

I am writing to object to the Mirvac ATP Redevelopment, SSD 15\_7317.

I would appreciate notification that this objection and attachments has been received.

The objections I'm making are summarised below and detailed in my Attachment 1 & 2. I expect my significant concerns and objections to be fully considered and addressed as part of the decision making process.

I strongly object to the proposal.

#### 1. Consultation

Consultation has not been adequate or meaningful. Please see my comments in Attachment1.

#### 2. Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements

The proposal does not comply with the SEARs. Attachment 1 documents some specific areas of non compliance.

#### 3. Heritage

The proposal fails to acknowledge or address the social and cultural heritage of the site.eg the occupation of the site by Aboriginal people over thousands of years, the social history of Aboriginal and other local community members employed in rail workshops and goods yards and the significant trade union activities on the site.

#### 4. Innovation and Technology

The site is named the Australian Technology Park. Current tenants have been required to demonstrate their focus on innovation and new technology. This proposal will result in a loss of this focus. The majority of the 10,000 CBA jobs will not meet these criteria. Although details have not been disclosed the majority of workers will perform back office functions including processing, customer service call centres, IT system support, etc. Having a computer on a desk and using business applications does not mean the work can be called technology focussed.

#### 5. Construction

The proposal does not comply with the SEARs. The planning and implementation for construction is incomplete and not acceptable. The traffic analysis and proposed routes ignore concurrent construction in the local area. The proposed daily timeframes are not acceptable. Please see comments in Attachment 1.

#### 6. The Buildings

Two of the proposed 3 buildings are not compliant. The requests for variations to the development standards for GFA and height in the currently proposed building designs should be refused as they are unnecessary and inappropriate. The proposed designs detract from the visual amenity inside and outside the site and result in severe negative impacts on the local community.

The individual buildings should be assessed on their individual merits as well as being considered as part of the overall ATP and the impacts on the surrounding areas.

The design of Building 1 seeks a 6.4% increase in GFA and a height increase at the western end from 4 storeys to 9 storeys. This does not consider the impacts on the existing adjoining residential area. The development controls specifically included the 4 storey restriction to ensure a step down to surrounding areas. The proposed design when viewed from the southern side will be huge. The EIS

states there will be panoramic views from the building through the curved glass facade but this glass facade will intrude on the privacy and cause evening light pollution for people living in residential properties to at least 200 metres south of the site. It will also overshadow homes and cause significant light pollution in the evening. Attachment 2 has more detail.

Building 2 proposes a massive footprint with a GFA increase of 35% The design of this building will have serious privacy and light impact for residents to the east of the building.

The proposed designs for Buildings 1 and 2 reduce visual amenity within the site and from surrounding areas due to the large footprints. They will block views of the heritage locomotive workshops which are an integral part of the site which demonstrates the important local history.

Alternative designs could resolve the issues I have raised. Building 1 could comply with controls and present a less intrusive impact by reducing western height. The glass facade to the south could be partially screened by something similar to the slats on the current NICTA building to minimise severe privacy intrusions and light pollution impacts on local residents. Visual amenity into the site could be improved if the enclosed outdoor child care centre space was removed. Most of the parking and the child care centre could be relocated to the Community Building if it included a relatively small increase in building height which would still be under the allowable height for the site.

Building 2 east west foot print could be shortened at both ends .In order to accommodate the GFA needs of the tenant the centre section of this building could seek a large but more acceptable height increase. This would allow better visual amenity towards the heritage locomotive workshops from within and outside of the ATP site as well as minimise privacy and light impacts on adjacent homes in Garden St.

## 7. Transport and Traffic

The information in the EIS regarding public transport, traffic and parking is deficient. It does not address public transport capacity, multi vehicle use of onsite parking, parking in nearby residential streets, impacts of other development traffic, proposed changes to traffic volumes and roads to the east, west and south of the site. My Attachment 2 discusses this in more detail.

The Transport Impact Assessment cannot be relied upon in an assessment of the proposal and should be rejected.

## 8. Redfern Waterloo Contributions Plan

Mirvac seeks not to pay the required levy and proposes alternative expenditure. This should not be agreed to. The focus of the proposed alternatives is mainly for the site and its workers and not services/facilities across the Redfern Waterloo area as required.

They state that they will do work to the value of \$25 million. For this capital cost they will plant trees and other plants, provide pay for use or time limited car parking, upgrade pathways and shared zone (to rectify probable damage during construction), upgrade the already existing sports courts, install table tennis tables(why???), provide new BBQs (when there are existing BBQs that are rarely used), provide outdoor tables with power points gatherings and external work (seems like additional GFA for CBA). They state they will also provide an equal access ramp from the ATP site to Redfern station which would be a great use of funds. Unfortunately it can't solve problems associated with access to most train services as most of the platforms only have steep stairs and no lifts!

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