

Hello Lucinda

I wanted to raise some issues wrt the response to our Submissions by Wee Hur.

Unfortunately I am currently travelling overseas until August and it makes providing a response problematic as I only have a phone available. Despite these difficulties our committee believe that it is best that I provide this response due to my previous background with the matter.

I am only able to provide a summary response referencing the issues we raised.

Item 1: Consultation

On 23 February 2022 we wrote to Wee Hur suggesting a meeting to discuss the proposal but received no response.

Item 2 Cumulative Impacts.

The response makes no attempt to answer the issue raised other than to state that the proposal is permissible, irrespective of whether it is good for Redfern. Many individuals/ entities have raised this issue over the three Wee Hur proposals. Perhaps it is just a failure of the planning process.

Item 3 Misrepresentation of Immediate Surroundings.

This issue has been raised before and ignored by the Proponent. One would assume that the the proponent is trying to present that the development is in a non-residential neighbourhood.

Item 4 Water Service

We would like some guarantee that the water issue will be adequately addressed. This has not happened in the past with other developments and has ultimately placed substantial additional costs on existing residents.

Item 5 Inadequate Parking

This is perhaps our greatest concern and the response does not address the issues we have raised in any way.

We state in our submission that we accept that the majority of students will not own a car. Our issue is the multiplier impact of the extra student residents in the area and as stated in the submission it is occasional student use (through GoGet etc), visits by family/friends, the provision of services and courier deliveries to the students and building that cause the problem. It is irrelevant that other similar proposals in the area have provided no parking, in these cases it is only poor decision making that greatly increases the magnitude of the problem and the issues for existing residents.

Please refer to our original submission.

We strongly believe a limited number of casual places must be provided with any development.

#### Item 6 Inadequate Feasible Alternatives Assessment.

The response simply does not address our submission issues and remains deficient under the requirements as outlined in the submission. Please refer to our original submission.

#### Item 7 Cumulative Construction Impacts

We remain concerned that any CTMP as part of a development consent will realistically mitigate these issues. It is difficult to see how the three (even two) projects could proceed simultaneously without major dislocation for residents in the immediate vicinity.

#### Item 8 Inadequate Bicycle Infrastructure

Noted - it would be hoped that a reasonable proportion of the Development Contribution was allocated to improved bicycle infrastructure.

#### Item 9 Roof Garden Privacy

A more resilient barrier than planter boxes should be provided.

#### Item 10 Wind Tunnel Impacts

The response is outside our level of expertise and therefore accept the response provided.

The committee believe that the issues we have raised are all reasonable and relevant but have mostly not been addressed in the response by the proponent. It is important that we have the opportunity to engage with DPIE on this matter as approaches to the proponent have achieved minimal outcomes.

In the first instance could you please acknowledge receipt of this email?

My normal phone contact is currently not available. I await your response, but is some form of VOI call, scheduled at our mutual convenience the best way forward ?

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]