suburb and its residents.</li> <li>• Considers that the report should be updated to reference the correct suburb and its history. Claims the error is misleading and non-compliant with the Geographical Names Board's policy.</li> </ul> <p><u>TMAP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments that the community has long questioned the factual basis of the TMAP document, as well as its independence from the developers, and that residents who have lived in the area well before the developments commenced know the traffic to the East of the site is over capacity.</li> <li>• Considers that the TMAP needs to be rewritten to include a more objective and actual observation of the traffic issue that currently exist east of the subject site.</li> <li>• Considers that solutions be identified that will specifically address both current and future demands in the area particularly east of the development.</li> <li>• Comments that the City of Ryde Traffic Committee and staff have stated that the TMAP does not assess the impacts these developments will have on the local residential communities and questions the credibility of the TMAP.</li> <li>• Concerned that Ryde Council as a major stakeholder was not included in the TMAP process and project group.</li> </ul> <p><u>Transport Assessment Report – parking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the reliance of this report on the inaccuracies of the TMAP is a major concern for many reasons including its independence.</li> <li>• Comments that there is currently a parking overflow into adjoining local streets. Questions what measures will be implemented to ensure local</li> </ul>
--	---

## Attachment 1 – Community Submissions Summary Table

Public Exhibition of the Draft Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific DCP and Draft Planning Agreement

Melrose Park South - 112 Wharf Road, 30-32 Waratah Street, Melrose Park and 82 Hughes Avenue, Ermington (Holdmark Sites)

	<p>streets and the boat ramp car park won't be impacted by overflow parking.</p> <p><u>Parramatta Light Rail Stage 2 and bridge</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Comments that it is a critical piece of infrastructure but an issue that is causing angst for local residents. Considers that the impacts of the bridge location on current residents is being ignored.</li><li>• Considers that no development should be approved until the bridge is a reality.</li><li>• Comments that it is disappointing that no one from outside the Parramatta LGA was appointed to the Parramatta Light Rail Advisory Group.</li><li>• Comments that as the location of the bridge is not confirmed, residents cannot understand on what basis it was decided the light rail stage 2 and associated bridge did not impact on anyone outside of the Parramatta LGA.</li><li>• Questions how the proposed street scheme and hierarchy can be developed to integrate with PLR2 if the State Government hasn't completed the planning process.</li><li>• Considers that the Proposal, DCP and VPA should be deferred until the PLR2 planning process has been completed.</li></ul>
--	--