

Attachment A

Additional Submissions

From: Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> on behalf of Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> <Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>>
Sent on: Tuesday, December 17, 2024 12:37:25 PM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Submission - D/2024/803 – 158 Wyndham Street Alexandria
Attachments: image001.png (5.27 KB), image002.jpg (2.92 KB)

Good afternoon, can the below email please be registered as a late submission for D/2024/803 – 158 Wyndham Street Alexandria.

Thanks,
Sam

From: Angel Nunley [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2024 12:28 PM
To: Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Re: Speaking item #5 Local Planning Panel - Wednesday 18 December 2024 5.00 pm

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Samantha

I was confused and thought that the meeting this week was speaking about the entire development.

What are my options to write about the 158 Wyndham Street development? And when will it go to the planning committee?

I have used the park on a daily basis for 22 years now and I am very concerned about any increase in height in the streets fronting the park. We all realise that the area is changing and that there will be development around us. It is precisely why the areas fronting Alexandria Park are so important. The park is already used by lots of neighbors who live in Waterloo precisely because it is a park for kids and dogs that is not surrounded by high rise buildings. This is going to be even more important as the area changes.

Best and thanks
Angel

From: [REDACTED]
Sent on: Thursday, October 31, 2024 11:18:05 AM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: D/2024/803 - 158 Wyndham Street, Alexandria NSW 2015
Attachments: objection letter - D-2024-803 - 158 Wyndham Street, Alexandria NSW 2015---.pdf (632.28 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hello Samantha Kruize

Here is hoping and praying you take into full consideration the effect this monstrosity of a development will have on the neighbours.

Thanks
Barbara De Luca
[REDACTED]

31 October 2024

Sydney City Council Planning,

Attention: Samantha Kruize,

Re: D/2024/803

Dear Ms Kruize

We are writing to express our very strong objection to the development application for 158 Wyndham St, Alexandria (D/2024/803)

My reasons for objecting to the Development application D2024/803 are as follows:

1) Misleading application

We understand the developer is also submitting a development application for 158 Botany Road which adjoins this property and there is insufficient reference to this further planned development in this proposal and how it will impact both sites.

We believe this creates a significant lack of transparency to the local community.

2) Non-compliant front setbacks.

Set-backs for this development are required to be 3m for the first five floors, and require an additional set back on the sixth floor.

This would require an additional 2.2m front setback required for the first five storeys (so that the balconies are setback 3m from the street).

The sixth floor does not comply with the 5-storey height limit that applies to that portion of the site within 20m to 21m of the front boundary and would need to be set back at least 17m further to achieve this.

As noted in the applicants SEE (section 6.2.1, page 36)

- The 6th storey is required to be set back to a point approximately 2/3 into the site (as measured from Wyndham street). This equates to a front set back of about 20-21 metres from the front boundary.
- The 6th storey is significantly non-compliant in terms of front setback (applying what is stated in the SEE would require a front setback in the order of 22m for the 6th storey) rendering it insignificant.

3) Shadowing, Solar Access and misleading shadow mapping.

There is a significant reduction of more than 30% in the solar access to neighbouring buildings and no mention the town planning standards for minimum solar access.

We believe that many of the neighbours are considering investing in solar panels and some have also been landscaped with current solar access in mind.

The shadowing documents in the DA are totally misleading as they do not include the shadowing from the proposed development of 158 Botany Road, which will entirely obscure any solar access for our property and many neighbouring properties.

The statement in the environmental effects document is misleading as it only focuses on the potential impact on 160 Wyndham Street, whereas the shadow analysis plans demonstrate a significant impact on many other neighbouring properties, as well as Alexandria Park.

4) Unsuitability of the site for the proposed development

I/We believe that the site is too narrow for a development of the height proposed and that it will have an adverse impact on the streetscape and the heritage setting of Alexandria Park and the outlook from this heritage item.

The architectural photos provided in the DA are totally misleading as it minimises the single storey house next door.

The actual structure would resemble a miniature skyscraper amongst a cohesive row of mixed height terrace houses.

This proposed building will be an eyesore and have significant impacts on the streetscape appearance, especially when viewed from (Heritage listed) Alexandria Park.

We understand there is a need to increase the supply of housing across Sydney, but we would argue that all the development in the Ashmore Estate, along Euston Road and of course, the major development proposed above and around the Waterloo Metro station more than meets this need.

In addition, we know there are proposals for ten-storey buildings (including affordable housing where the PetO outlet is currently), but this is near the IGA on McEvoy Street and opposite the cement factory and will not have the same adverse impact.

