

# Response to Public Submissions

Name	Concerns	Response
Anthony Irvine Smith	<p>As one of the owners of Unit 16/1 Margaret Street Redfern, which is a rooftop property and is situated virtually next door to the proposed development, I strongly object to this development on these grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Loss of Privacy: This development fully overlooks the large recreation outdoor area of the unit, and causes privacy and personal amenity and benefit to be lost and compromised.</li> <li>2.The size of the development is far too large for the size of the site. At 488 apartments the number of persons is too many given the lack of space around the proposal, skinny footpaths, no parking, overcrowding at Redfern station and local facilities, especially as Redfern is becoming overdeveloped.</li> <li>3. Supply: Given the numbers of student housing proposed and being developed, there is clearly a glut and oversupply developing in the area.E.G Similar proposals in Regent Street, Sussex and Everleigh Streets, plus Iglu and Urbanest covering closer to the city, As well as further student accommodation for Central Park, plus Darlington Street and Abercrombie Road.</li> <li>4.This development will cause the following problems for our unit: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Loss of Natural Light, on projections of a decrease of up to 60% during winter.</li> <li>b) Loss of Value, due to overshadowing and loss of privacy.</li> <li>c) Reduced income; Currently leased, with the building and construction noise, plus general inconvenience, will require a significant rental reduction to keep tenants.</li> <li>d)Tenants will be subjected to noise, dust and dirt.</li> <li>e) The proximity of this proposal means that with Margaret Street being so narrow, there will be a large 18 storeys tall building only several metres away causing a loss of privacy, plus extra noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. The unit block slated to be demolished for this development appeared to be well maintained and in good condition, and we certainly did not consider that such a proposal would be made when we purchased our unit.</li> <li>6.Design. Shows a large building on a small footprint overshadowing and dominating our building.</li> <li>7.Access to Margaret Street: This is a narrow street and the only access to 1 Margaret Street. During demolition and construction there is no possible way access will not be impeded or blocked for the duration.</li> <li>8. Water pressure: has been reduced in the area over some years to cater for other developments. Another 488 units will cause further loss of pressure.</li> <li>9. Building issues:1 Margaret Street has already suffered from foundation issues, possibly due to other constructions and railway tunnel vibrations. Constructing an 18 storey building next door, may not only create further problems, but also cause issues for any new construction.</li> <li>10. Another recent objection pointed out another major issue with student accommodation (Urbanest) being used for tourist accommodation when out of term. This is an extremely valid point especially when the DA disallowed this in the first place. Will this set a precedent for unused student accommodation? " Quote: I note that City of Sydney has approved use of Urbanest on Abercrombie Street as tourist and visitor accommodation outside term time (in spite of their original DA having an explicit condition that this would not happen). I have very serious concerns about student</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any development built on the site under the planning controls is likely to enable some overlooking of adjoining rooftops, including roof top terraces. Nevertheless, the proposal has been designed to minimise privacy impacts by re-orienting rooms in the tower to reduce south facing windows as much as possible and ensuing remaining windows exceed the 4 metre setback control on the southern elevation, thereby exceeding expectations for privacy compared with a compliant development. Refer to <b>Section 3.9</b> of RTS Report.</li> <li>2. The proposal is generally consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of an 18 storey building on the site.</li> <li>3. There is a growing demand for student accommodation in the area: refer to discussion in Section 3 of the EIS. The application does not propose short term tourist rentals</li> <li>4. Refer to <b>Section 3.7</b> of RTS report for discussion of solar access impacts which are demonstrated to be acceptable. The building has also been designed to minimise noise and privacy impacts, as discussed in Section 6.5 of the EIS and <b>Section 3.9</b> of the RTS Report. Impacts to property values and associated rental income are not a matter for consideration under the EP&amp;A but given the proposal has been designed in accordance with planning controls and expectations for amenity impacts, undue impacts to property values are not expected.</li> <li>5. 6. The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of an 18 storey building on the site.</li> <li>7. Standard conditions of consent will ensure construction is appropriately managed, including maintenance of access to adjoining properties</li> <li>8. Sydney Water has confirmed existing infrastructure is sufficient to service the site.</li> <li>9. Standard conditions of consent will ensure construction is appropriately managed. Geotechnical impact were considered in Appendix P of the EIS.</li> <li>10. The application does not propose short term tourist rentals.</li> </ol>

Name	Concerns	Response
	<p>accommodation intended for full-time occupancy being used for tourist accommodation with its frequent arrivals and departures. I note that none of the current or planned buildings have any provision for off-street vehicle access. So all the arrivals, departures, luggage, tour groups etc happens on the street (often double-parked). This is both inconvenient and unsafe. And it's happening right now with Urbanest on Abercrombie".Unquote.</p>	
