

Katharine Dillon
Marrickville NSW 2204

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta NSW 5022

This has been submitted online through NSW Planning Portal

cc. Jo Haylen MP, State Member for Summer Hill

To Whom it May Concern

I am writing to express opposition and to object to **SSD-76927247** known as The Timberyards by RTL Co. comprising multiple lots bound by Victoria Road, Sydenham Road, Farr Street and Mitchell Street, Marrickville.

I am a local resident who is alarmed by the excessive overdevelopment of the Timberyards precinct to the detriment of the local community. In particular the proposal delivers little, to no, actual community benefit and only seeks to benefit the commercial interests of the Applicant.

The proposal should be rejected on each or any of the following grounds:

1. Lack of Parking – Residential, Commercial and Visitor

1.1 The application proposes a total of 278 car parking spaces. Of this, 238 are designated as residential, however 22 of these are for car share vehicles, meaning only 216 are proposed to support 1,188 residential unit types and a proposed 2,500 occupants. This is severely inadequate and will significantly impact local amenity and cause parking chaos within existing local residential streets. Put simply there cannot be a control on these residents owning a car so the impacts to the local area will be devastating, the assumption that this cohort of the community will not buy a car is severely flawed and misguided.

1.2 Many of the local streets surrounding the proposed site lack off-street parking, relying on limited parking within the narrow surrounding streets to find parking for existing dwellings. The area is already burdened with traffic and parking congestion servicing Marrickville Public School and will be further impacted by the lack of parking delivered at the proposed site.

- 1.3 From personal experience as a renter during university study and early working career, I lived in a three bedroom apartment (with two dedicated parking spaces). All rooms were occupied by individuals who each had their own vehicle, relying on additional on-street parking. It can reasonably be expected that a similar resident profile will occupy The Timberyards, given there are little multi room dwellings designed for families. The level of parking amenity proposed by this application is severely insufficient for the volume and type of dwellings proposed.
- 1.4 The proposed development has no provision for visitor parking. With 1,188 housing types, it can reasonably be anticipated that not only will they have parking needs, but they will have significant volumes of visitors who also have parking needs. Any development must anticipate and provide for visitor access so as to not burden existing residential streets with more parking.
- 1.5 The application proposes public space uses for larger events and activations and has no parking provisions to support such events placing further strain on surrounding streets.
- 1.6 The construction proposes to create 760 construction jobs, adding another layer of parking burden through construction vehicles, trade and construction workers parking in surrounding streets. The applications Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan indicates no construction worker parking will be provided on site. It can reasonably be assumed that a proportion of the construction workforce will arrive daily via vehicular means and irrespective of “tool drop off zones” constructions workers will be significantly impacting parking within surrounding streets.
- 1.7 Local residents are already facing parking challenges in their own streets including that of commuters parking and walking to the Metro Station, Taxi’s parking between shifts etc, many do not have off street parking amenity and should not be burdened by overflow parking and the lack of amenity proposed by this development.
- 1.8 An argument may be run that timed parking and residential permits can be introduced to existing streets, however these streets are already at capacity and these measures will do nothing to alleviate the huge increase in parking needed by the introduction of a development of this size. Even with the likes of timed parking, constant movement of resident, visitor of event traffic will be enough to fully consume what little parking is currently available.
- 1.9 The density and number of apartments must be reduced and increased parking provision for residents and visitors provided to alleviate parking issues in the vicinity. There are also robotic solutions now that will largely reduce the excavation and costs to build the basement parking which should also be explored.

2. Inadequate Community Benefit

- 2.1** The application suggests it will deliver publicly accessible open space, a park, through-site link, and residential communal open space, including landscaped rooftops. The value of community benefit proposed appears to be that of some open spaces, a park and a through-site walkway, which are all proposed to be retained within ownership of the Applicant! This hardly justifies the extreme overdevelopment and burden the existing community will suffer at the hands of this development. The community already has the benefit of local parks and great open spaces including, Wicks Park, Henson Park, Marrickville Oval and the spaces proposed do nothing to enhance the area or provide additional public benefit greater than what is already enjoyed.
- 2.2** The application states that the project has “community connection at its heart”, This may be a tag line for its intended community within the project confines, however it delivers nothing to the existing community, only burdens that community with unacceptable development outcomes.