We would suggest that there are many other sites more suitable to this type of development than 158 Wyndham Street.

We must admit that we were surprised to learn that this site is included on the LEP for Green Square, which we believe is totally inappropriate given the nature and charm of the buildings in Alexandria surrounding the park.

We strongly believe that if such a narrow site is to be developed, the building height should be limited to three-storeys (and a single dwelling only). This ensures compatibility with the 3 storey contemporary terrace houses adjoining the site to the north.

5) Lack of parking for 5 x 3 bedroom apartments

There is no on-site parking proposed for these 5 x 3 bedroom dwellings and this is undesirable given the lack of on-street parking nearby.

The streets surrounding Alexandria Park (Wyndham Street and Power Avenue) is mostly unrestricted parking, and most housing close by does not have parking.

The newer apartments close by do have parking, but it is limited and residents are not eligible for parking permits as per Council's own restrictions on parking.

We also know that many non locals park in these streets whilst they catch trains to work, and the we regularly see vehicles parked for months on end with an area that is rarely policed.

Recently, two more parking spaces have been set aside for electric vehicle charging stations, and while we support this, it does mean that parking is becoming even more difficult.

While we understand the argument of proximity to public transport, the target buyer for a three bedroom apartment is likely to be families and most families will have at least one to two cars severely impacting on an already significant shortage of parking availability in the area.

This has implications on the communities' access to Alexandria Park as well as local businesses.

It is our view and that of the neighbouring community, that new developments should not exacerbate the already difficult parking situation, nor should developments of this nature move in on a residential area without consideration of the already pressing needs that are currently being ignored (ie: 24/7 parking in Wyndham Street and Power Avenue).

6) Impact on the streetscape of the area

Wyndham Street, Power Avenue and Buckland Street are characterised by a mixture of single and double storey housing with some triple storey terraces and low rise apartment buildings.

Putting a six-storey building at 158 Wyndham Street is totally out of keeping with the area as it would be the only building in the vicinity of this magnitude detracting from the very real appeal and charm of the area and the heritage listed Alexandria Park.

7) Proposed communal rooftop - privacy and noise

The DA proposes a communal rooftop area which is unacceptable, from a noise and privacy perspective.

We believe a Rooftop terrace will lend itself to parties which may be noisy and impinge on the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties. In addition, it will directly overlook adjacent properties and remove any sense of privacy.

8) Unacceptable precedent

Given the range of charming single, double storey housing, and the heritage and conservation listed Alexandria Park, the scale of the development does not fit in with the local area.

Allowing a developer to put a six-storey building on a block of land that previously had a single storey house on it sets an unacceptable precedent for the area giving future developers unfettered scope to take advantage of the community's living standards and potentially turn the area into an ugly suburb with little of the charm which makes it so attractive now.

9) Construction waste management and ongoing waste management

We are concerned with where bins are proposed to be located and stored.

We do not want bins left out on the nature strip which seems to be a regular occurrence with some of the three-storey buildings to the north of 158 Wyndham Street.

10) No Short Term Accommodation.

We are very concerned that the apartments will be used for short term accommodation. If this occurs, we expect that there will be severe impacts from noise and rubbish which is unacceptable.

We ask that a consent condition be imposed so that the apartments not be used for short term accommodation (such as Air B&B's).

13) Not enough information regarding the depth of the foundations

A six-storey building will require significant foundations, particularly as the area typically has a sandy substrate. In addition, we believe that the building is located only a few metres above aquifers.

We would like to know how subsiding and underpinning will be managed as a build of this magnitude could cause significant movement and damage to neighbouring properties.

14) City of Sydney - all developments (Ashmore estate etc) have more than met expectations of high density requirements.

We could challenge that living in an area which is the most densely populated area in the country would not need more med-high density living.

Surely the City of Sydney has more than provided for its burgeoning population and met the State Government's density requirements.

15) Breezeway

We are concerned there will be additional noise due to the number of people entering and exiting the property through the proposed breezeway corridor.

The corridor is on the south side of the proposed building and will affect the privacy of adjacent properties and and noise from foot traffic.

CONCLUSION

Community members have expressed concerns regarding the building's proposed height, potential parking congestion, and the precedent it might set for future developments.

The City of Sydney Council has a responsibility to ensure that new developments contribute positively to the community and adhere to established planning controls and design guidelines.

