

As local residents in the immediate vicinity, my partner and I object to the development proposal for the following reasons:

- The minimum affordable housing component “must be at least 10%” as defined by SEPP Section 15C. This proposal appears to have ~9.6% affordable housing (115 Of 1’188 apartments) and does not reach that standard. If it’s counted in another way, it will still barely reach 10%.
- The central part of the site is restricted by the OLS, being approximately RL50-RL53m across the site. The proposal appears to propose going right up to that limit.
- This site is not applicable for the Low and Mid-Rise Housing policy (LMRH) as suggested by the proposal as it’s;
  - Not within 800m of a Town Center as per the town centre map
  - Not within 800m of a railway, metro or light rail station as defined by SEPP Schedule 11
- The proposal relies on redistributing floorspace from the central part to the perimeter of the site “which is necessary to deliver affordable housing”. This redistribution will **breach the LEP limit of 13.2m by 5 floors** on Sydenham Rd.
  - As previously mentioned, the proposal either doesn’t, or barely reaches, the 10% minimum affordable housing component, so I don’t believe it is “necessary” to breach the LEP limit on Sydenham Rd by **5 floors**.
  - The applicant received guidance from the DPHI that “Any... variation request made... should be informed by meaningful and effective engagement with both Inner West Council and other relevant agencies...”. The fact that this DA has been lodged with the NSW DPHI rather than directly with the local council suggests “meaningful and effective engagement” has not occurred.
  - All buildings bar the central part will breach LEP limits.
- The sole SSD qualification is “the proposed works have an EDC exceeding \$50 million with more than 60% dedicated for the purpose of Build to Rent housing”. I do not believe that justification to be enough to forgo the usual local council planning process, and I believe bypassing the local council in this way suggests this DA is not in the best interest of the community.
- The proposal suggests no improvements to local roads. The need for an upgrade to Sydenham Rd/Victoria Rd was flagged as far back as 2018, as it was subject to a VPA tied to Precinct 47. My understanding is that that proposal was significantly scaled back. In that time and between the completion of this project adding 1,188 new apartments, no major improvements will have been made to that intersection.
  - I believe the traffic peer review provided with the DA is flawed, **as it only measured traffic volume during morning and afternoon peak periods on weekdays in April**, and didn’t consider either;
    - Weekend traffic issues, which are substantial
    - The afternoon school pickup period, which is relevant as Marrickville Public School is down the road and has ~470 students.
    - Any additional traffic added by the recent opening of the Sydenham Metro

- In addition, the recorded -314 volume change will be almost entirely negated by the proposed 238 parking spaces, which does also not take into account;
  - The approximately 900 other apartments, of which presumably some of them will have cars.
  - The recent completion of the closeby Wicks Place complex, which contains approximately 270 apartments.
  - The addition of any additional traffic for the soon to be open supermarket inside Wick's Place.
- I believe the traffic generation forecasts in the traffic report provided with the DA is flawed, **as it "estimates" current site usage to be 100 vehicles during peak hours. JMT consulting provides no evidence** to back up this claim, so it should be disregarded.
- The proposal does not provide enough parking spaces to service its residents or the commercial space, which will impact the available street parking.
  - I believe the traffic report provided with the DA's assessment is flawed, as it mentions reducing the number of driveways from 22 to 3 will "offer additional on-street parking opportunities", but does not take into consideration;
    - The additional street parking this provides will likely be dwarfed by the approximately 900 additional apartments without parking spaces.
    - The reduction in available street parking caused by the opening of the Sydenham Metro, which does not have a dedicated parking facility.
- The proposal side steps the usual council planning process, even though the site is already covered by an existing local council plan which still provides R4 High Density and MU1 Mixed Use. (*The Inner West Local Environmental Plan 2022*).
  - This side stepping of the local council suggests this DA is not in the local communities best interest.
- We believe the proposal broadly does not follow the Design Principles outlined in SEPP schedule 9, of particular note being;
  - Issues around "scale, bulk and height appropriate to the existing... character of the street and surrounding buildings", **such as the breach of the LEP limit by 5 floors.**
  - Concerns about "Appropriate densities are consistent with the area's existing or project population", as the DA proposes adding 1'188 additional apartments with no improvements to the local road infrastructure.
  - We have concerns around the existing resident's solar access and sunlight access due to the aforementioned breaches of the LEP limit.
  - Concerns that local social and health services such as schools and doctors will be unable to cope with additional proposed 2500 additional residents
    - It already takes weeks to book an appointment with a GP.