

**Desley Haas
5 Lyne Street
PO Box 109
Alexandria 2015**

**desleyhaas@ihug.com.au
0431 050 486**

***Submission on the Development Application,
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the
State Significant Development Application for the
Redevelopment of the Australian Technology Park
(ATP) (SSD 7317)***

Introduction

I wish to lodge objections to the Development Application SSD7317 on behalf of our family members, on the basis that:

1. The *Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)* does **not** address in any depth or breadth a significant number of the requirements of the *Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements*.
2. The *EIS* definitely does **not** meet those requirements, especially in identifying impacts and assessing for environmental, social and health risks.
3. The *EIS* has **not** addressed the issues outlined in the *SEARs* and does **not** accord with Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (EPAR 2000)*.
4. It especially does **not** with regards to social and environmental impacts that include heritage, traffic, noise, and construction impacts especially on residents of the nearby suburbs.
5. The *EIS* does **not** examine and definitely does **not** take into account to the fullest extent possible (any thing but) all matters affecting or likely to affect the environment by reason of the proposed development.
- 6.
7. *The EIS* does **not** address the height, bulk and scale of the proposed buildings within the context of the locality and nor does it ensure the

proposal does not create unacceptable environmental impacts, especially on the Locomotive Workshop.

8. The *EIS* does **not** analyse nor detail justification worthy of approval for the proposed building height in the context of the adjoining development and height controls, especially with the increase from 4 stories to 9 stories for Building 1.

After all the time, work and effort the community invested in BEP 1 and 2 and the promises of the NSW Government it is completely unacceptable to see no set back of 4 stories, on Building 1. as agreed.

9. We **strongly object** to any variations or increases in heights, GFA, etc being granted to Mirvac.

Building 2 is already a whopping 35% above the accepted maximum GFA allowed under the MD SEPP. Building 1 is 6.4% above.

Having the so-called Community Building (just another building for CBA/Mirvac uses) at 76% difference does **not**, in any way, shape or form make up for the increases in the other two buildings.

While the Community Building does not face directly into any residents homes., unfortunately, the other two buildings do. Any increases in height or bulk will have detrimental impacts on residents, their families and homes.

Perhaps Mirvac should be required the reality that the ATP is **not** surrounded, in the immediate area, by commercial or industrial zones but by residential zones.

10. The *EIS* does **not** give due consideration to the overall site layout, connectivity, open spaces and edges, facades, massing, setbacks, building articulation, materials, colours, landscaping, rooftop and mechanical plant.

Examples would be the total overwhelming of, and encroachment on, the Locomotive Building; the glass façade of Building 1 that will face directly into people's homes; the lack of set back of Building 1; the increase in stories in Building 1 against what was agreed under BEP 2; the size of the huge mass of Building 2 that is out of proportion with the other heritage buildings, local apartments and surrounding terrace houses and cottages; the destruction of so much of the public domain that makes the ATP so significant – a place of innovative technology work, heritage, open sky and peaceful community space.

11. Because the *EIS* does **not** meet many of the *SEARs'* and the *Environment Planning and Assessment Act's 1979* requirements, local citizens have serious concerns
 - about the deficiencies of the *EIS*,
 - whether the risk assessments have been conducted thoroughly and in depth,
 - whether the Department of Planning and Environment will instruct Mirvac to fulfill the legal requirements of the State of New South Wales.
12. Because the impacts fall on local children, families and the elderly who have never been consulted, we recommend that those issues and concerns be addressed, impacts re-assessed, and new risk assessment strategies and mitigation measures be identified for the preparation of new reports.
13. Because of the deficiencies and the standard of the *EIS*, we recommend that the *Development Application* by Mirvac be **not approved** in its current form.

Reality and Context

Before analyzing the *EIS* and attempting to write a credible submission establishing the reality and context that frames the *EIS* is paramount.

- The Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) is one of the top ten most politically powerful and influential organizations in Australia.
- The CBA is the anchor tenant of the three new Mirvac buildings that have been created specifically for the CBA.
- Mirvac, the new owner of the ATP, is a huge property development company and with its consultants JBA, has representatives on the Property Council of Australia and Urban Taskforce and, when required, representatives on the NSW Government's Planning Assessment Commission.
- The Australian Technology Park (ATP) has been zoned commercial but is metres away only from residential zones that circle the Park. It is neither a large commercial zone surrounded by other commercial developments as in the CBD nor a commercial zone surrounded by industrial zones.
- The ATP was public land owned by the citizens of NSW before being sold to Mirvac against the wishes of many citizens, businesses and Councils across Sydney.

- The NSW Government sold the land to Mirvac with certain agreements in place that the sale would be supported and particular hindrances to the sale resolved.
- The NSW Government as the seller, the vendor, will now be the assessor of the *EIS* for the Development Application.
- The ATP is not bare commercial or industrial wasteland. It is not under-developed land. It is land rich in culture and railway history. The heritage buildings and the history of the ATP, much-admired features within the local area, are of State and National importance to NSW and Australia.
- A State Significant Development for a bank by a developer on State Significant Land.
- Aboriginal land. Eveleigh Railway Yards later became the reason Aboriginal people from other areas of NSW moved for work to Redfern, the factor why Redfern became the heartland of Aboriginal Sydney.
- To the local community, the ATP has strong cultural, historical and social significance. To them, the ATP has worth and value, far more than being simply another city block or industrial 'brown' site to be exploited for higher financial gain.

While the importance of that reality and context may not be encapsulated in any one *SEAR* and has no legal significance, *SEARs* that do have legal standing and requirements have been ignored or left unmet in this *EIS*.

A. General Requirements: SEARs

1. The EIS must include:

- ❖ ***SEAR: an environmental risk assessment to identify the potential environmental impacts associated with the development, as in Section 6 of the EIS.***
- ❖ ***SEAR: measures to avoid, minimize if necessary, offset the predicted impacts, including detailed contingency plans for managing any significant risks to the environment.***

a) Areas of Impact and Risk Assessments:

The major concerns are:

1. The degree of noise, pollution, fumes and dust that will be impacting on the City of Sydney Child Care Centre and residents of the apartments and homes of

Garden and Cornwallis streets, the heritage terrace houses, town houses, cottages of Henderson/Lyn/Dadley/Alexander/Bradling/Kingsclear/Phillips/Gerard,etc.

2. The lack of recognition of the surrounding areas and the range of local streets that will be bearing the major environmental impacts.

3. The omission within the *EIS* of any recognition or assessment of the Aboriginal heritage, culture and the historical links to Eveleigh or the impacts on the Redfern Aboriginal community by the development

4. The safety risks that have not been identified, assessed nor addressed which will occur for school children and the older pedestrians who walk through the ATP daily.

5. The numerous impacts of the large numbers of Commonwealth Bank (CBA) employees on Redfern Station's and Sydney trains' capacity and safety.

6. The impacts on the local area by the huge increase of cars seeking parking spaces that won't exist in the ATP; the reality being that, for a variety of reasons, many people have little choice but to drive to work.

7. The size, bulk, height and locations of Building I and Building 2 will have serious impacts on the heritage buildings, the view lines, the existing public domain, and the residents and residents' homes that the buildings will be looming over and over-shadowing.

8. All of the above are health, social and environmental impacts that Mirvac should not be allowed to discount as they have been in conversations with residents. Discounted and dismissed simply because Mirvac is under pressure to deliver commercial outcomes for it's the consortium it formed to purchase the ATP, company shareholders and the CBA.

9. The focus throughout the *EIS* is on the CBA and delivering on CBA's demands. The focus does not include acknowledging the full extent of the environmental impacts of the development.

10. The *EIS* has no real focus on identifying nor lessening the impacts on the local communities and residents; not on developing the ATP in such a way to protect the public interest, nor on acknowledging and addressing the local communities' needs of the ATP, their close neighbour.

11. Fair to say, that the focus of the *EIS* is not so much on meeting the requirements in the *SEARs* and *EPAR 2000* but on twisting and turning the information prepared to appear superficially as if those requirements are being met.

12. Best examples of this technique are:

- the so-called 'Community' Building that is anything but.

- the constant reference through out the *EIS* to improving the Public Domain when in fact much of the current Public Domain will be destroyed.
- the manipulation of the traffic statistics to show that there will be little time delay or flow change on the intersections around the ATP.

b) Impacts on City of Sydney Child Care Centre, Alexandria Street

- The *EIS*, Section 2.6 states

Site investigations reveal that contamination sources are present at levels exceeding adopted ecological criteria and in relatively few locations, exceeding the adopted health-based criteria. ... Contaminants include... asbestos.

- In Section 7 of the *EIS*,

Childcare: the following noise mitigation measures have ben included in the assessment: Building 1 – 1.8m high solid barrier around the perimeter of the outdoor play area and Community – 1.5m high barrier around the sudden perimeter of the outdoor play area.

