

43

Shivesh Singh - Scottish Hospital Redevelopment MP10_0160

From: "Sara Stace" <staces@tpg.com.au>
To: "'Plan Comment'" <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 14/12/2010 10:53 PM
Subject: Scottish Hospital Redevelopment MP10_0160
CC: <allan.coker@woollahra.nsw.gov.au>, <peter.kauter@woollahra.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: Scottish Hospital-Save our Trees.pdf

RE: 2 Cooper St, Scottish Hospital Redevelopment (MP10_0160)

Local children plead to save our Garden of Eden

On Sunday 12 December 2010, the local children who live around the Dillon St Reserve interrupted their Christmas picnic with Santa to make a plea to save their local area.



The young children and their parents held up signs saying, 'Save our Garden of Eden', 'Save our Trees' and 'These trees are on Death Row'.

Although we welcome the idea of a larger parkland area (subject to a separate Voluntary Planning Agreement with Woollahra Council), we do not want this in lieu of retaining the amenity, beauty and serenity of the local neighbourhood.

Please find attached my letter of objection to the proposal currently before the Department of Planning.

Sara Stace

Owner, 801/40 Stephen St, Paddington NSW

Attn: Shivesh Singh, Department of Planning, 23 Bridge St Sydney NSW 2000

Copy: Alan Coker and Peter Kauter, Woollahra Council, PO Box 61, Double Bay NSW 1361

RE: 2 Cooper St, Scottish Hospital Redevelopment (MP10_0160)

Local children plead to save our Garden of Eden

On Sunday 12 December 2010, the local children who live around the Dillon St Reserve interrupted their Christmas picnic with Santa to make a plea to save their local area.



The young children and their parents held up signs saying, 'Save our Garden of Eden', 'Save our Trees' and 'These trees are on Death Row'.

Although we welcome the idea of a larger parkland area (subject to a separate Voluntary Planning Agreement with Woollahra Council), we do not want this in lieu of retaining the amenity, beauty and serenity of the local neighbourhood.

SAVE OUR TREES

We request that more trees should be retained, particularly the trees along Stephen St

Dillon St Reserve suffered a major loss of amenity when several trees came down in a violent storm a few months ago. This photograph is taken in front of the main tree stump and replacement cyclone fence. However, the adverse effect from the loss of these trees is nothing compared to the future loss of trees that will occur on the site. Some 88 trees are slated for removal, including 23 along Stephen Street alone.

- The EP&A Act states that proposed development should retain, wherever reasonable, major existing trees (Cl 33 f). The proposal does not meet this requirement, particularly along Stephen Street
- All trees along Stephen St are slated to be removed, with the exception of two trees in the far north-east corner. The current trees are up to 19 metres tall with canopies of 6 to 8 metres radius
- Residents have been told that the Aborist recommended removal of all trees along Stephen Street because they are weed species. This is not correct. The report classifies nine trees located near the boundary as Retention Value B 'Could be retained'. Most are Chinese Hackberry, Camphor Laurel and Coral Trees over 10 metres tall. The Woollahra Council Tree Preservation Order (TPO) says that any trees of these species that are over 10 metres in height are subject to preservation
- There are several examples elsewhere in this proposal where such species will be retained:
Of Retention Value B: two Hackberrys (T69, T76) and four Camphor Laurels (T5, T89, T107, T108)
Of Retention Value C: one African Olive (T19), two Coco Palms (T74, T75) and two Hackberrys (T92, T117). The African Olive and Coco Palms are such invasive weeds that they are fully TPO exempt, yet they are being kept in this proposal
- Located directly opposite 40 Stephen St is T37 - a mature Camphor Laurel. This magnificent specimen is 19 metres high and 8 metres radius. It provides a significant canopy and, if it were kept, would help reduce the visual impact of the RACF building. By way of comparison, T5 near the Brown St entry is an equal size Camphor Laurel. It is also classified as Retention Value B and is being retained. This is inequitable to the residents of Stephen St.
- T35 next to T37 mentioned above is another tree slated for removal. It is a mature Brushbox which is 17 metres high and 6 metres in radius. It has Retention Value B and is located very close to the property boundary. It is not a weed species and would be an ideal candidate for retention

REMOVE THE PROPOSED LOADING DOCK

We request that the loading dock on Stephen St be removed from the proposal

- The consultants' reports repeatedly refer to there being an existing service entry from Stephen St for the hospital when it was in operation. There is no such entry at present
- There is a large cluster of mature trees in the supposed location of the service entry. Looking at the existing hospital building and pavement, it is extremely unlikely that any service entry existed at this point
- The proposal has provided no historical documentation about the so-called existing service entry

Glen St and Stephen St are not suitable for service vehicles

- The additional heavy commercial vehicle traffic will significantly reduce the safety and amenity of Glen St and Stephen St
- The Traffic Report says the loading bay in Stephen St would generate up to 40 visits per week, depending on supplier contracts and waste collection frequency. This would tend to be concentrated between 8am and 4pm, adding 2-3 vehicles per hour to Stephen St, or 4-6 movements per hour (one every 10 to 15 minutes)

- In contradiction to the above statement, table 4.2 of the Traffic Report shows no increase in the number of vehicle movements per hour on Stephen St south of Glen St (19 in morning peak, 13 in evening peak remains unchanged)
- The Traffic Report says the traffic generated by the loading bay 'would not be numerically inconsistent with that of prevailing other uses in the area'. However, prevailing uses in the area are not loading bays for service and delivery vehicles.
- The Traffic Report does not say how trucks will turn around on Stephen Street. There is no turning circle at the end of the cul de sac, so vehicles currently use the car park of 40 Stephen St
- The Development Application shows two parallel parking bays on the street will be removed for the service vehicle entry. However the VPA with Woollahra Council shows the removal of seven parallel parking bays, and the creation of eight 90 degree parking bays outside Dillon Reserve. This would all be done at Woollahra Council's cost. This is not an equitable solution for residents or rate payers, and would result in the destruction of even more existing vegetation along Stephen St.