3. Proposed Design and Housing Structure designed to Profit

Developers/Investors not support community

- 3.1** The application and proposed housing structure proposed is timely and is leveraging current housing and cost of living pressures to support the application, purporting to be a solution to these issues. This should not be accepted. Build-To-Rent (BTR) arguably targets mid-to-high income earners, rather than low-income families who are most affected by the housing crisis, therefore the proposal should not be seen, nor supported as a solution to these issues. BTR reduces housing ownership opportunities, drives up housing prices and adds to the housing affordability crisis rather than being a solution.
- 3.2** The structure and type of housing proposed, in particular the Build-To-Rent, and co-living will have rental prices set to ensure profitability for the developer and investors rather than doing anything to support those who need housing support. The NSW Government states that affordable housing is generally set as a discount to market rents. If those rents are derived to maximize investment returns, they can hardly be pitched as affordable, particularly within an inner urban area of Sydney. The applicants own Social Impact Assessment already identifies through the SGS Rental Affordability Index, Marrickville is rated unaffordable for the average rental household in Greater Sydney and extremely unaffordable for a single income couple with children. Rental affordability will not be improved by this development, rather

it will remain unaffordable to average rental households and only support commercial returns of the Applicant.

- 3.3 Transient Communities – given the lack of home ownership opportunities and proposed BTR and co-living arrangements, there is a strong likelihood of highly transient communities with little sense of ownership and community engagement. Marrickville and surrounds currently benefit from a highly social and community oriented population and transient, disconnected communities will negatively impact the social fabric, place increased pressure on infrastructure, communities amenities and important services such as schools, childcare and sporting groups.

4. Traffic Impacts

- 4.1 Entry/Exits to Site – the existing design funnels traffic into narrow residential streets, causing unacceptable traffic flow and will cause traffic issues in narrow adjacent streets which can currently accommodate only one car wide e.g Edward Street (along its entire length) or Illawarra Rd (in significant parts). Funneling traffic through this area will cause unacceptable traffic and safety concerns to the area, in particular young children residing in the vicinity. Streets such as Gorman, Thompson and Edward Streets are already rabbit runs for vehicles seeking to avoid traffic lights on Illawarra Rd and Farr Street, which will only increase by funneling traffic to the site through this area.
- 4.2 Safety Issue to Marrickville Public School – A main entrance and highly utilized drop off/pick up area to Marrickville Public School is located on Thompson Street, along with access to the school parking facility on Farr Street. The introduction of designed ingress/egress zones from the site on Farr Street along with construction activity creates unacceptable safety risks to local school children in the zone.
- 4.3 Any traffic design to the site, should remove all access from these local residential streets and in turn funnel all traffic through Mitchell Street to alleviate unacceptable safety and traffic risk. Mitchell Street is bound only by light industrial and commercial premises and designs could easily accommodate separate entrances off this location for both residential and commercial needs.

5. Bulk, Height and Scale – Out of Character and Excessive

- 5.1 The bulk and scale proposed by the application is disproportionate and out of scale with adjoining areas. Whilst it is acknowledged rezoning has occurred and recent development such as Wicks Place has been completed, the bulk, height and scale of the proposed Timbryards development is excessive and

out of scale to adjoining low density residential sites along with Marrickville Public School. The height delivered at Wicks Place on the Eastern side of Victoria Rd, is adjacent to light industrial uses with no impact on residential adjacencies unlike the proposed site which is adjacent to and overlooking low density residential premises. The bulk, height and scale within the area should be isolated to the eastern side of Victoria Rd.

5.2 The application seeks to redistribute height from the central part of the site to the perimeter of the site to take advantage of additional bonuses for affordable housing given the central part of the site is impacted by the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) for Sydney Airport. This redistribution is excessive and unacceptable, being an exceedance of between 21.7% and 155% over the maximum permissible height! The OLS restrictions on the site should not give rise to a redistribution of height to alternate locations (i.e Buildings A, F and G) at the perimeter, nor should an exceedance of the LEP and height bonuses be granted. A reduction in BTR or Co-living density should be enforced to deliver any affordable housing requirement.

6. Profiteering of Developer

6.1 In the Environmental Impact Statement accompanying the application, it is suggested the development will “deliver important social and economic benefits to the community”. As proposed the application is made up of Build-To-Rent (BTR), co-living and affordable housing, all proposed to stay within the control of and for the economic benefit of the developer. With little to no actual community benefits, this does nothing to support social and economic outcomes for the community, only going to deliver commercial returns to the Applicant.

I urge The Department of Planning and Environment and the Minister for Planning to reject this proposed development on any or all of the above grounds and safeguard the local residents and community from the impacts of this overdevelopment, in particular that of parking and surrounding street impacts.

Regards

Katharine Dillon