- While it may be admirable that strategies are being implemented for the two Child Care Centres in the CBA buildings with regards to noise, is the same consideration being displayed for the Alexandria Street, City of Sydney Council's Child Care Centre for the local children that closely borders the site of Building 1?
- The Centre will be subjected to the noise of contractors' trucks, building cranes, dump trucks loaded leaving the site on the exit road running behind the Child Care Centre to Henderson Road.
- Mitigation measures are headed *Noise and Vibration, Wind, Reflectivity* but so far I can find no reference to the dust and pollution particles that will obvious occur and will cause major issues for all three Child Care Centres, residents of the local area and CBA and ATP workers.
- Building 1 and Building 2 will be the closest buildings to the local residents whose homes in Garden, Cornwallis, Henderson, Lyn, Alexandria, Dadley, Phillips, Gerard, Kingsclear, Brandling, etc are adjacent, or a 100 metres or so, from these buildings. The dust, fumes and pollution, especially on windy days, will be impacting directly on residents and their homes.

- Mirvac has already had experience in the mitigation of dust as in the newspaper article below, so it is strange that dust is not mentioned in the EIS,

Mirvac and Bondi locals in dust-up over the developers's \$81 million Moreton Complex by Sean Thompson, Wentworth Courier, September 24 2015.

MIRVAC has installed a water cannon to reduce dust at its \$81 million Moreton development at Bondi, but residents say it's still not enough. Installation of the water cannon comes after a residents' action group raised the issues of dust, noise and street access with Waverley Council last week.

Ocean St resident Claus Topke is one of several residents calling on the developer to act. He said his apartment was constantly covered in fine dust from the construction site next door.

Mr Topke said dust had infiltrated every room in his house. "I have to keep cleaning but even worse is how the dust is impacting the health of children and young families," he said.

"Doctors are attributing sick children with the dust exposure ... people also feel like they are locked inside- their homes to keep away from the dust and noise, so something has to be done."

- Unlike with dust, the EIS in Section 7 does make certain commitments regarding contaminated soil:

to document the procedures and standards to be followed to remove the risks posed by contaminated soils, to make sure the site is suitable for permissible land uses, while ensuring the protection of human health and the surrounding environment

- and concludes that
the site can be made suitable for the intended uses and the risks posed by contamination can be managed in such a way as to be adequately protective of human health and the environment.
- All very good, providing such claims are not simply words but are implemented to a high standard, thoroughly.
- On the other hand significant questions still remain:

1. What strategies will be implemented to ensure that the dust from the asbestos and contaminated soil will be contained as they are excavated and trucked away?
2. What mitigation measures will be in place to ensure that what occurred at St Peters recently with contractors' trucks being loaded with asbestos and then leaving the site with loads uncovered does **not** occur in the ATP?

Especially when the trucks will be loaded and leaving in the close vicinity of the Council Child Care Centre.

3. Have the current pollution levels been determined to establish a baseline for the ATP and for the surrounding areas that are likely to be impacted?
4. Will the pollution levels of petrol and diesel fumes, dust from asbestos and contaminated soils, chemicals used, etc. be monitored regularly, during and after, the construction phase?

5. In the interest of the health of residents, workers and CBA employees, that this occurs is extremely important.

Especially important when the three Child Care Centres are affected by the impacts.

That the information of the levels, when monitored be shared with the local community groups and representatives, is also of importance, and a necessity.

- The reality is full, documented proof and details of potential impacts and mitigation measures have **not** been provided sufficiently enough in the *EIS*.
- The current development proposal will result in unreasonable and difficult-to-manage environmental, social, and health impacts. How does Mirvac intend to mitigate all of those impacts, not simply some of them?

c) Definition of the Impacted Local Areas

5. Surely it is a given, that to identify the environmental impacts of any development, the first requirement would be to define the environment, location and context in which the development and major impacts will occur.

6. The *EIS* has spectacularly failed to meet this requirement.
7. Because of the failure, the baseline data that has been presented is therefore inadequate and incomplete.
8. The fact is the ATP is not an island, standing on its own. The ATP is surrounded not by oceans, not by other industrial or commercial zones but by residential zones and conservation areas.
9. This mind-set of the ATP as an entity standing alone is quite obvious in the shallow, uncritical analysis of impacts and assessment in the *Transport Impact Assessment* , and *Noise and Vibration Assessment, Façade and Reflectivity Statement, and Stakeholder and Community Engagement Report*.
10. This *EIS* is repeating the same folly, or tactic, of the Redfern Waterloo Authority, past managers of the ATP, of treating the ATP as a insular identity, internally focused, an island, completely unattached to its context and surroundings.
11. No matter how much the focus of the *EIS* is internal to the ATP, the reality is that the impacts of any of the developments in the ATP stretch far beyond Henderson Road and Garden Street, the streets to which most reference is made in the *EIS*.
12. Henderson Road may be considered one demarcation line for the discussion of impacts, but what is not acknowledged is that behind Henderson is not empty space but the environment and streets of the suburb of Alexandria.
13. In 2.2 of the *EIS*, the residents, their families and homes are just the nameless, unimportant *wider community adjacent to the Davy Road and Henderson Road*.
14. Alexandria, the legal name of the wider community, is adjacent and borders directly with the frontage of the ATP. The boundary line of Eveleigh (ATP) and Alexandria is, actually, straight down the middle of Henderson Road.
15. But those facts are either ignored or missing, as below, from page 32, *EIS*, where the suburb of Alexandria does not even rate a mention in the surrounding suburbs!
16. With regards to the ATP: *Create a new hub for the **surrounding** suburbs of Eveleigh, Redfern and Erskineville, integrated into the local network of streets.*

17. The conservation area and heritage terrace houses and cottages of the un-named Alexandria are discounted in the *EIS*, simply as “residential”, of little importance. No recognition is given to the important historical and social environment of Alexandria. It’s as if we, and the suburb, simply don’t exist.
18. None of the Alexandria terraces and cottages that are in close vicinity to the ATP feature in the photographs in Figures 20 to 25 of the *EIS*.
19. Meanwhile the photograph of Henderson Road has been angled in such a way that the terraces and cottages in that road do not appear.

‘Tis interesting when the homes are clearly visible in maps published in the *EIS*!
20. The crucial fact that has been completely ignored in the *EIS* is that the many of the family homes of north Alexandria will be metres only away from Building 1.
21. Bearing the full brunt of the environmental impacts of the development of Building 1, will be those very streets of the non-mentioned Alexandria, (and one of Alexandria’s main roads, Henderson Road), - the tiny streets behind, or turning off, Henderson Road – the streets of Lyne, Alexander, Kingsclear, Brandling, Park, Newtown, Dadley, Phillips, Gerard, Garden, Wyndham, etc.
22. The *EIS* has done an excellent job of completely ignoring the facts that:
 - the Building will block out much of the view of the sky for many of the homes in the streets opposite.
 - the glare from the lights of the well-lit offices of Building 1, through the glass façade, will be impinging directly on the homes at night.
 - during the day the Building will be overshadowing the balconies and gardens.
 - employees of CBA will be looking directly into the windows and backyards of the houses.

- employees will have grand views of residents' bedrooms and bathrooms.
 - Security of home sweet home and privacy? Children able to sleep at night facing lights? No stress and health implications?
23. Why are those impacts on Alexandria, the ATP's closest neighbour, not being considered as part of the risk assessment and mitigation measures? Blinkered vision? Lack of research and competent practical investigation or simply poor knowledge of the area?
24. Or is more that too many difficulties and too much work is created if the *EIS* acknowledges the potential impacts on Alexandria? Better to ignore and hope the residents will just go along with it all? Residents didn't last time with the construction of the Channel 7 building. Residents won't this time.

d) Impacts on Local Areas from Strategies involving Workers' Travel

1. What it most intriguing is that the *EIS* does not mention the previous impacts caused, during and after, the Channel 7 building's, (8 Central Avenue), construction. The construction workers first, and then employees of Channel 7, swamped the parking spaces in the nearby Alexandrian streets. The problems with the reflection from lights, the noise and pollution generated, were constant.
2. Taking into account that Building 1 will be constructed on a building block closer to these homes, it is perfectly feasible to state that the impacts on that environment with the development of Building 1 and the other two new buildings, housing 10,000 new employees, will be far much greater than that caused by one building and 2,000 new employees.
3. If Mirvac and JBA had bothered to consult the local residents in any meaningful way, valuable information would have been gathered. Information that would have assisted in correctly identifying many of the environmental, social and health potential impacts that will, in all reality, be the result of the construction of the three new buildings in the ATP.
4. Instead, in the *EIS*, the consultants have committed the folly of making the same presumptions as were made in the past.

