

44 Pitt Street
Redfern 2016
21st March 2013

Major Project Assessment
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
Sydney 2001

RE: Application No MP09_0068

Dear Sir,

We write to elucidate our concerns regarding number of elements relating to the proposed development at Rachel Forster Hospital.

1. Despite the size and scope of this development only a very small number of Redfern residents were notified about this development. Given the number of new residences proposed for this site it would be appropriate to allow more of the community to consider the application and voice its concerns (if any).
2. Although the developer called a voluntary meeting with the local residents some time ago in a (vain) effort to allay their concerns, there has been no further information or action regarding this site and its considerable problems. The community has a right to know, for instance, what – if anything – has been done to remediate the asbestos on site.

There is no mention of such contamination in the developer's Preliminary Environmental Assessment, either in point 6.1.2 State Environmental Planning Policy 55 – Remediation of Land, nor in point 7.7 Contamination.

This could well become a public health concern, and could also be in breach of state planning laws from the start.

3. The number of vehicles that this development will attract is considerable. Redfern residents currently have concerns about parking and traffic in a residential area already congested with cars in small streets. While Pitt St may not necessarily be considered small, it is still only one lane each way, and can barely cope with its current volume of traffic at peak times.

While the plans allow for 170 parking spaces (for 159 apartments) this does not address visitor parking in any real way.

4. The number of apartments facing onto Albert Street has grown considerably since first viewing of the plans. There are a number of residents of that street who have very

real concerns about privacy and noise issues. We have concerns about both the general precedent and amenity of the area.

5. The site has approval for 150 apartments. The applicant claims that there is suitable mix of apartments from single to 3 bedroom apartments, but conceded during the voluntary community meeting that the so-called 3 bedroom apartments were indeed 2 bedrooms with sunroom. Little seems to have changed to the plans since then. It is therefore not unreasonable to consider that these extra 9 apartments have not properly been considered and are solely to the financial benefit of the developer.

At any rate, the proposed FSR of 1.99:1 greatly exceeds the current allowable ratio.

We have, as members of the Redfern Society, been approached by a number of residents adjacent to the development who have both shadowing and amenity issues. These MUST be addressed and we suggest you contact each adjoining property, including apartments in apartment blocks.

We believe this development is poorly designed and there are health and amenity concerns for the entire neighbourhood which have not been adequately addressed. You must reject this current application as it exceeds FSR significantly, has serious shadowing and amenity impacts.

Yours truly
David Williams and Robert Barry