

The NSW Department of Planning & Environment's call for submissions on the Application to convert the **Department of Education and Lands buildings - 23-33 & 35-39 Bridge Street - to Hotels.**

Secretary of the Department set out requirements, one of which was consultation with the community and local landowners. The Section on Community – Public Consultation – seems entirely taken up with Government entities.

I cannot see where the Department has made any effort at all to talk directly with and consult the Owners of Bridgeport, 38-42 Bridge Street, Sydney. How would you respond on this please?

The failure to call upon and **consult** with Bridgeport Owners on such a major proposal, which will no doubt run concurrently with AMPs major redevelopment project on the Eastern and Northern sides of our Residential building, might surely only be interpreted as a complete disregard for the concerns and social/financial wellbeing of Bridgeport Owners/Residents.

I am looking at section 6.10 of the Stage 1 EIS– there was no consultation with the community or with us as landowners. This seems relevant to the Stage 1 modification. Then there is the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirement for Stage 1, Item 9. Bridgeport owners are affected landowners and yet we were not consulted. There is no mention of Bridgeport in the Environmental Impact Assessment so how/why was Stage 1 consent granted? As well, it seems that the Department did not inform the Secretary that her requirements had not been complied with.

As such, I do not agree with the proposed modification to the Stage 1 consent. The increase in height to the top of the ladder would further limit the outlook from my windows, and I have not been consulted in accordance with the Secretary's requirements.

Please confirm that you will this time bring this to her attention, since the Department failed to do so at the time of the Stage 1 application.

Trish Burt



15 December 2016



NO INCREASE IN HEIGHT TO TOP OF LADDER

From: Trish Burt <[REDACTED]>
To: "pittwater@parliament.nsw.gov.au" <pittwater@parliament.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Saturday, 3 December 2016, 12:13
Subject: EDUCATION AND LANDS BUILDINGS - BRIDGEPORT APARTMENTS

Dear Minister Stokes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

As two-thirds of Bridgeport Residents are either immediately opposite the Department of Education building or face the Lands building, it is perhaps appropriate to draw to everyone's attention to the proposal to light the entire facades of these two buildings and the impact it will have on those who reside at Bridgeport?

Bridgeport Residents may be more than slightly offended were they to realise that we appear to have not been treated as key stakeholders, unlike the owners of 50 Bridge Street (AMP), which is a more distant property.

In relation to the section on lighting (page 39 of the EIS) - I reference the points listed at the end of this email. Importantly: according to **Council for the City of Sydney's Development Control Plan**:

"External lighting must not disturb the amenity of residents in the locality."

Planning's Brendon Roberts, Team Leader, Key Sites Assessments, recommends that we read a page 'overleaf' to his 16 November 2016 letter. Were that that was all that is needed...

I cannot find any consideration of whether the lighting will disturb Bridgeport Residents; the facades will obviously be bright. (See also the attached Appendix.)

One assumes the proposals presented for these two buildings to NSW Residents is a 'done deal' and by way of receiving a letter and inviting one to make a Submission, our State Government considers that Community Consultation has taken place. Yes/No?

If I am not mistaken, the claimed 'windfall' to NSW tax payers in rental for these properties is somewhere in the vicinity of \$3,500.00 per building per week for the next 120 years. Yes/No?

[REDACTED]

Will the Department of Planning and the Environment please provide full details on how the planned construction works, lighting, etc, etc on the Department of Education and Lands buildings will disturb the amenity of residents in the locality, i.e. those who live opposite, and how could/would we be compensated?

Sincerely

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[Neighbours Not Strangers](#)
[PETITION](#)
[Facebook](#)

3.10 Illumination Strategy

A conceptual Illumination Strategy has been prepared by Point of View and is appended to the Architectural Design Report at **Appendix B**. The general approach that will be adopted for the Lands Building includes:

- § uplighting inside sculpture niches and the face of existing sculptures;
- § uplighting to column facades to major windows;
- § lighting to balustrades;
- § uplighting to the underside of arches from spotlights mounted to ledges;
- § mounting of linear LEDs to the top side of ledges to uplight cornices;
- § provision of cool white illumination to the roof structure;
- § mounting of linear LEDs to frieze and top face of ledge;
- § provision of low profile linear LED projectors to accent the upper façade;
- § provision of low profile line LED projectors to accent the main clock façade within the clock tower;
- § uplighting to the mid-level clock tower columns and arches;
- § provision of LED s to wash the underside of the tower cap;
- § backlit clock fascia; and
- § provision of cooler white tower dome to accentuate a change in materiality.

The lighting design for the Education Building includes:

- § ground recessed uplights to enhance the entry portal within the rusticated podium;
- § provision of in-ground uplights to illuminate the rusticated sandstone façade, which will also provide reflected light to the public domain;
- § provision of low profile linear LED projectors to accent the main columns;
- § provision of surface mounted accent lights to the underside of the balcony and linear LEDs to uplight the balustrade;
- § provision of spot lights mounted to the top side of the balcony to illuminate the decorative carvings on the façade;
- § mounting of linear LEDs to the top side of the ledge to uplight the cornice;
- § mounting of linear projector LEDs to the top side of the ledge to uplight the façade and indirectly illumine the upper cornice;
- § mounting of linear LEDs on the ledge to uplight scrolls;
- § provision of cool colour temperature to the new façade;
- § provision of surface mounted uplights to new glazed façade;
- § provision of uplights to illuminate the façade cladding in between glazing on the new roof;
- § integration of linear LEDs to the nose of the new roof canopy, to provide a wash of consistent light;
- § provision of reflected lighting and protection of a water ripple to the underside of the upper canopy.