

To Whom It May Concern:

Objection to proposed Forest Lodge Integrated Seniors Living Development (SSD-75493483)

I am writing to you in regards to the planning proposal at the above address. I am an owner of an apartment on the top floor in the premise next door at 1-3 Larkin St, Camperdown. I have resided there for close to ten years and it is currently tenanted for the last year. The development proposal at [2-32 Junction Street, Forest Lodge](#) includes:

- A six-storey integrated seniors housing facility comprising 71 independent living units and a 12-bed residential care facility.
- Significant site works including tree removal, earthworks, and infrastructure augmentation.
- Ancillary uses such as a café, cinema, hair salon, and multipurpose space.
- Publicly accessible open space and pedestrian links adjoining Larkin Street Reserve.

I am strongly opposed to this development due to the following concerns:

- a) Parking and Traffic
- b) Bulk and Scale
- c) View Loss
- d) Sunlight and overshadowing
- e) Privacy, noise and amenity
- f) Community engagement failures

Firstly, Larkin St and the surrounds already experiences a high volume due to the proximity to USYD and RPA. The building is too big for the site (exceeds the recommended FSR) and does not provide enough parking. It only has 78 parking spaces which is already short by at least 6 resident spaces and there is no visitor parking at all. A seniors living development will bring a lot of visitors – family, carers, health workers – and all of those people will need to park somewhere. With no visitor parking provided, they will park in Larkin Street which is already under pressure. Housing SEPP's non-discretionary rate clearly anticipates visitor parking, and the proponent is not meeting that requirement. There is only space for thoroughfare in both directions for one car at a time. During peak hours or during garbage collection times, there is significant congestion at best, or completely blocked at worst. The garbage collection for the Junction St premises is accessible via Larkin St, which increases the amount of times and volume per week there is garbage collection. Since the garbage will be collected more often, the premises outside our building ends up being an unofficial dumping spot which introduces rodents and litter throughout the street. Thoroughfare via Larkin St will also be impacted. The proposed introduction of Ancillary spaces is also unreasonable due to the above.

The bulk and scale of this project massively exceeds what is allowed. The planning rules allow a maximum size of 1.25:1. This proposal is 1.95:1 which is about 56% larger than what is supposed to be allowed. The building is far too big for the site and will look out of scale compared with the area. This will completely alter the character of the neighborhood and will surround our property. Currently, the frontage and neighbourhood enjoys a nice balanced sunlight throughout the day and mature

trees providing enjoyable greenage. However, the introduction of a premise this large and close to the boundary lines will change it to a concrete jungle.

In addition, our views of the city skyline will be massively impacted. The developer never contacted you or asked for access to your apartment before lodging the DA. What we can see from our living room and balcony are:

- i) Full uninterrupted center view of Sydney Tower (standing/sitting)
- ii) Full uninterrupted view of Barangaroo and Crown Sydney. (standing/sitting)
- iii) Full uninterrupted view of Sydney Skyline towards Eastern suburbs. (standing/sitting)

From our Kitchen, we can see;

- i) Full uninterrupted center view of Sydney Tower (standing/sitting)
- ii) Full uninterrupted view of Barangaroo and Crown Sydney. (standing/sitting)



Figure 1 Photo Taken on 7/10/25 (Living Room)



Figure 2 Photo Taken on 7/10/25 (Kitchen)



Figure 3 Photo Taken on 7/10/25 - Eastern Sydney Parklands (Balcony)



Figure 4 Photo Taken on 7/10/25 - Balcony











If the development will go ahead as proposed, we will have complete loss of views of items i) and iii) and potential partial loss of ii) in the balcony and living room, and complete loss of i) in the kitchen. I have attached photos to this submission to show the nature of these views. These views are integral to the value and enjoyment of my property. As the City skyline has floor to window ceilings, the views are actually viewable from hallway, kitchen, living room and balcony. Even walking through the house, the iconic Sydney Tower is viewable during the day and night. During special events such as New Year Eve, the New Year Eve fireworks are viewable across the skyline and every year we will hold a viewing party. As I have temporarily moved away, I still think and miss that view and only know that I have spent some time away, do I realise how often I would enjoy that view subconsciously.

Along with personal impact, the loss of a view will also have a impact financially on a) the value of my apartment and b) the rental income of my apartment. The view is a major character and asset of my apartment and it was a major reason I purchased the property as well as why my tenants pay above market rate for it. For clarification, my property is 1.4 million AUD which well exceeds the average price of a 1.2 million AUD for a comparable property. My property is also rented out above market rate at \$1000 per week versus \$928. Also, in total, my property has spent 0 amount of weeks untenanted during two rounds of leases whilst the same can not be said for other apartments in the area. This is unreasonable to me for the below reasons:

- a) Developer never contacted or asked for access before lodging DA.
- b) Proposed development is unreasonable in terms of FSR and Bulk and Space
- c) Complete loss of iconic landmark views of Sydney Tower and enjoyment of events such as Fireworks.
- d) Significant impact to the personal enjoyment of residents and tenants

e) Significant impact financially to property and rental price.

The proposed development also will affect the sunlight and overshadowing. Currently, in winter, the sunlight will hit the face of the building and then is nicely balanced by the shade of the mature trees. This is nicely balanced. However, if this property is developed, then the whole side of the building will lose this access to the sun. We feel left out of this process as we were not consulted. In fact, I only knew about this project from a catchup with a neighbour of the eve of the deadline. I am currently in hospital with my wife celebrating the birth of our second child and feel very taken aback. As there was no consultation from the developer nor did they contact any on site study, any reports submitted by the development by not reflect the true nature of the impact on the sun or the views. They relied on drone photos and desktop studies instead of visiting the affected premises which effects the validity of their report. This proposed project massively exceeds the floor to space ratio and the bulk of scale in comparison to infrastructure is extremely inadequate.

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to the proposed development at 2–32 Junction Street, Forest Lodge (SSD-75493483). The application is excessive in bulk and scale, fails to provide adequate parking, causes unacceptable loss of views and sunlight, and will significantly diminish the amenity and value of neighbouring properties. **It is also non-compliant with relevant planning controls, and the lack of meaningful community consultation is highly concerning.**

I respectfully request that the consent authority refuse the application in its current form. Should the proponent wish to proceed, the development must be substantially redesigned to comply with planning requirements and to minimise adverse impacts on surrounding residents and proper impact studies should be performed to truly understand the effect of this development.

Thank you for considering my submission. I am willing to provide further information or attend any meeting or hearing to elaborate on these concerns.