<b>Beryl Ford</b>	<p>I do not support this proposal.</p> <p>Educating international students is big business in Sydney as evidenced by the number of buildings for student accommodating, and the expansion of buildings within Sydney University grounds and surrounds.</p> <p>The increased services that need to accompany high rise development are never forth coming, indeed funding to health, police, emergency services is constantly being reduced. City dwellers are already experiencing increased waiting times in hospital emergency departments. Much higher levels of people on public transport.</p> <p>City dwellings have already had large amounts of high rise buildings in Redfern and surrounds. Again we have seen more foot traffic, heavier road traffic, congestion on trains and buses.</p> <p>If there is to be ever increasing numbers of students coming to Sydney the needs of the university will override the living conditions of city dwellers who will have heir landscape altered by ever increasing high rise apartments. The face of Sydney will change not by well planned, service supported dwellings, but by the profit margins of universities and developers.</p> <p>We share the space in Sydney with plant and wildlife so much of this is being destroyed by concrete and glass.</p> <p>Perhaps there are other Australian cities that can better accommodate these students, with the same high level of learning.</p>	<p>The objection appears to be to high rise development and student accommodation generally.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of both high-rise development on the site and student accommodation / boarding house development.</p>
<b>Brad Campbell</b>	<p>I object to this proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Population density in the area has increased dramatically over the last few years, particularly due to the rise in student accommodation. Given other proposed developments in the immediate area this new building will further increase density and place added strain on all local amenities and infrastructure.</li> <li>2. If the building is to go ahead, the height should be adjusted down to perhaps 12 storeys to be more in keeping with the buildings further along Gibbons Street. This would provide a staged decrease in height and allow the building to fit in with the surroundings.</li> <li>3. More student accommodation is not required in Redfern. In close proximity, on Regent Street, there is an 18 storey Iglu building and another currently under construction. The two buildings provide approximately 1,000 student beds, not to mention the proposed student accommodation in The Block redevelopment. This would take available student accommodation to well over 1,500 beds.</li> <li>4. Is there a market for this or are developers creating a market? Over the last two years there is a current downturn in the numbers of international students travelling to Australia for education, another building is probably unnecessary and could lead to an oversupply of beds.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planning controls applicable to the site have been designed to enable an uplift in population density. The site has been found to be ideally located for additional density, being immediately adjacent to a public transport node and with excellent access to the CBD, services, and a number of universities.</li> <li>2. Planning controls permit and expect 18 storey development. A reduction in building height would result in a development that would be inconsistent with the scale and character of all other development within the centre and with the intention of the controls to create a consistent high-density town centre adjacent to a major transport node.</li> <li>3. 4. A report by Colliers International "<i>The Graduation of a Sector: Australian Purpose Built Student Accommodation Research &amp; Insights Report 2018/2019</i>" advises Australia is among the top three destinations for international students studying abroad and a primary drawcard is the ability to accommodate students in close proximity to the university at an affordable price. The report also demonstrates there is a</li> </ol>

Name	Concerns	Response
		<p>significant upwards trend in enrolments, including international enrolments and as such, demand for associated housing will continue to grow. At the same time, there is a shortfall of housing in Sydney, compared to other cities, particularly within price ranges affordable to students within the inner-city areas, accessible to the universities</p>
<b>David Glover</b>	<p>As a nearby resident, I'm concerned at the dramatic increase in population with all the student accommodation that's been built or approved.</p> <p>There are several hundred units completed and hundreds more already approved. So we simply don't yet know their full impact. While I'm certainly not opposed in principle, I feel we should pause on further approvals until those already approved are complete, occupied and we have a better understanding of their impact on the local area.</p> <p>I'm also concerned at what may happen if there turns out to be an oversupply of student accommodation and its use changes.</p> <p>I note that City of Sydney has approved use of Urbanest on Abercrombie Street as tourist and visitor accommodation outside term time (in spite of their original DA having an explicit condition that this would not happen). I have very serious concerns about student accommodation intended for full-time occupancy being used for tourist accommodation with its frequent arrivals and departures. I note that none of the current or planned buildings have any provision for off-street vehicle access. So all the arrivals, departures, luggage, tour groups etc happens on the street (often double-parked). This is both inconvenient and unsafe. And it's happening right now with Urbanest on Abercrombie.</p> <p>Ideally, let's pause before approving yet more of this type of use to give us time to properly understand its impact.</p> <p>If not, I would strongly recommend this and all plans include provision for loading and unloading passengers on the site rather than on the road to at least reduce the disruption and improve the safety of this.</p>	<p>The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of student accommodation / boarding house development.</p> <p>Planning controls have been designed to enable an uplift in population density. The site has been found to be ideally located for additional density, being immediately adjacent to a public transport node and with excellent access to the CBD, services, and a number of universities.</p> <p>The proposal does not include any tourist and visitor accommodation and is not a matter for consideration in the assessment of this application.</p> <p>Loading and unloading of goods will be carried out on the site. To ensure the safety of pedestrians using the link, it will not act as a public roadway and access to the link for loading will be controlled by the site manager.</p>
