

Victoria Rd Timberyards Proposal March 2025

I wish to object to The Timberyards proposal by RTL Co for 1,188 units in 7 buildings of 8-13 storeys and 2,057M2 retail on the following grounds: It is a large site of 39 lots bound by Victoria Rd, Sydenham Rd, Farr St & Mitchell St. and it does not provide the homes and infrastructure needed.

Only 40 units will be 3 bedrooms & 272 2 bed roomed which needs to be changed. Data on Predicted population growth from Inner West documents indicate that "The Principal style of accommodation that the Inner West will require in the next 10 years should be suitable for 2 to 3 person households" and this should be implemented into this proposal.

Only 10% (111) units to be built as "Affordable Rentals" at Market Price. Is this in perpetuity or a short period of time? The proposal should be for perpetuity regardless of the percentage offered.

The Inner West desperately needs more affordable housing, however what is proposed here will not be affordable to many Key workers. Build to Rent Mosaic Development on Illawarra Rd Marrickville currently has a 2 bed roomed unit (with parking) listed as \$1,045 p.w. By the time the Timberyards are built an "Affordable rental" (most probably without parking) will be well over \$1,000 p.w.

The Inner West Desperately needs more Public and Social Housing and there is none planned for this development.

In London all new developments must provide 35 to a maximum of 50% inclusionary housing and considering the large scale of this development a much higher percentage of homes should be dedicated to social housing, considering incomes and not solely based on Market Price reduction.

The parking provision of 216 parking spaces for so many residences (not even .5) is totally unacceptable considering the fact that most Sydney households have at least one car & many have many more cars considering shared houses & the fact that adult children stay at home much longer with parents. With gentrification and many more professional people having work and family cars or the problem of increased ownership of much bigger vehicles has greatly exacerbated parking stress over the last few decades. The overspill in other developments onto neighbouring streets is not possible here because there is very little untimed parking and there is frequently no parking. Residents will not be offered Residential Parking permits so where will they park? Demand already exceeds very limited supply in this area of the Inner West. The argument that the development is close to public transport does not mean that residents will not have cars. Not everyone can ride a bicycle, especially seniors & families with young children and transporting children to weekend sports on limited weekend public transport is extremely difficult. The proposal to provide such minimal parking discriminates against families and people with disabilities who are dependent on their cars for mobility.

The Sustainability of this site should be questioned considering the large number of residents who will be impacted by the Aircraft movements & noise from landing & take off. International Research over many years has shown that noise has many negative impacts on long term health, learning, loss of sleep and general well being.

This area sits in a 25-30 Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) Contour and is not suitable for such a large scale development.

The Sydney Morning Herald February 28 2025 article "The Sydney suburbs excluded from "missing Middle housing plan" (by Max Maddison) talks about the fact that large parts of the Inner West earmarked for development under the State Government's "low-and-mid-rise reforms" will be exempted due to Aircraft noise. Suburbs include Annandale, Leichhardt, Petersham & Stanmore and parts of Kingsford and Rockdale. There's no mention of Marrickville or Sydenham which are in the 25-30 Contour but the rules should still apply considering the greater impact.

The explanation of excluded land on The Department of Housing's website states "The policy does not apply to any area contained within the ANEFR contour of 20 or greater" "The 20+ contour is considered a high level of noise exposure and generally affects land under the flight landing paths nearing the runways. Additional density is generally discouraged in these areas to ensure the effective operation of the airport and to minimise exposure to hazardous noise levels."

If Dual occupancies will be banned how can such a large increase in population density be acceptable on the proposed site.

The Proposal states that an "Acoustic assessment report will accompany the application demonstrating that the proposal is designed to meet internal acoustic requirements of buildings in areas affected by aircraft noise but what about balconies and open spaces? Any area where children play should be covered to protect them not just from the noise but also from the toxic fuel & dust that falls from the planes. The Pocket park and through site links should all be covered to protect residents from noise and pollution.

There's also the problem of the Airport Obstacle Surface and the acknowledged problem that "crane incursion into the Take off climb surface for Sydney Airport may not be approved by the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development Communication & Aviation. (Protection of Air Space Regulations 1996)"

The fact that the site is flood affected is acknowledged but considering the fact that site is on the historic Gumbramorra Swamp needs more serious attention considering the impacts of climate change and predicted weather events. and the possibility that such large buildings may sink.

Many new builds in the Inner West have multiple defects and it is of concern that the quality of the construction will be monitored carefully to ensure the health and safety of residents and the long term viability of the buildings.

Buildings of much lower heights would be better suited to this site and the proposal needs reviewing to comply with airport conditions and to consider the quality of life which be offered to residents.

Heather Davie
Marrickville 2204
22.3.2025

