



2nd May 2008

Dear Participant,

33 Cross Street, Double Bay - Community Information Day

On behalf of Ashington I would like to thank you for participating in the Community Information Day held on Saturday 12th April, 2008 to discuss the redevelopment of the Stamford Plaza Hotel site at 33 Cross Street, Double Bay.

We are pleased to forward to you the draft Record of the Comments raised during the information session together with the list of participants.

Urban Concepts advises that it has taken every care to ensure that the comments have been faithfully represented and recorded. If there are comments that have not been recorded or recorded incorrectly we apologise for any misrepresentation and advise that it has not been deliberate. We ask that you advise us of the mistake or omission and we will amend our records accordingly.

The Record has been issued as a **draft**. If you would like an amendment made to the Record please advise Urban Concepts either via mail, email or facsimile **by close of business Monday 19th May, 2008**. Our contact details are set out below.

In accordance with our Privacy Statement the Record identifies no name recorded adjacent to a comment or question unless requested.

It is important that you read the draft Record carefully and advise Urban Concepts of any misrepresentations. Once the draft Record has been finalised Urban Concepts will then issue the final Record.

I would also like to take this opportunity to encourage you to return to our office your completed survey questionnaire. To date we have only had 8 surveys returned. Your time in completing the survey would be greatly appreciated.

On behalf of Urban Concepts, Ashington and the consultancy team I would like to thank you for your participation.

Yours faithfully,

Belinda Barnett
Director, Urban Concepts

33 CROSS STREET, DOUBLE BAY PROJECT CONTACT DETAILS:

Mailing Address:

PO Box 780
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

Fax: 02 9964 9055

Tel: 1800 068 018

Email: doublebay@urbanconcepts.net.au



DRAFT

Record of Comments

Arising from the

33 Cross Street, Double Bay

Community Information Day

Held on

Saturday 12 April, 2008

at the Vibe Hotel

9am, 12noon and 3pm sessions

Prepared for

The Approval of Information Day Participants

Prepared by
Urban Concepts

Issued 2nd May 2008



Disclaimer

Urban Concepts has taken every care to ensure that the comments raised by the participants have been faithfully represented and recorded. If there are comments that have not been recorded or recorded incorrectly we apologise for any misrepresentation and advise that it has not been deliberate.



1.0. 9am INFORMATION SESSION

1.1. List of Participants

Name	Address
ANDERSON, Craig	20/10 Lincoln Crescent, Woollloomooloo
BLENDULF, Eileen	Beauty at the Bay Day Spa 412 New South Head Road, Double Bay
BREED, Peter	58 Carlotta Road, Double Bay
DOWLING, Margaret	5 Raine Street, Woollahra
GREGORY, Tony	26 Glendon Road, Double Bay
GUTH, Sally	Kensington Gardens 7/35 William Street, Double Bay (Lives behind the Hotel)
HUGHES, L.J. MARSHALL, S.A.	10/35-39 William Street, Double Bay (Live behind the Hotel)
JAGELMAN, Di	101/14 Macleay Street, Potts Point
JOHNSTON, Robert	8/44a Bayswater Road, Rushcutters Bay
RIDHALFH, Jenny	Suite 1, 235 New South Head Road, Edgecliff
RUNDLE, Geoff (Councillor)	Mayor, Woollahra Council PO Box 61, Double Bay 1360
SOUVLIS, Lucas and Norma	4/45 Cross Street, Double Bay

1.2. First Thoughts

At the outset of the information session each participant was asked to identify the thoughts that first came to mind when they heard about the redevelopment of 33 Cross Street. The answers given by participants at the 9 am session are presented below.

FIRST THOUGHTS
• Will there be a loss of parking.
• Would like to see residential apartments on the site.
• What will the parking arrangements be.
• What will the size of units be. Would like to see some smaller 2 bedroom units.
• Will the shopping mall go?
• Opportunity for a good quality boutique hotel.
• The hotel building should not have been built in the first place. It broke all regulations height and bulk.



