

Cathie Tanaka,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Independent Planning Commission,
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street,
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Redevelopment Channel 9 Site, Artarmon

As a long term Artarmon resident and long term APA member, I would like to add my voice to the deep community concerns regarding the redevelopment of the Channel 9 Site, especially in response to the major changes proposed to the approved plan.

I do not support the major proposed changes and additional 60 unit increase, and I do not support a development of this density for this site. My reasons follow.

1. Traffic and Parking

The development is isolated from any major transport interchanges, yet it is proposed to be a development of 460 units, which means an enormous increase in traffic and parking in an area that is on the corner of two main roads.

The site has only bus access to the city for commuters, no train access, so residents will have to rely on cars. This, along with a childcare centre on site being accessed twice daily, as well as other visitors, workers, and trades to the site regularly, will create gridlock conditions for traffic on the corner of Artarmon and Willoughby Roads.

PAC's determination of 400 units for the site took this into consideration and so determined the maximum density with this understanding. Therefore, this provides a benchmark for the maximum density levels appropriate for the site to which planning models should adhere.

2. Building Heights Too High

A proposed height of nine stories is too high and constitutes a heavy overdevelopment of the site, and this is especially evident when excavation has to be included in the plan in order to squeeze in more units.

Residents living in units such as this will be prone to damp and poor ventilation, continual outgassing from paints and carpets, creating unhealthy living spaces that have to be served continuously by air conditioning in order to keep them ventilated and liveable.

So they constitute the least desirable type of unit and will be unlikely to attract buyers in an oversupplied market and should be eliminated from the plan.

3. High Density, High Rise Development at Risk from Shortfalls in Energy Infrastructure

Living in a cement apartment serviced by lifts and air conditioners, especially those below ground level with limited natural ventilation, is a highly undesirable addition to any development and a very old style of development that is based on an understanding that our energy supply will be affordable and able to meet the high-energy demands of such developments.

With the lack of timely movement to renewables now, and a political climate that favours old and out-dated fossil fuel energy supplies, coupled with a general trend to high-rise overdevelopment across Sydney that requires constant high-energy supplies, residents are faced with a future of possible energy shortages and ever rising energy costs. We are already seeing this trend in energy prices now, and this concern negatively affects buyer response.

As a potential buyer myself who may have to downsize in the near future, I would not be attracted to such a development due to future rising energy prices, and the liveability and access issues. Instead I will be looking at townhouse, or low density developments, and even eagerly searching for developments that are ahead of the game, planned along sustainable lines with proper green areas, tank water,

grey water systems, solar and all the things that would give me confidence that the place would be liveable in the future.

It is unlikely, I assume, that the developer would be able commit to a sustainable development such as outlined above at this late stage of the game, but it is the type of development that really is interesting many buyers now and will be the benchmark of the future.

However, for now, thinking of the proposed development increase as it stands, the most important aspect is that the developers and IPC *carefully consider the impact of future energy use of any development.*

4. Oversupply in a Slowing Property Market – Danger for Developers

It is very important to look at market trends also. Sydney's market has slowed now and it's due to get even slower, so a development will need to be doing a lot of things right to attract buyers who have plenty to choose from in an oversupplied market.

Understanding this from the developers point of view, they have to ensure the development is largely sold from the plan in order to balance funding for future developments. So it is very important to develop with an eye to the future to attract buyers now. Developers do not want to find themselves in a position where they are unable to sell because they are simply supplying the same thing to an oversupplied market.

Developers need to clearly understand that good urban design will sell well, and that too many of the same types of high-rise that have high energy use from lifts and air conditioning are looking very undesirable now, especially in a slow, oversupplied market.

Conclusion

So, in conclusion, for the reasons stated above, I urge the commission to

- (1) clearly reject the 60 unit increase, and if the developers can't create a more unique, sustainable, appropriate development of interest to buyers, then at least hold to the limits set by PAC and the Land and Environment Court,

- (2) make the whole development at least somewhat more appealing to buyers, profitable for developers, and liveable for residents, by rejecting excavations in order to fit in further apartments, and
- (3) reduce the height and storey levels of the buildings along Artarmon Road and Richmond Avenue to that which was set by PAC and the Land and Environment Court.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission on a very important matter for all Artarmon residents.

Yours faithfully,

Cathie Tanaka