The council needs to assess proposals against the Sydney Local Environmental Plan and the Sydney Development Control Plan, which aim to preserve the area's character and ensure sustainable development.

We believe this particular development does not comply with these guidelines and negatively impacts the community.

We sincerely hope that community feedback from concerned residents are considered in the decision-making process.

NICK AND BARBARA DE LUCA



Proposed SIX
storey building on
a Hic site of a
Smgle storey
house

Single
storey
house

From: John Hackett [REDACTED]

Sent on: Wednesday, October 30, 2024 5:26:46 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2024/803 - 158 Wyndham Street ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015 - Attention Samantha Kruize

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hello,

I wish to object to this development. I live nearby and am most concerned for a number of reasons.

It's quite obvious from the design picture that this building is totally out of scale with its neighbours. It's four storeys higher than the row of modern terraces to its north and it completely dwarfs the house to its south and almost completely blocks any sunlight past the early hours of the morning in summer. In winter I imagine it would get no sun at all. Similarly the other houses to its south which are also low dwellings. This development is so tall that it would also block some sunlight from the park opposite which hundreds of locals use daily, particularly in the morning when they exercise their dogs. Morning is when the shadowing would be at its height.

I understand that this development has no plans for car parking. Parking in this area has been at a premium for quite some time now and with the loss of an entire block of parking due to Waterloo station and more recently, two car spaces (opposite this development) have been reserved for essential EV charging. To add another 5 residences without parking is madness. The construction process would doubtless cause chaos with parking and traffic in general with very large vehicles involved.

I note that a previous DA had been lodged for a 35m tall commercial building. If this didn't go ahead surely this new DA should not be approved.

While I realise the need for housing in inner Sydney I'm afraid that this development has paid no attention at all to local aesthetics and character.

John Hackett
2/138-142 Botany Road
Alexandria NSW 2015
[REDACTED]

From: Mark Gill <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Friday, November 1, 2024 4:06:47 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: DA for 158 Wyndham St, Alexandria (D/2024/803)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

28 October 2024

Sydney City Council Planning
Attention: Samantha Kruize

Dear Ms Kruize

Re: D/2024/803

We are writing to express our very strong objection to the development application for 158 Wyndham St, Alexandria (D/2024/803) My reasons for objecting to the Development application D2024/803 are as follows:

- 1) Misleading application We understand the developer is also submitting a development application for 158 Botany Road which adjoins this property and there is insufficient reference to this further planned development in this proposal and how it will impact both sites. We believe this creates a significant lack of transparency to the local community.
- 2) Non-compliant front setbacks. Set-backs for this development are required to be 3m for the first five floors, and require an additional set back on the sixth floor. This would require an additional 2.2m front setback required for the first five storeys (so that the balconies are setback 3m from the street). The sixth floor does not comply with the 5-storey height limit that applies to that portion of the site within 20m to 21m of the front boundary and would need to be set back at least 17m further to achieve this. As noted in the applicants SEE (section 6.2.1, page 36) the 6th storey is required to be set back to a point approximately 2/3 into the site (as measured from Wyndham street). This equates to a front set back of about 20-21 metres from the front boundary. The 6th storey is significantly non-compliant in terms of front setback (applying what is stated in the SEE would require a front setback in the order of 22m for the 6th storey) rendering it insignificant.
- 3) Shadowing, Solar Access and misleading shadow mapping. There is a significant reduction of more than 30% in the solar access to neighbouring buildings and no mention of the town planning standards for minimum solar access. We believe that many of the neighbours are considering investing in solar panels and some have also been landscaped with current solar access in mind. The shadowing documents in the DA are totally misleading as they do not include the shadowing from the proposed development of 158 Botany Road, which will entirely obscure any solar access for our property and many neighbouring properties. The statement in the environmental effects document is misleading as it only focuses on the potential impact on 160 Wyndham Street, whereas the shadow analysis plans demonstrate a significant impact on many other neighbouring properties, as well as Alexandria Park.
- 4) Unsuitability of the site for the proposed development. I/We believe that the site is too narrow for a development of the height proposed and that it will have an adverse impact on the streetscape and the heritage setting of Alexandria Park and the outlook from this heritage item. The architectural photos provided in the DA are totally misleading as it minimises the single storey house next door. The actual structure would resemble a miniature skyscraper amongst a cohesive row of mixed height terrace houses. This proposed building will be an eyesore and have significant impacts on the streetscape appearance, especially when viewed from (Heritage listed) Alexandria Park. We understand there is a need to increase the supply of housing across Sydney, but we would argue that all the development in the Ashmore Estate, along Euston Road and of course, the major development proposed above and around the Waterloo Metro station more than meets this need. In addition, we know there are proposals for ten-storey buildings (including

