

Client

Mirvac

Project

7 Railway Street Chatswood
Outcomes Report

Date

11 August 2010

Contact

Oliver Young
9387 2600
oliver@elton.com.au



Sydney
t (02) 9387 2600
PO Box 1488
Level 6, 332-342 Oxford St
Bondi Junction NSW 1355
f (02) 9387 2557
consulting@elton.com.au
www.elton.com.au
ABN 56 003 853 101

Prepared by	Oliver Young
Date	11 August 2010
Job number	10/1817
Document name	7 Railway Street Chatswood Outcomes Report
Version	Final

This document is
printed on paper produced
using sustainable forestry
practices and chlorine
free pulp

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Consultation overview	3
2.1	Consultation objectives	3
2.2	Consultation activities	3
2.3	Consultation context	3
3	Issues analysis	4
3.1	Stakeholder feedback	4
Appendix A		6
Appendix B		9
Appendix C		11

Appendices

Appendix A: Mirvac notes of 22 July 2010 meeting (Willoughby City Council and Mirvac)

Appendix B: Willoughby City Council notes of 22 July 2010 meeting (Willoughby City Council and Mirvac)

Appendix C: Record of meeting with Chatswood Chamber of Commerce on 11 August 2010

1 Introduction

Mirvac is lodging an application with the NSW Department of Planning (DoP) to develop a 43 storey mixed use commercial and residential building, together with three areas of public open space, at 7 Railway Street in Chatswood. The subject site is adjacent to the North Shore railway line and located next to two existing residential towers that have been developed by Mirvac, Epica Apartments and Cambridge Apartments. The subject site is in the Pacific Place precinct.

The proposal was declared a major project on 18 September 2009 and will ultimately be determined by the Minister for Planning under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Director-General's requirements (DGRs) were issued for the project in November 2009.

Section 13 of the relevant DGRs requires that Mirvac *"undertake an appropriate and justified level of community consultation in accordance with the Departments Major Projects Community Consultation Guidelines October 2007."*

Mirvac engaged community consultation specialists Elton Consulting to independently facilitate a period of consultation with those direct interested in the proposal.

Accordingly, this report provides information on:

- Community consultation activities undertaken prior to lodgement of the application with the DoP and
- Feedback received during the period of consultation (28 June 2010 to 23 July 2010).

It is important to note that the feedback contained in this report:

- Is not part of the formal public exhibition process which will be held following lodgement of the application with the DoP;
- Cannot be construed as being statistically representative of opinion within the wider local community;
- Was gathered as part of a statutory planning process and
- Represents comments on draft concepts prepared by Mirvac.

2 Consultation overview

The purpose of consultations was to provide individuals and organisations likely to have a direct interest in the proposal with information on the project and an opportunity to express their views.

As per the Major Project Guidelines 2007, the community of interest for these consultations were:

- Those directly impacted by the project (neighbouring residents) and
- Individuals and groups likely to have an interest in the local or regional implications of the project (Willoughby Council, the Member for Willoughby and the Willoughby Chamber of Commerce).

(Please note: Elton Consulting understand that Mirvac also undertook consultations with Railcorp)

2.1 Consultation objectives

The key objectives of this consultation were to:

- Create community awareness of the proposal;
- Provide accurate and relevant information about the draft proposal to adjacent residents, Willoughby Council and the Member for Willoughby;
- Provide a forum for stakeholders to comment on the proposal prior to the application being lodged with the DoP and
- Assist the project team to better understand the local context and specific site issues.

2.2 Consultation activities

Stakeholder briefings were held with representatives from the adjacent residential developments including:

- The Pacific Place Community Association including the Epica Apartments Executive Committee;
- The Cambridge Apartments Executive Committee;
- Residents from the upper level of Epica Apartments and
- Executive members of Regency Apartments (2A and 2B Help Street).

Briefings were also provided to Willoughby Council officers and the Member for Willoughby.

The meetings were attended by representatives from Mirvac and Elton Consulting. Elton Consulting were not present at the briefing with Council officers.