Keep the parking fees in the ATP high, express high expectations that the employees will use public transport and the problem will be solved. Did not solve the travel and traffic problems in the past and definitely will not this time around.

5. Four years of traffic and parking nightmare for both residents and employees of Channel 7 ended up in major conflict involving the ATP and residents and consumed significant resources and energy of the ATP and City of Sydney Council. How much worse will these impacts be with five times the number of new staff arriving at the ATP?
6. It is no secret that the traffic and parking policies and strategies of Redfern Waterloo Authority/ATP/Channel 7 were the cause during and after the construction of the Channel 7 building, 8 Central Avenue, of the unnecessary conflict and chaos in our streets.

Suggestions/Questions:

- a) How difficult would it have been for the consultants to speak directly and at length with the local communities, not simply rely on what information was passed on by Urban Growth?
- b) How difficult would it have been to research and to learn from the past *Traffic and Parking Reports* from the City of Sydney Council, AECOM and the Alexandria Residents Action Group of 2011 and 2012?
- c) In preparing the *EIS*, were the construction workers' and employees' car parking requirements and the increased traffic identified that will be the result of the construction of the three new buildings to house the 10,000 employees of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA)?
- d) Was a travel needs analysis or a baseline of the CBA employees' mode of transport conducted? If so, why are no copies included in the *EIS*?

Comments

As no data nor statistics have been provided in the *EIS* of what type of positions the employees will be filling, what shift work will be involved, where the employees live, how

they intend to travel to the ATP, it is difficult to fully gauge the parking and traffic situations.

What we do know is: A cap of 1,600 car spaces for the ATP has been set under SEPP 2005.

- Mirvac will be providing 1,574 car spaces.
- ARUP in Section 5.8.1 of the *EIS*, as part of the Pedestrian Analysis, concludes that *as a result of the proposed development approximately 4,100 employees will be arriving at AM peak hour* from Redfern Station.
- Based on the statistics in Table 2.4 of 2.11 *Existing Transport Modes* in the *Transport Impact Assessment, (TIA)* Appendix F of the *EIS*:
- 600 may be bicycling to work. From Parramatta? Blacktown? Granville?
- In excess of 4,600 employees may be driving to work.
- That may leave the impact of approximately 3,026 people searching for and expecting to find car parking spaces in the surrounding streets of Alexandria and Redfern where already very few spare car spaces today exist.

So where in the *EIS* is an explanation given, or mitigation measures described, the locations of where these employees will be able to park their cars?

e) Impacts on Local Areas from Strategies involving Public Transport

- i. In Section 6.1 of the *Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment (TIA)*:
- ii. *It is intended that limited car parking supply in combination with the presence of high quality public transport, high bicycle parking supply and Green Travel Plan initiatives....would encourage staff and visitors to the site to choose alternative transport modes to the car.*
- iii. Previously in Section 2.1:
- iv. *It is expected in future that travel mode would change to heavily biased towards public transport modes as the*

proposed development would implement measures to encourage people to use more sustainable transport modes.

- v. This may be true to an extent, once employees and visitors overcome their fear of the heavily graffitied areas of North Eveleigh that welcome people to Redfern, and of its reputation, but would it be true for thousands of staff who may not live near train stations or who would face numerous changes of buses to reach their workplace or who have family commitments and time constraints that would prevent them from using public transport?
- vi. In Section 5.8.3 of the *EIS, Construction and Traffic Impact Management*,
- vii. *Importantly all site workers and visitors to the site shall be actively encouraged to take public transport to and from the site.*
- viii. How on earth could tradesmen and contractors be expected to travel by train? With their toolboxes and equipment? Was that inserted in the *EIS* to see if residents actually read the contents? Or was it a touch of humour to lighten the heavy reading?
- ix. Such encouragement, expectations and behaviour management strategies did not succeed with the construction workers and employees of the Channel 7 building.
- x. Why would anyone then expect that such a strategy would be successful now, especially when Redfern Station and the trains are significantly more overcrowded, to the point of being a matter of public safety, than they were in 2011?
- xi. The reality then was, when the employees and tradesmen did not wish to pay the high parking fees in the ATP, they simply flooded the local streets and, even when parking restrictions were imposed, the practice continued so the streets became moving car parks.
- xii. In Section 2.2.3, the *EIS* states confidently Redfern Station has *excellent connectivity ... outstanding connectivity* states.
- xiii. Except the consultants who wrote those statements forgot one thing. *Connectivity* is a very different aspect to *capacity*. Especially on the Western Line that presumably most of the CBA employees will use, the trains in peak times are at over capacity now.

- xiv. As established in a Survey in March 2015 published as *Sydney Trains: Our Performance*:

The average load for the Western Line during the peak morning period from 8am to 8.59am is 137% and the maximum is 166%. During the evening peak hour 5pm to 5.59pm the average load is 113% and the maximum load is 168%.

- xv. Based on weekly personal experience, I know that the over-crowding of the trains extends far beyond the times given. Even if one can board a train, it often is the case that one stands as far as Strathfield and some nights as far as Blacktown, before a seat is free.
- xvi. For a parent with a child or children at the CBA Child Care Centres in the ATP to board the trains during peak hour. would be impossible.
- xvii. To ensure a seat in a less cramped train, one has to arrive at Redfern Station to travel to Riverstone no later than 4pm or wait til after 6.30pm.
- xviii. For CBA shift workers, they will discover the waiting time between trains on the Western Line after 9pm is 60 minutes, not 30 minutes. Last train is 12.27am.
- xix. Where possible, we never travel to Riverstone after 8pm. A few unpleasant incidences have taught us it is simply not safe, especially after the train leaves Blacktown.

Comments to Summarise

One level – superficial information in EIS

- But logically, what is wrong with encouraging and expecting the CBA employees and site contractors to use public transport? Nothing wrong just that practically and realistically, different strategies, different solutions than *expecting, encouraging* are required.
- The *EIS* definitely does **not** demonstrate that *parking rates will support the shift to public transport use and sustainable travel* as in Section 1.3.

- The fact, is, if acknowledged and consulted in any depth, City of Sydney Council staff and local residents can, and would have, through their previous experiences, proposed far more creative and innovative solutions at the ATP to resolve the parking and traffic impacts on the local environment.

Second Level - information that exists but not provided in EIS

Extract from my email to Ross Hornsey, JBA, prepared 26th February, 2016

*With regards to the information from the **Commonwealth Bank**, thank you very much for persisting on our behalf.*

In not replying to the actual questions we submitted, CBA is either obviously playing their cards very close to their chest, regarding the employees coming to the ATP or do we presume that they actually haven't yet decided which employees, other than IT staff, will be transferring to the ATP?

That does seem a little strange when the buildings are being constructed to meet CBA's specifications for a specific number of staff.

Without knowing the answers to the information we requested, it is extremely difficult to analyze the EIS in any worthwhile manner. To achieve that, we need to know:

- * what staff will be working in which sections of the CBA at Eveleigh*
- * what their hours of work will be*
- * how many will be shift workers as with the Call Centre*
- * where they live now*
- * how they travel to work now*
- * how they intended to travel to Eveleigh - train, bus, bike or walk.*

I do not believe that an organisation as large, powerful and as creatively IT-focused, allegedly, as the CBA would not have this data and information.

*3. Without the information, it is difficult to make sense of the **staff-travel** sections in the EIS.*

a) The main concern with the transport proposal is that the majority of 10,000 staff (minus 1,574 who will have the car spaces) are expected to travel by public transport, ride a bike or walk.

b) The same strategies of keeping the rates for parking high and expecting staff to use public transport, no matter how far they may live from a train station or regular bus route, failed spectacularly when Central 7 building was being constructed.

c) ATP management and Urban Growth are well aware of that fact.

d) It may be fine if many of the CBA staff decide to rent or buy a house closer to Eveleigh (best of luck with that!) but it will be very different for those who remain living in the Western Sydney and try using their same mode of travel to Eveleigh

c) Awfully long bike ride from Parramatta especially as bikes aren't allowed on expressways or major roads!

I find it hard to believe that intelligent, professional people would be relying on the parking and traffic strategies given in the EIS.

4. so the **question remains** is critical information being intentionally withheld in the EIS or is it a case that completely different strategies are being planned but the requirement of informing the residents is not being adhered to?

5. the only thing that seems to make sense is that strategies to make the travel by trains far more attractive to CBA employees are in place but, for some unfathomable reason, are not in the EIS nor therefor for public viewing: Strategies such as

a) the updated plan for a walkway/access (as mentioned in the TIA as an option) from the platforms to the ATP is allegedly well under way to ease congestion on the platforms and especially on Platform 10 which is the main "shortcut" used by most workers to the ATP.

b) the capacity of the trains on the Western Line, especially in peak hours, is anywhere between 137% and 166% over capacity in the morning and 113% and 168% in the evenings (courtesy of Sydney Trains).

