

# Block 8 - Central park



Mon 11/24/2014 1:55 PM

To: Mark Brown <Mark.Brown@planning.nsw.gov.au>;

The Department of Planning 23 - 33 Bridge Street SYDNEY NSW 2000

Attention: Mark Brown

Email: [mark.brown@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:mark.brown@planning.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Mark

Central Park: Response to Department's Assessment

Thank you for extending time to respond with regard to Block 8. We believe the review has erred and warrants further review in terms of open space and overshadowing.

Further, we ask that the department review the process for this particular application to allow each petition (per one individual) to be considered as one submission.

In particular we note that local residents had confidence that their voices would be heard through the "petition", only to learn later that their petition is being treated as one submission – thereby limiting the potential for independent review of the proposal; and making further representations in person.

Many of these residents live in the immediate area near Block 8.

Key concerns are the lack of open space, potential loss of privacy and any increase in overshadowing – particularly as the initial assumptions in terms of property type (residential vs commercial use) was often incorrect, which transpired in the wrong base data and considerations in terms of solar access.

Further given many of these properties already have limited solar access, with living areas often having insufficient solar or daylight access, it makes the case for having sufficient access to both private and public space. In particular, many of these properties only have limited private open space, increasing the reliance on Chippendale Green for public open space.

However, given the projected population for Chippendale (from 4,061 in 2011 to well over 9,000 by 2017) and the significant increase in workers and visitors, while the introduction of Chippendale Green is welcome it does not address the critical lack of open space, which in 2006 was already only 1.36sqm per person – barely 20% of the minimum open space for the City of Sydney.

As such, any reliance for open space by residents of new buildings, such as Block 8 on Chippendale Green should not be permitted to be built without having sufficient private open space in their building – as any reduction increases the reliance on Chippendale Green and effectively reduces the open space for local residents. It also effectively impacts incoming residents both in terms of the open space they have, as well as the incoming population.

Further the influx of visitors into the area and use of Chippendale Green as well as publically accessible private space for events was not previously considered or evaluated. This has had a significant impact on both the existing and incoming residential communities. This has led to an absence of accessible space, and instead an influx of visitors to the area – during the day, and after hours. This further establishes the need for open space.

In addition, plans for Block 8 were subsequently changed after being initially exhibited for public comment – with key concerns ignored, such as locals suggested a better mix of apartments and a reduction in the number of apartments to encourage a more sustainable and balanced social mix. Instead the proponent has introduced substantially more apartments, and failed to address the apartment depth which is likely to further warrant the need for quality open space.

Further, the current proposal contradicts the outcomes sought by the expert advisory board in 2008 – whereby an additional expert report was sought in relation to the impact of the bulk and scale would have on adjoining properties – and in particular their solar access. Unfortunately, a number of mistakes were made that led to some homes being identified as commercial premises. As such, the impact on nearby properties was not recognised, and the approval for concept 2 followed assessed on incorrect data. As such, closer consideration is warranted on the impact that any increase in bulk will have on these properties – given that these homes are also used as the residents work areas and are totally reliant on light from the north in the absence of light from the east and west as well as southern elevation.

Further last year, the L & E Court when considering an application for 58-64 Abercrombie Street, acknowledged the impact from overshadowing and the bulk and scale on local homes – whereby the application was refused.

We suggest a site inspection may help better present concerns and address the issue. We would be pleased to assist in this process. Please let us know if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Name]

Chippendale, 2008