affordable housing where the PetO outlet is currently), but this is near the IGA on McEvoy Street and opposite the cement factory and will not have the same adverse impact. We would suggest that there are many other sites more suitable to this type of development than 158 Wyndham Street. We must admit that we were surprised to learn that this site is included on the LEP for Green Square, which we believe is totally inappropriate given the nature and charm of the buildings in Alexandria surrounding the park. We strongly believe that if such a narrow site is to be developed, the building height should be limited to three storeys (and a single dwelling only). This ensures compatibility with the 3-storey contemporary terrace houses adjoining the site to the north.

5) Lack of parking for 5 x 3 bedroom apartments There is no on-site parking proposed for these 5 x 3- bedroom dwellings and this is undesirable given the lack of on-street parking nearby. The streets surrounding Alexandria Park (Wyndham Street and Power Avenue) are mostly unrestricted parking, and most housing close by does not have parking. The newer apartments close by do have parking, but it is limited and residents are not eligible for parking permits as per Council's own restrictions on parking. We also know that many non locals park in these streets while they catch trains to work, and we regularly see vehicles parked for months on end within an area that is rarely policed. Recently, two more parking spaces have been set aside for electric vehicle charging stations, and while we support this, it does mean that parking is becoming even more difficult. While we understand the argument of proximity to public transport, the target buyer for a three-bedroom apartment is likely to be families and most families will have at least one to two cars severely impacting on an already significant shortage of parking availability in the area. This has implications on the communities' access to Alexandria Park as well as local businesses. It is our view and that of the neighbouring community, that new developments should not exacerbate the already difficult parking situation, nor should developments of this nature move in on a residential area without consideration of the already pressing needs that are currently being ignored (ie: 24/7 parking in Wyndham Street and Power Avenue).

6) Impact on the streetscape of the area Wyndham Street, Power Avenue and Buckland Street are characterised by a mixture of single and double storey housing with some triple storey terraces and low rise apartment buildings. Putting a six-storey building at 158 Wyndham Street is totally out of keeping with the area as it would be the only building in the vicinity of this magnitude detracting from the very real appeal and charm of the area and the heritage listed Alexandria Park.

7) Proposed communal rooftop - privacy and noise. The DA proposes a communal rooftop area which is unacceptable, from a noise and privacy perspective. We believe a Rooftop terrace will lend itself to parties which may be noisy and impinge on the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties. In addition, it will directly overlook adjacent properties and remove any sense of privacy.

8) Unacceptable precedent. Given the range of charming single, double storey housing, and the heritage and conservation listed Alexandria Park, the scale of the development does not fit in with the local area. Allowing a developer to put a six-storey building on a block of land that previously had a single storey house on it sets an unacceptable precedent for the area giving future developers unfettered scope to take advantage of the community's living standards and potentially turn the area into an ugly suburb with little of the charm which makes it so attractive now.

9) Construction waste management and ongoing waste management We are concerned with where bins are proposed to be located and stored. We do not want bins left out on the nature strip which seems to be a regular occurrence with some of the three-storey buildings to the north of 158 Wyndham Street.

10) No Short-Term Accommodation. We are very concerned that the apartments will be used for short-term accommodation. If this occurs, we expect that there will be severe impacts from noise and rubbish which is unacceptable. We ask that a consent condition be imposed so that the apartments not be used for short-term accommodation (such as Air B&B's).

11) Not enough information regarding the depth of the foundations A six-storey building will require significant foundations, particularly as the area typically has a sandy substrate. In addition, we believe that the building is located only a few metres above aquifers. We would like to know how subsiding and underpinning will be managed as a build of this magnitude could cause significant movement and damage to neighbouring properties.

12) City of Sydney - all developments (Ashmore estate etc) have more than met expectations of high density requirements. We could challenge that living in an area which is the most densely populated area in the country would not need more med-high density living. Surely the City of Sydney has more than provided for its burgeoning population and met the State Government's density requirements.

13) Breezeway. We are concerned there will be additional noise due to the number of people entering and exiting the property through the proposed breezeway corridor. The corridor is on the south side of the proposed building and will affect the privacy of adjacent properties and noise from foot traffic.