<b>Gai Mitchell</b>	<p>There needs to be a maximum number of student accommodation in this area because the traffic and pedestrian flow will be impacted. There is already Iglu in Regent Street; a proposal for Eveleigh Street of 24 storeys. There are enough student accomm in Abercrombie and Darlington Road and also Central Park. Enough is enough. The community village atmosphere is disappearing and we are Isolating our low socio economic group. Its not always about money but good taste.</p>	<p>The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of student accommodation. As demonstrated in the EIS, traffic impacts will be reduced by the proposal, as existing on-site parking will be removed. Pedestrian movements will be improved as a result of the through site link.</p>
<b>Jane Seldon</b>	<p>Good gracious, enough already, there is an overwhelming amount of student accommodation in this area, much to the detriment of long term residents and families.</p> <p>There is not near the amount a recreational space for any more than already here.</p> <p>And if the this greedy governments totally overwhelming concept of what they think is appropriate for Waterloo we shall be the most overcrowded area in Sydney.</p> <p>I also see no plans here for either sustainable or low cost housing. This to me is another greedy grab by developers to not consider the area but to squeeze every dollar they can for the cheapest possible outlay.</p> <p>No matter what you chose to believe there will be extra parking needed and we have no need for more retail. The cafes that are here are more than adequate.</p>	<p>The objection appears to be to additional density and student accommodation generally.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of both high density development on the site as well as student accommodation development.</p>

Name	Concerns	Response
	<p>Just another grab for high rentals. Look after the current community, people who have been paying your rates for years, consider the impact of yet another few hundred students and if every second one becomes a food courier we are in trouble.</p> <p>Students themselves are lovely but we have no facilities left. Dear Planning Minister, I would like to know what you have learnt about planning, human factors, demolition, sustainability, conservation, community needs, recycling, utilities access and over supply. Just imagine if your home was inundated in this way how would you feel.?</p>	
Kath Waples	<p>I have concerns over the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• number of residents - it is a significant increase on the local area</li> <li>• security issues given that it is proposed for short term student rentals who are generally not community minded like apartment owners</li> <li>• hours of operation of the exterior cafe/business proposed for William Lane</li> <li>• substantial reduction in light on my apartment given the proposed 18 levels</li> <li>• impact on local environment &amp; infrastructure including Policing, waste management etc</li> <li>• proximity of building works and disruption to the foundations of our building (massive issues in the past for our building)</li> <li>• traffic management of the building site during demolition and construction phase</li> <li>• general cleanliness of area and our building during construction phase given that our building is only a matter of metres away from the our boundary.</li> </ul> <p>I am happy to provide more information and discuss at any time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has been found to be ideally located for additional density, being immediately adjacent to a public transport node and with excellent access to the CBD, services, and a number of universities.</li> <li>• The operator will be responsible for security on the site. Refer to operational management Plan at Appendix W of the EIS and discussion in Section 6.1.5 of the EIS on security</li> <li>• The William Lane cafe has been removed in the RTS scheme.</li> <li>• Refer to discussion on Solar Access in <b>Section 3.7</b> of the RTS report</li> <li>• Building Impacts will be controlled through a Construction Environmental Management Plan and standard conditions of consent.</li> </ul>
Kelly O'Brien	<p>I have concerns relating to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dormitory rooms planned for the podium mean high density bedrooms looking directly into our properties at 1 Margaret st</li> <li>• The podium height is higher than planning standards</li> <li>• There is already another property at 80-88 regent st being assessed for student housing in addition to the newly completed Iglu at 66 regent st. This is already a huge increase in student housing within a very small area. I agree with Donald Glover's comment that the impact of current plans should be measured before any more are approved.</li> <li>• The planning documents show the Podium on Margaret st side being up to the boundary. Does this mean the building will be even closer to 1 Margaret st than the current building</li> <li>• This seems to be premium priced student accommodation. How does this address housing affordability in inner sydney?</li> <li>• what measures are in place to minimise disruption and noise for the residents in 1 margaret st?</li> <li>• what measures can be made to allow sunlight for the residents at 1 margaret st? Is something like the heliostat at central park chippendale feasible? Based on the plans it seems we will have a significant decrease in light into our building.</li> <li>• how will additional parking requirements be met?</li> <li>• the laneway seems to be only optional at this stage, will there be an increase to the building size if the laneway is not approved?