



DESIGN COLLABORATIVE Pty Limited

ABN 36 002 126 954
ACN 002 126 954

Planning and Development Consultants

www.designcollaborative.com.au

Director

J Lidis
BTP (UNSW)
MPIA CPP

Associate Director

David Rippingill
BEP (WSU)
Juris Doctor (UNE)
RPIA

Consultant

G W Smith BSurv(QLD)
MCP(MIT)
FPIA MRTPI FAPI
MIS Aust

27 October 2017

Ref: 171059.1L

NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Director – Key Sites Assessments

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Submission – MP 06_0101 MOD 2 and SSD 8135 for premises known as 77-123 Eveleigh Street, Redfern

Introduction

We act on behalf of our clients', the owners and occupiers of apartments in SP 63769 at 34-46 Regent Street, Redfern who are located in close proximity to the proposed development site across the existing railway corridor between Redfern and Central Station.

We have been retained to review the subject application and if there are valid town planning grounds of concern, to raise those for consideration in the assessment of the application.

After reviewing the application documentation, the relevant planning controls and undertaking an inspection of our clients' premises, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of our clients' property and surrounding area directly attributable to the excessive bulk and scale proposed which directly results in a sense of enclosure and overbearing mainly due to the typology of buildings proposed and exceedance of what is accepted as the maximum heights of buildings in the area which is 18 storeys compared to 24 storeys for the proposal.

The result of the above is a building which exceeds the maximum established height by 6 storeys in the form of a bulky curtain wall building.

On the above basis we are of the opinion that the application should be refused, especially as the case has not been made as to why the proposed bulk and scale is acceptable in the context where the highest buildings are 18 storeys not 24 storeys and with a significant "curtain wall" effect as proposed by the subject applications.

Context

The proposed development site sits to the north-west of our clients' building across the railway corridor connecting Redfern and Central Stations.

Impact of the proposal on our clients' land

The areas of concern to our clients' and based on our review of the subject application are directly attributable to the excessive floor space and building height resulting in bulk and scale issues.

The documentation for the proposed development, in our opinion, has not demonstrated why the proposal should be supported. Most notably it fails to provide the necessary justification for the floor space and building heights, especially as there are serious adverse amenity impacts with respect to a sense of enclosure and overbearing mainly due to the typology of buildings proposed which through a "curtain wall" form and exceedance of what is accepted as the maximum heights of buildings in the area which is 18 storeys compared to 24 storeys for the proposal. These issues are dealt with below.

A. Floor Space

The proposed development seeks to provide for a large bulky building up to 24 storeys in height which would have the appearance of a "curtain wall" from our clients' property.

It is clearly not the case that no substantive adverse impacts arise from the bulk proposed as detailed above.

In determining whether the bulk proposed is appropriate, the following well established urban design criteria should be considered.

- The floor space does not result in excessive bulk and scale; and
- The floor space does not result in any significant detrimental impacts to surrounding development.

It is clearly not the case that the floor space does not result in excessive bulk and scale and any significant detrimental impacts to surrounding development. As detailed in this submission, a sense of enclosure and overbearing are substantive adverse impacts directly attributable to the proposed FSR.

B. Building Height

The proposal at 24 storeys would be well in excess of the maximum height limit established in the area of eighteen (18) storeys.

It is clearly not the case that no substantive adverse impacts arise from the height proposed. A sense of enclosure and overbearing are substantive adverse impacts directly attributable to the proposed height.

In determining whether the height proposed is appropriate, the following well established urban design criteria should be considered.

- The height does not result in excessive bulk and scale; and
- The height does not result in any significant detrimental impacts to surrounding development.

It is clearly not the case that the proposed height does not result in excessive bulk and scale and any significant detrimental impacts to surrounding development as detailed above.

Conclusion

Based on the above, we have concluded that the subject application should be refused. We have formed the view that the proposed development will have significant adverse impacts on our clients' amenity with respect to a sense of enclosure and overbearing directly attributable to the excessive floor space and height proposed as detailed in this submission.

We would be pleased to discuss the above matters further if required. In the meantime, we look forward to being kept informed of progress on the processing of this application.

We also invite the assessing officer and the decision makers with respect to this matter to attend on-site to see first-hand the impact of the proposal before any reports or decision is made with respect to the application. Our office can be contacted to assist with making those arrangements.

Should you have any enquiries with respect to the above please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss.

Yours Faithfully,
DESIGN COLLABORATIVE PTY LTD

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Lidis', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

J Lidis
Director