

From: Jon Daley <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Jon Daley <[REDACTED]> <Jon Daley <[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Friday, November 29, 2024 6:31:21 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2024/937 - 100 Botany Road ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015 - Attention Georgia McKenzie

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Georgia,

I write concerning the development application D/2024/937.

I am a resident of Wyndham Street at 104 Wyndham St, Alexandria.

Overshadowing

The proposed development will provide significant overshadowing of the adjacent properties and limit the amount of winter sunlight that is currently available to properties. The current study and assessment does not accurately represent our experience of the winter sunlight and appears to be misrepresentative of the impact that it will have on the adjacent properties. I suggest that the City of Sydney should request an actual survey of the sunlight in the winter time to determine a baseline and to assess the effects, the simulation is simply not accurate to our experiences in the last 2.5 years of occupancy.

Noise, Vibration and Dust

The proposed development does not appear to have provided adequate consideration to the noise, dust and vibration of the construction and the likely impact on the adjacent residents of Wyndham Street. The implied level of construction will be significant and should have restricted working hours from 08:00 to 17:00 to limit the impact of the construction activities.

Implications on privacy and quality of life

The proposed development appears to have a significant impact on the privacy and overlooking of many private areas of residential addresses with little attempt to limit or adjust the design to protect residents. Windows should be restricted when facing residential addresses and architecturally designed to limit the occupants of the proposed development from looking "straight out" into overlooked and adjacent properties. The application includes intentions to provide terraces from level 5 and a shared patio on level 7, all of these proposed outdoor spaces at height overlook the adjacent private residences and are not in keeping with the normal architecture of the area and do not respect the residents right to privacy. Attempts to suggest that the areas will restrict access to the balustrades with planters is misleading and an attempt to use a technicality to avoid addressing the key concern and fundamental right of the residents to privacy. I would request that all South facing outdoor spaces are reduced, balustrades are not translucent, opaque and should be solid and at least 1.8m in height to protect the privacy of the residents.

Impact to the structural stability of Wyndham Street Premises

I am an owner occupier of 104 Wyndham Street and I have significant concerns over the structural impact of the demolition of the adjacent property to the terrace at 100 Wyndham Street and the impact of these works on the residences 102, 104, 106 etc. The boundary wall of 102 is structurally linked to the 100 and shares a boundary wall. I am concerned that any works not adequately planned and prepared, without significant protective temporary works will have a fundamental impact on the structural integrity of not only my property at 104 Wyndham Street but others in the vicinity. Subsequently, the apparent planned excavation for the two storey basement adjacent to traditionally built terrace homes will undermine the foundations of adjacent properties and impact their structural stability. Further the excavation methods for the basement are likely to be high vibration and cause significant disruption to subgrade beneath the referred properties. I request that the City of Sydney require the developer through their application to demonstrate how they will not impact the structural integrity, nor the implied quality of life associated with living in a structurally sound property.

Further concerns over construction requirements

The geotechnical investigation report provided by Douglas and Partners considers the mitigations that will be required to be implemented during the development. I note that the level of mitigations are significant and are highly likely to have a significant detrimental effect on the structural stability of the adjacent occupied properties. City of Sydney should consider in its evaluation, how the developers can protect the adjacent properties from significant damage when little has been determined about the existing structures foundations, the impact of dewatering on adjacent structures, the impact of suspending and terminating dewatering activities on adjacent properties, the use of ground anchors and supports in the substratum below existing properties. The geotechnical report also highlights the presence of Ashfield Shale and Sandstone bedrock beneath the proposed development, that will need to be mechanically excavated with large construction machinery, potentially cause significant ground vibration to adjacent "turn of the century" properties that will not doubt be structurally impacted by the excavation works. I am concerned that the letter from George Andrianakos of Robert Bird Group does not provide an accurate summary of the structural considerations due to the incorrect survey information.

Misleading Survey Documents

Further to my considerations of the structural stability of the Wyndham Street properties, I am concerned that the survey data used to prepare the development application is incorrect and does not accurately represent the site conditions and property interfaces. I am not clear whether the intention is to mislead the City of Sydney in its assessment of the application, but it appears that it has avoided addressing the impacts of the property interfaces and therefore the impact of the proposed development. I request that the Developers be instructed to complete a detailed and accurate survey of the buildings subject to the proposed application and within a 500m radius of the application to ensure that impacts of the construction are not misled during the application evaluation by the City of Sydney.

Hazardous use of radioactive materials

It appears from the application and the provided materials that the application is for a medical research facility that intends to use nuclear related technologies including "Proton therapy". I am unclear of the risk presented to residents, nor how hazardous and harmful materials and emissions will be managed during the use of the property. The development does not appear to consider the impact of radioactive or nuclear related waste being separated from normal pedestrian traffic and nor how at basement level 3, local residents will be protected from nuclear radiation through the structure and existing substratum. I am further concerned that the nuclear facilities appear to be positioned close to the residential properties on Wyndham Street and not on Botany Road at a point further from residents. The same statement applies for the location of the decontamination plant, which one assumes is for nuclear decontamination and equipment cleaning. Without further information, I would suspect that the facility would require a dedicated water supply to avoid the nuclear radiation proliferating into the common domestic potable and wastewater systems.

Incomplete details on use of space

The facility which appears to have a primary use of proton therapy, considering my prior points, does not provide any details on the use of spaces marked "research and development". I must assume, without further information, that these spaces may also involve the use of nuclear or radioactive materials and from the designs shared in the application appear to provide no structural radiation protection. I request that the City of Sydney consider that all spaces above the structural armoured basement levels are restricted from containing, storing, use or otherwise, any activities with radioactive or nuclear materials. Significant restrictions on the use of these spaces should be considered and implemented by the City of Sydney in its evaluation and determination to protect human health and the environment, in accordance with the POEO Act 1997.

Misleading separation of development applications

It appears that the development application D/2024/937 is intrinsically linked and associated with the separate development application D/2024/885. Initial consultation of these plans showed that these developments were being sought together and have subsequently been separated initially to mislead and confuse the residents impacted by both development applications. In separating these applications, it appears that the developer is attempting to separate the impacts of the construction and the application by attempting to have them assessed separately. I strongly urge the council that the effects of these applications be joined. In considering these applications together, I seek that the council consider that the development is of significant scale and imposition to the local residents, is not in keeping with the predominant usage of the current streetscape and will be detrimental to the local residents and the social

environment. One cannot avoid the clear premise that this application has been separated to mislead and fraudulently misrepresent the development plans of the combined D/2024/885 and D/2024/937 Development Applications. Perhaps the applications are separated for the developer to avoid planning thresholds due to size, value or otherwise and avoid some of the cumulative impacts of the combined applications on the residents and the local area.

I write to request that the development application is rejected with these comments and on the basis that the developer, with this application, is attempting to mislead and falsely represent their plans through the separation from D/2024/885.

Sincerely,

Jon Daley