

I am writing to object to the Mirvac ATP Redevelopment, SSD 15_7317, on the following grounds.

- Shadowing of Alexandria Childcare Centre

I object to this proposal and request it be amended on the grounds that the proposed western edge height of building 1 will significantly overshadow the Alexandria Childcare Centre.

The developer has requested an exemption from the current height restrictions on this portion of the plan but has not demonstrated strong reasoning for why this should be allowed.

I propose that the current height restriction be maintained and no consent be given for over-height development in this area.

- Parking

I object to this proposal and request it be amended on the grounds that the proposed number of car parking spaces is a large increase on the current use. The current typical average day use is in the order of 200 to 300 cars in the 2 main car-parks per day.

This is represented in the development's own documentation.

The current modelling of traffic impact does not take account of recent local population increases, the arrival of 6,000 new residents by 2020 at the Ashmore Estate, the proposed large scale residential developments of City to Eveleigh and the 60,000 cars projected to utilise Euston road on the completion of the WestConnex. Cumulatively, the impacts of many developments encouraging car movements into already saturated roads has not been adequately modelled.

Therefore I propose that the Commonwealth Bank and Mirvac develop a zero-car development for the ATP and design for a sustainable, future-oriented, public and alternative transport model.

- Overshadowing & privacy loss for residents on Henderson Road

Modifications to Building 1 need to be made because the current design, which proposes a glass facade overlooking Henderson Rd, will allow workers in the building to see into local residences. At the very least, screening needs to be installed on the south side of the building, as has been done in the case of the NICTA building.

The shadowing of Building 1 is excessive, even without considering rooftop plant and equipment. It could be avoided by reducing the size of Building 1, or by reallocating some of the bulk of the building further north. Seeking to equate shadowing caused by a building with

shadowing caused by trees is inappropriate; the effects are quite different, as is impact on visual amenity.

On the grounds outlined above I strongly object to the approval of the ATP redevelopment as currently described in SSD 15_7317.