

Submission

I am Jonathan Alford, resident owner in Wilona Avenue, Lavender Bay since 1997. My home is located within the Lavender Bay Heritage Conservation Area and will be significantly impacted by the proposed adaptive reuse of 5 Blue Street.

Affordable Housing

Strongly Support

I welcome the proposed provision of 'co-living' accommodation at 5 Blue Street.

Accommodation for single support and essential workers is sorely needed.

The State Government evidently acknowledges the critical need for genuinely affordable housing for low and middle income workers, yet, in establishing the Housing Delivery Authority and the demonstrably slap-dash classification of many development proposals as so-called 'State-significant', the State Government has opened the door to developers to provide high-end luxury accommodation with spectacular harbour views with the bonus of greater building height in exchange for allotting a small percentage of floor space, generally for a limited period, for 'affordable' accommodation, regardless of the effect of greater building height on existing communities. In the case of 5 Blue Street, steeply sloping land exacerbates the effect of overshadowing on residential properties to its south, particularly Wilona Avenue.

To the credit of the proponents of the development at 5 Blue Street, they propose a good percentage of floor space for co-living accommodation in perpetuity. This is to be commended.

Lack of Family Accommodation

Nonetheless it is disappointing that the co-living accommodation provided will not be suitable for families.

Building bulk

Loss of Solar Access

The increase in width and depth will cause a substantial loss of solar access to properties to the south of 5 Blue Street and possibly south-west to the vital public space of St Peter's Park.

It is not clear from the EIS what the precise increase in width of the proposed structure will be, especially given the progressive oblique angle increase in width as the tower gets closer to Blue Street. I estimate the increase in width of the south face of the existing solid tower, not the buttress, at 50%. I note that I put this question during the Community Engagement Session and the estimate of increase provided was 2 metres, however, this depends on what existing point one takes; from my property I see the solid tower not the buttress which only rises to a certain level. Perhaps the 2 metre increase measurement provided by the proponents applies to the 45 degree angle to the south-east corner designed to facilitate a harbour view while accommodating the possibility of

a 20-storey tower on the St Francis Xavier site. In any case, the effect of the proposed increased width of the tower, regardless of the precise extent, is a substantial loss of solar access to my property throughout the winter period. Presently the rear of my house receives solar access when the sun emerges west of 15 Blue Street, and disappears again as the sun goes behind 5 Blue Street. The effect of the greater bulk of the proposed structure is, clearly, that the solar access between 15 and 5 Blue Street will be significantly reduced.

7.1.3 refers to 'setbacks' but the opposite is true as the buttress sits over the driveway access to parking at 5 Blue Street, and therefore protrudes beyond the existing building line on the southern side.

It is curious that consideration is given to solar access within the co-living housing (Section 69(2)(c) Standards for co-living housing) but not to existing properties in the Lavender Bay Heritage Conservation Area.

Zoning Change

The RL65 Zoning for Blue Street Plaza must be maintained

It is imperative that the RL65 zoning for the Blue Street Plaza be maintained.

This essential control was established by North Sydney Council to preserve solar access to the low-rise residential area to the south of North Sydney Central Business District between the hours of 10am and 2pm.

It is particularly crucial as the land slopes steeply to the south of Blue Street exacerbating overshadowing.

In any case it is not necessary for the entirety of the 5 Blue Street site to be rezoned as RL116 to facilitate the proposed building.

Traffic and Parking

The problems associated with Traffic & Parking have been seriously underestimated

The location of the constricted site 5 Blue Street, directly above the railway line and at a busy road junction creates significant problems regarding traffic ingress and egress and availability of off-street and on-street parking. As mentioned in the Traffic Impact Report (Appendix M) the site is served by 33 bus routes, many of which pass along Blue Street and Miller Street. There are 20 bus routes with stops adjacent to 5 Blue Street

Incidentally page 54-55 of the EIS **5.4 Pre-Conditions to Exercising the Power to Grant Consent**, pre-conditions to be fulfilled by the consent authority before exercising their power to grant development**Section 2.120** requires a consent authority to consider the impacts of road noise and vibration on residential development when adjacent to a road corridor with an annual average traffic volume of more than 20,000 vehicles.

