

9 March, 2026

To whom it may concern:

Proposed Development SSD-97528708 at 160 Oxford Street Paddington NSW 2021

The proposed development at 160 Oxford Street Paddington (SSD-97528708) represents a conscious perversion of the state government's objectives by the developer, Toohey Miller, whose real interest is the financial gain that will inure from the construction of a massive ultra-luxury apartment block in Paddington.

The developer is in no way motivated by the government housing policy except to the extent that it offers a loophole that permits exploitation of this kind. The development proposal must be rejected for the following reasons:

1. Failure to satisfy government housing policy and reduction of affordable housing

The proposed development makes a mockery of NSW government policy. The stated intent of the housing reform is the creation of **additional** affordable housing supply. This proposed development achieves the very opposite.

The current housing on the site(s) of the proposed development already provides a total of **27 genuine affordable housing options** plus several townhouses. These are long-established and furnish affordable housing to essential workers, students and creatives.

In contrast, the proposed development will offer just **ten** (notionally) affordable housing opportunities. In other words, the net result of the development will be **17 fewer affordable housing options** than there are at present.

A development resulting in a reduction of affordable housing is non-sensical in light of the stated government policy, whose objective is to increase supply.

In this context it must also be noted that the proposed development is for **high-end luxury apartments**. There is no doubt that even during the fifteen-year capped "affordable" term, the rental cost of the units, with swimming pools and underground parking, must therefore far exceed that of the current affordable housing. It is likely that even the "cheapest" units will cost \$1000 per week after the reduction, assuming a market rate of \$1250.

Even worse, once the capped rental period expires, these nominally affordable units will then be subject to drastic rent increases, rendering them affordable for high income earners only. At that point there will consequently be **zero affordable housing options** in a location where there are currently 27.

This development proposal is therefore contrary to the intent of NSW housing policy as it fails to meet its stated objective of increasing affordable housing supply.

2. Irreversible destruction of unique heritage streetscapes and village

The proposed development will be an eyesore utterly at odds with this section of Paddington. Paddington is a unique suburb in Sydney, indeed in Australia, so much so that it is a drawcard for visitors from far and wide.

The corner of Paddington around Gipps Street/Shadforth Street/Prospect Street/Liverpool Street/Spring Street is of immense historical value as the oldest part of the suburb. It is made up of single storey heritage-protected cottages lining narrow streets, which makes it very distinctive and aesthetically harmonious.

The proposed ten-storey tower would crush these streetscapes. It makes no attempt to engage with the historical aesthetic of the area. The development will exceed even the height of St Vincent's Hospital, currently the tallest structure in the vicinity. It would be an abomination to destroy a unique urban environment that has been carefully preserved for 150 years for the sole purpose of enriching a developer.

Moreover, the chaos the extended construction period will bring to the area in terms of parking, traffic, noise etc. is unimaginable.

All this for a net result of ultimately doing away with the affordable housing that currently exists in this location.

I would urge you to see the development proposal for what it is: a rapacious attempt to reduce supply by exploiting government housing policy to generate profit for Toohey Miller at the expense of those current residents who already have access to genuine affordable housing, while also irreversibly destroying a heritage area.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Kind regards,
Fabian Muir