NO GARBAGE, LAUNDRY OR KITCHEN ON STEPHEN ST

- Residents were told during the public consultation that no garbage would be picked up from Stephen St (in contradiction to the Traffic Report). This loading bay would only be used for laundry service and kitchen / food supplies for the RACF. All other laundry, food and garbage services for other uses (Nursing home and ILU) would be from Brown St
- However, there is a large garbage room directly adjacent to the loading bay on Stephen St
- There is also a commercial kitchen and large laundry room outside 40 Stephen St. Residents are concerned about the noise and exhaust air from these uses
- All of these uses should be located well away from existing residents on Stephen St

RELOCATE THE AIR CONDITIONING UNITS

- Plans show a large bank of air conditioning condenser units to be located opposite 40 Stephen St
- These will be noisy and running 24 hours a day. The section shows they will be half buried, however this will not mitigate the noise impact on 38 and 40 Stephen St, which have living rooms and kitchens facing these air conditioner units
- The air conditioning condensers need to be located where they will not impact on 38 or 40 Stephen St residents

SUMMARY - SIGNIFICANT DETRIMENTAL OUTCOMES FOR THE COMMUNITY

The proposal for the Scottish Hospital has significant detrimental outcomes for residents and the local community.

For children, the experience of Dillon St Reserve is not just the park itself or the playground equipment. It is the joy of watching birds feeding and hearing their birdsong. It is walking to and from the park along this quiet cul-de-sac: their laughter as they walk to and from the playground is a true pleasure to hear. It is playing in the dappled sunlight of trees, noticing the changing of seasons when leaves dry up and fall, or when they return as buds in Spring.

With the redevelopment of the Scottish Hospital site we would like to think that all the existing residents in the area, and the future residents of the aged care facility, can enjoy the view of trees and the sound of birds for many years to come.

Regards,

Sara Stace, 801/40 Stephen St, Paddington NSW 2021

FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS

There are statements in the consultants' reports that are either wrong or misleading. Here are some examples:

'Locating the built form between the trees to enable the maximum retention of vegetation is a positive outcome as it maintains the current landscape character around the site, mitigates the visual impact of any development and continues the visual and heritage contribution of the site to the surrounding area.' (Urbis p80)

- This statement is incorrect on all aspects. The built form along Stephen St will not be located between trees, it will not retain any existing vegetation, it does not maintain the current landscape character, will not mitigate the visual impact of the development, and will not continue the visual and heritage contribution of the site to the surrounding area.

'The mature plantings and significant drop within the site provides the opportunity to achieve taller buildings within the site if they are located to sit within the tree canopy and contained by trees away from the street edges. This will follow the existing approach to development on the site.' (Urbis p26)

- This principle has been adhered to on other parts of the site, but has been disregarded for Stephen St. The proposal will place 5 to 6 storey buildings along the street edge with minimal setbacks, and in doing so remove every existing tree along the streetscape and replace them with shrubs

'The design responds to the streetscapes surrounding the site and minimises negative impact... There will be no adverse impacts on neighbours privacy, amenity, solar access or views.' (Urbis p65 and 66)

- There will be significant adverse impacts on neighbours from the proposal: noise from regular service vehicles and air conditioning units, loss of privacy, and the destruction of the magnificent canopy of trees that provide greenery and a diversity of birdlife.

'It is not considered that any dwelling for which view analysis modelling was undertaken will be affected by view loss as a result of the proposal' (Urbis p 114)

- View analysis modelling was undertaken for any residents that requested it. Three units within 40 Stephen St were analysed, as well as the entry foyer. All views were negatively impacted, with the lower levels looking directly out at balconies and windows of the RACF building just 16 metres away

'Locating the taller buildings towards the southern end of the site which can take higher building forms without the resultant impacts on neighbouring buildings' (Urbis p 114)

- The higher building forms are proposed to be located opposite 38 and 40 Stephen Street. There are ninety people living in these units – ranging from the elderly ageing in place to families with young children. To say that there will not be any impacts on neighbouring buildings is disingenuous.

'In the case of the current outlook enjoyed from residents at 40 Stephen Street in particular (and other Stephen Street residents in general)... the altered outlook onto the RACF building is not significantly different from the majority of outlooks experienced by residential dwellings in Paddington. This dense urban area is characterised by buildings constructed along the street edge, which is consistent with the approach to the street interface of this RACF building.' (Urbis p114)

- The RACF building is up to 6 storeys high (18.3 metres to roof parapet height) which is much higher than most other buildings in the local area. The local characteristic is a mix of terrace houses and two-storey walk-ups. Its height, bulk and usage are significantly different to the surrounding residential precinct.

'As the site is not zoned for open space there can not be a reasonable expectation to retain such an outlook into vegetated areas.' (Urbis p114)

- With the trees protected under Council's TPO, and being located on the boundary of the site, it is not unreasonable for residents to expect the vegetation will remain mostly intact – particularly where trees are healthy and vigorous as stated in the Arborist's report