Meetings were also held in early August 2010 with:

- The Willoughby Chamber of Commerce, attended by Mirvac and Elton Consulting* (*See Appendix C for record of meeting*)
- The residents on level 31 of Epica Apartments onsite at their residence (attended by Mirvac)

2.3 Consultation context

Stakeholders at the briefings were shown Power Point presentations with draft content comprising:

- A site plan;
- Photos;
- A rendered image from the corner of the Pacific Highway and Railway Street;
- A rendered image of Western Plaza landscaping;
- Approved and proposed building footprints, open space and building setbacks;
- View analysis: Cambridge Apartments;
- View analysis: Epica Apartments, Levels 2 – 27;
- Approved and proposed photo montages from Epica Apartments Level 32 facing South;
- Building heights of surrounding buildings in plan and section;
- Public open space concept;
- Section through tower
- Basement entry level and B1.

3 Issues analysis

3.1 Stakeholder feedback

A record of issues raised during stakeholder meetings was taken by Elton Consulting. A themed summary of issues raised at these meetings is outlined below.

3.1.1 Pacific Place Community Association

Changes to approved plan

Members of the Community Association supported the removal of retail on the ground floor of 7 Railway Street indicated in original plan (approximately seven shops) on the basis that:

- Existing retail and commercial space surrounding the site is not being fully utilised and
- Additional retail space could increase the amount of foot traffic in the local area diminishing amenity for Pacific Place residents.

Public open space

Security concerns were raised in relation to the proposed public open space areas, particularly the podium level above the rail enclosure structure.

- The existing boundary fence, which currently separates Pacific Place residents from the proposed open space, was not seen as sufficient to deter members of the public from entering the Pacific Place residential precinct;
- This area is adjacent to a childcare centre;
- Relative privacy offered by the podium level open space may encourage anti social behaviours, particularly at night and
- It was suggested that the public not be allowed to access the open space above the RES and that a plan of management be investigated to restrict entry to the podium level open space at night.

Visual amenity – Epica Apartments

There was general acknowledgement that the visual orientation of the Epica Apartments is primarily East and West, preserving the views of the majority of Epica Apartments' residents. However, it was raised that the views of levels 31 and 32 would be impacted by the proposed new building.

On-street parking

It was suggested that there are existing parking issues in Railway St caused by removal trucks moving in residents to Epica Apartments.

Members of the Owners Corporation reported that this is caused by the height of the Epica Apartments loading dock entry which is not high enough to accommodate many removal trucks.

It was suggested that Mirvac review the loading dock entry heights for the proposed 7 Railway Street building to ensure entry for removal trucks and garbage trucks.

Protection from wind

There was a query as to whether the new plan will provide the Pacific Place precinct with sufficient protection from prevailing winds.

Representatives from the Owners Corporation reported that the orientation of the approved building footprint provided a better wind barrier to southerly winds than presently exists on the vacant site.

3.1.2 Epica Apartments - level 31 residents

Residents on level 31 of the Epica Apartments reported a range of issues including:

- The height of the proposed building would significantly impact views currently enjoyed to the south ;
- The proximity and orientation of the north facing balconies on the proposed building would significantly impact privacy as units on levels 30 and 31 have south facing windows;
- Both the loss of views and privacy would impact their property value;
- Traffic and parking issues including:
 - Problems with removal trucks parking on Railway Street as they are unable to get into the Epica Apartments loading dock
 - Help Street seen as a dangerous intersection for pedestrians. The original Pacific Place master plan included a pedestrian bridge across which was seen as a positive
- Concerns around potential security issues for Pacific Place residents in regard to the proposed open space. Particular concerns were raised around the potential for anti social behaviours in and around the proposed podium level open space above the RES.

3.1.3 Cambridge Apartments Executive Committee

Visual amenity

Members of the Cambridge Apartments executive indicated that the orientation of the proposed 7 Railway Street building would impact view corridors through MacIntosh Street and views to the South West (Homebush Bay).

