

Application No: SSD 13_6123

Campus Improvement Program 2014-2020 for Camperdown-Darlington

RAIDD Response to RtS for SSD6123

Date: 24 August 2014

Name: RAIDD (Residents Acting In Darlington's Defence)

Address: Darlington, NSW, 2008

SHEPHERD ST SERVICE CENTRE

We remain opposed to the proposed Service Centre on Shepherd Street. We understand the rationale behind having principal Service Centres but repeat our suggestion that a more appropriate location for it would be near the intersection of Shepherd and Cleveland Streets.

This would mean the heavy service vehicles could enter and exit from the main arterial road of Cleveland Street and would therefore be kept off residential streets.

EUCALYPT TREES

The number of trees proposed to be retained following the objections of residents to their removal is still insufficient and not acceptable. More should be done to preserve these important trees.

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS

We repeat the submission that the University should provide a written undertaking to only use 85% of each envelope in its modified CIP and that the Department should specify a maximum of 85% utilization of the envelopes for each building in any approval.

Overall, the height, scale and density of the proposed buildings is still far too great on all suggested precincts. Not only do buildings such as those proposed create overshadowing but also mean loss of light and therefore, loss of wellbeing especially in regard to the Regiment building which is in close proximity to the housing on the corner of Darlington Rd and Golden Grove.

DARLINGTON TERRACES

We vehemently object to the University's proposal to completely infill the backyards of every heritage listed terrace house (bar 3) from 86 – 130 Darlington Road with 3 storey extensions. The University will have used almost every piece of land for building on leaving very little open space, vegetation or light which are all important to the health and wellbeing of humans.

The National Trust has given these terraces an "A" rating – "highly intact". The University should not be allowed to degrade the heritage value of these terraces which are very close to the Golden Grove.

LACK OF COMMUNICATION and CONSULTATION

In its Response to Submissions, the University has in some cases misrepresented and in others totally failed to answer the community submissions in regard to the lack of consultation about and communication in regard to the CIP.

The community submissions were about the fact that the University had not consulted with the community about the CIP during the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as it had been instructed to do by the Director General of the Department of Planning. The University does not address this issue at all.

The University's response refers to "specific and regular email Invitations" to "community drop-in sessions" having been sent out. These were **not** sent out during the period that the EIS was being developed, which is when the consultation should have taken place, but were sent out well after the EIS had been finalized and only after protests from the community about the insufficient time given to respond to the wealth of documents lodged on the Department's website.

In its Response to Submissions, the University also refers to a specific email from RAIDD dated 20 March 2014, which was actually a reply from two members of RAIDD to an email from Julie Parsons, University of Sydney Project Manager, inviting them to the last "community drop-in session".

The RAIDD members replied that, due to other commitments, they themselves would not be able to attend this session and that they had not been able to attend any of the other sessions. They asserted their view that these "community drop-in sessions" did not in fact constitute the consultation as specified in the Director General's Requirements.

The University has misrepresented the RAIDD email in its response. The University says that RAIDD said in the email that they "would not be seeking alternative arrangements as offered by the University". This is not true. In the RAIDD email nothing was said about not seeking "alternative arrangements as offered". Furthermore, the email which RAIDD was replying to did

not contain any such offer. The invitation to the last “community drop-in session” was extended to the wider RAIDD email list.

It is clear that the University has not done the right thing in regard to consulting and communicating with the community about the CIP. In its Response to Submissions the University has not addressed this at all and instead tries to make it appear that it is the community, the people it should have consulted in the beginning, who are being obstructive, when this is not the case at all.

FAILURE TO FOLLOW PROCESS

The point being made in the original submission about the process was that the University had not complied with the Director General’s Requirements by not consulting with the community during the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the CIP and that therefore the “Development Application should not be considered by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure”.

The University, in its “CIP Response to Submissions” document, refers on its front page to a “State Significant Development Application” yet chooses to respond in this same document to this in part by saying that “SSD13_6123 is not a Development Application” but rather a “Concept Strategy”.

One of the numerous documents lodged on the Department of Planning website by the University is one titled “SSD Completed Application Form 1.pdf”. The heading to this form, which bears Greg Robinson’s signature, is “State Significant Development Application”. This is why it was referred to in RAIDD’s original submission as a Development Application.

Even though the University says that SSD13_6123 is not an application, it then goes on to refer to it as one anyway. The Response says “The University lodged a test of adequacy of the DGR’s with the DPE (formerly Department of Planning & Infrastructure) prior to officially lodging the Campus Improvement Plan application.”

During the course of 2013 the University had held meetings with the local community, at RAIDD’s request, in regard to the Abercrombie Precinct Development, the Abercrombie Street Student Accommodation and the Darlington Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Strategy. The University had asked people for their names at these meetings. They did not, however, ask permission for these names to be subsequently made public.

Despite this, the University went ahead anyway and listed all of these names in Appendix N of the EIS which related back to a section headed “Community Consultation”.

One of the submissions from the community expressed outrage at having their name used in this section of the CIP EIS. The University’s response does not address this at all and merely quotes what was said in Section 10.2 of the CIP EIS in regard to the meetings that the people in the list had attended. These meetings had nothing to do with the CIP EIS.

The clear implication of referencing these community members' names from a section of the EIS called "Community Consultation" is that the University had consulted with the community in regard to the EIS of the CIP, when this was not the case at all. The community members had no idea about the CIP when they attended those meetings.

The implication that the required community consultation had taken place was obviously conveyed successfully to the Department as the University goes on to say in its Response that "On 18 December 2013, DPE determined that the CIP satisfactorily addressed the DGRs for the purposes of public exhibition."

Clearly the Department believes that the community was consulted in the development of the EIS for the CIP when it is equally clear to the people who should have been consulted that they had not been.

The absence of any consultation with the community about the EIS for the CIP during its development is not addressed at all in the University's Response.

The University chose to ignore the Director-General's Requirements in relation to community consultation. Not only that, it then hoodwinked the Department by making it appear in the EIS that the required consultation had actually taken place.