From:	Maxim Jacenko
To:	Plan Comment Mailbox
Subject:	Objection - Planning Proposal 3/19 - 173-179 Walker Street & 11-17 Hampden Street, North Sydney
Date:	Thursday, 5 November 2020 1:52:56 PM

To the Planning Panel Secretariat at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment,

As a local resident of the area, I am writing to voice strong objections to the proposed development plan for the sight of 173-179 Walker Street & 11-17 Hampden Street, North Sydney, 2060.

The plan is completely preposterous and shows a complete disregard for the impact on the surrounding community. The following points outline the key areas in which the community shall be detrimentally impacted by the proposed development.

- **Solar access requirements in SEPP 65** : Stipulates that 'Living rooms and private open spaces of at least 70% of apartments in a building receive a minimum of 2 hours direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm at mid winter in the Sydney Metropolitan Area. This would be severely questionable for the majority of apartments in Belvedere and the Heritage directly across from the proposed site along with impact on the offices and business across the road. The proposed building shall provide significant overshadowing and loss of light. As an example, 28Kafe would receive no sunlight until the middle of the day. East facing lower level apartments in the Belvedere are unlikely to receive any direct sunlight at all, a clear violation of SEPP 65 requirements.
- **Adequacy of parking**: Parking in North Sydney is already at a premium. As a resident of Belvedere apartments, I only have a single car space. Guest street parking on weekdays is severely limited and it is often not possible for a guest to find parking. My Mother-in-law and Father-in-law visit at least one day a week to assist with child care for my daughter, in order for this arrangement to take place I need to park my car on the street the night before as by 7am the next morning there is already zero vacancy on Walker and surrounding streets. With the addition of more apartments in the area, for instance 168 Walker Street the parking situation would be unsustainable. Not only this, there are apartments in multiple residential buildings around that do not have their own car space and I have no doubt there will be apartments in the proposed plans that shall not have their own car space.
- **Traffic Congestion**: On a given day at the intersection of Walker and Berry Street, morning traffic will be backed up until Ridge Street and it may take multiple sets of lights to be able to turn onto the highway (city or north bound). It is often extremely difficult to navigate my way out of the driveway which may come after waiting minutes for the opportunity to arise. With so many additional apartments on the single block, and now proposed across the street on the other side of the road dry wall, the situation shall become significantly worse.
- **Loss of Privacy**: Currently there are a number of apartments that are directly opposite the proposed site e.g. the Belvedere and the Heritage that look outward and are not currently facing any other residential apartments. An apartment block of this stature shall now place tens of floors worth of apartments that look directly into each of these apartments - this is unacceptable from a privacy standpoint and is clearly a loss of privacy to all these residents.
- **Low cost housing ploy:** The fact that the submission is offering low cost housing with a spin-off cost benefit to the council should be seen as an insult. It is a clear ploy to gain approval for the development and is a cynical bid by the developers

to endear themselves to the decision makers. We know that low cost housing in a new development in this area would merely consist of a handful of one bedroom studio apartments with no car space, serving minimal benefit in providing something substantial for people to live in and minimal benefit to the community. Furthermore, it shall result in parking more cars in an area where adequacy of parking is already an issue.

With these key areas of impact in mind, I urge you to serve the community with its best interests at heart and reject this proposal.

Could you please reply with an acknowledgement that my objection was received and considered - I would like to know that my voice was heard in the matter.

Regards,

Maxim Jacenko