Security concerns around proposed open space

The Cambridge Executive raised a number of security concerns in relation to the proposed open space areas including:

- The podium level open space area above the RES provides an easily accessible entry point for members of the public to the Cambridge apartments;
- Safety issues related to the childcare centre and
- The Podium level open space could potentially attract anti-social behaviours particularly at night

Security concerns were also raised in regards to the tunnel which runs from the 7 Railway Street site to the forecourt of Cambridge Apartments. There was a view that the proposed open space may attract high school kids and antisocial behaviour that would flow through the tunnel to the forecourt of Cambridge Apartments.

Impact on property values

Members of the Cambridge Executive reported concerns about the impact of the proposed new building on Cambridge Apartment property values due to loss of visual amenity by the height, scale and proximity of the new building in relation to Cambridge Apartments.

3.1.4 Regency Apartments – 2A and 2B Help Street

Height and scale of proposed building

Representatives of the Regency Apartments Executive reported perceived impacts caused by the height and scale of the proposed building to be the main issue, in particular:

- That the increased height of the proposed building would cause significant loss of sunlight and overshadowing to the Regency Apartment complex and adjacent open spaces and
- That properties on the western side of Regency Apartments would experience a loss of privacy.

It was suggested that a lowering of the proposed tower height might be achieved by spreading the

building footprint over the proposed public open space and private open space intended for the residents of 7 Railway Street over the railway line.

Impact on property values

The Regency Apartments Executive indicated concerns regarding the impact on property values from loss of amenity caused by overshadowing and loss of light

Security concerns around proposed open space

It was suggested that the proposed open space areas at 7 Railway Street had the potential to be a security risk for adjacent residential buildings in Pacific Place:

- Potential for anti social behaviours and
- Increased foot traffic.

Change of use of site

A number of members of the Regency Executive indicated that the building height and use should not be changed from the existing approved 23 storey commercial building as there is existing demand for commercial office space in Chatswood.

3.1.5 Local member feedback

Feedback was received from the Member for Willoughby. Key issues included:

- There is the potential for impacts on the amenity of adjoining properties;
- The proposal may generate traffic impacts;
- Increasing the commercial component could be considered;
- Residential development in the Chatswood CBD provides an opportunity to maintain the integrity of surrounding low density suburbs in the Willoughby LGA
- Disappointment that a resolution could not be reached with Willoughby City Council
- Concerns regarding potential security impacts of the proposed open space on adjacent Pacific Place residential buildings
- Generally supportive of overall concept.

3.1.6 Willoughby Council feedback

A meeting was also held with Willoughby Council Officers on 22 July 2010. Elton Consulting were not present at the briefing with Council. A detailed record of the meeting and issues raised was taken by both Mirvac and Willoughby Council officers. These have been attached as Appendix A and Appendix B.

Appendix A



MEMORANDUM

Date 22 July 2010

To Oliver Young (Elton Consulting)

CC Simon Healy

From Nicole Vince

Subject **7 Railway St Chatswood**

Notes of briefing session held with Greg Woodhams and Noni De Carvalho of Willoughby City Council held at Mirvac on 22 July 2010

1.0 Introduction

- Mirvac advised of up coming intention to lodge and updated Council on community consultation process. Apologies given for Elton Consulting.
- GW advised that Council object to the proposal on the basis it is inconsistent with the Masterplan, Metro Strategy, Inner North Sub-Regional Strategy

2.0 Water Feature

GW noted water feature had been removed. Mirvac advised the RES walls would be screened by vertical elements such as rail tracks with vines grown up them.

3.0 Neighbouring Buildings

GW advised that 4 McIntosh Street and 7 Help Street had been identified as a likely commercial redevelopment with the current owners discussing options for a commercial building with 1,500m² floor plates. It was suggested that Mirvac consider the design and cross viewing impacts of the relationship between the sites.

4.0 Eastern Plaza & Through Site Link

GW asked whether the retail space on the Eastern Plaza remained. Mirvac advised that it was not included in the proposal because the area of the land on the Eastern Plaza was too narrow to support a stand alone building and that there was insufficient foot traffic for support the use.

Mirvac advised the through site link would be maintained.