</li> <li>• overall it seems to be a very large building proposed for a small site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South facing bedroom windows in the podium result in less overlooking impact than existing windows and balconies in the existing building.</li> <li>• The podium height complies with planning controls.</li> <li>• Existing policy and controls permit and encourage student accommodation development.</li> <li>• The podium is setback from Margaret Street, resulting in a better outcome than expected under the planning controls which encourage nil setbacks to Margaret Street.</li> <li>• Boarding houses are a recognised form of affordable housing. The development enables provision of more affordable accommodation for students, compared to ordinary dwelling rental and relieves pressure on the local housing rental market.</li> <li>• Refer to discussion on noise in Section 6.5 of EIS.</li> <li>• Refer to discussion on solar access in <b>Section 3.7</b> of RTS report.</li> <li>• Refer to Section 6.3 of EIS for assessment of parking</li> <li>• The through site link is an integral part of the development and not an optional feature.</li> </ul>

Name	Concerns	Response
<b>Marietta Krimotat</b>	<p>As the owner of 9/1 Margaret st Redfern, I object to this development on the following ground</p> <p>This 18 storey building will cause a significant loss of value to our property and privacy.</p> <p>This development is proposed for a side where an existing 5 storey building stands . There's not near the amount a recreational space for any more than already here.</p> <p>There are already several hundreds units been completed and approved in Regent street, Sussex street and Everleigh street.</p> <p>This area is unable to accommodate 18 storey building with 488 students, there are not enough parking space.</p> <p>Already existing students accommodation building in our area ,over supply as short term rent, will result in significant noise and problems in the area.</p>	<p>The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of an 18 storey building on the site and additional density within the area. Refer to relevant sections of EIS and RTS report for discussions on privacy, parking and noise impacts.</p>
<b>Sally Irvine-Smith</b>	<p>As the owner of 16/1 Margaret Street Redfern, a rooftop property immediately adjacent to the proposed development, I strenuously object to this development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Privacy: this 18-storey development will completely overlook my property which includes a significant outdoor area which is the chief recreation space in the property. My loss of privacy and amenity will be absolute.</li> <li>2. Over-development: this 18 storey building on a very small footprint comprising 488 apartments is an over-development for the area. The area is unable to accommodate a further 488 persons: the sidewalks are too narrow, there is not enough parking space, and the facilities at Redfern Station and the shopping precinct simply cannot handle this growth in conjunctions with the remainder of development going ahead in the immediate vicinity.</li> <li>3. Over-supply: there is clearly an over-supply of student housing in the vicinity with similar developments approved in Regent Street, Everleigh Street and Sussex Street. Iglu and Urbanest service the area closer to the city with even more student accommodation in Abercrombie Street, Darlington Road and Central Park. Already other student accommodation buildings in the area have been approved as short-term tourist rentals which will result in significant noise and social problems in the area.</li> <li>4. Blocking natural light: The projections for natural light distributed by the developer demonstrate a significant decrease in the winter months, which will occur two-fold in other parts of the year. Our property will receive around 60% less natural light and sunlight if this proposal is allowed to proceed.</li> <li>5. Loss of value: This development will cause a significant loss of value to our property which it completely overshadows, especially giving the complete and total loss of privacy we will suffer.</li> <li>6. Loss of income: This development will cause me significant loss of income in relation to this property which is currently lease. The loss of amenity and privacy ensuing from the development will mean I have to reduce the current rent by a significant amount.</li> <li>7. Inequitable: this development is proposed for a site where an existing 5-story building stood. This building was in good condition and I could not have imagined it would be torn down to be replaced by an 18-storey megalith when I purchased my property.</li> <li>8. Design impact: this 18 storey building will be opposite an area of 5 storey buildings. It will give that area of Gibbons Street a cliff-like appearance going abruptly from 18 storeys to 5 with no graduation. In addition, the building is unattractive and poorly designed.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Privacy: Any development built on the site under the planning controls is likely to enable some overlooking of adjoining rooftops, including roof top terraces. Nevertheless, the proposal has been designed to minimise privacy impacts by re-orienting rooms to reduce south facing windows as much as possible and ensuing remaining windows exceed the 4 metre setback control on the southern elevation, thereby exceeding expectations for privacy compared with a compliant development. Refer to <b>Section 3.9</b> of RTS Report.</li> <li>2. The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of an 18 storey building on the site.</li> <li>3. There is infact a growing demand for student accommodation in the area: refer to discussion in Section 3 of the EIS. The application does not propose short term tourist rentals</li> <li>4. Refer to <b>Section 3.7</b> of RTS report for discussion of solar access impacts.</li> <li>5. 6. Impacts to property values and associated rental income are not a matter for consideration under the EP&amp; A Act, but given the proposal has been designed in accordance with planning controls and expectations for amenity outcomes, undue impacts to property values are not expected.</li> <li>7. 8. The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision of an 18 storey building on the site.</li> <li>9. Standard conditions of consent will ensure construction is appropriately managed, including maintenance of access to adjoining properties.</li> <li>10. Sydney Water has confirmed existing infrastructure is sufficient to service the site.</li> <li>11. Standard conditions of consent will ensure construction is appropriately managed. Geotechnical impact were considered in Appendix P of the EIS.</li> </ol>

