From:	Jean Nette Koay
To:	Plan Comment Mailbox
Subject:	Submission - East Walker Street - Proposal for High Rise Buildings 173-179 Walker Street
Date:	Tuesday, 17 November 2020 1:58:12 PM

Hi,

I am writing in relation to the **Planning Proposal 3/19 - 173-179 Walker Street & 11-17 Hampden Street, North Sydney. My understanding is that** the applicant sought a Rezoning Review through the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. The Rezoning Review was heard by the Sydney North Planning Panel who resolved that the Planning Proposal has merit and should proceed to the next stage of the plan making process, being the issuing of a Gateway Determination. A Gateway Determination was issued on 6 July 2020, enabling the Planning Proposal to proceed to public exhibition.

I own a unit at The Miller, 221 Miller St, North Sydney, and would like to strongly object to this rezoning and proposed development in general. I think the reasonings provided by the Council back in August last year:

• the indicative building typology does not adequately respond to the existing development controls which apply to the subject R4 zoning and also notes that the extent of view analysis is inadequate and requires further refinement;

• The requested heights do not provide an appropriate transition of building heights from the existing CBD development to across the subject R4 zoned land and the heritage area;

• contrary to the objectives of the R4 zone in that it will ‘compromise the amenity of the surrounding area or the natural or cultural heritage of the area’ and will not ‘ensure that a reasonably high level of residential amenity is achieved and maintained’;

• contrary to the provisions of NSDCP 2013 in relation to residential flat building development and the Area Character Statement for the Hampden Neighbourhood;

• inconsistent with a number of objectives and actions under the relevant Regional and District strategies applying to the land;

• not adequately demonstrate that it will not result in excessive overshadowing of adjoining dwellings;

• does not adequately demonstrate that it will not result in overshadowing of Doris Fitton Park;

• loss of views for surrounding apartments;

• the benefits of the Special Provisions Design have not been adequately demonstrated;

• the traffic information submitted does not adequately demonstrate that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the local traffic network; and

• insufficient information has been provided in relation to the uplift in value from the proposed LEP amendments in order for Council to determine if the applicant's public benefit offer is reasonable.

I strongly urge that the above needs to be seriously considered before this development progresses.

Thanks,
Jean Nette Koay