The following clearly erroneous statement appears: *'It is noted that Blue Street is not identified as a road corridor with an annual average traffic volume of more than 20,000*

vehicles'. That's 55 vehicles per day, on one of North Sydney's busiest streets; they're dreaming! Presumably this should read 'annual average daily traffic volume...if not, the number of bus movements alone far exceeds 20,000.

A fundamental error in the Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix M) appears to be the comparison of parking requirements for a by no means fully tenanted commercial building with a proposed residential building with 290 occupants. Even if the co-living residents can operate successfully with no car ownership, ie: solely using public transport, the mere two levels of parking (73 spaces) for the 'market' apartments will barely suffice.

The co-living tenants will not be eligible for resident parking stickers for vehicles so would be restricted to use of unrestricted spaces on, Blues Point Road, Miller Street, Mackenzie Street and Walker Street. On-street parking in this locality is already extremely restricted.

The Traffic Impact Assessment also makes comparisons: *'Traffic surveys were undertaken in September 2025 at the existing site access points to understand the level of traffic generated by the current site uses, with these surveys indicating the following traffic movements: • AM Peak hour: 24 vehicles (20 vehicles in, 4 vehicles out) • PM Peak hour: 23 vehicles (3 vehicles in, 20 vehicles out). The proposal is forecast to result in a reduction in peak hour traffic movements'*

This was at a time when the building was far from fully-tenanted yet the Traffic Impact Assessment estimates that *future use will result in a net reduction of car movements and therefore a net reduction of traffic movements generated by the developments*. This is plainly ludicrous.

Cumulative Effect of Multiple Developments

It is daunting enough for local residents to consider and constructively comment on individual development proposals, but there are currently four SSD developments in close proximity with six towers, most ranging from 14 to 35 levels. Collectively these can have a devastating effect on the amenity of the suburb of Lavender Bay which is predominantly a Heritage Conservation Area with homes of 1 -3 levels and where the maximum height of an existing building is 9 levels (7 Lavender Street).

Some of these proposed developments involve the net loss of genuinely affordable accommodation. The significant issue of the nationwide housing shortage is that relating to low and middle income earners and housing for essential workers. Most local residents are supportive of the provision of housing for these people. In reality relatively little of what developers propose will do anything to alleviate this housing issue. The attraction for developers is the provision of luxury apartment development in harbourside locations, the sales marketing for which is focussed to a significant degree

on foreign nationals, many of whom will not occupy such apartments year-round. State Government may have had noble intent in initiating this drive to provide housing but have, through slap-dash, precipitous mechanisms created a situation in which the relationship of ministers, ex-government certifying entities and developers has now coalesced in an opaque miasma. This provides little confidence in the integrity of the process, and has the potential to destroy the amenity of local communities.

Working Hours

The proposed work hours should accord with consideration for the amenity of local residents who bear the burden of construction impacts.

Work hours should not exceed NSW Guidelines viz: Monday 7am – 6pm, Saturday 8am-1pm.

Conclusion

I am broadly supportive of the proposed adaptive re-use proposal for 5 Blue Street.

I commend the provision of co-living accommodation in perpetuity with the reservation that accommodation should also be provided for families on low incomes.

I also have significant concerns relating to the

***loss of solar access** as a result of the substantially **increased width** of the tower.

***the proposal to change the zoning** of Blue Street Plaza and the possibly of further future loss of solar access.

***Traffic and parking impacts** associated with a residential building with an estimated 290 occupants.

***Proposed unreasonable hours of work.**

***Lack of consideration of cumulative effects of multiple proposed developments in the immediate area.**

I would be grateful for due consideration of my submission and appropriate amendments to the proposal.