

Hi Mark

Thanks for the opportunity to comment further. Our response to EG's RfS is as follows:-

1. It's encouraging to see that EG has taken on board many of the principles expressed in the GreenWay submission in relation to width of public access ways, works within the GreenWay corridor etc. There are, however, insufficient details provided in response to our specific comments in the GreenWay submission about design excellence, WSUD, place making, public art and activation, which is disappointing.
2. Re: WSUD - the only acknowledgement of this is shown in the plans of the central medians in the two new roads. It would be good to see design details of WSUD treatments along the route of the public access way from Smith St to the light rail stop, including on Portion 4 (which is proposed to be privately owned but publicly accessible);
3. Re: design excellence. An assurance is given in the RfS that "the design of the new works is considered to be of the highest standard". There is no evidence/drawings to substantiate this. Recognising that it maybe premature to expect detailed public domain designs at this early stage (eg lighting, street furniture, landscaping, public art), it is preferable for these details to be the subject of deferred consent, following consultation between the proponent and urban design specialists from TfNSW, Ashfield and Marrickville Councils. The design treatments need to be consistently applied to the public domain in Portion 3, Portion 4 (which will have an easement for public access) and the access way leading through the light rail corridor to the light rail stop.
4. Re: width of public access way (portion 3) adjacent to Building 1C. The width is only 3ms, which is too narrow to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists making their way to/from the light rail and GreenWay shared use path.
- 5: Re: width of public access way/sight lines. There's a risk that Building 1C will interfere with the sight lines (and passive surveillance potential) along the access way to/from the light rail stop and proposed GreenWay.
6. Re: place making/activation/community connections. The proponent states that "the underlying design intent has always been to provide buildings and facilities which provide active uses along the public thoroughfares". Whilst the value of this is acknowledged, it needs to be noted that activation and community connections are not just achieved through design and the provision of open space during construction. There is a need for an on-going dialogue throughout the detailed design process and subsequent occupation/use of the site to achieve best practise place making/management approaches to the publicly accessible spaces throughout the development and, particularly, en route to/from the light rail stop and proposed GreenWay. One way forward may be to require the proponent to establish and resource this dialogue with relevant staff from TfNSW and the councils until such time that the parties consider the necessary approaches have been implemented. Specific details about how this might be achieved could be articulated in an Agreement between the proponent and the council(s).
7. Public access through portion 4. It would be reassuring to see this annotated on the subdivision plan.

Happy to discuss any of the above in more detail, if it would be helpful.

regards

Nick



Nick Chapman
GreenWay Place Manager

T: (02) 9716 1864

M: 0417 402 043

nickc@ashfield.nsw.gov.au

www.greenway.org.au

260 Liverpool Rd Ashfield NSW 2131