

**Claudette Rechterik 39 Francis St, Leichhardt, 2024**

**26/7/2026**

Objections to the Residential Building at 40-76 William Street Leichhardt – Application  
No: SSD-119545240

**To:** NSW Department of Housing, Planning and Infrastructure

**Re: Objection to the Proposed Development at 40–76 William Street**

I write to strongly object to the proposed development at 40–76 William Street.

I acknowledge that I accept the Departments disclaimer and declaration, including confirmation that my submission does not contain offensive, threatening, defamatory or inappropriate content.

This proposal is fundamentally inconsistent with the established planning principles that underpin the NSW planning system. It represents an overdevelopment of the site that is incompatible with the existing urban character, will have significant adverse impacts on surrounding residents and public spaces, and fails to demonstrate that it is in the public interest. The photo attached to this application, by the applicant clearly demonstrates, that the development is NOT IN ANY WAY in keeping with the surrounding area.

Under **Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979**, the consent authority must consider the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposal, the suitability of the site, submissions from the community, and whether the development is in the public interest. On these matters, the proposal should be refused.

### **1. Excessive Size and Scale**

The proposed development is entirely inappropriate in both its size and scale when viewed in the context of its surrounding neighbourhood.

The built form substantially exceeds the established character of the precinct and fails to respond appropriately to the existing streetscape, adjoining buildings and public domain.

The NSW planning framework consistently promotes development that responds to local context rather than dominating it. Good planning requires compatibility with surrounding development, not simply maximising development yield.

This proposal represents overdevelopment of the site.

## **2. Previous Independent Planning Decisions**

The history of this site is highly relevant.

Previous proposals for this site, with only 5 storeys and 143 units, have repeatedly been rejected through multiple planning assessment processes, including determinations involving:

- the Land and Environment Court;
- Inner West Council; and
- the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel.

We are now assessing a 2 - 3 fold increase in size of development. **How is this even possible?**

While each application must be assessed on its own merits, the repeated refusal of substantially smaller proposals demonstrates longstanding and well-recognised concerns regarding the suitability of intensive development on this site.

Unless those fundamental planning concerns have been resolved, the consent authority should be absolute in its refusal for a significantly scaled up version.

## **3. Unacceptable Overshadowing**

The proposal will create significant overshadowing impacts affecting surrounding streets and neighbouring properties, including:

- William Street
- Francis Street
- James Street
- Allen Street
- North Street
- Hubert Street

These impacts extend well beyond the site itself.

Please look at the below image and tell me whether this building will have no impact on amenity.



Loss of sunlight affects:

- residential amenity;
- public streets and footpaths;
- tree canopy;
- open space;
- passive surveillance;
- neighbourhood liveability;
- Mental health.

The Apartment Design Guide and broader NSW planning principles recognise **access to sunlight as a key component of residential amenity**.

The proposal fails to appropriately balance development intensity with protection of existing amenity.

#### **4. Inadequate Infrastructure Capacity**

The proposal places additional pressure on infrastructure that is already constrained.

The surrounding area is already experiencing increasing demand on:

- local roads;
- public transport;
- schools;
- open space;
- community facilities;
- parking;
- drainage;
- utilities.

The planning system requires consideration of whether infrastructure can adequately support additional development.

There is insufficient evidence that the existing infrastructure can absorb the significant increase in population generated by this proposal without reducing service levels for existing residents.

Growth should occur only where infrastructure capacity exists or is funded and committed.

#### **5. Housing Need Must Be Considered Holistically**

The justification for this proposal appears to rely heavily on increasing housing supply.

However, housing supply alone should not override fundamental planning principles.

Recent census data has identified a substantial number of dwellings across the Inner West that are unoccupied on Census night. While Census vacancy figures do not necessarily equate to permanently vacant homes, they indicate that housing availability and utilisation are more complex than simply increasing dwelling numbers. It is estimated approximately 800 - 1,000 houses are uninhabited within the Inner West. At least 2 of these are in the Allen Estate on Francis St that have been vacant for the entire time I've lived in Leichhardt which is over 20 years.

This suggests that policy responses should address housing utilisation alongside housing supply.

Approving developments that cause unacceptable planning impacts cannot be justified solely by broad housing supply objectives.

The need for housing does not remove the obligation to deliver good planning outcomes.

## **6. Public Interest**

Section 4.15 requires consideration of whether the proposal is in the public interest.

The public interest requires development that:

- respects neighbourhood character;
- protects residential amenity;
- provides appropriate environmental outcomes;
- is supported by adequate infrastructure;
- contributes positively to the community.

This proposal fails to achieve these objectives.

Instead, it would:

- significantly alter the existing character of the locality;
- diminish amenity for surrounding residents;
- create unacceptable overshadowing;
- increase infrastructure pressure;
- establish an undesirable planning precedent for future overdevelopment.

Approving a proposal that is fundamentally inconsistent with established planning principles would undermine confidence in the integrity of the planning system.

## **Conclusion**

The proposed development at 40–76 William Street represents an excessive and inappropriate form of development that is inconsistent with the objectives of the NSW planning framework.

It fails to adequately respond to the established character of the locality, imposes unacceptable environmental and amenity impacts, places further pressure on infrastructure, and has not demonstrated that it serves the public interest.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the consenting authority refuse the application in its current form.