CONCLUSION

Community members have expressed concerns regarding the building's proposed height, potential parking congestion, and the precedent it might set for future developments. The City of Sydney Council has a responsibility to ensure that new developments contribute positively to the community and adhere to established planning controls and design guidelines. The council needs to assess proposals against the Sydney Local Environmental Plan and the Sydney Development Control Plan, which aim to preserve the area's character and ensure sustainable development. We believe this particular development does not comply with these guidelines and negatively impacts the community. We sincerely hope that community feedback from concerned residents is considered in the decision-making process.

Yours sincerely

Mark A Gill

From: Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> on behalf of Samantha Kruize
<SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> <Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>>
Sent on: Thursday, November 7, 2024 11:44:31 AM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: FW: Query: D/2024/803 - 158 Wyndham Street ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015

-----Original Message-----

From: Rod Denson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2024 11:41 AM
To: Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Query: D/2024/803 - 158 Wyndham Street ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

I have an objection to this proposal as there is no provision for parking in an area where the situation is already dire Rod Denson
178 Wyndham St Alexandria

From: Travelling Senorita <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED]
Sent on: Thursday, October 31, 2024 6:46:20 AM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: D/2024/803 – 158 Wyndham Street ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015 – Attention Samantha Kruize, Senior Planner

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hi there,

I object to the above DA as it appears the developer once again is benefiting without care or consideration to the surrounding neighbours.

The area is already swamped with cars & has not got adequate parking, the community is engaged & cares about their people & place.

Please consider these people & their livelihoods, instead of one individuals wealth.

Thank you 🍀🍀🍀🍀

Kylie Mitchell-Smith
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

We acknowledge the Bundjalung people as traditional owners and custodians of the land on which we work and live.

From: Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> on behalf of Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> <Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>>
Sent on: Monday, November 11, 2024 8:18:17 AM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: FW: Query: D/2024/803 - 158 Wyndham Street ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015

From: Trudi Scrymgeour [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 9, 2024 6:49 AM
To: Samantha Kruize <SKruize@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Query: D/2024/803 - 158 Wyndham Street ALEXANDRIA NSW 2015

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong objection to the development application for 158 Wyndham Street, Alexandria (D/2024/803). As a resident of 168 Wyndham Street, just a few doors down from the proposed site, I am deeply concerned about the impact this development could have on my property, our community, and the surrounding environment. There are several key issues with this proposal that I believe should prevent it from moving forward.

First and foremost, the application lacks transparency. Notably, it fails to mention the nearby development at 158 Botany Road, which will have a direct impact on this project. By omitting this crucial piece of information, the developers are misleading both the public and local stakeholders about the full scope of the changes in the area. The impact of the 158 Botany Road development cannot be ignored, and the fact that it isn't addressed in this proposal is troubling. It feels as though the developers are trying to avoid scrutiny, and that's something we as a community cannot stand for.

There are also serious concerns about the proposal's compliance with planning regulations, particularly when it comes to setbacks and height limits. For the first five floors, the setback is only 0.8 meters, when a 3-metre setback is required. The sixth floor exceeds the height limit and doesn't meet the 6-metre setback requirement either, needing an additional 17 meters to comply. This isn't just a small mistake – these are substantial violations of the planning rules, and they simply cannot be overlooked. If the developers can't follow the established regulations here, it sets a dangerous precedent for future developments in the area.

Parking is another major issue. This part of Alexandria already suffers from a severe lack of parking, and the proposal to add new apartments without providing any off-street parking is simply irresponsible. While it's true that the site is well-served by public transport, the target market for these three-bedroom apartments is likely to be families, and families typically own cars. The existing parking shortage already puts pressure on local businesses and residents, and this development would only make the situation worse. We can't afford to ignore the strain this will put on our infrastructure.

Another concern is the impact on solar access. The proposed building would severely limit the amount of sunlight reaching our home, as well as the homes of our neighbors. Many of us in the area rely on solar power, and the loss of sunlight would have a direct impact on our energy bills and quality of life. The shadow analysis submitted with the application does not fully reflect the real impact of the development, and I worry that many residents are not fully aware of the consequences. This is a serious issue that deserves more attention.

Finally, I believe that the scale of the building is completely inappropriate for this site. The narrow lot simply isn't big enough for a six-storey building, and the architectural renderings presented in the application are misleading. The development would completely dominate the streetscape, appearing out of place among

the surrounding terrace houses. It would be a glaring eyesore, especially when viewed from Alexandria Park, which is a heritage-listed area. This kind of development would ruin the character of the neighborhood and diminish the visual appeal of the park, which many of us hold dear.