Name	Concerns	Response
	<p>9. Access: access to our Margaret Street property will be significantly impeded during construction. It has a single narrow entrance-way via Margaret Street. Unimpeded 24-hour access while construction, while absolutely necessary, will be difficult to achieve.</p> <p>10. Water pressure: the water pressure in the area is low – another 488 unit will put severe strain on already limited resources and infrastructure.</p> <p>11. Construction concerns: the area on which our property is built already suffers foundation issues due, possibly, to the adjacent underground rail line. Construction of a major 18-storey building in very close proximity will only exacerbate these issues.</p> <p>12: Proximity: Margaret Street is very narrow, and the design will mean that 18 storeys of small, unattractive apartments will be only a scant few metres away overlooking our property with all the noise and privacy problems that occasions.</p>	<p>12: The proposal has been designed to minimise noise and privacy impacts: refer to discussion in Section 6.5 of the EIS and <b>Section 3.9</b> of the RTS Report.</p>
<b>Spider Redgold</b>	<p>No part of the development should not be higher on the skyline than channel 7 as viewed from Wilson St or the Eastern side of Redfern Station on Little Eveleigh ST.</p>	<p>Building height is determined by the applicable planning controls, which permit 18 storeys.</p>
<b>Stephanie Almgren</b>	<p>As resident that has just seen yet another approval go ahead with the Iglu on regent st and now this coming up for approval, enough with the student housing and affordable housing.</p> <p>I have concerns with the numbers that will be the bedrooms – fire hazards, how is this regulated?</p> <p>What about the height of the building, this will block views that I currently have and also have "new residents" looking into the building. Another investor cashing in when the height should remain the same as the original building and no higher!</p> <p>The parking situation is already bad, with the stripping of 10 spots last year on Gibbons st and now the closure of Marian St near the station - thats a considerable loss, will there be more parking thats untimed? what are the measures in place?</p> <p>I wholeheartedly agree with Kelly her concerns are also mine;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proximity of building works and disruption to the foundations of our building (massive issues in the past for the street, with already traffic jams)</li> <li>• traffic management of the building site during demolition and construction phase</li> <li>• general cleanliness of area and buildings during construction phase given that other buildings have done the same and caused bugs and rodents to come out of the demo.</li> <li>• there is already a considerable amount of noise along Gibbons St, how are you going to reduce this and the impact made on all the buildings in street.</li> </ul>	<p>Planning controls permit and encourage student and affordable housing.</p> <p>The proposal has been designed to comply with fire safety requirements and this will be ensured through standard conditions of approval.</p> <p>The proposal complies with the height control applicable to the site.</p> <p>The proposal results in no changes to on-street parking in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>Construction Impacts will be managed in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan and standard conditions of approval.</p>

Name	Concerns	Response
<p><b>Anonymous (315943)</b></p>	<p>THE PROPOSAL IS NOT SUPPORTED IN ITS CURRENT FORM.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Size of units and accommodation planning</li> <li>2. Lack of environmental efforts</li> <li>3. Reluctance to pay development contributions</li> <li>4. Overshadowing of current buildings</li> <li>5. Impact of increased pedestrians crossing Gibbons St</li> </ol> <p>1. Size of units and accommodation planning:</p> <p>The standard regulated size for single occupancy rooms is 12m sq. Just because rooms in other developments are less than this does not make it acceptable. Standards are set for a reason, so one questions why the proposed private space is so mean - perhaps to allow more bodies to be squeezed in to increase profits?</p> <p>While the inference is that each unit will have a single occupant, it is also stated that each unit is restricted to a maximum of 2 occupants. Is this acceptable?</p> <p>Stating that " smaller rooms translate to provision of greater housing supply as well as more affordable housing" does not address the various impacts of overcrowding. The people who are likely to occupy these units are students, probably on visas, and thus unlikely to complain. It is unrealistic to anticipate that everyone in the units will get on, be sociable and utilise the common areas happily.</p> <p>In boarding houses, which essentially what this development is, 30% of units are required to have private open space. It is projected that there will be no balconies, so will the "lost" private open space be added to the required communal space?</p> <p>With regard to the communal kitchens, the documentation does not appear to reflect the stated standard requirements. The information presented is non specific and ambiguous, and thus one suspects that the requirements will not be "exactly" met. Recirculating range hoods are not nearly as effective as those that vent externally. The communal kitchens should have an automatic external ventilation duct.</p> <p>For those units with kitchenettes, it is imperative that if external venting is unavailable, that the filters are easily replaceable.</p> <p>It is critical the ventilation, acoustic and insulation proposals be implemented in full.