

The current proposed development plan for this apartment precinct, is inappropriate for the existing community, does very little to help in the housing crisis and just seems to be shaped by greed. There is potential here for a great development that brings housing and value to the area, as well as providing space for businesses, tourists and the wider community. But the current plan is far from that. Please refuse the current development plan, I have outlined points below in support of my request.

1. The original plan for this development was almost half the size with 3 and 6 storey blocks, which were appropriate to the area and blended in more with existing dwellings and the feel of Marrickville community. The proposed plan is ridiculous in the extreme and prioritises profit of the developer over the community. This land is appropriate for low- to mid-rise apartment blocks, not for the intrusive planned 8+ storey blocks.
2. The number of apartment and potential residents in this space is excessive and will drastically change the community feel of the current area. As highlighted in points below, the local infrastructure is not equipped to cope with this many additional residents. The original plan of ~650 residents is more appropriate and lends much more towards a successful, community feeling precinct.

### **Height limit breached**

3. Block G, the block on Sydenham Road: The developers propose 8 storeys, the legal limit is 3.
  - a. It is unreasonable to have a large 8 storey block straight on Sydenham Road with no smaller blocks in front to set-back or step up first. This should be brought down to 3 storeys (the original, compliant plan) so the plan is less aggressive and has less visual impact on existing residents and the general feel of the neighbourhood.
  - b. This proposed 8 blocks creates significant shadowing over houses on surrounding streets. According to the developers' own shadow reports some of the houses will have less than 2 hours of sunlight, one house only 30 mins! This breaks the law for the extent of overshadowing on neighbouring dwellings.

We know how important sunlight is to good mental and physical health for everyone. These homes have elderly residents who have lived here for many years, these homes have solar panels, which residents rely on for energy provision. Neighbours and the larger community should not be so significantly negatively impacted by the greed of developers.

### **Inappropriate Housing Mix**

4. The development is a strange mix of housing, especially with 873 1-bedroom apartments. This mix of housing is unlikely to meet community housing need and create a strong community. Strong community connections increase sense of belonging and general well-being and they decrease crime rates, loneliness and reliance on welfare systems. Community between all different people is important but this housing design fails to support that.
  - a. When speaking to the development team at the community consultation, they did not have plans to actively create & promote this co-living community they advertise. They did not intend to design into

the plan the cross-over which nurtures community i.e. shared kitchens. They only plan to provide empty, passive space in which they hoped people would connect. This is a poorly thought through design which might work in a student housing context but fails to translate well to housing for young professionals.

- b. This student-housing like design has a time and place, but it is not an appropriate design in this community. This design does not benefit the potential residents or existing community.
5. Out of the 1188 apartment, only 40 are planned to be 3-bedroom. And only 275 2-bedroom homes. This proposed plan has little provision for families, or older people down-sizing. This plan doesn't fit the Marrickville demographic, we need multi-bedroom housing for families or friends to share. It does not appear as though this design has been guided by the need of the community.

### **Unaffordable Housing**

- 6. Build to rent is a good idea on paper, but the developers portfolio show that they are not interested in this as an affordable option, but rather as a way to cram as many people in and charge high rent. The developer currently charges ~\$800 per week for 1-bedroom student housing. That is not affordable rent. This development is marketed to young professionals, it's feasible to assume rent will be set even higher.
  - c. The development has a single landlord (the developer), there is no competition or pressure to prevent the developer from setting rent. As the above point illustrates these developers have a history of setting extremely high rents. This is very concerning in a housing crisis.
  - d. Build to rent developments can work when they have longer-term rental contracts i.e. 3-years, so renters can have housing security and build a community. This developer has been advised to do this and has not committed. Contracts will be the standard annual contracts which doesn't address the need for housing security.
- 7. The developers have said they will charge "market-rate" for their apartments. Market rate rent is not affordable for so many people already, the community needs rents that are lower than market rate. As point 5 evidences the developers have a history of setting high rates which is detrimental to our community and does not provide much-needed housing that is financially accessible. The developer has been advertising this plan as an answer to the housing crisis, however, the current plan seems driven by profit rather than providing much needed housing at reasonable, affordable rent.
- 8. Less than 10% of these apartments are planned to be affordable housing. The developer can do better. Housing affordability is a real crisis; the developers' have included the absolute bare minimum of affordable apartments, so they can win the State development bonuses. The plan should include a higher proportion of affordable homes into the mix.

9. There is no social housing planned in. The InnerWest needs more social housing, particularly housing that is integrated with non-social housing neighbours. There is a desperate need for social housing in the InnerWest

### **Transport Failures**

10. The developers claim that most of the residents would use public transport. But at the same time have planned in no improvement to surrounding roads, public transport, pavements, cycle-ways etc. This seems illogical when over a thousand people are planned to come into this precinct. The surrounding pavements and roads surfaces are already poor.
11. The developer has only provided 216 parking spaces for residents' cars for 1188 apartments. The average number of cars per household in Australia is 1.8, and car use is the most popular method of commuting to work (from latest census). It is reasonable to assume that most residents in this precinct would own a car. There are not enough car spaces provided. Parking on surrounding streets is already very difficult. This will impact surrounding residents severely.
  - e. Car traffic on Sydenham and Victoria Road, and surrounding streets is heavy and jammed already. The current road design and infrastructure cannot handle the extra load of cars. As stated above, the development plans do not include upgrades to surrounding roads.

### **Local Facilities Overwhelmed**

12. The local medical facilities and hospital infrastructure cannot cope with an additional thousand plus residents. Most local GPs are not taking new patients because they are full. The hospitals that provide for this catchment; RPA and St George, are not equipped to look after that many additional people. Any proposed plans should have included space for a bulk-bill GP, and space for imaging services.
13. Local schools are full. The developers' detail in their plan that Marrickville public school is under attended. This is untrue; consultation with the principal confirms that they are at capacity and have had to turn students away.

### **Additional**

14. Disruption caused by the construction will be highly significant and detrimental to residents. The surrounding roads are single lanes, with heavy traffic already. There has been no adequate plan for movement of construction vehicles or for parking of workers' vehicles.
  - a. The school next door to the construction site will be severely impacted by noise, dust and congestion. Construction vehicles will clash with parent vehicles during student pick-up, on the small one-lane back-roads. The safety and well-being of school children and parents has not been considered.
15. The public consultation was very poor. Public consultation hours were generally during work hours which made it difficult for people to attend. The consultation dates were then changed at very short notice. Numerous

attempts to meet with and talk to a member of the development team were knocked back, consistently switched timing and never came to fruition. The developers seem to have done as little as possible to genuinely inform and engage the community.

16. The current Timberyards development does not align with the community's visual character. Its design is unappealing, with a harsh and imposing visual impact. It's clear from the current design mock-up that the development's height, and design clashes grotesquely with the surrounding low, bricked, individual dwellings that help to create the suburb's character. This area could be developed in a way that blends into, and adds to the character of the suburb, but the developers have not chosen to do this.

The proposed Timberyards development plan is entirely in-appropriate and detrimental to the existing community and future residents. It does not foster or create the community spirit that Marrickville is known and valued for. The planned housing does not deliver what the community needs and does almost nothing to ease the housing crisis.

A well thought-through design with lower tower blocks, that fits into the character of Marrickville and provides needed and genuinely affordable housing, would be a great addition for this land. Unfortunately, as the current plan stands, it is far from this, which is why I am asking you to reject this proposal.

Many thanks!