

Mark Brown

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 25 August 2014 1:24 PM
To: Mark Brown
Subject: Submission - Block 8, Central Park

23 August, 2014

[REDACTED] Dick Street
Chippendale NSW 2008

Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Mark Brown

Dear Mark

SSD 6092, Block 8, Central Park
13 storey building including 178 residential units and two retail premises

I am a local resident and property owner, [REDACTED]
Dick Street (less than 30 metres from the proposed site).

We have lived at this address for the past 20 years, and also work from home.

Our home is a large warehouse, with our (artist) studios on the ground level and our home above. In the absence of windows for solar access on the east and western side of our property, our living and work areas are reliant on solar access from the north - particularly during winter months.

The proposed plans will have a devastating impact in terms of our residential amenity, and our ability to successfully live and work at home.

Our concerns formed part of the submission that CRIG lodged; however given that some of our key concerns have not been addressed or adequately explained by the proponent, we have now made our own submission.

Our key concerns follow:

1. The proposed building will overshadow our home during the winter months when we are heavily reliant on solar access.

We have also learnt more recently that the data that formed the basis for overshadowing studies for Concept Plan 1 and Modification 2 appears to have relied on data which in part is incorrect. It appears the findings then formed the basis for comparative studies for this application.

Specifically our home was shown as a commercial building in the initial studies, rather than a residential home (this is similarly the case for a number of other buildings on Abercrombie Street, as well as elsewhere). See Annexure A.

We were surprised to see this given we have always lived and worked from home; and previously raised concerns about the impact from overshadowing and the massing to our home. Further, the local community group previously identified some of these discrepancies; yet it appears that the base data was not changed.

While we appreciate that the Concept Plan and a number of subsequent amendments have been approved; given that a number of assumptions appear incorrect we believe that the plans should be amended to minimise any impact on our home given the current studies show an increase in overshadowing to our home, as well as other properties. This could be achieved by reducing the massing or setting the building further back from O'Connor Street.

We also note that assertions were made last year, when we attended the information session about plans for Building 4S. Specifically that the changes to the previous L-Shaped block enabled a reduction of about 20% in massing to be achieved for Block 8. This allowed the building to be integrated with the adjoining heritage conservation area.

We note that the RTA to the CRIG submission states that:

"While the GFA of Block 8 was reduced in Concept Plan Mod 8, there was no reference made to this being done to improve the interface with the heritage conservation area, rather the focus of Mod 8 was Blocks 1, 4N and 4S".

This is incorrect. While the proponent's response seeks to justify the increase in GFA (from other buildings and the inclusion of the Loggias into the GFA calculations), the response contradicts representations made to me at the community "consultation" process in February last year. It also contradicts criteria for SEPP 65 - that the environmental factors should be taken into consideration, namely sun access rights for Chippendale residents and mitigate the scale of change to adjacent heritage areas.

The response is also at odds with the Design Integrity Panel's recommendation, which were made at the time of the revised Concept Plan (modification 2):

"detailed form of the commercial buildings along Abercrombie Street (Blocks 1, 4 and 8) to ensure compatibility to the scale of building in the area" (refer Annexure A):

Further, while the proponent's response seems to dismiss concerns about the overshadowing of our home/workplace, the cumulative impact is not small. In response, could our concerns be reviewed independently so that these issues can be addressed?

2. The removal of open space on the south side of Block 8 impacts us visually in terms of the scale and massing; we also lose some of our sky vista, and there is an impact in terms of our visual privacy.

In response, we ask that the plans be amended to either set back the building from O'Connor Street or alternately reduced the massing. These changes may also provide the opportunity for additional open space.

We also have the following concerns:

3. Insufficient open space is provided as part of Block 8; rather it relies on the use of public open space that is already at a premium in this area.
4. The plans do not provide a good mix of apartments to ensure a cross section of residents and sustainable social mix and demographics.

Previously we were assured that Block 8 would accommodate largely “larger” apartments designed for families to ensure a greater social mix. Hence we were surprised to see 122 apartments in the initial scheme shown to us. Yet, despite raising our concerns about the number of units, the plans now show 178 apartments – a number of which are dual occupancy arrangements. While this may be respond to market forces at this time, the emphasis on one market, a higher number of residents and similar demographic is at odds with some of the key decisions that underpinned the approval of concept plan (modification 2); nor does it consider the longer term sustainability of the area.

Further, we raise our ongoing concerns about the consultation process, namely:

5. I was one of the participants that attended the CRIG briefing for Block 8 by Elton Consulting / Frasers in October last year. This was a briefing rather than a consultation session. I was unable to attend the subsequent public briefing on the Saturday; however along with a couple of colleagues attended the meeting with Frasers in February this year.

In short, there appears to be a deliberate strategy to minimise information with the “consultation” process typically like a “roadshow”. In the case of the meeting with CRIG last year, incorrect data was provided with the building repeatedly referred to as only being 7 storeys high. After repeated questioning 12 stories was stated; and then only after much argument, it was acknowledged as a 13 storey building.

Likewise insufficient information was provided in relation to the overshadowing of local properties and a refusal to disclose the overall height of the building – with comment such as we will get back to you on this; and then subsequently not disclosed. Similarly, at the meeting with Frasers in February this year, there was a reluctance to discuss concerns about the increase in neither massing nor the overshadowing. Rather, we were referred to Dr Quek, the MD for Frasers, who despite follow up did not return or respond to our concerns.

Further, minutes of meetings were not provided until very recently despite a number of requests making it difficult to check. Sadly this situation has been par for the course for many years – including meetings with Elton / Australand before the sale was reneged and the site later sold to Frasers. This has led us to feel that despite feedback our concerns will be ignored.

CRIG has however encouraged us to let you know about our concerns, in addition to the petition we recently signed. We are hopeful that this detailed feedback provides you with sufficient insight so that our concerns are addressed.

Please let me know if you need any more information or would visit our home to gain a better understanding of our key concerns.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]