So, as has been alleged, will the new train schedules due once the North West Rail is completed to Chatswood in 2018 or 2019 show more trains being diverted to the Western Line to solve the over-crowding for CBA employees?

Pity about the commuters on the other lines, as a limited amount of trains can only operate at the same time due to signalling issues.

c) And then there is the new Redfern Station! That will solve all problems or not ... to be built with the money from the sale of public land at North Eveleigh or the ATP. Is CBA/Mirvac depending on that proposal for a new or upgraded station? Only problem – proposal has been floated since 1945? For almost as long as the promise of the secondcoming, as a Rail Corp manager commented recently.

- Many residents, presuming that lessons would have been learnt after the last development at the ATP, rightly wonder if the current *EIS* is nothing more than a quick cut and paste job, a tick-in-the-box exercise, a *fait accompli*, rather than an *EIS* based on an environmental risk assessments that identify the very real potential environmental impacts from the new developments.

Comments

The *EIS* **does not** meet *SEAR* requirements, especially with regards to parking and traffic:

- to comprehensively and precisely identify the potential environmental impacts or to assess those impacts in any meaningful way.
- to provide realistic measures to avoid, minimize, and offset the predicted impacts.
- to include detailed contingency plans for managing any significant risks to the environment.

Recommendations:

- a) that JBA, Mirvac, and CBA provide to the public and local communities the correct information, facts and data with regards to the CBA employees and the agreements and plans that are in place regarding Redfern Station and Sydney trains.
- b) that JBA, Mirvac and CBA provide realist measures to avoid, minimize and offset the impacts; to detail how the risks will be managed of bringing 10,000 employees into an area without public transport that will meet that potential demand.
- c) *The Green Travel Plan* of the TIA does not achieve this in any real sense. It is recommended that the excellent travel plan of the Built Environment Plan 1 be revisited and reinstated.
- d) As Waterloo Station will not be operational before 2024 and seemingly no specific plans are in place for the new Redfern Station, it is recommended that CBA, as is happening now from Strathfield to Homebush, provide buses to and from work at the ATP for their employees.
- e) that buses be supplied for tradesmen travelling to and from the ATP as well.

f) Transport and Accessibility and Transport Impact Assessment

For all the reasons and details given above, the *EIS* has **not** adequately met these requirements:

❖ SEAR: addressed the demand for car parking and the loss of existing tenant parking on the site

1. In section 6.1, *TIA*, it is noted that approximately 333 existing car spaces within Lots 8 and 12 would be displaced by the proposed development...The Channel 7 building includes approximately 361 visitor parking spaces located on Central Avenue. The Channel 7 visitor parking spaces will not be allocated to staff and will continue to be available for visitors, with persons with parking licences within Lots 8 and 12 provided within the Channel 7 building etc., etc.

The total occupancy of the ATP site was determined as 67% and 63% during the evening and peak periods respectively. The peak occupancy was at 79%.

So while those statistics implies that some wriggle room exists, the questions still arise:

1. If currently there are 5,500 people working in the ATP and 46% of them drive (Section 2.1.1, *TIA*) that means approximately 2,530 drive cars to work.
2. At present 1,453 car spaces are used in the ATP.
3. Channel 7 will be the main source of parking for those who lose the parking spaces when Lots 8 and 12 become construction sites but where will the following people park:
 - the visitors who would park normally in the 361 visitor parking but will find other drivers seeking parks there from Lots 8 and 12?
 - the staff who are unable to pay for parking in the 339 staff parking and who are not allowed to park in the visitor parking spaces in Channel 7?
 - the construction workers (as said before, very difficult to board a crowded train, as proposed in the *EIS* section, with a large toolbox and building materials?

The *Construction and Traffic Impact and Management*, Section 5.8.3 states

Importantly, all site workers and visitors to the site shall be actively encouraged to take public transport to and from the site.

What strategies *actively encouraged* involve are not defined.

- Where will the parking be for the cranes, building equipment and large machinery?
- the public attending large events at the ATP (if Mirvac permits them still to continue)?

Yet, once again, the main aim in the *EIS* to address the above parking problems is *to take advantage of the close proximity to Redfern Railway Station and minimize car usage to the site*. No details on how that will be achieved. No research tabled to support the successful outcomes of that statement.

Or is it more likely that the Vice Chancellor's Oval, the prime Public Park and sporting field within the ATP, will become the main parking area during the construction phase; and not just for construction vehicles which would be bad enough?

That is, if the vehicles can maneuver around the probable *stockpiles of excavated filling*, hopefully not including the contaminated soil or asbestos, or *other materials*, on the Vice Chancellor's Oval (Section 7.0 TIA)

The stockpile height will need to be restricted to a maximum of 2m.

No mention that the main walkway is around the Vice Chancellor's Oval and the Mitchell Way begins at the Oval. Won't be too healthy for the drivers of parked vehicles, cyclists and or pedestrians on a windy day if the piles are not firmly covered!

C. Public Domain and Urban Design and Traffic Accessibility: SEARs

1. Pedestrian and Cyclists

- ❖ ***SEAR: determine the adequacy of pedestrian and cycle facilities to meet the likely future demand of the proposed development and give consideration of measures to be implemented.***
- ❖ ***SEAR: identify and analyse key pedestrian desire lines to the surrounding area and links to Redfern Station.***
- ❖ ***SEAR: demonstrate the pedestrian circulation, accessibility and connections on site and to surrounding streets in a schematic form***

Comments

a) Pedestrians

I presume that for anyone, who has not walked through the ATP for as many years and as frequently as many of the local residents have, may have some difficulty in presenting a true picture and understanding of the pedestrian circulation and connections.

Be that as it may, the descriptions given of the circulation and infrastructure, the links to the Station are almost unrecognizable, in the small segments presented in the *EIS* and *TIA*.

- No due recognition or acknowledgement are given of the importance and significance of the roads and paths of the ATP as a "track" to Redfern Station, Redfern and the City to the local community.
- Evidence of that value and importance is how quickly the ATP Management and Urban Growth, at the time of the announcement of the

sale of the ATP, had prepared the covenant to protect the residents' right of way access to the ATP, knowing full well the level of concern.

- The main pathway through the ATP is from Henderson Road along the pathway beside the Oval to Mitchell Walk through the Square and up the stairs to the entrance of Redfern Station via Platform 10.
- The other track to the Station is along Cornwallis Street depending on time and load.
- The majority of pedestrians do not walk along Locomotive Street to Alexandria unless to work at Channel 7 or for local residents, at night.

Questions to be addressed

a) Was there an analysis in the *EIS* and *Appendix Z* of where the majority of pedestrians were walking to and from?

b) Was there any analysis of the health, social, environment and public safety impacts on pedestrians from the impacts of the development introducing more heavy vehicles into the Park?

- Did the analysis identify:
 - The number of people who are walking through the park due to the difficulty of catching a train at Erskineville during peak hours?
 - The elderly who don't own cars and who use the park for recreation strolls?
 - The number of local dog owners who access the Park every day?
 - More importantly was Alexandria Community Park School consulted before the analysis was completed?
 - Was the number of school children who walk through the ATP every school day collated?
 - Was the fact taken into account that the children travel through the Park as it is the safest route to their school?
 - If the path through the Park from Redfern and the Station to the School becomes unsafe from traffic into the Park that will mean the children will be forced to walk to school along extremely busy main roads and to cross dangerous major intersections.

- In turn that will result perhaps in more parents having no choice but to drive their children safely to school, which then will only exacerbate even more the traffic situation in the area.

Comments

The core of the problem is:

1. The ATP has been residents, workers and visitors walking track to and from the Station, Redfern and School, relatively free of vehicles and traffic for years.
2. With the development of the Park to meet the requirements of the CBA, the amount of constant traffic that will be drawn into the Park means pedestrians and cyclists, the main users of the walkways, will be in direct competition with the vehicles for right of way and safe passage through the Park.
3. *A traffic engineering assessment of the importance of providing priority should be undertaken to ensure the high number of pedestrian do not cause excessive queuing for vehicles on Locomotive Street towards Garden Street...and Central Avenue and Garden Street. EIS, Appendix Z.*
4. Who from the engineer's perspective, has the right of way – pedestrians? Or cars?
5. But, yes, a real danger exists that the flow of pedestrians could cause the vehicles to back up?
6. The response to the requirement of complying with Planning Policies (*NSW Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling*) in Section 5.3 of the *EIS*, is quite amazing in its denial of reality that the above engineer can perceive quite clearly.
7. *The proposed development will improve walkability and cycle access across the Redfern-Waterloo precinct through the provision of enhanced routes, active transport facilities and wayfaring signage. The proposed development will improve connectivity to the surrounding street network and the wider area, consistent with the guidelines.*
8. How would walkability be improved with increased traffic, increased numbers of pedestrians, increased congestion inside and outside of the ATP as a result of the development with its 10,000 employees and retail businesses, Child Care Centres, etc., even after the construction period?

