

I write to formally oppose the proposed modification to the approved development at 903-921 Bourke Street, Waterloo, which seeks to significantly increase the number of dwellings beyond what was originally assessed and approved.

While the initial approval reflected a scale of development that aligned with the character and capacity of the area, this amendment represents a substantial intensification that fails to adequately consider the existing limitations of local infrastructure and the resulting impact on living standards.

1. Infrastructure Capacity Already Under Strain

The surrounding area is currently experiencing clear pressure on essential infrastructure. Roads are frequently congested, particularly during peak hours, and operate at or near capacity. Increasing the number of dwellings to the extent proposed will inevitably exacerbate traffic volumes, leading to longer travel times, reduced road safety, and increased environmental impacts such as noise and air pollution.

Public transport services are similarly strained. Buses servicing the area are often overcrowded, it is already near impossible to get to the city on a weekday morning, with limited ability to absorb additional demand without significant upgrades. There is no clear evidence that the necessary transport infrastructure improvements will be delivered in tandem with this increased density.

2. Diminished Livability and Amenity

The scale of the proposed amendment risks significantly diminishing the livability of the area. Increased density at a high-rise scale is inconsistent with the established and planned character of the locality, which is more appropriately suited to mid-rise development.

Excessive building height and bulk can lead to reduced access to sunlight, increased overshadowing, loss of privacy, and a sense of overcrowding. These factors directly affect residents' quality of life and undermine the balanced urban environment that the original approval sought to achieve.

The area is already subject to significant residential dwellings, adding this density will further add to residents lack of space and overcrowding, The politicians and developers pushing for this density won't be the ones living here, we have borne the brunt of density for years, enough is enough.

3. Impact on Local Services and Amenities

Beyond transport, essential services—including healthcare, schools, childcare, and community facilities—are already operating under pressure. A dramatic increase in population density without corresponding investment in these services risks overwhelming them, reducing accessibility and quality for existing and future residents alike.

The proposal does not appear to adequately address how these cumulative impacts will be managed, nor does it demonstrate that sufficient infrastructure planning has been undertaken to support the intensified development.

4. Inconsistency with Appropriate Planning Outcomes

Mid-rise development represents a more appropriate and sustainable form of density for this location. It allows for population growth while maintaining a balance with infrastructure capacity, urban character, and amenity.

The proposed high-rise intensification appears to prioritise yield over considered planning outcomes and does not align with the principles of orderly and sustainable development.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposed modification represents an overdevelopment of the site that fails to adequately account for existing infrastructure constraints and would result in a tangible decline in living standards for current and future residents. The original approval struck a more appropriate balance between growth and livability, and this balance should be maintained.

I respectfully request that this application be refused, due to unacceptable impacts on infrastructure capacity, service provision, and the long-term livability of the area.

Yours sincerely,
Concerned local resident.