

Sunday, 19 April 2026

**RE: Submission in Opposition – SSD-95997711**

**Mixed Use development – 903-921 Bourke St, Waterloo, NSW**

I write to formally object to the proposed modification to the approved development at 903-921 Bourke St, Waterloo (SSD-95997711), which seeks to increase the height and density of the existing consent to deliver approximately 250 additional apartments.

I have lived in the East Redfern area for over 22 years and own two properties in Baptist Street, Redfern. I am the founder of the East Redfern Neighbourhood Alliance (ERNA), representing residents and businesses across the East Redfern precinct. My objection reflects both personal experience and broader community concerns.

**Excessive Density and Scale**

The proposed increase in height and density is inappropriate for the existing urban context. The scale of the intensification is disproportionate to the surrounding built form and will materially alter the character of East Redfern, particularly along Baptist St and Bourke St, which remain among the last intact low-rise residential and heritage-sensitive areas in the locality.

The proposal represents a significant overdevelopment of the site and fails to adequately respond to the cumulative impacts of density already experienced in the broader Danks St and Waterloo surrounds.

**Construction and Traffic Impacts**

The extended construction period associated with the development of this scale will impose substantial disruption on a predominantly residential area. This includes;

- Prolonged noise, dust and general amenity impacts
- Increased heavy vehicle movements
- Further congestion in an already constrained road network

The surrounding streets, particularly Baptist St and Bourke St North (between Phillip Streets to Cleveland Streets), are already heavily impacted by traffic associated with nearby commercial and entertainment precincts, including Moore Park and Wunderlich Lane.

**Inadequate Infrastructure capacity**

The submission fails to demonstrate how existing infrastructure – already under strain – will accommodate the additional population.

## **Parking**

On-street parking is already at capacity. Residents frequently cannot park near their own homes. Existing pressures include overflow from Wunderlich Lane, Moore Park, and commuters parking locally to access Public Transport to the CBD. The addition of further dwellings without adequate parking provision will exacerbate an unsustainable situation.

## **Public Transport**

Bus services, particularly the 304 route to the CBD, are consistently at capacity during peak periods before reaching stops along Baptist Street. Additional density without corresponding transport upgrades will worsen accessibility and liveability.

## **Local Schools**

Local schools, including the newly built Inner Sydney High School, are already at or near capacity. There is no clear plan for accommodating additional students generated by this development.

## **Healthcare**

Access to primary and specialist healthcare in the area is already constrained, with wait times of up to two weeks for a general practitioner and for weeks for certain specialists. Increased population density will further strain these essential services.

## **Planning Inconsistencies and Equity**

There is a clear inconsistency in planning outcomes. For example, a development application at 168 Baptist St was refused for a minor extension due to impacts on neighbouring apartments' views – despite those apartments being constructed after the terrace. In contrast this proposal seeks approval for significant additional height and bulk that will overshadow established homes in Baptist Street and Bourke Street.

This raises serious concerns regarding equity and consistency in planning decisions.

## **Impact on Local Character**

East Redfern is valued for its diversity of housing, heritage character, and strong community identity. While some level of change is expected, it should not come at the expense of existing residents or the erosion of local character.

There is genuine concern within the community that overdevelopment will result in similar outcomes to nearby precincts such as Zetland and parts of Pyrmont – areas

characterised by high density, poorly integrated developments with limited long-term liveability.

## **Conclusion**

This proposal prioritises additional yield over considered urban planning outcomes. It fails to adequately address infrastructure constraints, community impacts, and the preservation of local character.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed modification and request that it be refused.

Yours sincerely,

Tracy Piper