

29th August 2022

Amy Watson,
Team Leader, Department of Planning and Environment,
Locked Bag 5022, Parramatta

Attention: Amy Watson & Jennie Yuan
Email: Jennie.Yuan@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Amy Watson & Jennie Yuan,

**RE: SSD-5093-MOD-5 ("the SSD")
Amendment to maximum GFA of Lot 206 (now Lot 117) to
affordable housing ("the Proposal")
6 Halifax Street, Macquarie Park (Lot 117 DP1224238)
("the development site")**

We write in relation to above modification of development approval on behalf of Lu Gan, who are the owners and occupiers of 502/19 Halifax Street, Macquarie Park, which is located in very close proximity to the proposal.

On behalf of the owner, we would like to **OBJECT** the proposal by SSD (modification to development approval to increase maximum GFA) with the following concern outline below which will be elaborated on the following document.

1. Concern of exceed of GFA
2. Concern of Traffic & Amenities
3. Concern of Parking & Visitor Parking
4. Visual, Overshadowing & Setback

We hope that NSW Department of Planning and Environment would look into this in detail and not approved a development modification that are not sustainable to the neighborhood which resulted to a negative impact to the user and surrounding. As much as we understand the importance of affordable housing, the area and surroundings are not prepared in any means to have such development without impacting the community.

Your Faithfully,
Kyearn Ngoi
NSW, VIC Registered Architect, DIPB Registered,
Member of Australia Institute of Architect

Kyearn & King Associates – t/a
Kyearn Architecture

NOMINATED ARCHITECT
Yong Xiang Ngoi (Kyearn)
No 10854 (NSW)
No 20812 (VIC)

NOMINATED PRINCIPAL DESIGN
PRACTITIONER & DESIGN PRACTITIONER
PDP0000727

ABN: 23 641 743 008
ACN: 641 743 008

Gross Floor Area

The Gross Floor Area of the proposal for modification has exceeded the maximum allowable GFA base on RLEP. The proposal of the building architecture design has not show enough comprehensive planning and design been undertaken but instead took a very general approach mentioning that it will be resolved during submission of development approval. Apart from the exceed of GFA in the proposal, the draft proposal does not show any effort from architecture design to take into any consideration of neighboring lot, adjacent and building along Halifax that is develop by Landmark. The proposal does not show any relation to setback between adjacent building and neighboring properties including regulation to DCP & ADG guidelines. The proposal between the proposed 2 building shown by SJB has indicated to have a Breezeway between building but has tried not to dimension the flaw in design consideration for this proposal. The breezeway has shown on the plan has seen to be very narrow setback between buildings. The proposal to seek for modification of this GFA to exceed the permissible GFA will set a precedence to the area. This will result and impact the amenities greatly.

Traffic & Amenities

The current traffic and amenities with NBH has already been seen with traffic congestion from time to time as the inflow and outflow from Wicks Road & Halifax Street is all single road lane. With NBH having 592 Apartments completed and Landmark proposing 950 apartments, this has already provided tremendous stress to single road lane. It has been a shocker that approval and planning was granted with such density without proper traffic and road planning including amenities to support such density. With this modification to set precedence to surrounding Landcom subdivided site, this will be a total joke for the area having one entry single lane path with such density. I strongly urge State Government to reconsider this approval. Although public transport and metro s around the corner, it is clearly seen that the alternative is not merely a reason for residence not having a car. The current capacity of traffic has already shown minor strain to the area with incoming development from Landmark 950 apartment will worsen the situation.

Concern of Parking & Visitor Parking

Although it might comply with the regulation of apartment to carpark ratio base on apartment mix, the reality we are facing here traffic congestion as well as insufficient parking. NBH itself has already been a nightmare with parking insufficient and without visitor car spaces in the development. With the increase in apartment with affordable housing and Landmark 950 Units, this will inevitable force the parking of residence and visitors to flood the street parking. We have already seen this with residence from Delhi Road Apartment parking their cars in vicinity of Halifax street. Although in regulaton that is complies minimum carparks, the reality is we are in Sydney and

residence have cars. There are a lot of concern regarding parking for residence, visitors and also road infrastructure of one lane to support the development of so many development including development proposing to exceed GFA.

Visual, Overshadowing & Setback

Visual, overshadowing & setback are another sets of problem we are encountering. Visual impact from height will obstruct the view of macquarie park and Lane Cove National Park skylines. The overshadowing might not affect our building but it will definitely affect the neighboring upcoming properties and development. This problems might includes proposal of neighbouring property does not meet the minimum number of unit achieving daylight. One of another concern were setback where the proposal does not take into consideration of setback in relation to neighboring properties to local and state regulation including DCP, LEP & ADG. The proposal of Breezeway and setback between its own proposal does not seems to have taken care off.

I strongly urge that the department of planning and environment NSW would look into this meticulously and in detail that such detriment modification shall be thoroughly assess. I agree and understand the importance of affordable housing, but I believe these shall be done in a sensible and efficient manner that will not cause issues and bad impacts to the community and amenities when its not plan for such density and developments. I strongly suggest that planning department could objecting the proposal of modification.

Thanks
Best Regards
Kyearn Architecture