I understand the need for more housing in our community and agree with higher density around transport hubs, but this particular development is simply not right for this location. There are other, more suitable sites in Alexandria where a project of this scale could be considered. I strongly urge the council to reject this application and take into account the concerns of the local residents who will be most affected.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns. I trust that you will make the right decision in the best interest of the community.

Sincerely,
Trudi Scrymgour
168 Wyndham Street
Alexandria

From: Vanessa Knight <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Wednesday, October 30, 2024 6:09:39 PM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Objection to Development Application D/2024/83 - 158 Wyndham Street, Alexandria. NSW 2015
Attachments: DA submission 2024803 - objection 20241030.pdf (2.17 MB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

I wish to object to D/2024/803 for 158 Wyndham Street Alexandria.

My objection document is enclosed.

Regards,

Vanessa Knight

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
41 Suttor Street
Alexandria. NSW 2015

28 October 2024

Sydney City Council Planning,
Attention: Samantha Kruize,

Re: D/2024/803

Dear Ms Kruize

I am writing to express our very strong objection to the development application for 158 Wyndham St, Alexandria (D/2024/803).

My reasons for objecting to the Development application D/2024/803 are as follows:

1. Non-compliant front setbacks.

Set-backs for this development are required to be 3m for the first five floors, and require an additional set back on the sixth floor.

This would require an additional 2.2m front setback required for the first five storeys (so that the balconies are set back 3m from the street).

The sixth floor does not comply with the 5-storey height limit that applies to that portion of the site within 20m to 21m of the front boundary and would need to be set back at least 17m further to achieve this.

As noted in the applicants SEE (section 6.2.1, page 36)

- The 6th storey is required to be set back to a point approximately 2/3 into the site (as measured from Wyndham Street). This equates to a front set back of about 20-21 metres from the front boundary.
- The 6th storey is significantly non-compliant in terms of front setback (applying what is stated in the SEE would require a front setback in the order of 22m for the 6th storey) rendering it insignificant.

2. Shadowing, Solar Access and misleading shadow mapping.

There is a significant reduction of more than 30% in the solar access to neighbouring buildings and no mention of the town planning standards for minimum solar access.

I believe that many of the neighbours are considering investing in solar panels and some have also been landscaped with current solar access in mind.

The shadowing documents in the DA are totally misleading as they do not include the shadowing from the proposed development of 158 Botany Road, which will entirely obscure any solar access for the subject property and many neighbouring properties.

The statement in the environmental effects document is misleading as it only focuses on the potential impact on 160 Wyndham Street, whereas the shadow analysis plans demonstrate a significant impact on many other neighbouring properties, as well as Alexandria Park.

3. Unsuitability of the site for the proposed development.

I believe that the site is too narrow for a development of the height proposed and that it will have an adverse impact on the streetscape and the heritage setting of Alexandria Park and the outlook from this heritage recreational park.

The architectural photos provided in the DA are totally misleading as it minimises the single storey house next door to the south.

The actual structure would resemble a miniature skyscraper amongst a cohesive row of mixed height terrace houses.

This proposed building will be an eyesore and have significant impacts on the streetscape appearance, especially when viewed from (Heritage listed) Alexandria Park.

I understand there is a need to increase the supply of housing across Sydney, but I would argue that all the development in the Ashmore Estate, along Euston Road and of course, the major development proposed above and around the Waterloo Metro station more than meets this need.

In addition, I know there are proposals for ten-storey buildings (including affordable housing where the PetO outlet is currently), but this is near the IGA on McEvoy Street and opposite the cement factory and will not have the same adverse impact.

I would suggest that there are many other sites more suitable to this type of development than 158 Wyndham Street.

I must admit that I was surprised to learn that this site is included on the LEP for Green Square, which I believe is totally inappropriate given the nature and charm of the buildings in Alexandria surrounding the park and the physical distance to Green Square proper.

I strongly believe that if such a narrow site is to be developed, the building height should be limited to three-storeys (and a single dwelling only). This ensures compatibility with the three storey contemporary terrace houses adjoining the site to the north.

4. Misleading application.

I understand the developer is also submitting a development application for 158 Botany Road which adjoins this property and there is insufficient reference to this further planned development in this proposal and how it will impact both sites.

I believe this creates a significant lack of transparency to the local community.

5. Lack of parking for 5 x 3 bedroom apartments.

There is no on-site parking proposed for these 5 x 3-bedroom dwellings and this is undesirable given the lack of on-street parking nearby.