9. To residents, we already have more than effective connectivity to the surrounding street networks.
10. Taking all the above into consideration, the *EIS* does **not** meet the requirements of the *NSW Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling* with regards to pedestrians.
11. The *EIS* also does **not** meet requirements of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* 5(e) in that by the development increasing the amount of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles across the walking paths of the ATP is does **not** provide significant benefits in regards to social, economic environmental considerations, especially for school children and other pedestrians.
12. Fundamentally, what is the most important in terms of the public's social, health and environmental needs,
 - a) the heritage features and open public domain of the ATP that the community enjoys and treasures or
 - b) CBA wanting to return to close to the City, turning the ATP into a network of roads with an influx of traffic and congestion to create the buildings and space and resources exactly the same as the CBA already has at Homebush?

Will this be in to the Public's interest? No. In CBA's interest? For them to find out, as no doubt they will.

On the above grounds, I totally **disagree** with the statement in Section 5.8.2 of the *EIS* that site circulation and accessibility is satisfactory.

1. The real question of site circulation and accessibility, one would have thought, was one of the most important to address in the *EIS* documents.
2. Considering the significance of the pathway, track, through the ATP, how satisfactory will be the accessibility and safety , not for Mirvac, not CBA, but, on the basis of public benefit, for the local citizens and the workers:
 - when the construction trucks and heavy machinery begin entering Central Avenue and Locomotive Street from Garden Street, (where they will have a huge impact on the residents of Zinc Apartments and others homes in Garden Street)?

- when a huge increase of pedestrians walking from the Station is generated, if CBA can persuade most of their employees to use public transport?
- when traffic, especially of construction trucks, significantly increases across the two crossings on Mitchell Walk, which at the moment have speed bollards, speed hump and zebra crossings?

One would have thought especially when children's safety was at stake more proactive strategies would have been listed in the *EIS* and *TIA*.

In spite of what Mirvac believed disability access is available at the ATP; down the ramp to the left when one enters the ATP from Marion/Cornwallis intersection.

b) Cyclists

1. Unfortunately, as mentioned previously, approximately details and data concerning the CBA employees have been not been provided in the *EIS*:
 - their work hours,
 - how many are shift workers,
 - where they will be travelling to and from,
 - how many will be using the Child Care Centres and will possibly need to drive,
 - the travel mode of the employees now and expected mode at Eveleigh,
 - how many will be cyclists.
2. Even though one would expect that the CBA must have supporting travel - mode details for the present employees, the only statistics that have been given in the *EIS* are based on the Bureau of Statistics for the recent employees of tenants and Channel 7 at the ATP.
3. Based on those statistics, it is hard to imagine 600 cyclists travelling from the Western Suburbs to Eveleigh (presuming the majority of the 10,000 employees live in that area) or, if is the case, from Wollongong or the Northern Beaches.
4. Because of this lack of information from CBA and Mirvac it is impossible to judge whether, with regard to cyclists, what will be required has actually been determined. So impossible to see that the details have been considered properly.
5. What can be judged is the lack of acknowledgement of the problems that have existed for many years with cyclists within the park.

6. The lack also of any real consultation with the residents by Mirvac which once again demonstrates the shallowness, the poverty of the information used in the *EIS*.
7. Bikes have struck pedestrians a number of times especially along the walking path to Mitchell Way in the ATP. Local residents have been lodging complaints for years.
8. The problem is caused mainly because of the lack of bell warnings or calls to indicate that a bike is passing.
9. Where the danger, of being hit increases, is at the end of the walking path at the intersection of Mitchell, Henderson and Davy roads. Pedestrians need to turn either to the right or left to access the traffic lights. Accidents occur if a bike is coming behind and has not given due warning that they are there, and the cyclist has no idea which way the pedestrian will turn.
10. With the large increase in construction, maintenance, and service vehicles as well as employees' cars and visitors' traffic, the risk of accidents for cyclists and pedestrians at the two crossings on Mitchell Way will greatly increase.
11. No mention of this obvious potential situation nor strategies to address the problem have been identified in the *TIA*.

Recommendations

The *EIS* and its documents:

- do **not** determine the adequacy of pedestrian and cycle facilities to meet the likely future demand of the proposed development.
- do **not** give consideration of measures to be implemented, especially to the crossings of Mitchell Way.
- do **not** identify and analyse competently, in sufficient detail, the key pedestrian desire lines to the surrounding area and links to Redfern Station.
- do **not** demonstrate correctly the pedestrian circulation, accessibility and connections on site and to surrounding streets.

We recommend:

a) that the *EIS* be **not** approved in its current form until urgent issues of the safety of the crossings of Mitchell Way be examined in light of the significant increase in construction and employee traffic, bikes and pedestrians.

b) that strategies that ensure the safety of the young pedestrians and cyclists be identified and implemented before construction begins and that strategies be negotiated with Alexandria Park Community School.

c) that in light of the deficiencies of the *TIA* a new, comprehensive *TIA* Report be prepared.

D. General Requirements: SEARs

1. Cumulative development impacts

❖ SEARs: consideration of potential cumulative impacts due to the other development in the vicinity.

In Section 3.2 of the *TIA*, is mentioned a meeting on 14th December 2015 with Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) where RMS advised that in compiling the *TIA* it would be requested for the traffic assessment to consider the cumulative effects of the Central to Eveleigh Corridor Project which includes the ATP site.

- What seems totally amazing is that:
 - with West Connex ending in Alexandria with the expectation that the cars will somehow disperse through the narrow streets of Alexandria,
 - with Euston Road, one main road over from Mitchell Road, increasing in the number of cars, trucks, vans a day from 6,000 to 61,000,
 - with the very real possibility that if Euston Road becomes too crowded, as it already does, the overflow will pour into Mitchell and Henderson roads and other streets in Alexandria,
 - with the new apartments opening in the Ashmore Estate at the Sydney Park end of Mitchell Road, and others being constructed in Fountain Street and along Mitchell Road,
 - with the construction of Waterloo Station and the traffic that will generate around Buckland, Wyndham and Botany roads and the increased traffic that will be crossing Henderson Road,
 - neither the RMS or the consultants of the *EIS* have taken the cumulative impacts on the roads surrounding the ATP into consideration. Amazing!
 - Even more amazing is the claim, in Section 5.5.2 *Future Conditions Intersection Analysis Results* in the *TIA*, made of the

local intersections, especially of the intersection of Mitchell, Henderson and Davy under post development traffic conditions:

- *the additional traffic generation would generally have minimal impact on the surrounding intersections with negligible changes to delay and level of service*

The majority of assessed intersections would continue to operate with LoS B (delay of 43-47 seconds) or better with the exception of the Henderson intersection with Davy Road.

The performance of Henderson Road intersection with Davy road would change from LoS C (29 to 42 seconds) to LoS B (43 to 47 seconds)

However traffic delay would remain consistent with a negligible increase of two to three seconds.

From the above it is concluded that the proposed development would not create any material adverse impacts on the surrounding intersections. The future performance of the assessed intersections would be consistent with those found under existing conditions.

The analysis indicates that the proposed changes to Davy Road would have no impact to the traffic performance of Henderson Road intersection

- There will be no major change to Henderson, Mitchell, Davy intersection? That is:
- in spite of 10,000 employees moving to Eveleigh.
- perhaps as many as 4,600 people, based on current statistics for ATP employees, driving to work
- all the vehicles, loaded large trucks and heavy machinery involved in the construction of three buildings coming in and out through Garden Street, Henderson Road and Davy Road.
- the increase in service and rubbish trucks, taxis and couriers for the 10,000 employees and retail outlets.
- the distribution and delivery trucks for the proposed supermarket.

- the impact of Davy Road having fewer lanes, and of the drop offs for two Child Care Centres' whose access will be via Davy Road.
- Then when you add all the accumulative effects of :
 - the overflow from West Connex pouring down Mitchell Road and especially from Euston Road when that begins to jam with the 61,000 cars expected daily.
- the construction of Waterloo Station and when it begins operation
- the increased traffic involved with the building of new apartments in the Ashmore Estate and Mitchell road.

And no impact? In one word, incredible!