FIRST THOUGHTS	
•	Resident living behind the site – Concerned about noise – construction and operation. Increased use of the walkway alongside the property that connects to William Street.
•	Concerned about more people using the walkway through to William Street.
•	Double Bay was/is a small suburb. Concerned about too much expansion.
•	Welcome development. Business owners struggling. How long will project take – what market will it attract – international – would like to see Hotel.
•	Concerned about the loss of another hotel – nothing to cater for tourists.
•	Style of Double Bay – Classical rather than modern.
•	Concerned about height and bulk of any development.
•	Concerned about what will happen underground – structural stability.
•	Redevelopment is an exciting opportunity.

1.3. Comments Recorded during Question Time

The following comments were recorded during the facilitated question and answer time.

COMMENT/QUESTION	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
• Resident directly behind in William Street is very concerned about construction impact and its effect on property values. The present façade of the hotel provides protection and privacy. Would not want to have people looking into their apartment or have uses that would increase noise such as restaurants and cafes.	The design of any new building will pay careful attention to the relationship with surrounding properties. Any public activity such as restaurants and cafes will be located in appropriate areas within the development so as to minimise any effects on surrounding residents. The orientation and location of balconies and windows will also be carefully considered with respect to neighbouring properties.
• If you can make this development bright, easy to clean. There is so much dirt/mess in Double Bay all the time. If you can get the formula right for this development then this will spread throughout the centre.	The materials selected for the development will be carefully selected so as to ensure they retain a high quality appearance into the future.
• When you go to Council – can you try and get the theatre back or can you incorporate a theatre/cinema in this development.	We have no control or influence over the former cinema site on New South Head Rd, but we do know that council is aware of the requests from the community for a cinema to be in Double Bay. As part of detailed design we will consider a cinema as part of our development, however it should be noted that cinemas take up both a lot of height and space on a site.
• What is your preferred option – knock it down or refurbish. Isn't it too big to knock down.	We feel that our objectives, and that of the broader community can be better served by rebuilding the building from the ground up while retaining the existing floor space. However the aim of the community consultation process is to better understand the objectives of the broader community so that this assumption can be confirmed or otherwise.
• How high would you go if you redistribute the existing floor space on the site?	We believe a better public domain can be created by lowering much of the current building, and in fact having no building at all on parts of the site. With the existing floor space retained this will mean that parts of the building are taller than the existing



COMMENT/QUESTION	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
	<p>building. The height of these elements and the location of them needs to be carefully designed. It is a balance between creating high quality public space at ground level, reducing the bulk of the podium elements of the building, and modifying the height and location of taller elements so as not to overshadow or overlook, and to minimise any view loss of surrounding properties. This design process can only begin in detail following consultation with the community to understand the relationship to those surrounding properties, and the opportunities and challenges they provide. Following the initial information day more detailed concepts and options will be developed, and these will be presented to the community in the near future.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could you have less floor space (a smaller development) and make it more expensive? 	<p>The market determines the pricing for the development, and while smaller, more exclusive developments can attract a premium, the options have been analysed in detail, and it is not feasible for us to redevelop the building without retaining the existing floor space.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing building floor to ceiling heights are very low. How many storeys would a new building be? 	<p>The existing building has relatively low ceilings on the upper floors, but very high ceilings on the lower floors. So while the existing building has six floors, it is 28.5m tall, which equates to over 9 conventional stories in height. See two points previous in relation to building height.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will you handle the parking requirement if you are not going down to excavate? What will you do? 	<p>The existing building has 173 carspaces. With either a refurbishment of the existing building, or a new building, this is an adequate number of spaces. If the building is rebuilt it will include a hotel and additional retail, and a lower amount of residential (around 30-40 units), so the effect on parking will be less, and more spaces will be available for casual and short term parking.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are the Directors of Ashington? 	<p>Mark Bouris, Craig Anderson and Craig Minahan</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who would you use as a hotel operator? 	<p>We are currently going through a process to discuss the development with potential hotel operators. The hotel which can be incorporated if the building is rebuilt will be a boutique 5 star hotel. The types of operators targeted are Morgans Hotel Group, Starwood, Ritz Carlton, Mandarin Oriental.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does Ashington make political contributions? 	<p>Ashington has never made any political contributions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To get this far you must have options – could you please provide a more detailed description of what you intend to do on the site. 	<p>Since we acquired the opportunity to purchase the site until quite recently we have been subject to confidentiality with respect to the development which has prevented us from having discussions with the broader community. During this period we prepared a large number of basic options for the site to better understand the constraints and opportunities any redevelopment would have. These basic options, as in all design, were based on some key assumptions regarding the site and how it can better relate to the community and surrounding properties. The community consultation process is designed to verify these assumptions before designs are resolved to a more detailed level to then</p>