5.0 Upper Plaza (Top of Railway Enclosure Structure)

Mirvac advised the space above the RES will be provided as public open space in line with Council's objectives. GW asked whether there was an active use on the RES such as a café (as per the commercial scheme). Mirvac advised there was no café and retail uses could not be commercially supported on top of the RES. GW suggested in lieu of stairs and terraces providing access to the RES from the Western Plaza, that a glass lift similar to that at Hickson Rd Walsh Bay could be considered. Mirvac advised that the ramps and terraces were a function of the basement design below and would be retained and used for terraces and access.

Mirvac advised that public consultation with Pacific Place had identified that the residents preferred the top of the RES to be for Pacific Place / 7 Railway St residents only due to security concerns. Both parties agreed a management plan should be in place to close the area at night.

6.0 Landscaping

GW / ND asked whether there would be deep soil for trees and to reduce wind impacts. Mirvac advised there would be zones with deep soil and that trees would be planted in line with the Wind Consultant's recommendations and there will be trees along Help and Railway St.

7.0 Residential

Mirvac advised the scheme would comprise 304 apartments which was an increase from the 277 on the PEAR. The scheme with 277 apartments had almost 50% 3 Bedroom apartments and Mirvac decided to increase the number of 1 beds and 2 beds thereby increasing the number of apartments.

8.0 Commercial

It was discussed in line with DoP's letter 3,600 – 4,000m² GFA was considered substantial and would be provided in three floors. GW / ND advised they had been notified of this by email from DoP.

Referring to the section of the building, Council advised that as a potential compromise, they may be supportive if levels 5 – 14 were converted into commercial resulting in about 12,000 – 13,000m² GFA of commercial. ND advised this was still below the 24,000m² commercial which was the figure given to the DoP by Council used to factor job creation in Chatswood.

9.0 Car parking

Mirvac advised car parking has been reduced since the PEAR with parking in line with DCP rates. GW asked about the clearance height of the basement to ensure loading. Mirvac advised the existing clearance to the shared access driveway would be maintained.

10.0 Sustainability

GW asked if the building was going to be 6 stars with a co-generation plant. Mirvac advised that it would be BASIX compliant with rainwater collection, solar panels and other active and passive ESD design features.

11.0 Section 94 contributions

GW asked if contributions had been calculated yet. Mirvac advised that this still needed to be addressed.

12.0 Shadows / Solar access to Neighbours

Mirvac tabled draft shadow diagrams illustrating the impact to Victoria Mall between 11.30 – 2pm during winter solstice. The impact on Victoria Mall was reduced compared to the approved commercial scheme. ND asked about impact on surrounding neighbours. Mirvac advised this would be done with the submission.

13.0 Timing

GW asked about timing / commencement of the development considering that the CTI site was on the market. Mirvac advised that we would likely proceed regardless of how the sale of the CTI site goes because we offer a different product.

14.0 FSR

ND asked what the FSR was. Mirvac advised that this would be considered in the submission and was still being finalised. However, the FSR would be higher than the approved commercial scheme but the building footprint was likely to be approximately 30% less.

15.0 Final Comments

GW stated that they were opposed to the development. It provided no benefit to Chatswood. It was contrary to the Chatswood Strategy. It was not required to meet dwelling supply targets. DoP had advised them yesterday that DoP should not compromise centres such as Chatswood. GW stated that these views were his and ND's views and not Council's view. However, they had spoken to Council who had indicated they had similar views. GW / ND want a development on this site – just not this type. Mirvac advised post lodgement a letter would be circulated to residents advising of the lodgement and how to view the documents. ND confirmed that in addition to this DoP would also run a notification. Mirvac agreed to send GW a copy of the letter to be circulated to residents. It was discussed that Council would like a briefing post lodgement with key features and rendered images provided.

Appendix B

WCC OFFICER COMMENTS ON THE MIRVAC PROPOSAL FOR 7 RAILWAY STREET, CHATSWOOD – MP_0154.