</p> <p>The planning of the laundry facilities is intriguing. The number of washing machines per unit has been reduced from the standard as the size of the washing machine has been increased. Students/single people usually have small loads, so a large washing machine, even if weight adjusted, would appear to be a waste of water and energy. It is unlikely the charge for the usage would be weight adjusted. It is also unlikely that those living in the units would do a communal wash to take advantage of the larger sized machine.</p> <p>Wouldn't it make sense to have more smaller machines that are both time, energy and water efficient ?</p> <p>While it is stated that there would be a short time cycled wash as an option, this could also be an option on smaller machines. Having a reduced number of machines also potentially increases the wait time to use a machine.</p>	<p>1. Size of units and accommodation planning</p> <p>Refer to discussion in Section 3.10 of RTS report. All room sizes have been increased. All rooms will be single occupancy. Generous communal open space is provided well in excess of minimum standards and will offset the lack of private open space. All kitchen facilities will meet requirements and detailed information can be provided at construction certificate stage. Laundry facilities have been designed based on extensive experience of these types of developments and has been addressed at Section 3.15 of the RTS report. Details of the design of DDA units are provided in the Supplementary Design report at <b>Appendix D</b>.</p>

Name	Concerns	Response
	<p>Will there be a time out for use of washing machines during peak energy use periods?</p> <p>Traditionally blocks of flats had a series of clothes lines available for the occupiers to dry their clothes at no cost to themselves or the environment. While it is acknowledged that this is difficult in tower blocks why are other options not sought? A drying room with through ventilation, a north facing glassed room, clothes lines in each apartment ? Why is it now acceptable for driers to be the only option ? An environmental and financial cost.</p> <p>It is stated that 19 units will be provided for those with disabilities. Unfortunately, there is no information as to what this entails. Larger? Different design? Variable bench heights? Wider doorways? Wheelchair accessible showers and bathrooms? Will these occupants also be able to utilise the laundry facilities, communal kitchens, outdoor spaces or lifts easily?</p> <p>It is stated that vibration and noise transmission from the underlying rail tracks will be ameliorated due to improved design factors that will be implemented during the construction phase. Consideration also needs to be given to the fact that State Rail is neglecting its obligations with regard to the frequency of its maintenance schedule, thus increasing the likelihood of an increased impact from noise and vibration.</p> <p>Gibbons St Reserve is the public open space for multiple apartment buildings in the area. This is yet another, and certainly not the last, increasing the potential demand past what the capacity of the area can support. Gibbons St Reserve is a sloping grass area, not suitable for the playing of any games. While it is appreciated as a tree lined green open space, it is also on the opposite side of Gibbons St, a perpetually busy street with very limited pedestrian access from the proposed development.</p> <p>2. Lack of Environmental Efforts:</p> <p>IS IT GOOD ENOUGH TO MEET THE "MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND THERMAL CONTROL"? Should not the goal be to excel and be innovative in ways to minimise energy requirements and maximise thermal control?</p> <p>Double glazing is more energy efficient than thicker glass, yet this is not specified. External window coverings or blinds are also omitted from the proposal. A very effective way of reducing unwanted summer heat. Why?</p> <p>Photo voltaic solar power is mentioned as a possibility.....should this not be an essential component of the development?</p> <p>Are there individual instantaneous hot water units in each unit? This would reduce the volume of water wasted before the water became hot, and also reduce the cost of the hot water. I acknowledge that this is expensive in the first instance, but it would also encourage the occupiers to reduce their water waste and costs.</p> <p>There is no mention of water recycling or stored rainwater for use on the planned garden areas.</p> <p>Gibbons St becomes a wind tunnel north of Marian St. There is discussion about reducing the wind impacts due to, and on, the Gibbon St frontage. Is there no design available for small wind turbines to take advantage of this phenomenon? Perhaps this could be a challenge for the architects and environmental planners, or even those with ideas at UTS, Sydney University or the UNSW?</p> <p>Efficient recycling will be an ongoing challenge and ongoing education should be anticipated.</p> <p>During construction, there will need to be continual prevention of spoil and rubbish into the gutters. In a vast majority of cases, containment of contamination is an initial effort only.</p> <p>And back to the laundry proposal - are larger washing machines and clothes driers the best option?</p> <p>3. Reluctance to pay development contributions:</p>	<p>2. Lack of environmental efforts</p> <p>A BASIX certificate has now been provided for the development ensuring it will achieve water efficiency, energy efficiency and thermal comfort targets.</p>

Name	Concerns	Response