COMMENT/QUESTION	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
	be presented to the community for discussion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many floors is in the existing building at the moment? 	The existing building has 6 floors, but the lower floors have very high ceiling heights. It is 28.5m tall, which is equivalent to a bit over 9 conventional stories in height.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing height on this site is not acceptable. 	This view is noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mayor indicated that he could not understand why the plans shown to Council in November were not shown to the Community at this Information Session. It was suggested that Ashington was not fully disclosing their intentions. "Why won't you show overheads of what you have"? 	<p>A summary of the design options referred to previously were presented to council late last year. At that time we said that the options were based on some fundamental assumptions about the site and its relationship to surrounding buildings. We wanted to discuss these with the broader community before formal design work commenced but had been unable to do so due to confidentiality restrictions. The current community consultation process is designed to test these assumptions so that current options can be assessed, and new options prepared. In any design process it is critical to get the ground rules or assumptions right in the first instance before detailed design commences. Following these sessions in April, further, more comprehensive design work will be undertaken. We would then come back to the community again having formulated a range of alternatives so the consultation can continue, and all interested members of the community can become part of the formal design development process.</p> <p>It is also important to note that in the presentation to council some options were presented which we stated clearly were not our design intention, but were presented to facilitate discussion and demonstrate the effects of different building forms on surrounding properties.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful developments provide for 'village atmosphere'. What does a village atmosphere mean to people – it is not a 25 storey tower or 9 storey tower? 	<p>"Village atmosphere" will mean different things to different people, it can mean scale of buildings, but we generally view it as having a number of factors: fine urban grain, buildings with less bulk, active outdoor space, street front retail, a mix of uses – hotel, retail, residential, commercial.</p> <p>There have been some public comments regarding a building in excess of 20 stories, Ashington has no intention of lodging plans for approval for a building in excess of 20 stories.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mayor indicated that it was unrealistic to suggest that construction should commence in mid 2009 given the assessment timeframe and council elections. It was indicated that 2010 would be more realistic. 	There are statutory periods that set out the length of time approving bodies have to deal with submissions put to them. We do not view twelve months to gain development approval as an unrealistic timeframe. The mayor's comments however are noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would encourage you to stand in Cross Street in winter and see where people walk. People walk on the opposite side of the street where the sun shines. Must get sunshine back into Cross Street. 	This will be looked at as part of the detailed design options. The increase of sunlight into public space is one of the key design parameters of the development.



COMMENT/QUESTION	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Residents of 35-39 William Street. Galbraith walkway rear of Hotel runs through to William Street (The Hotel has a right of way agreement over this access). Two thirds of the walkway is owned by 35-39 William Street apartments and is covered by Strata plan 45091. We must be consulted in relation to this interface and the flow through of pedestrians. Concern about uses that would be placed on the walkway. Would not want to see restaurants. There are also public liability issues associated with this pathway.	<p>Detailed consultation with respect to specific property issues with all the adjacent owners will be undertaken as part of any development process.</p> <p>The comments with respect to uses on that portion of the site are noted and will be looked at as part of the detailed design process.</p>