1. We continue to be implacably opposed to the development. The proposal is a short term view of development for the land without consideration of the appropriate strategic planning for Sydney and Chatswood.
2. Undermines Chatswood's future as a major strategic centre on the north side of Sydney.
3. Contrary to the s117 Directions 1.1 and 7.1.
4. Contrary to the Metro Strategy and Draft Inner North Subregional Strategy by significantly reducing job providing land use in a major centre.
5. Residential dwelling targets of the Metro Strategy are met elsewhere in Willoughby.
6. Will result in Chatswood not being able to meet its jobs targets for the Metro Strategy. Land supply for business uses in Chatswood is limited. The site is essential for significant employment generation and business balance in Chatswood.
7. Will set an adverse precedent for other sites and existing buildings to seek residential use in the current property market.
8. Does not consider the long term strategic role of major subregional centres like Chatswood that requires the provision of jobs and business activity at transport nodal locations.
9. Ignores Chatswood's role in the Global Arc of Sydney.
10. Exceeds the floor space and height controls of SREP5. Exceeds the floor space controls for residential development on the Pacific Place site in SREP5.
11. Contrary to the exhibited Draft WLEP 2009 which proposes to zone the site B3 Commercial Core where residential development is prohibited consistent with the Pacific Place negotiated and agreed outcomes between Council and Mirvac and ratified in the site specific environmental planning instrument changes in 2000.
12. Contrary to the site specific DCP provisions for the Pacific Place site.
13. Contrary to the Master Plan approval in Development Consent 1999/1812.
14. A commercial office building has already been approved by Council in accordance with all objectives, principles and controls for the Pacific Place site and substantial commencement has occurred.
15. Public precinct open space provision on the site generated floor space bonus. Public precinct is part of the site that is maintained and managed by the site owner for use by occupants and the public for recreation. Active use of the area at the top of the rail enclosure structure by outside seating attached to café/restaurant on the north facing section of the approved development was an essential attribute for the success use of the open space that will not be provided by the proposal.
16. Council will not accept an open space dedication and take on responsibility for maintenance when the open space is in stratum.

17. Retention of the pedestrian link under the railway is supported subject to appropriate design.
18. Shadowing impacts on nearby sites and the public domain especially Railway Street, future Interchange units/open space and the Mall need to be confirmed.
19. Potential amenity impacts (privacy and view loss) with future redevelopment of adjoining commercial lands to the east.
20. Extent of loss of views by Cambridge, Epica and Regency to be confirmed.
21. Landscape scheme deletes water feature in original concept;
22. Access to RES top could be simplified by a glass lift;
23. Location of retail at Help St corner does not exploit potential of the exposure to the open space, especially for café use.
24. Ensure adequate clearance for trucks to loading area.
25. Reduction in car parking supported;
26. Council may look more favourably on an alternative scheme that extended the lower office levels up to Level 14 with a wider floor plate then residential above (additional 10,000-12,000 GFA commercial)
27. Development should achieve at least a 4 star green rating incorporating cogeneration

These are not the views of the Council but represent the preliminary views of the Council Officers in relation to the draft Concept scheme.

Greg Woodhams
Environmental Services Director

Appendix C

Record of meeting with Chatswood Chamber of Commerce

A briefing was held with the Chatswood Chamber of Commerce on 11 August 2010. The meeting was attended by representatives from Mirvac, Elton Consulting and Directors from the Chamber.

A power point presentation was given by Mirvac, identical to the presentation shown at stakeholder briefings with adjacent residents.

A summary of feedback received from those who attended the briefing from the Chatswood Chamber of Commerce is outlined below:

- The site is strategically located next to transport (Chatswood Station) making it an important site for employment uses;
- Planning for this site should take into account both the long term and short term needs of the community;
- The Chamber supports local business and as such would like to see more commercial in the Chatswood CBD. There was a general consensus that there has been very little new commercial stock come onto the local market for some time;
- There was a recognition that the commercial property market in Chatswood has been in decline for some time and that making commercial work on the 7 Railway site would be difficult;
- Attendees reported a range of issues leading to the decline of the Chatswood commercial property market including:
 - Lack of onsite parking within local commercial buildings
 - Comparative cost of Chatswood office space when compared to alternative locations
 - Increase of commercial stock across the lower North Shore.