

# Allison Meyer

12 Rosalind Street Cammeray NSW

E: [almeyer@y7mail.com](mailto:almeyer@y7mail.com)

Project: Cammeray Seniors living

Address: 19 - 23 Rosalind Street Cammeray NSW 2062

Application: SSD - 96505456

Our objection to the proposed seniors living development at 19- 23 Rosalind Street Cammeray on the NSW planning portal. This reference is: SD-96505456

We are long time residents of Rosalind Street and we are strongly objecting to the bulk of this proposed development and the blatant way the developer is seeking to build luxury units under the guise of a seniors development to gain planning control benefits.

After attending all the webinar information sessions, the in-person event and a review of the documents submitted by the proponent for the 5 and 6 storey towers described as Seniors living development proposed at 19-23 Rosalind Street, Cammeray on the NSW planning portal, reference SD-96505456, **I object to the substantial bulk of this proposal which would result in a 5 storey tower with a side setback of 3 metres to the east boundary for the first 3 storeys above ground level then 6 metres for the remaining storeys above. And a 6-storey tower with a side setback to both the east and west boundaries of 3 metres and a set back to its southern boundary of 6 metres for the first 4 storeys above ground level and then 6 metres setback to its east and west boundaries and 9 metres to its south boundary. The significant loss of solar access and privacy to the adjoining neighbours to the east, west and south is contrary to what is prescribed in the Seniors Housing Design Guide and by reference in Section 18.0 Alignment with the Apartment Design guide [ADG]. Both documents are published by NSW Planning.**

I object because in the area within Amherst, Falcon, Miller and Alexander Sts, which is more than 50 hectares, which Rosalind St is within, there are no apartment buildings of more than 4 storeys, whereas the proposal is significantly higher and bulkier, with reduced setbacks.

I object to the excavation of 2 floors which brings the total to 8 floors. This will require the removal of the sandstone, which will require intensive rock breaking and jackhammering, heavy truck movements, which are estimated at over 11,000 movements on a quiet residential street.

I object to the setbacks which remain grossly non compliant with some areas only 3metres where the ADG requires a larger I - where the ADG requires a minimum of 6 metres between habitable rooms and side boundaries for buildings up to 12 metres, the ADG recommends even greater separation - typically 9 metres or more - to preserve privacy, solar access and amenity. These standards are NOT being met, and the height of the proposed buildings remains excessive.

I object because the proposal includes a retail shop on Rosalind Street, which is unprecedented, will increase traffic and set a precedent for further retail in a quiet residential area.

I object because the developers are using the NSW governments Housing Delivery Authority pathway to SSD status. To do this they are increasing the size and cost of projects - allowing them to bypass local government planning controls.

I object because the project proposes to replace existing fifty five one and two bedroom units of affordable housing with forty nine mostly four bedroom and three bedroom + study units under the guise of Seniors Living - which, considering the height, equate to luxury apartments with significant views.

I object to the two care beds, both are located in the basement, despite this complex being promoted as a seniors living complex.

I object due to the plans from the architect which does not include space for appropriate staffing, furnishings, furniture and equipment to support the accomodation for the care within the RCF on a long term basis. This is required under the SHDG. They are also not showing any space for a nurses station, to support the peoples medical needs with equipment and the nursing staff needs or a commercial kitchen.

I object because the inclusion of care rooms underground appears non-compliant with NSC LEP. This should not qualify the development for the 25% FSR bonus.

The loss of privacy for my young family and many other families in our area will be effected greatly due to this project. We are loosing a low income apartment block for a multi million dollar package. This block of land would be perfect for young families. We have so many great schools in the area, the streets are thriving due to the metro been so close and it should be all to share.

Thank you for your time,  
Allison Meyer  
E: [almeyer@y7mai.com](mailto:almeyer@y7mai.com)