- Once again, if the local community had been engaged in meaningful consultations and participations, we could have easily informed the *EIS* consultants that particular intersection when Channel 7 with its 2,000 employees moved into the ATP became one of the worst and most dangerous crossings in Sydney, as described recently by Frank, a resident of The Alexander Units, in Alexander Street.
- The impacts on the walkability of our area were significant from the construction of just one building, the Channel 7 building.
- The amount of time wasted waiting for the lights to change at the corners of Mitchell and Henderson roads; the speed at which cars race across Henderson Road into Davy Road; the fact that ten steps out from the footpath on a green light the lights change and one is left stranded in the middle of the crossing with cars on a green arrow turning at speed across the crossing.
- Residents have lobbied for years to have changes made to improve the situation and now, as a result, it will become even more highly congested and unsafe.

Comments

The *EIS*:

1. definitely does **not** demonstrate due consideration of the potential cumulative impacts due to the other development in the vicinity.
2. does **not** meet this SEARS' requirement of considering the potential cumulative effects from their own and other developments.

Recommendations

a) that a new *Traffic and Parking Assessment Report* be prepared before the *EIS* is considered for approval, on the basis, that the current report is completely lacking in detail or consideration of the impacts of West Connex, Waterloo Station construction and operation, the Ashmore Estate development, and the new apartment blocks in Mitchell road the Fountain Street area.

E. Traffic and Accessibility: SEARs

❖ ***SEAR: detail the traffic and transport impacts (including Bus services ...) and how these will be mitigated.***

1. Drawing on all the reasons and examples given above the *TIA* and *EIS* is shown to be deficient in detailing traffic and transport impacts from the re-development of the ATP.
2. In the *EIS*, the number 308 bus information is incorrect.
3. For some of the bus services, the times given of service frequency is allegedly inaccurate or insufficient in giving the complete picture of the service available.
4. The traffic impacts on the intersections:
 - I have walked the intersections, referenced here, for the past 23 years. The walkability of the area around the ATP was severely impaired with the construction of one building and the introduction of 2,000 employees.
 - The Henderson and Mitchell Road has become a nightmare. Because cars at speed are turning around corners of the intersection on a green arrow without being able to see the pedestrians on the crossing it can be very dangerous. The lights take forever to change.

- No adverse impacts from the redevelopment of the ATP? The increase in traffic, noise, pollution from petrol and diesel fumes, the stress of trying to dodge cyclists and cross the intersections without being hit by a truck?

5. The proposed Mitigation Measures 6.0 and 7.0 of the EIS states:

a) Based on the existing intersection performance and the likely traffic to be generated from the proposed development, all key intersections will perform at an acceptable level of service during peak service. As such, no mitigations are required to manage the surrounding road network.

Such a statement defies rationality. And a statement even worse

b) Sufficient parking is accommodated within the ATP to meet the demands of the proposal
which involves 10,000 employees vying for 1,574 car spaces with the 5,500 staff that already work at the ATP

c) and the number of parking space is less than the maximum number permissible under SEPP Major Development 2005.

Yes, at least that is correct but where are the mitigation measure to address thousands of employees unable able to find car spaces to park their cars?

Recommendations

1. That a new *TIA* of the *EIS* be prepared on the basis, the *TIA* and the *EIS* do **not** meet the requirements of the *SEARs*, nor the mitigation measures required, for impacts involving parking, traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.
2. That new realistic, practical mitigation measures be established.

F. General Requirements: SEARS

a) Jobs, Employment

- ❖ ***SEARs: an estimate of the jobs that will be created by the future development during the construction and operating phases of the development.***

It is a pity there isn't a *SEARs* for hoodwinking, bamboozling, misrepresentation, and fudging of the truth. The *EIS* would meet that requirement admirably.

1. Through out the *EIS* the positions that the 10,000 employees will fill are presented as if they are new positions.

Such statements are totally misleading.

2. All that is happening, in complete contradiction of many City of Sydney and NSW Government Plans, is that 10,000 employees with their jobs are moving from the Parramatta, Sydney Olympic Park, Lidcombe, to Eveleigh. That is, in spite of Government endeavouring for untold years to encourage the creation of new jobs for the thousands in Western Sydney.

The move is transferring existing jobs of the CBA, not creating new ones.

3. Unlike Melbourne's 20 minute rule of having work, sport fields, shops, libraries, services only 20 minutes from home, the NSW Government, CBA and Mirvac are moving employees even further from home to work than many already are.

Allegedly, the move is because of the cost of supplying buses from Strathfield for employees at Olympic Park. The local train services were considered not frequent enough.

4. Guess what? The transport from Redfern Station, being many Sydney workers' end of journey or near end of journey trip, is even more crowded, uncomfortable and very difficult to access a train in peak hour.
5. Hiring buses for the staff to and from may be the only solution for a number of years to come.
6. The article below *West becomes Workers Paradise* published in the *Daily Telegraph* on 23 January 2008, describes the effects on employees when the CBA moved from the City to Homebush.

Now the CBA is moving back again. All the wonderful supermarkets, gym and retail outlets Mirvac is promoting for the community use at the ATP, in fact, is simply replicating of what is already at Homebush – the food outlets, the gym, the Child Care Centres, even down to the glass atriums in the buildings.

As explained in the *Daily Telegraph's* article *West becomes Workers' Paradise* in 21 January 2008, the sad part for the employees like Ms M below is that they will be facing again the long and punishing hours commuting, leaving them exhausted at the weekend and out of pocket at \$900 a year for the cost of the new fares on the Western Line.

In 2008, the move slashed Ms M.'s four daily train treks to none, saving her \$160 a month in rail tickets and even more for fuel and daily parking. The long and

punishing four hours spent commuting each day continued for a year until her employer, the Commonwealth Bank, relocated its headquarters to Homebush.

The relocated departments were all kept closer together, meaning there was no longer any need for meetings in Burwood. It changed her life.

Instead of being cramped on a noisy train of questionable hygiene, Ms M can now relax with a visit to her son at the Commonwealth Bank's bright childcare centre or work out or swim at the nearby aquatic centre and gym.

The new CBA... developments represent not just new office space - but a new suburban lifestyle.

CBA (has) taken a dramatic step away from the government grey painted cubicle farm. They are architecturally stylish - at the Commonwealth Bank six levels are connected by bridges in a central glass atrium.

And CBA offers employees a lifestyle membership that includes discounts to Sydney Olympic Parks gym, swimming pool, food outlets and sporting and cultural events. They have a concierge service for dry cleaning and shoe repair, free parking for the first 12 months, and a free shuttle bus to key areas in Parramatta and the CBD and subsidised services from the Eastern Suburbs and Inner West. Employees can salary sacrifice, not just food and drink from their cafe, but at other retailers and childcare. At lunch, employees can take a free shuttle to shopping centres.

Sound familiar?

7. No new jobs, if any, just moving jobs in and out of the City, as one can if one has yearly profits of \$8 billion.
8. It is still to be seen how many of the employees will choose to resign if they can, rather than face the discomfort of travelling for hours on crowded public transport. There will be new job opportunities then.
9. As we have no information or data about the type and specific number of jobs that will be located in the CBA Buildings in the ATP all one can do is speculate. Impossible on those grounds to challenge any estimation of jobs created.
10. But under this *SEAR*, what would be preferable to see is a focus by Mirvac and CBA on an increase in local employment, local jobs in the area around the ATP.
11. While it is obvious the establishment of child care centres, supermarket, gym, cafes, restaurants is only replacing what CBA already has at Olympic Park, perhaps the *EIS* would have displayed more integrity if it had been honest, instead of promoting these establishments as if they were new initiatives for the local community... whether they needed them or not.

The proposed retail use of Building 2 includes a 500m² boutique supermarket. It is proposed to operate the supermarket on a 24/7 basis as low scale shop serving the local community for supply of general provisions. As such it is expected that the majority of custom would be for walk-in

workers and residents living in nearby developments including the existing and proposed developments within the ATP site.

12. The local community definitely does not need another supermarket. There are two low scale convenience stores already in short walking distances of the ATP, one in Mitchell Road, open from 7am to 10pm; 11 large supermarkets that stock everything one could want and that can be easily accessible and at reasonable cost.
13. We definitely do not need a boutique supermarket. The CBA employees obviously do.
14. On the other hand, who but the shift work-employees of CBA would need 24 hour access? Have the public safety factors been considered in encouraging people to be walking around the streets and ATP late at night?
15. Alexandria is reknown for the number and quality of our cafes and restaurants just short walks across the road from the ATP . More in competition are not required.
16. How more preferable for the local economy and the building of social networks would it be, if the CBA employees frequented the cafes and restaurants that are already operating and thus supporting local jobs?
17. Which raises the question why are the CBA and Mirvac not supporting local workers , local jobs and local businesses?
18. Likewise, why aren't they fulfilling 5(a) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* for State Significant Development Projects

*To encourage the proper management, development of conservation of natural and artificial resources including agricultural land, natural areas, forests, minerals, water, cities, towns and villages for the **purpose of promoting the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment***
19. With the lack of recognition by Mirvac of the local Aboriginal community instead of building a new gym, what better way to show support for the Aboriginal and local communities and protecting local jobs than encouraging CBA employees to access the gyms and pool already in existence at the National Centre for Aboriginal Excellence and the Eloura Tony Mundine Gym?
20. Other new jobs? Any construction jobs will be short-term and most will be contractors.