	<p>It would appear that the development is considered a SSD, and that the controls over this development swing between B2 and B4 zoning. My interpretation is that there are different regulations for "affordable rental housing" and boarding houses, and that this development is seeking to reduce the number of regulations it needs to comply with.</p> <p>Due to the fact that the development will increase the stock of affordable housing, albeit for students, a 20% increase in capacity is allowed. This is a commercial development, and with the increased capacity comes an ongoing increase in profit. This is further increased with the proposed reduced room size and lack of private open space. My opinion is that all required development contributions should be paid.</p> <p>4. Overshadowing of current buildings:</p> <p>An increased number of apartments at 1 Margaret St will have no direct "solar access". The proposed development is to the north of these apartments, with a narrow road separating them.</p> <p>While the report was prepared by experts, it is hard to conceive how an 18 story tower block would not have a greater overshadowing impact on this building.</p> <p>It is also likely that the overshadowing will negatively impact the Gibbons St Reserve, especially during the winter months.</p> <p>5. Impact of increased pedestrians crossing Gibbons St.</p> <p>It is postulated that this development is an affordable housing development, specifically targeting students. It is unlikely that these students will be attending UNSW, more likely UTS, Notre Dame, Sydney Uni or private colleges within the Sydney CBD. Consequently, all these students will need to cross Gibbons St. The pedestrian crossing at the Redfern St/ Gibbons St intersection is currently congested, with people crossing between cars as the traffic slows.</p> <p>With an increased number of people crossing, this hazard is going to increase, as is the potential for an accident, as the footpath on Gibbons St is narrow adjacent to the railway station.</p> <p>The structure of the new entrance to Redfern Station is poor to substandard. Pedestrians heading for the station from Gibbons St clash with those leaving the station, all on the narrow very busy corner of Gibbons St and Lawson St. There are also signalised pedestrian traffic lights at this point, but those waiting to cross just add to the congestion.</p> <p>Service vehicles for the units or the commercial properties will need to use either Gibbons St or Regent St, adding to the already busy traffic flow.</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <p>As a SSD, the proposal should be held to the highest standards in design, energy efficiency and reduced environmental impacts. From my reading of the proposal, it is significantly lacking in all these aspects, and there is a degree of ambiguity which does not bode well for an optimum result. Consequently, I believe that the proposal should be withdrawn until all standards have been met, and innovative initiative shown in achieving the highest standards of design, energy efficiency and reduced environmental impact.</p>	<p>3. Reluctance to pay development contributions</p> <p>The Applicant is no longer seeking an exemption from payment of contributions.</p> <p>4. Overshadowing of current buildings</p> <p>Refer to discussion in <b>Section 3.7</b> of the RTS report for an assessment of shadowing impacts to 1 Margaret Street and Gibbons Street Reserve</p> <p>5. Impact of increased pedestrians crossing Gibbons St</p> <p>In the context of all pedestrians currently crossing Gibbons Street at the station daily, the additional population on this site will not be significant. It is noted RMS, Transport for NSW and Council have not raised any concerns with the impact of the proposal on the operation of the crossing, traffic flows or the station entrance.</p>

Name	Concerns	Response
<p><b>Anonymous (306760)</b></p>	<p>The Block is proposed to have around 500 students. This is proposing around 500. There is another student housing proposal for Regent St. Surely there is enough student housing in the area already with the Iglu project on Regent just recently built.</p> <p>How does this demonstrate a mix of residents for the area?</p> <p>The foot paths walking down Lawson street towards USyd or UTS are unbearable with the amount of people walking along them. There are NOT well established pedestrian facilities in the area. The assessment of the numbers in conjunction with other proposed student accom projects needs to be considered. And this should be undertaken during class and not in holidays.</p> <p>The community consultation appears significantly underwhelming.</p> <p>The wind tunnels are terrible. It is not clear how this will "improve" them.</p>	<p>The objection appears to be to additional student accommodation generally. The proposal is consistent with existing planning controls and planning policy which support and encourage the provision student accommodation / boarding house development.</p> <p>Community consultation by the Applicant included face to face meetings, a doorknock campaign, emails, phonecalls, and provision of information as requested. Section 4 of the EIS outlines how the Applicant responded to feedback during the consultation process. Community consultation by the Department has been carried out in accordance with the regulations. In both cases, the extent of consultation is typical for a development of this scale.</p> <p>Wind impacts are further addressed in <b>Section 3.8</b> of the RTS report</p>
<p><b>Anonymous (305397)</b></p>	<p>I object to this submission as there is a brand new student accommodation on Regent St with another one currently under construction right next to it. Redfern needs more supply to meet the high demand for housing from would-be home owners, having a third 18-storey high density student accommodation in a 100m radius will only act as another barrier to home owners.</p> <p>Additionally, 18 storeys is excessively high in a vicinity of Redfern that otherwise only reaches 4. This is a suburb close to the city, it is NOT the CBD.</p>	<p>The proposal is consistent with applicable planning controls and policies which permit and encourage student housing and 18 storey development.</p>
