

APPLICATION No.- SSD-97528708 LOCATION- 160 OXFORD STREET PADDINGTON
2021. APPLICANT- THE TRUSTEE FOR TM NO. 8 DEVELOPMENT UNIT TRUST. COUNCIL
AREA- WOOLLAHRA MUNICIPALITY. CONSENT AUTHORITY- MINISTER FOR PLANNING
AND PUBLIC SPACES

David Summers
49 Gipps Street
Paddington NSW 2021

9 March 2026

Email – daveszantner@gmail.com
Phone – 02 9335 0596

Submission – Objection to Proposed Development

Key Concerns

- **Net loss of affordable housing:** 27 existing lower-cost rental units would be demolished and replaced with only 12 “affordable” units within a luxury development.
- **Affordable units unlikely to be genuinely affordable:** Even with a 25% discount, estimated rents would remain well beyond the reach of most people earning \$80,000 or less per year.
- **Excessive height and scale:** The proposed building significantly exceeds the prevailing five to six storey scale of surrounding developments in Paddington.
- **Heritage and structural risks:** Excavation for four basement levels may impact nearby heritage terrace houses dating back to the 1800’s.
- **Infrastructure and access issues:** Waste collection and servicing remain unresolved in narrow surrounding streets already difficult for large industrial vehicles to access.
- **Inconsistent documentation:** Conflicting information regarding building height, unit numbers, car spaces and other features make the proposal difficult to properly assess.

Net Loss of Affordable Housing

The proposal would demolish an existing apartment building containing 27 relatively affordable rental units (currently \$500-600 per week) and replace it with a 44-unit luxury apartment development containing only 12 “affordable” units. This results in a clear net

loss of genuinely affordable housing in the area and would displace existing residents who rely on these lower-cost units.

Failure to Deliver the Intended Public Benefit

The Affordable Housing scheme is intended to increase housing opportunities for low-income residents in inner-city areas. In this case, the proposal does not deliver that public benefit. Based on current rental levels in nearby developments (approximately \$900-\$1,100 per week for comparable one-bedroom units), even a 25% discounted rent would remain unaffordable for people earning \$80,000 or less per year (i.e. award rate earners and/or essential workers). These proposed units once completed would need to rent for approximately \$1,200 to \$1,400 per week to return a profit to the builder / investor. As you can see, the demographic would have to change to attract renters who are on higher paying jobs (to be able to afford the “new” rents, once the new complex is completed. It means low-income earners will be forced to move further away from the city to achieve rents to what they are currently paying each week.

Misuse of the Affordable Housing Provision

The inclusion of a small number of discounted units appears to be used primarily as a mechanism to justify additional height and density for what is otherwise a luxury residential development aimed at higher-income buyers or investors.

Excessive Height and Incompatible Scale

The proposed height is inconsistent with the character of Paddington, where most surrounding buildings are approximately five to six storeys. A development of this scale would be out of character with the established streetscape and surrounding residential environment.

Heritage and Structural Concerns

Many nearby terrace houses date back to the 1800s and have fragile foundations. Excavation for four basement levels raises legitimate concerns about potential structural impacts on surrounding heritage buildings.

Infrastructure and Access Constraints

The proposal includes extensive basement parking yet does not provide a clear or workable solution for waste collection. Garbage trucks already have difficulty accessing Gipps Street and surrounding streets due to their narrow width. A development of this size would place additional pressure on local access and servicing infrastructure.

Inconsistent and Conflicting Information

The documentation associated with this proposal contains several inconsistencies, including conflicting information regarding the number of units, affordable housing units, car spaces and building height. Some documents refer to eight storeys while the

architectural plans appear to show ten. Other details, such as swimming pools and tree removal, are also unclear. These discrepancies make it difficult for the community to properly assess the proposal and make an informed decision.

Conclusion

For these reasons, the proposal should not be approved under the Affordable Housing Project Scheme. The existing block of 27 low rent units already provides what the state government is trying to achieve – affordable housing. The proposed development is luxury apartments which will not benefit anyone currently living in the existing block of units.

I request that this proposal be rejected, as it does not appear to satisfy the objectives of the affordable housing provisions or the broader planning principles intended to protect the character and liveability of the local area.

Sincerely

David Summers