Recommendations

1. that Mirvac reconsiders the importance of job creation for local people and not rely solely on CBA jobs.
2. that Mirvac and CBA encourages employees to support local jobs in the local cafes, galleries, restaurants, supermarkets, shops and gyms.

G. Built Form and Design Quality: SEARs

b) Height, Bulk and Scale of new buildings

- ❖ ***SEARs: address the height, bulk and scale of the proposed buildings within the context of the locality and ensure the proposal does not create unacceptable environmental impacts.***
- ❖ ***SEARs: Analysis and details justification for the proposed building height in the context of the adjoining development and height controls.***
- ❖ ***SEARs: Consideration of the overall site layout, connectivity, open spaces and edges, facades, massing, setbacks, building articulation, materials, colours, landscaping, rooftop and mechanical plant***

Existing buildings - Locomotive Workshop

- ❖ ***SEAR: The development, especially Building 1 and Building 2, does not show respect nor display consideration of the relationships and interface with existing buildings, public domain and street network***
 - ❖ ***SEAR: The EIS does not address how the proposal retains and promotes the existing and future built form and fabric of the ATP.***
1. How any architect or developer who professes to respect the value of heritage buildings and then designs a massive building like Building 2 to dominate the landscape in front of the Locomotive Workshop obviously, in truth, holds no value of nor respect for heritage buildings?
 2. Section 6 of the *Heritage Impact Statement and the Archaeological Impact Statement Appendix* acknowledges

The ATP provides importance evidence of the founding and gradual expansion of the largest railway workshops in NSW over a period of 100

years. Eveleigh Railway Workshop was a highly significant and ambitious public endeavor that rarely occurs today.

So important that such a building with so much history attached, the site of much highly skilled work and expertise, so loved and admired by the community and railway workers, that is can be permitted to be overwhelmed, hidden from open view and diminished, by a massive building for a bank!

A bank at present that is allegedly facing fraud charges in America; that has been left reeling from a damning Senate inquiry into widespread misconduct in its financial planning division, which culminated in a recommendation for a royal commission.

3. *The rich character of the site provides many opportunities to celebrate the Locomotive Sheds and the historical industrial character. (Section 3.8, EIS)*
4. Building 2 neither celebrates the Locomotive Sheds nor shows any relationship with the Sheds except to be plonked in front to totally overwhelm, diminish and obliterate the Sheds.
5. Oh, yes, but Building 2 has a wavy roof line that is suppose to mimic the Locomotive Sheds. Many in the community saw that effect as absolutely insulting.
6. *EIS in 5.4.5, The proposal provides a building form which is vastly consistent with the building envelopes In addition, the proposal reflects the historic character of the railway yards.*
7. No details how the proposal achieves any of that, just a blank statement when the evidence ist hat the proposal clearly does the opposite.

c) View and Sight Lines

- ❖ ***View analysis to and from the site from key vantage points and streetscape impacts.***
- ❖ ***Identify important sight lines and visual connectivity to and through the site***

Visual and Views

1. The sadness and anger about what is to occur to the Locomotive Workshops caused many to walk out of the Community Information Session that Mirvac held late 2015 when the plans were first displayed. Many were too upset to fill out evaluation sheets and simply left.
2. The interesting part is that the *EIS* acknowledges that:

- a. *The ATP site holds great significance for members of the local community and current and former workers within the NSW Railways and is central to many local community members connection with Redfern and Darlington area. Appendix G, 6.0.*
 - b. Yet Mirvac fails by its actions to display or act in any manner that acknowledges that statement. Instead it is arrogantly ignored.
3. The truth of the matter is that the significance of the beautiful sight lines of the brick, Neo Classical Locomotive Workshops will be totally lost, blocked out by the massive bulk and height of Building 2.
4. *The rich heritage character of the site provides many opportunities to celebrate the Locomotive Sheds and ATP historical industrial character. (EIS, Section 3.8)*
5. To celebrate? By destroying the character and aspect of the Workshops by building another building directly in front, obliterating all views?
6. Who at Mirvac, or at the Department of Planning and Environment, really understands the importance of those Workshops to the community?
7. *The ATP site holds great significance for members of the local community and current and former workers within the NSW Railways and is central to many local community members connection with Redfern and Darlington area. Appendix, 6.0*
8. All the fine words expressed in the *EIS*, about valuing and protecting heritage and the importance of historical preservation are worth nothing, are false, phoney, and pure humbug.
9. As long as the CBA and Mirvac gets what they want, then everything else becomes irrelevant.
10. If the Locomotive Workshops that represents to citizens the proud history and achievements of the largest railway workshops in NSW over a period of a 100 years is diminished, the old street in front becoming yet another canyon walk, with no sunlight, more wind, because of the height and bulk of Building 2, irrelevant?

Not to local citizens. railway workers and admirers of heritage buildings.
11. The views and perspective of the Locomotive building from Henderson and Mitchell roads will be completely blocked by Building 2.
12. The view that local people and visitors have enjoyed daily for 100 years from the Alexandria Post Office and admired the Neo Classical Workshops will be gone.

13. The pleasant walk into and around the Park with views of the sky and the heritage architecture will be destroyed.
14. In essence, Building 2, even if it wasn't 35% over size of acceptable limits, completely obliterates, obstructs, overwhelms, belittles the Locomotive building and the heritage environment of the ATP.

A very poor, uncreative, non-innovative Place Making at the most. The proposal definitely does **not** achieve to any degree, as claimed, of a reasonable balance between the protection of private views and the protection of public domain views.

The *EIS* does **not** identify important sight lines and visual connectivity to and through the site.

Lots of fine words about the heritage of the ATP in the *EIS* yet in the end no protection of the very places and buildings that represent all the fine heritage that the ATP encapsulates.

d) Aboriginal Heritage

- ❖ ***SEAR: address the impacts of the proposal on the heritage significance of the ATP precinct***
- ❖ ***SEAR: assess the impact on any proposal on any aboriginal and non-Aboriginal archeology within the ATP Precinct and outline any proposed management and conservation measure to protect and preserve archeological.***

1. If the local community was horrified and sad about the lack of respect and appreciation of the Locomotive Workshops shown by Mirvac, it was nothing compared to the outrage that many expressed about this Section of the *EIS*.
2. In a very short paragraph in the *EIS* Section 5.9 to simply refer to the Archeology, the past long gone, as if the only importance, regarding Aboriginal people is whether archaeology remains are there or not, was deeply disrespectful.

Curio Project confirms that no Aboriginal sites are recorded in or near the site and no Aboriginal places have been declared in or near the site by means of Office of Environment and Heritage AHIMS search. The proposed development is unlikely to have any impact on Aboriginal objects or sites.

The Section in the *EIS* regarding development certainly had an impact.

3. In Appendix G, the following was quoted from Godden, Mackay, Logan (December 2013) *ATP Conservation Plan*, Vol. 1, in Section 5.1,

of the EIS.

The ATP site and its surrounding suburbs have an important and strong legacy of Aboriginal historical connection to the region.

At least here, in this Section, acknowledgement is given to the fact that Redfern, the heart of Aboriginal Sydney, exists because of the many Aboriginal people who came to work in the Eveleigh Railway yards from Western and Northern NSW.

The ATP site holds great significance for members of the local community and current and former workers within the NSW railways and is central to many community members connection with the Redfern and Darlington Area. Appendix G, 6.0.

4. With regards to the *Public Art Strategy*, Appendix V, 3.0, the writers of the Strategy do acknowledge the potential special link between art and history and community.

The site has significant history. Artwork would assist in the community's understanding of the history of the site and its environs and enhance the everyday experience of visitors.

Unfortunately in the Strategy, little recognition is displayed either of the cultural richness and artistic abilities of the Cadigal Aboriginal community today or the skills of the young Aboriginal artists training at Eora TAFE College Sydney .

There are also many opportunities and places within Eveleigh and the surrounding area that not only illustrate Aboriginal cultural heritage but are an important legacy for future generations of Aboriginal and Non Aboriginal people. Appendix G, 3.0

5. But hopefully, in this instance the Guiding Principles of the *Public Art Strategy* will be more than just shallow, hollow words.

The public art strategy consists of a series of guiding principles to help identify opportunities and approaches to providing public art, ranging from community based local works to iconic major projects.....

