



PCU080339

Department of Planning  
Received

27 NOV 2020

Scanning Room

**Waterloo Metro Quarter 2020**

**SSD – 10441, SSD – 10440, SSD – 10439, SSD – 10437, SSD – 10438**

I object to the current proposal. Submission below.

I have made no political donations in the past 2 years.

It is an appalling abrogation of responsibility that a SSD does not include or assess the impact of the significantly increased pedestrian activity that will occur following the development of the Waterloo Metro Quarter and the opening of the Metro. There will be streams of people crossing Botany Road and Wyndham St to access Sydney Uni, South Eveleigh and Redfern Station.

It is likely that there will be an increased demand for bus services along Botany Rd during the peak periods. Even with the current services, usage will increase, thereby increasing the stopping time at each stop. Given this is a major thoroughfare from the city, it would be judicious to consider widening Botany Road along this block to create a permanent bus lane, allowing freer traffic movement. Buses then exit the lane via the traffic lights at the junction of Botany Rd/Wellington St.

The state government should be ashamed that it has accepted the minimalist approach to affordable housing. Where are the “workers” going to live? Affordable housing is an investment in the future of the population and the state budget, reducing the potential for homelessness, domestic violence, human destruction and all the associated ramifications and costs.

**Submission by [REDACTED] in relation to the Waterloo Metro Quarter.**

I strongly object to the proposal for the development of the Waterloo Metro Quarter. Little consideration or accommodation has been given to the local neighbourhood. The site has been developed to give maximum value to the developer, with only lip service given to good planning.

## **NORTHERN PRECINCT: SSD - 10440**

While the building has been reduced to 17 storeys, this is not at the behest of the community.

The reduction in height is most definitely welcomed, however, the reduction is not as great as implied, as the height of the commercial space is higher than residential.

It would appear that to be an attractive commercial site, a larger continuous floor space needed to be provided. To accommodate this, the building height was reduced, and the width increased. This also provided a benefit in reduced construction costs.

It is also likely that the taller tower failed to comply with the overshadowing regulations. As it is, the plaza has the absolute minimum allowable sunlight during winter. This is beggarly given the number of people projected to be using the plaza. Surely some smart young architect can provide a blueprint building which can still accommodate the desired commercial space, reduce the height of the tower and significantly increase the amount of sunlight in the plaza and surrounding areas.

The tower would also have increased overshadowing of Alexandria Park (well evaluated and documented) but no mention of the impact on the current buildings to the east (potential park within the Waterloo Estate redevelopment).

The commercial tower is a cultural and visual clash with the three 19<sup>th</sup> C heritage buildings on the adjacent corners of the intersection of Botany Road/Ragland St/Henderson Rd. Further design is required to bring at least a skerrick of affinity to the neighbourhood.

A change of use has been lodged to allow the change of shape and height of the building to facilitate commercial viability. Removing this from the residential stock then “justified” reducing the number of affordable housing units to be provided from 35 to 24. This is completely unacceptable. Should the change of use be approved, as part of that approval, the affordable housing stock should remain at 35.

The positives from the amendments are;

1. Reduced height
2. “Raglan Walk”
3. Rooftop gardens

### **CENTRAL PRECINCT: SSD – 10439**

It is disconcerting that the community facilities have been reduced to one room, a room whose use is controlled by the developer. Consequently, it cannot be considered public.

In the original concept, there was planned space for community and support services. This has gone. These services need to be confirmed within an allocated space

Childcare is welcomed. The hours of operation would need to be commensurate with the commercial, retail and residential needs of the immediate community.

This tower of 24 storeys, with 150 units, could be market apartments, BUT ONLY if the tower for student accommodation became AFFORDABLE HOUSING. Would this not generate more profit and provide an improved social mix conducive to becoming a neighbourhood?

The question that needs to be asked - would potential home owners be prepared to purchase next to a tower of students which could become a boarding house when international student numbers drop.

The positive from the amendments;

1. That the affordable housing stock remains in perpetuity.

### **SOUTHERN PRECINCT: SSD – 10437**

The proposal to have a 25 storey tower dedicated to student housing, apart from being a new concept for this development, is unacceptable. This has the potential to become a boarding house by stealth when international student numbers decline. Even the evaluation provided in the EIS flags the possibility that international student numbers will not continue to increase and may have already peaked. Currently, in the immediate area, there are two towers under construction for student housing, with a third under planning.

It is unlikely that the students will become a cohesive part of the neighbourhood. There is also concern that the open space, what there is, will become dominated by the students.

There is, and will continue to be, a desperate need for affordable housing close to the CBD and within the neighbourhood.

Again I ask: why is this building not dedicated to affordable housing?

I am also concerned that the original building had 23 floors, and now, within the same height, it has become 25 floors. What has been reduced or compromised to facilitate this?

The tower for social housing has 70 units. The minimum required. Of great concern is the fact that there is no communal space within that tower. It is essential that an easily accessible area is provided to allow the evolution of a community and neighbourhood. Support services need to be accessible here or within the Central Precinct.

The plaza is described as publicly accessible open space, which is NOT public open space. Consequently, this means that access to, and use of the plaza, remains under the control of the developer. There is access to private open space, some of which is landscaped, in/on some of the towers. Unfortunately, even with this space, the availability of "open" space is minimal.

The plaza itself is a thoroughfare, a main thoroughfare serving the metro. Not exactly what is anticipated when described as a plaza or public open space. Given the proposed adjacent student accommodation, there will be constant movement through the plaza, plus whatever is generated by the Waterloo Metro Quarter becoming a destination/commercial space.

#### **BASEMENT: SSD – 10438**

While the objective to reduce car usage is admirable, the minimal availability of parking space for support workers, care providers, nursing staff and such like is concerning. These professionals are on a tight schedule and require ease of access to be punctual and efficient.

#### **CONCLUSION OVERVIEW:**

1. Insufficient affordable housing
2. Given the proposed amendment for commercial space, affordable housing should return to the initial number of 35.
3. Overshadowing in all directions
4. Decreased availability of support services on site.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Study the submission from Redwatch: seriously consider and respond to the information provided.
2. Increase the number of affordable housing units to a minimum of 35.
3. Increase the number of affordable housing units to greater than 35
4. Listen to the community