The streets surrounding Alexandria Park (Wyndham Street and Power Avenue) are mostly unrestricted parking, and most housing close by does not have parking.

The newer apartments close by do have parking, but it is limited and many residents are not eligible for parking permits as per Council's own restrictions on parking.

I also know that many non-locals park in these streets whilst they catch trains to work, or as they work nearby at South Eveleigh, and I regularly see vehicles parked for months on end within an area that is rarely policed.

Recently, two more parking spaces have been set aside for electric vehicle charging stations, and while I support this, it does mean that parking is becoming even more difficult for residents.

While I understand the argument of proximity to public transport, the target buyer for a three bedroom apartment is likely to be families and most families will have at least one to two cars, perhaps even a trade vehicle or van, severely impacting on an already significant shortage of parking availability in the area.

This has implications on the communities' access to Alexandria Park as well as local businesses.

It is my view and that of the neighbouring community, that new developments should not exacerbate the already difficult parking situation, nor should developments of this nature move in on a residential area without consideration of the already pressing needs that are currently being ignored (i.e.: 24/7 parking in Wyndham Street and Power Avenue).

6. Impact on the streetscape of the area.

Wyndham Street, Power Avenue and Buckland Street are characterised by a mixture of single and double storey housing with some triple storey terraces and low-rise apartment buildings.

Putting a six-storey building at 158 Wyndham Street is totally out of keeping with the area as it would be the only building in the vicinity of this magnitude detracting from the very real appeal and charm of the area and the heritage listed Alexandria Park.

7. Proposed communal rooftop – privacy and noise.

The DA proposes a communal rooftop area which is unacceptable, from a noise and privacy perspective.

I believe a Rooftop terrace will lend itself to parties which may be noisy and impinge on the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties. In addition, it will directly overlook adjacent properties and remove any sense of privacy.

8. Unacceptable precedent

Given the range of charming single, double storey housing, and the heritage and conservation listed Alexandria Park, the scale of the development does not fit in with the local area.

Allowing a developer to put a six-storey building on a block of land that previously had a single storey house on it sets an unacceptable precedent for the area giving future developers unfettered scope to take advantage of the community's living standards and potentially turn the area into an ugly suburb with little of the charm which makes it so attractive now.

9. Construction waste management and ongoing waste management.

I am concerned with where bins are proposed to be located and stored.

I do not want bins left out on the nature strip – which seems to be a regular occurrence – with some of the three-storey buildings to the north of 158 Wyndham Street.

10. No Short Term Accommodation.

I am very concerned that the apartments will be used for short term accommodation. If this occurs, I expect that there will be severe impacts from noise and rubbish – especially furniture and other household waste – which is unacceptable.

I ask that a consent condition be imposed so that the apartments not be used for short term accommodation (such as Air B&B's).

11. Not enough information regarding the depth of the foundations.

A six-storey building will require significant foundations, particularly as the area typically has a sandy sub strate. In addition, I believe that the building is located only a few metres above aquifers.

I would like to know how subsiding and underpinning will be managed as a build of this magnitude could cause significant movement and damage to neighbouring properties.

12. City of Sydney – all developments (Ashmore estate etc.) have more than met expectations of high-density requirements.

I would challenge that living in an area which is the most densely populated area in the country would not need more medium-high density living.

Surely the City of Sydney has more than provided for its burgeoning population and met the State Government's density requirements.

CONCLUSION

I join other community members who have expressed concerns regarding the building's proposed height, potential parking congestion, and the precedent it might set for future developments.

In addition, I note that even under the State Government's new Transport Oriented Development Policy that 'All residential flat building and shop-top housing developments proposed in the new controls must be on a lot with a minimum width of at least 21 m at the front building line. Building line is defined in Part 1, Division 1, Section 1.5 of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008*'.

While I understand that this policy has not been put in place for Wyndham Street, surely the principle applies – the land width at 158 Wyndham Street is a mere 8 meters, less than half the restricted width outlined above.

The City of Sydney Council has a responsibility to ensure that new developments contribute positively to the community and adhere to established planning controls and design guidelines.

The Council needs to assess proposals against the Sydney Local Environmental Plan and the Sydney Development Control Plan, which aim to preserve the area's character and ensure sustainable development.

I believe this particular development does not comply with these guidelines and negatively impacts the community.

I sincerely hope that community feedback from concerned residents are considered in the decision-making process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vanessa Knight', with a stylized, flowing script.