<p><b>Anonymous (310736)</b></p>	<p>I write as a residential neighbour to this application's location in Redfern (less than 300m).</p> <p>At the time of writing, there are already 6 high density buildings (up to 18 storeys each) in the block between Marian Street and Lawson Sq in Redfern - adjacent to this applicant's property - comprising about 775 units, with another approved development at 80-88 Regent Street (also in the same block) to be built comprising commercial and 185 residential units. This brings the current total number of residential units alone in one block to 960!</p> <p>None of them however are near the numbers of SSD 9194 - seeking 488 student units in an area a quarter of the size of the block referred above. I doubt there are even 500 units between Margaret St, Redfern down to McEvoy Street, Alexandria along Wyndham Street.</p> <p>To put it in perspective, all other neighbouring units are between 3-5 storeys. The 18 storeys proposed encroaches on the lower density side of the street (split between Gibbons St, Redfern and Wyndham St, Alexandria). The height of the building will cast a large and forever morning shadow across the road to the Gibbon St Reserve adversely impacting what little fauna there is.</p> <p>If this application is approved, the increase in resident numbers will adversely impact the quiet of the neighbourhood and also the look of the street. I fear this is merely a creep of higher density buildings into an area that does not need it. Why not build closer to the metro on Botany Road or even on Redfern Street? Gibbons St is a major and very busy artery for transport heading into the city/north. Redfern station is already overpacked. The closest uni is 1km away, not exactly next door. In summer, during the uni semester break, we feel this building may be an AirBnB for visitors, increasing the transient traffic in our neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposal is for a boarding house / student accommodation which is materially different to, and can't be compared to the density of a residential flat building.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with applicable planning controls and policies which permit and encourage student housing and 18 storey development.</p> <p>Section 3.7 of the RTS report discusses shadowing impacts and demonstrates shadowing is consistent with that expected by the controls applicable to the site. Impacts to Gibbons Street Reserve are shown to be negligible.</p> <p>The site is within an area that has been identified under planning controls and policies as suitable for high density development.</p>

Name	Concerns	Response
<b>Anonymous (314406)</b>	<p>I object to the development application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it relies on obtaining a GFA uplift pursuant to the State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 (SEPP), but has not established that the accommodation to be provided within the development satisfies the definition of 'Affordable Housing' contained in clause 6 of the SEPP;</li> <li>• the development, should it be deemed affordable housing governed by the terms of the SEPP, breaches the SEPP in the following respects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It proposes boarding rooms (noting that the definition of boarding room in clause 4 of the SEPP means 'a room or suite of rooms') of greater than 25sqm (see clause 30(1)(b) of the SEPP and the proposed terrace style accommodation);</li> <li>○ the terrace style accommodation will accommodate more than 2 adult lodgers, contrary to clause 30(1)(c) of the SEPP;</li> <li>○ it proposes residential accommodation on the ground floor of the development, in breach of clause 30(1)(g) of the SEPP; and</li> <li>○ it does not demonstrate compliance with the parking requirements in clause 30(1)(h) of the SEPP;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• it is proposed that the development will provide no on-site parking, such that significant additional burden will be imposed on surrounding roads and lanes, with concomitant traffic impacts (and no current proposal as to how these impacts will be addressed or minimised);</li> <li>• there is no demonstrated need for additional student accommodation within the area given the significant number of approved student accommodation premises within the vicinity of the proposed development; and</li> <li>• whilst not a prohibited development, the proposed development does not advance the objectives of the Business Zone - Commercial Core zoning of the land on which it is to be constructed under Schedule 3 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (State Significant Precincts) 2005.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A requirement to satisfy the definition of affordable housing relates only to Divisions 1 and 5 of the SEPP (in-fill affordable housing and residential flat buildings - social housing providers). Provisions relating to Secondary Dwellings (Division 2) Boarding Houses (Division 3) Supportive Accommodation (Division 4) and Group Homes (Division 7) apply to those developments regardless of the definition of affordable housing. In this case, in accordance with Clause 27, the relevant provisions of the SEPP apply to the proposal, as 'development for the purpose of boarding houses'.</li> <li>• These statements are incorrect and it is noted that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All rooms are less than 25sqm, excluding the kitchens and bathrooms as required,</li> <li>○ No rooms will accommodate more than 2 lodgers</li> <li>○ clause 30(1)(g) permits ground floor use as it is permitted under the SSP SEPP which applies to the site</li> <li>○ compliance with the bicycle parking requirements has been demonstrated and a SEPP 1 objection has been previously submitted for the motorcycle parking</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parking is addressed at 6.3.2 of the EIS. There are no minimum on-site parking requirements for cars under any applicable EPIs and the absence of on-site parking will ensure the proposals consistency with strategic planning objectives to reduce reliance on private vehicles in favour of more sustainable transport options. To mitigate against potential on-street parking impacts caused by students who may decide to own a private vehicle, it is recommended tenancy agreements be imposed to ensure students are restricted from bringing a car to the site and are unable to apply for an on-street resident parking permit</li> <li>• Student accommodation is permissible on the site and there is no requirement to demonstrate need. Nevertheless, Section 3 of the EIS has demonstrated the growing need for student accommodation.</li> <li>• The objectives of the Business Zone - Commercial Core zone have been previously addressed in Section 5.6.1 of the EIS where it is demonstrated that the proposal would advance the zone objectives.</li> </ul>