They build on the past, while responding to the new ideas about art, story telling interpretation and cultural expression and ensure a balance between the site, historical significance audience and identity. Appendix V,4.0

6. Mirvac has completed so many fine iconic major projects. In keeping with the heritage and history for the Aboriginal people and railway workers of the ATP we are hoping that, with the wealth of Aboriginal artists, writers and story tellers in Redfern, community-based, local public art projects for the ATP will have Mirvac's support.

7. To do so would **fulfill** the legal requirements of the *SEAR* referring to the creation of jobs as well as in 5 (d) consultation and 5(e) public interest of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.
8. If Mirvac and CBA desire to build relationships and acceptance within the surrounding communities, Public Art involving local communities would be an excellent strategy to implement.

Recommendations

1. That Mirvac acknowledges by its actions the importance of the Aboriginal community in Redfern and Waterloo and its historical links with the ATP
2. That Mirvac explores with them the possibility of local Public Art projects involving local artists, story-tellers and writers.

e) Public Domain

- ❖ ***Address all aspects of the public domain, including open spaces within the precinct, road paving, on-street parking, footpaths, cycleways, tree planting, outdoor dining, public art and lighting.***

Throughout the *EIS*, the improvement of the Public Domain is constantly trumpeted, as the big positive, the big selling point.

Because Mirvac has conducted mostly Information Sessions, not valid Consultation processes, they appear to have missed the point that:

1. The community has never had anything but praise for the public domain of the ATP. The gardens have been well maintained, the areas kept safe, clean and tidy. ATP Management has maintained an excellent standard. Many local residents do **not** see any need for major renovations of the Public Domain, other than more substantial trees along Henderson Road to absorb the pollution, noise and lights.
2. No amount of new paving, new tree planting will make up for the loss of wide views of the sky; the peacefulness while walking through the Park, relatively calmly, without having to dodge streams of vehicles, other pedestrians and cyclists; the relatively fresh air not polluted by exhausts. We are to lose all of that. For what in return? Refreshed Public Domain that does not need major refreshing?

Comment

The *EIS* does **not** show in sufficient detail that all aspects of this **SEAR** have been explored from the public's view point nor that the community was consulted on the specific plans.

Recommendation

1. That true consultations regarding the Public Domain, not Community Information Sessions presenting Mirvac's ideas, be held with the community as required under 5 (c) Objects, of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*

to provide increased opportunity for public involvement and participation in environmental planning and assessment.

f) Public and Community Interest

I would like to raise a matter, under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, matters for consideration, specifically with relation to

b) the likely impacts of that development including environmental on both the natural and built environments and social and economic impacts in the locality

e) the public interest.

regarding the anchor tenant of the new developments in the ATP

- In 2014 it was claimed that the CBA was set to make a record profit that year of more than \$8 billion. (*CBA tellers driven to despair by hard sell*, article by Adele Ferguson, Ben Butler, July 1, 2014.)
- In 2015 *Commonwealth Bank compensation scheme for victims of financial planning scandal 'a joke', Senate inquiry hears*, by [Stephanie Ferrier](#) 28 Oct, ABC News

A Senate inquiry has heard 'explosive' evidence from a whistleblower who has accused the Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) of continuing to deny justice to victims of its financial planning scandal.

CBA customers lost hundreds of millions of dollars after financial planners put their clients' money into high-risk investments without their permission.

- In 2016, from Rohan Pearce *Computer World* 19 February

The Commonwealth Bank and a US-based not-for-profit organisation that has sued the bank are seeking to reach an out-of-court settlement. The legal action is linked to an Australian criminal case involving allegations that former CBA IT executives accepted kickback.

Reports as such somewhat takes the gloss off the picture Mirvac paints of the CBA being such high-technology and innovative IT company which the community should be fortunate to have moving into the ATP.

- While the information from the media does not infer that all CBA employees are tainted by the behavior of some of the IT and Financial Services staff, the culture that exists within the CBA is a concern for the community.

- The *EIS* mentions in Section 1.2, of the *Stakeholder and Community Engagement Report Appendix* that:

Urban Growth has been working with stakeholders ... to develop a long-term plan for Central to Eveleigh Development that will guide the redevelopment of these mainly government lands and act as a catalyst to develop a thriving, vibrant and more connected area for people to play work and live ...

as if that wasn't happening locally already.

- Perhaps it would be more constructive if Urban Growth chose more wisely which organisation they promote to purchase public land.
- Perhaps they need to be more concerned about what type of culture they have agreed to import into the local community than being concerned with developing a more thriving, vibrant local area.
- Questions that require answers:

What could be the social impacts on the community from such a culture as described above? and is such a culture in the public interest?

g) Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA)

Based on the information given in the Submission:

1. The *EIS* is **not** in accord with many of the objectives in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 in regards built form and design nor gives due regard to the social and environment impacts including heritage, traffic, noise, and construction impacts.

2. The EIS is **not** in compliance with particular Planning Policies.
3. It does **not** meet *SEPP1* (Development Standards) nor comply with *SEPP* (Infrastructure) 2007.
4. The *EIS* is **not** consistent with the land use and design within BEP1 for the ATP.
5. It does **not** honour nor respect the built form character of the ATP as residents were promised under BEP1 and BEP2.
6. The EIS does **not** demonstrate regard to economic and social considerations and therefore the carrying out of this project is not justified.
7. Interestingly the plans espoused in the *EIS* fail to meet three of their own objectives for the development.
8. Given that the planning merits and public benefits have not been adequately researched, analysed and documented it is recommended that this application by MIRVAC be **not** approved in its current form.

Summary Comments

The *EIS* reads as if it has been a superficial cut and paste job.

It appears very much to have been prepared on the basis

- that there was no need for in-depth research, nor effort in referencing the history of ATP recent issues to enhance the success of the plans for the site, such as can be found in past reports of Redfern Waterloo Authority, of the City of Sydney Council and of local community groups.
- No need for recognition and acknowledgement of the severe impacts on immediate environment as a result of constructing three new buildings, one oversized by 35%, in an area metres only away from a residential zone of young families, valuable heritage homes and Child Care Centres.
- No need for much effort when it appears to be a tick-in-the-box exercise for the tenant CBA, one of the ten most politically powerful organisations in Australia.
- The *EIS* is definitely not to the standard of a DA/EIS that would be expected of an *EIS* submitted for approval to the City of Sydney Council.
- One would have thought very high standards of preparation and content would be required for *A State Significant Project*.

- In essence, the lack of information and details in the *EIS* present a shallow, deficient case and do not meet many of the legal requirements under NSW Law.

Compilation of Recommendations

a) that JBA, Mirvac, and CBA provide to the public and local communities the correct information, facts and data concerning the CBA employees and what agreements and plans are in place regarding Redfern Station and Sydney trains.

b) That JBA, Mirvac and CBA provide realist measures to avoid, minimize and offset the impacts; to detail how the risks will be managed of bringing in 10,000 employees into an area without public transport that can meet that potential demand.

c) It is recommended that the excellent travel plan of the Built Environment Plan 1 be reinstated instead of *The Green Travel Plan* in the *TIA*.

d) As Waterloo Station will not be operational before 2024 and seemingly no specific plans are in place for the new Redfern Station, it is recommended that CBA, as is happening now from Strathfield to Homebush, provide buses for their employees to and from work at the ATP.

e) That buses be supplied for tradesmen travelling to and from the ATP.

f) That the *EIS* be **not** approved in its current form until urgent issues of the safety of the crossings of Mitchell Way be examined in light of the significant increase in construction and employee traffic, bikes and pedestrians.

g) That strategies that ensure the safety of young pedestrians, especially, and cyclists be identified and implemented before construction begins and that they be negotiated with Alexandria Park Community School.

h) That a new *Traffic and Parking Assessment Report (TIA)* be prepared before the *EIS* is considered for approval, on the basis, that the current reports are completely lacking in detail or consideration of the impacts of West Connex, Waterloo Station construction and operation, the Ashmore Estate

development, and the new apartment blocks in Mitchell road the Fountain Street area.

i) That recommendation is based on the fact that the *TIA* and the *EIS* do **not** meet the requirements of the *SEARs* nor the mitigation measures required, for impacts involving parking, traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.

j) That new realistic, practical mitigation measures be established.

k) That Mirvac acknowledges the importance of job creation for local people.

l) That Mirvac and CBA encourages employees to support local jobs in the local cafes, galleries, restaurants, supermarkets, shops and gyms instead of setting up competing businesses.

m) That true consultations regarding the Public Domain to gather the community's ideas, not Community Information Sessions presenting Mirvac's ideas, be held with the community as required under 5 (c) Objects, of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*

to provide increased opportunity for public involvement and participation in environmental planning and assessment.

n) That the *Development Application* by Mirvac and the *EIS* be **not** approved in its current form until the *EIS* meets the appropriate standards and the State of NSW's legal requirements.

Desley Haas and Family
29 February 2016