

**Re Cammeray Seniors' Living, 19–23 Rosalind Street, Cammeray, NSW 2062
(SSD 96505456)**

I, Michael Eric Wright, of Unit 6, 3 Cammeray Avenue, Cammeray, NSW 2062, **object** to this proposed development, and submit the following observations...

- The proposal appears to me to be a blatant attempt to get around local planning controls by posing as affordable housing for the elderly. It is clearly designed, in fact, for rich and privileged residents, as evidenced by the **preponderance of spacious, 2-, 3- and 4-bedroom apartments**, together with a **wine cellar, private dining room, gym, sauna, steam room, pool and cinema**.
- As a result of the development, **54 smaller, genuinely affordable apartments and small cottages will be destroyed**, displacing residents who genuinely require such housing – including essential workers such as teachers and nurses, and young families.
- **Care hub** provisions for those "senior" residents who fall sick are absolutely minimal, consisting of just **two care beds in tiny basement rooms without any windows**, and located next to the plant room and laundry. **By including these, the developer qualifies for a percentage "bonus" total floor space**. But no mention is made of any arrangements for how "patients" occupying these care beds will be cared for – or by whom.
- The tallest **proposed building will be about 18.4m high** (compared with the existing buildings' maximum of 8m) – a height only achieved, it seems to me, by "burying" part of the development underground. **The height of 18.4m far exceeds the R4 zoning provisions for the site** – even with the "seniors' bonus" provision allowing a 15.8m maximum. **This, the developer's failure to comply with the building code, should be enough on its own to disqualify the proposal**.
- **ALL IN ALL, THE PROPOSAL IS TOTALLY OUT OF CHARACTER WITH THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBOURHOOD, AND FAILS TO EVEN COMPLY WITH ITS OWN REASONING. IT ALSO SETS A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT FOR OTHER PARTS OF THE LOCAL AREA.**

OTHER SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

- **Setbacks are totally inadequate** – as little as 3m, often with non-compliant overhead awnings.
- **Loss of all 24 trees currently on the site** – including a **50+ year old fig tree with a 2.5m trunk** at the centre – **is unacceptable**. Such **trees provide shelter and privacy**, not only for residents of the development themselves, but – even more importantly – for neighbours. They also **provide a vital habitat for birds and other wildlife**.
- The proposed **newly-planted replacement trees are highly unlikely to provide any adequate substitute**. The soil zone proposed is only 3m deep, which is unlikely to be enough to support adequate root growth needed for substantial replacements.

- **At least 100 neighbouring residents will be directly impacted by this proposed development**, with numerous balconies and windows in close proximity – causing overshadowing and loss of privacy. **Where the development backs onto West Street, neighbours will be faced by a 6- to 8-storey building directly on their boundary.** Similarly, neighbours at **27 Rosalind Street will have the high wall of a building right on their side boundary.**
- The driveway onto Rosalind Street is proposed to serve 89 parking spaces (supposedly for "elderly" drivers), as well as service vehicles, garbage trucks, and delivery vans. **Its location tight against the boundary wall or fence is liable to create a serious hazard for pedestrians on Rosalind Street**, including many school children walking to and from Anzac Park Public School, which is only 250m away.
- **There has not been any adequate consultation with existing residents or neighbours to the site.** The one community engagement session that took place was conducted by the estate agents Colliers, who failed to invite many neighbouring residents and closely controlled questioning by attendees.
- One more factor that **allows the developer to avoid scrutiny** by North Sydney Council and its residents is the valuation of the project at just \$1m above the threshold for such local control.

I CAN ONLY CONCLUDE THAT THE DEVELOPER'S PROPOSAL IS NO MORE THAN A CYNICAL ATTEMPT BY THE DEVELOPER TO MAKE A HUGE PROFIT FROM A SCHEME THAT WOULD BE TOTALLY RULED OUT OF ORDER IF IT CAME UNDER PROPER LOCAL SCRUTINY.