

**From:** Lisa Delazzari <delazzaril@y7mail.com>  
**To:** "Caroline.Owen@planning.nsw.gov.au" <Caroline.Owen@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 4/14/2013 7:46 pm  
**Subject:** Objections to MP06\_0171 MOD 8, MP08\_0253 MOD 4 & SSD 5700-2012

14 April 2013

Attention: Ms Caroline Owen

Ref: MP06\_0171 MOD 8, MP08\_0253 MOD 4 & SSD 5700-2012

I make the following objections to the above mentioned applications by Frasers for the Central Park site.

This proposal represents a significant departure from the land uses which were originally considered for this particular site, and with that departure comes a completely different set of potential impacts, none of which appear to have been adequately addressed. It has the potential to substantially change the character of the locality which is likely to result in corresponding social and economic impacts. It does not comply with the Concept Plan.

This application does not contain a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) for the project. Commercial use is the predominate land use which has been identified in all of the key strategic documents for this area of the Central Park site, and a shift towards housing for student accommodation is a substantial movement away from this original land use and has significantly different potential implications on the local area, all of which need to be addressed in a comprehensive social impact assessment.

The following non-compliance items relating to SEPP 65 are noted from Appendix 1 of the EIS:

1. Building separation, should be 14 metres but is less than 13 metres
2. Building orientation for solar access
3. Site area available as deep soil planting areas, to allow mature tree-planting
4. Minimum unit sizes, to provide adequate space for resident comfort and utility
5. Minimum percentage of kitchens with natural ventilation, to minimise the need for mechanical ventilation and energy consumption
6. Solar access in mid-winter. Only has 42% compliance with extended catchment hours ie: 0700 to 1700 hrs
7. Storage areas, for occupants' use
8. Minimum balcony depth, for adequate outdoor open space

The environmental risk assessment is incomplete and should be revised. Changing from commercial to residential use would have a detrimental effect on economic activity. This has not been factored into the risk assessment and should have been. Neither have the substantial social risks of overloading this area with a demographic dominated by foreign students.

The Director-General's

Requirements required the economic impact assessment to address" ... specifically (the) impacts resulting from the deletion of the approved commercial floor space and the provision of a predominantly residential development." The EIS does not identify what the consequences of removing the office space may be, as the DGRs explicitly require.

The economic impact assessment, is subjective ,misleading and incomplete. It does not address alternative uses for the Block 4S site. For example:

- Whether there are other forms of development, which may also have positive economic and social effects in the locality, to a greater degree than would student accommodation.
- Whether the Central Park precinct and the locality would benefit from a greater proportion of permanent-resident housing overall,
- The quantum of student housing proposed for Central Park, with regard to strategic planning objectives, for the site and the locality
- Planning and development of a State Significant Site which should not be driven by relatively short-term economic conditions.

The design of the proposed building is highly purpose-built. The lack of adaptability to other uses of such a purpose- built project brings its longer term sustainability into question.

The "affordability" of the rent for the proposed accommodation, for students, is questionable.

Permanent residents are more likely to provide a greater contribution to both day-time and evening economies compared with students. A high proportion of permanent households would have higher disposable incomes than student households.

Yours sincerely,

Lisa De Lazzari  
PO BOX 814

Broadway 2007

## Second Submission from Objector

**From:** Lisa Delazzari <delazzari@y7mail.com>  
**To:** "caroline.owen@planning.nsw.gov.au" <caroline.owen@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 4/24/2013 8:54 am  
**Subject:** SUBJECT: Mod. 06-1717 Mod 8 OBJECTION

Dear Caroline,

It has just been brought to my attention that this modification to the approved Concept Plan proposes to allow Block 1 land use to be changed from commercial to residential use, should the proponent wish to do so. No other details about Block 1 are supplied at this stage, by which I can understand what is proposed.

I strongly object to the proposed changes to the Concept Plan to allow the changes to the land use for Block 1, should the proponent choose to do so.

Any change to the land use for Block 1 should go through a proper application process via a SSD so that the details are fully known and can be reviewed by the public. At that time a further modification can accompany the plan. To make a modification now to the overall residential/commercial mix without providing further detail, is particularly disappointing and totally contrary to the representations that were previously made.

This application accompanies a separate application to exercise Block 4S from Block 1, to enable student accommodation

I strongly object to the change in land use for Block 4S because it does not meet the relevant SEPP 65 guidelines and has a cumulative impact in terms of local residential amenity and social sustainability.

The approval of the concept plan was made on the basis of a minimum of at least 30% commercial and residential use to ensure the best planning outcomes.

I object in the strongest form and ask that the Department ensure proper probity and that the public is properly informed.

Yours sincerely  
L DeLazzari  
Long term Resident of Chippendale