

PO Box 181  
Summer Hill  
NSW 2130  
08/05/2013

NSW Planning and Infrastructure

Attention Mark Brown

Dear Sir,

**Re MP 10\_0180 Stage 1 Project Application for a mixed use development of the Former Allied Mills Site.**

My wife and I have been the owners of, and have resided at, 15 Edward St Summer Hill for just on 31 years.

We were disappointed to find out on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May that an exhibition to support the proposed development of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site had been on display. We had received no notification that this was happening, either from the applicants or from Ashfield Municipal Council, and found out a week ago from a neighbour, and an officer of your department emailed us the web site details. Hence our submission of comments is made today.

We are not opposed to the redevelopment of the site to residential and some commercial uses in general terms, but we do have serious concerns about the specifics as set out in the documents and plans on your website. These have been used, particularly the concept plan, architectural plans and traffic and parking assessments. Our comments follow.

1. Height of buildings facing Edward St.
  - a. The predominant residence style in Edward St is free standing single storey dwellings with a few 2 storey dwellings. Most were built in the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, or perhaps even a little earlier. There are no 3 or 4 storey structures in Edward St. and no row of terraces.
  - b. The Concept Plan indicates a 4/6 floor building will be erected opposite our house located at 15 Edward St. In fact this is the only building of greater than 2 storeys facing Edward St proposed in the concept plan for the development of the Summer Hill Flour Mill Site. Consequently the height of buildings fronting Edward St proposed in the concept plan will disadvantage us and our immediate neighbours more than any other Edward St residents, and this is not fair treatment.
  - c. The proposed 4/6 storey building to be erected opposite our residence at 15 Edward St will occlude the sky we are currently able to enjoy. It will also degrade our privacy by creating a situation where people living on the opposite side of Edward St will be looking down into our living room and our main bedroom. Once again the concept plan does not treat our residence fairly.
  - d. It is noted that there are other areas deeper in the site which are currently shown as open space which could be used to erect a 4/6 floor building. Some of the open space could be relocated to the Edward St frontage, thereby providing an amenity

for all Summer Hill residents, rather than being restricted for the enjoyment of unspecified private users. The developers should explain why they are proposing to improve the amenity for new residents at the expense of degrading the amenity of our property which we have enjoyed for more than 31 years.

- e. We strenuously object to the possibility of a multi storey building being constructed opposite our home, or anywhere else in Edward St. The concept plan needs amendment to stop promotion of such a concept. All buildings fronting Edward St should be limited to 2 storeys maximum.

2. The design of buildings facing Edward St.

- a. The plans suggest a very modern, 21<sup>st</sup> century appearance to the proposed terraces on Edward St which will clash aesthetically with the existing free standing residences built in the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This appearance will detract from the current appeal of the existing buildings as residences, and no doubt degrade the value of the existing residences once the modern structures are built on the eastern side of Edward Street.
- b. The architects should be charged with the task of designing buildings which are compatible with the existing, predominantly one or two storey free standing homes in Edward St., and not design buildings which clash with the existing residences on the western side of Edward Street.

3. Traffic through the site.

- a. The current plan has the potential to put a great many more cars into Edward St., particularly during peak hour. In fact up to ¾ of the vehicles housed in the site's proposed underground car parks, and much of the site's on- street parking, could end up using Edward St. to arrive at or depart from their parking location. In other words hundreds more vehicles will probably use Edward St, Smith St and Old Canterbury Rd.
- b. At peak times Edward St is already congested at the Smith St intersection, with traffic from the roundabout at the junction of Smith and Carlton Crescent already backed up in Smith St to the west of Edward St. In fact at 8 am this morning (08/05/13), this traffic was banked up back to Lackey St.
- c. Consideration should be given to restricting traffic in the two new internal roads on the site to be in one direction only. The new roads are those that run from Edward St to Smith St and the other which runs from Edward St to Old Canterbury Rd. It would be preferable from the Edward St perspective for the entry to the site to be from the Edward St entrances, and the exits out onto Smith St and Old Canterbury Rd. If the developers are correct in their assessment of the minimal impact of the additional traffic generated by their proposed development, this submission should pose no additional problems.
- d. The increased traffic in Edward St is underestimated, both from this proposal and the adjacent McGill St development. The traffic study shows 0 increased traffic in Edward St resulting from the McGill St development, despite the fact that a lot of traffic in Edward St comes out of Lewisham via Toothill St and then into Old Canterbury Rd, and thence into Edward St (or goes in the opposite direction). This

being so, by direct observation over many years, it defies logic to think that the Macgill St development will not add to it, for the people exiting that development and wanting to travel to Summer Hill or through it, are faced with the same decision as those exiting Toothill St. As has been pointed out above, many of these take the route through Edward St, where there are no speed humps.

- e. A more thorough study of the existing traffic flow needs to be undertaken, and reasonable projections made for the impact of additional cars.
- f. There is no existing exit from Summer Hill to turn South-west into Old Canterbury Road through an intersection controlled by traffic lights. The intersection of Edward St and Old Canterbury Rd should have traffic lights controlling the intersection in both directions to and from Old Canterbury Rd.

4. Parking provision.

- a. Not all houses in Edward St have provision for off street parking and It is frequently difficult to find a convenient parking space in Edward St.
- b. The problem becomes worse for visitors.
- c. The accuracy of the developers' consultants' estimates of the impact of additional traffic and the demand for parking remain to be tested in reality. As the development is proposed as a phased development, the developers should be required to fund traffic and parking studies by an independent body, such as Ashfield Municipal Council. These studies should be based on extensive measurements to establish a sound and unbiased pre-development baseline, and subsequently assess the impact of additional traffic and parking problems created by the phased development of McGill St and Summer Hill Flour Mill sites on the location's roads, particularly on Edward and Smith Streets and Old Canterbury Road. The developers should be required to have a contingency plan to provide additional parking if the current estimates are inaccurate. They should be required to lodge a significant cash deposit to remedy any shortfalls in their planning. The bond should extend for 5 years beyond the completion of the final stage of development, and be used to remedy problems of infrastructure not predicted or glossed over by the developers in their development proposals.

We look forward to the favourable consideration of these comments by the applicants and your department.

Yours sincerely

David and Sue Loane