Vanessa Knight

Vanessa Knight
41 Suttor Street, Alexandria, NSW 2015



From: Zoho - Gary [REDACTED]
Sent on: Friday, November 1, 2024 4:03:55 PM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Further objection to Development Application D/2024/83 - 158 Wyndham Street, Alexandria. NSW 2015
Attachments: 20241030_DA_2024_803_Objection2_GCS.pdf (2.2 MB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

I wish to further object to D/2024/803 for 158 Wyndham Street Alexandria.

My objection document is enclosed.

Regards,

Gary Speechley
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

41 Suttor Street
Alexandria. NSW 2015

GARY SPEECHLEY & VANESSA KNIGHT

41 Suttor Street Alexandria NSW 2015

Date: 30 October 2024

Reference: Objection to DA/2024/803 – 158 Wyndham Street, Alexandria NSW 2015

City of Sydney
GPO Box 1591
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Samanth Kruize

Dear Ms Kruize

I am writing to express our very strong objection to the development application for 158 Wyndham St, Alexandria (D/2024/803), and add additional material to my objection.

My additional reasons for objecting to the Development application D/2024/803 are outlined as follows:

Objection 1:

The project is grossly underestimated with respect to estimated cost, highlighting the Architect and Applicant are not acting with **integrity** or **reasonable care**. The actions of the Architect in this regard contravenes Clause 4.1(a) of the NSW Architects Registration Board Code of Professional Conduct which states:

4. Provision of architectural services generally

(1) In providing architectural services, an architect must-

(a) act with integrity and reasonable care

Objection 2:

The Architect and Applicant appear to be adopting a sacrificial development application strategy, where they have deliberately overdesigned the development with the view to reduce the number of floors through Council requests and in any subsequent Land & Environment Court proceedings. The actions of the Architect in this regard contravenes Clause 4.3 (a) of the NSW Architects Registration Board Code of Professional Conduct which states:

4. Provision of architectural services generally

- (3) An architect must withdraw from the provision of any architectural services if the architect reasonably believes that, in the architect's professional judgment, the provision of the services would require the architect to act—*
- a. in a manner that the architect considers unethical*

Objection 3:

The development is essentially 8 storeys when the rooftop terrace, stair and lift overrun are considered. The FSR calculation overlooks key area calculations and misleadingly oversized services, and equipment zones excluded from the FSR calculation. These areas excluded from the calculation include but are not limited to the following:

- the primary scissor fire stair which must be counted at one level
- excessively sized lift shaft
- blank zones not labelled or indicating any function adjacent to the lift shaft and the stair to the northern boundary allowing for the planning to be reconfigured and habitable areas to be substantially increased in size, thereby increasing the FSR considerably, during the Construction Certificate application process

Objection 4:

The provision of 6 solar panels at approximately 2.4kWh output is a disingenuous attempt to make a contribution to the sustainability of the project. A solar array of this size, at peak output capacity, is inadequate to offset the running costs of even half of one three-bedroom air-conditioned apartment.

Objection 5:

The overshadowing of numerous properties to the south of the development is grossly unacceptable.

Objection 6:

The bulk to the street and to neighbours to the south as viewed from both public and private outdoor spaces respectively is grossly unacceptable as to be unconscionable to propose.

The actions of the Architect with respect to Objection 3, 4, 5, 6 above contravene Clause 4.1 (b)(i) of the NSW Architects Registration Board Code of Professional Conduct which states:

4. Provision of architectural services generally

(1) In providing architectural services, an architect must—

(b) provide the services—

(i) in a manner that (at the time the services are provided) is widely accepted in Australia by peer professional opinion as competent professional architectural practice, and

And, I as undersigned, reserve my right to make a formal complaint to the NSW Architects Registration Board should the Architect fail to promptly withdraw from the provision of any further architectural services to this development in accordance with Clause 14. of the NSW Architects Registration Board Code of Professional Conduct which states:

14. Advising client of inability to follow client's instructions

An architect must, as soon as is reasonably practicable, advise the client in writing of any thing that would, or would be likely to, prevent the client's instructions relating to the architectural services being followed, including the responsibility of an architect to withdraw from the provision of the architectural services under clause 4 (3) of this Code

CONCLUSION

I join other community members who have expressed concerns regarding the building's proposed height, potential parking congestion, and the precedent it might set for future developments.

Sincerely,



Gary Speechley



Proposed SIX
storey building on
a the site of a
single storey
house

Single
storey
house