

As a resident of the residential establishment at 486 Pacific Highway St Leonards (the 'Jackson' Tower of St Leonards Square), I oppose strongly to the Applicant's proposal (SSD-88113706) and think it should be refused.

1. It is a significant turn to the existing approvals given on this site

This site has undergone numerous changes in planning control over the last few years. These progressively involved:

- a notable increase in the allowed storeys per the St Leonards/Crows Nest 2036 Plan;
- increase in Floor Space Ratio (to 15:1) and setting of height limit (at RL 175) from planning proposals with the Lane Cove Council in 2020-2021;
- reduction in setback from 16m to 12m from the South Side boundary of the Applicant's site per the SSDA Concept Plan in February 2025 (with 271 Build-to-Rent units permitted); and
- now, the Applicant has proposed a further reduction in setback to 9m and approximately additional 7 storeys to be constructed, comprising a total of 541 Build-to-Rent units.

The current maximum height of RL 175, alongside with other limitations, was set based on what the decision makers had assessed to be the maximum appropriate for this site and neighbourhood, having regard to planning controls, policies, and materials submitted by the site at the time.

Given the numerous assessments, consultations and rules established throughout these processes, I have expected, as objectively reasonably expected, the outcomes on this site, in particularly the height limit and numbers of Build-To Rent units permitted, are well settled. I have already made decisions based on these collective outcomes, only to find that "the worst is yet to come".

The constant changes and 'revisits' of planning proposals here, each time trying to test the boundary, has undermined my confidence in the integrity of the planning system. I have no certainty when this would come to an end.

In addition, I also noted the extraordinarily constrained exhibition time of this Application by the Department. It is unclear to me why the Department has effectively facilitated the community's loss of confidence in our planning system. It is difficult not to perceive that procedural fairness and proper regards to public interest have failed.

2. Degrading living conditions

We are already in a very dense neighbourhood comprising several high-rise buildings in our immediate surroundings. These include another tower (known as the 'Williams') of St Leonards Square, 2 towers at "88 Christie Street", the "Landmark", and the approved development adjacent to Pacific Highway, known as the 'Telstra Exchange' site.

With the severe lack of open space in this area, the wind tunnel effect, which is already very observable from time to time here, will definitely worsen. In addition, an increased height in the Applicant's site will surely reduce further access to view, sunlight and skyview in my apartment, so do many apartments in my building and surrounding residential buildings.

It is also logical to follow that the market value of my, and all of our, apartments, are compromised.

3. Misleading statement by the Applicant

The Applicant has asserted that public consultations have been properly done and that no negative responses have been received. This is just plainly wrong. There was no notice/consultation, or if any, in any case, no notice/consultation reasonably expected in the context of this significant amendment to existing approvals, were made available to current stakeholders.

4. Traffic congestion

All the existing and proposed high-rise buildings aforementioned rely on the Christie Street-Nicholson Street – Oxley Street roadways for immediate vehicle access to/from the Pacific Highway. All of them have limited room for expansion. The introduction of another 541 Build-to-Rent units at the Applicant's site would significantly add congestions, daily, to these existing roadways – not only from official occupiers of the units, but also from associated servicing traffic (e.g. garage removal, moving house trucks, food and parcel deliveries). Bear in mind that there is no alternative access for us to use.

In conclusion, the Applicant's proposal should be refused.