

ASHFIELD & DISTRICT HISTORICAL SOCIETY Inc

The Society's Rooms are located at
Thirning Villa, Pratten Park
Arthur Street, Ashfield.
Email address: adhs@optusnet.com.au

*P.O. Box 20
Ashfield NSW 1800*

29 March 2013

Director, Metropolitan & Regional Projects South
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001
Attention: Mark Brown

By email: mark.brown@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Brown

**RE: MP10_0180 Stage 1 Project Application Summer Hill (former) Flour Mill – 2-32
Smith St, Summer Hill**

The Ashfield & District Historical Society (ADHS) has previously made written submissions during the exhibition of the Concept Plan and to the Planning and Assessment Commission (PAC). I also addressed the PAC at its meeting on the 20/11/12 on the Society's behalf.

As a local resident some 100metres from the Edward St boundary of the site and with qualifications and experience in both town planning and heritage conservation, I have also made submissions to the Department and the PAC on the Concept Plan.

These submissions have made reference to the valued landscape elements of the overall site and their heritage significant as noted in the assessment completed by Rod Howard in 1998. Particular attention has been drawn to the avenue of brush box in the northern sector of the site (retained in the Concept Plan) and the line of wine glass palms at the Smith St frontage and the significant trees at the corner of Smith/Edward Sts (also shown in the Concept Plan and Preferred Project Plan).

In response, p39 of the final Preferred Project Report submitted by SJB in March 2012 notes:

“The trees at the Smith Street frontage, including the wine glass palms, are proposed to be retained and incorporated into the publicly accessible open space areas.”

The Stage 1 Project Application plans however show the **removal** of these significant trees at the Smith Street corner with Edward Street, the justification apparently to be found in arborist Stuart Pettendrih's report.

Mr Pettendrigh rates these trees at low streetscape value and further he states they are not significant in the locality. These views are certainly **not** those of the AD&HS Committee (which includes members with relevant qualifications) nor myself as a resident of the immediate locality. Other residents I have spoken to are also surprised (and then annoyed) at Mr Pettendrigh's assessment.

Mr Pettendrigh does note in his report that his comments are based on a visual inspection of the tree() only, with no root investigations, drilling or sampling. He surmises that the roots are likely to be under the existing driveway and carpark (at the front of the existing former mill office building) and that '... (they) won't survive the (proposed) construction'. However the Concept Plan/PPP does **not** show any proposed development further north than the existing north –facing wall of this existing office building and, given that this building has an existing basement area and is separated from the trees by the width of a driveway and carpark, it is difficult to see how Mr Pettendrigh can arrive at his conclusion that the trees can be removed, certainly without any investigation.

The Concept Plan/PPP documents show that the Stage 1 Edward Street terrace as a terrace of **eight (8)** dwellings, with the northernmost end wall of the terrace aligning with the **southern** side of the existing Edward St driveway crossing (to the office carpark referred to above). This can be established by reference to the curvature of the Edward St boundary, which commences on the northern side of this driveway crossing. However, the Project Application shows this terrace as nine **(9)** dwellings – any encroachment to the north of the existing office building should not be permitted and the siting of the terrace (if it is to be approved at 9) relocated to extend further to the south along Edward St, which can be readily accommodated. This would preserve the status quo for the Smith/Edward St trees.

The correct approach in ADHS's view is for recognised protective measures to be taken for these Smith/Edward Street trees during the construction phase (including excavation), as commonly applies (including when dealing with the retention of trees) by conditions of consent. If there has been a northern encroachment of the terrace by the Stage 1 plans this should be corrected, in furtherance of the protection of these trees.

Thank you for the opportunity to make the above submission.

Yours Sincerely

David Rollinson
BA, M Sc(Arch Cons), Dip Urban Studies, Dip T&CP, PhD
President, Ashfield & District Historical Society.

NOTE: The Stage 1 Project Application also proposes retail floor space at the Smith St end of Building 4A. The Concept Plan/PPP at no stage envisaged anything other than residential uses for this part of the site. The provision of retail areas here is surprising as the overall provision of 44 dwellings in this Stage would not generate a viable level of resident demand and there is no evidence of any wider locality need.

Retail floor space should only be provided within the Mungo Scott buildings and near to the light rail station, as the Concept Plan shows.