2.0 12pm INFORMATION SESSION

2.1. List of Participants

Name	Address
CARMICHAEL, Sean	14 Bradley Avenue, Bellevue Hill
CLAYDON, Reg	29/60 Darling Point Road, Darling Point
HAKIM, Dr Claude and Roslyn	10/45 Cross Street, Double Bay
HOUSEMANN, Jennie	PO Box 1472, Double Bay
MANSBERG, Janina	11/45 Cross Street, Double Bay
MINBASHIAN, Dara and Nazy	14/45 Cross Street, Double Bay
RAMSEY, Elizabeth	121 Edgecliff Road, Woollahra (unable to stay, couldn't find parking)
ROFE, Peter and FISHER, Mary	25 William Street, Double Bay
SPON-SMITH, Dale	18 Rickard Avenue, Mosman
WILLMOT, Graeme and Leseley	The Chancellor Building Apartment 7/38 Bay Street, Double Bay
WYETH, Nick	22B Fleming Street, Northwood

2.2. First Thoughts

At the outset of the information session each participant was asked to identify the thoughts that first came to mind when they heard about the redevelopment of 33 Cross Street. The answers given by participants at the 12pm session are presented below.

FIRST THOUGHTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about how this site can be redeveloped, traffic generation increasing the population and the associated demands that will be placed on existing services and impacts on environmental amenity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the new development incorporate retail/commercial in a mall arrangement or will retail be located at the street frontage?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What height will the development be or will it be contained in the envelope of the existing building?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it be strata/company title? What will its legal structure be? Will there be a tenant's committee?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident 45 Cross Street. Will it be pulled down – what will be the impact on our property - noise, dust, structural stability, privacy?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident 45 Cross Street. Demolition of Hotel – very concerned. What will be the internal arrangement/footprint/orientation of apartments on the site? Concerned about impacts on privacy, noise etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believe this development can become the focal point if it is done correctly.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident 45 Cross Street. Property shares a common wall with 33 Cross Street. Bedroom, bathroom, balcony is located along this common wall. If the building is demolished how will this common wall be treated? Will the building be knocked down or will the redevelopment retain the shell and be cosmetic. How much of external wall will be knocked down?



FIRST THOUGHTS	
•	Would like to see the existing arrangements changed – so that there is a separate ingress/egress arrangement for 33 Cross Street.
•	Resident 45 Cross Street very concerned about construction noise impact.
•	Will there be a boutique hotel incorporated into the site? Would not like to see only apartments. Double Bay must have a hotel.
•	Could a Cinema be put into this development similar in style to a Verona Cinema.
•	Concerned about the bulk and scale. Concerned about the interface between the site and the adjoining residential area. Would like to see a friendly inviting façade at Cross Street.

2.3. Comments Recorded during Question Time

The following comments were recorded during the facilitated question and answer time.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
• What makes you think you cannot develop a hotel in the existing building?	The current hotel is in need of at least substantial refurbishment in the near future. A refurbishment of the existing building to incorporate a hotel is not economically feasible. From a land economics perspective, hotels are worth significantly less than residential or retail.
• Is it correct to say that the quality of residential would not be as good if it is a refurbishment project?	A refurbishment utilising the existing structure will have to include some compromises on what is considered best practice design. By rebuilding the building a much higher quality property can be created.
• What is the development timing involved for this project and how does it vary for refurbishment versus a new building?	The timing of approvals will be similar, but most likely longer for a new building. The construction period will be longer for a new building, I would estimate the difference to be 2 years as opposed to 18 months.
• Have you made the decision to demolish?	We believe that a better outcome from both the community and our own perspective can be achieved by rebuilding the property as opposed to working with the existing structure.
• What height would a new building be?	We believe a better public domain can be created by lowering much of the current building, and in fact having no building at all on parts of the site. With the existing floor space retained this will mean that parts of the building are taller than the existing building. The height of these elements, and the location of them needs to be carefully designed. It is a balance between creating high quality public space at ground level, reducing the bulk of the podium elements of the building, and modifying the height and location of taller elements so as not to overshadow or overlook, and to minimise any view loss of surrounding properties. This more detailed phase of the design process can only begin following consultation with the community to understand the relationship to those surrounding properties, and the opportunities and challenges they provide. Following the initial Information Day more detailed concepts and options will be developed, and



COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
	these will be presented to the community in the near future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is a realistic outcome in terms of height? Four-five floors higher in smaller sections above existing building. 	The final design will be subject to negotiations with the approving bodies and will take into account the views of the community. It is too early to say what a realistic outcome is.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If demolition occurs will you retain the existing floor area? 	We believe a demolition and rebuild has distinct advantages in this case, however for it to be feasible, the existing floor space would need to be retained.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident 45 Cross Street. Let's not delude ourselves you will knock down the building. We live next door. You are talking about 2 years of construction. How will the common wall be treated? The noise will be unbelievable. How will we live there for 2 years? What would happen along this wall? I might end up with windows looking right into my apartment. 	Detailed studies including dilapidation reports and engineering assessments will be undertaken of adjoining properties prior to any construction work commencing on the site. Construction adjacent to properties is not uncommon, and methods of minimising any disruption will be put in place and discussed in detail with adjoining owners once the design is further resolved. The design of the wall adjacent to 45 Cross St is not resolved, but the amenity of adjoining owners will be a key priority in the development of all design options. The purpose of community consultation is to start dialogue on issues such as this, and to make our design team aware of community concerns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident 45 Cross Street. What would you envisage on the 45 Cross Street side of the building? What will be behind the wall? 	The design of the wall adjacent to 45 Cross St is not resolved, but the design will focus heavily on the amenity of adjoining owners. The purpose of community consultation is to start dialogue on issues such as this, and to make our design team aware of community concerns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you seriously considered a Cinema in this project? Would there be enough space? 	As part of detailed design we will consider a cinema as part of our development, however it should be noted that cinemas take up both a lot of height and space on a site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the value of the project? 	The end value of the project has been estimated at \$350 million.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it possible that you would go to State Government as a Major Project under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979? 	There are two lawful approval mechanisms for this project, one being a DA through Woollahra Council, the other being a Part 3A submission through the Department of Planning. As any business does, we assess all the options available to us. Regardless of the approving body, the opinions of residents will form a key part of the design development process, and the commitment to further community consultation remains.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where would you put increased height? Have you got any written assurances from Council regarding height? 	If the building is rebuilt, one option would be to reduce the height of parts of the property, and increase other parts. The increased height would need to be designed and located so as to provide a better outcome in terms of public amenity, outdoor space, overshadowing, overlooking and view loss. This will be more closely looked at in the next stage of development, and options will be presented for discussion with the community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car Parking – will there be an adequate number of space if you are planning to use the existing basement carparking 	The existing building has 173 carspaces. With either a refurbishment of the existing building, or a new building, this is an adequate number of



COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
arrangements?	spaces. If the building is rebuilt it will include a hotel and additional retail, and less residential (around 30-40 units), so the effects on parking will be less, and more spaces will be available for casual and short term parking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you knock down the building, shouldn't you comply with Woollahra Council's new height rules in its DCP? 	<p>The DCP controls were written approximately 20 years after the existing building was built. The current building is significantly in excess of the controls for the site. It is unrealistic for council to write controls for the site that are so different from the existing building. It is not economically feasible to build a building in accordance with the controls, and this will be the case for any other property owner in a similar situation. We believe a better outcome can be achieved by rebuilding the building while retaining the existing floor space, however if this approval cannot be achieved, the existing structure and building form will be retained and refurbished, and the property will remain non compliant with the controls.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident of 45 Cross Street. Will demolition of the common wall put cracks in our wall? 	<p>Detailed studies including dilapidation reports and engineering assessments will be undertaken of adjoining properties prior to any construction work on the site. Construction adjacent to properties is not uncommon, and methods of minimising any disruption will be put into place and discussed in detail with adjoining owners once the design is further resolved.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If development application failed with Woollahra Council would Ashington lodge a Part 3A application to the Minister for Planning? 	<p>There are two lawful approval mechanisms for this project, one being a DA through Woollahra Council, the other being a Part 3A submission through the Department of Planning. As any business does, we assess all the options available to us. Regardless of the approving body, the opinions of residents will form a key part of the design development process, and the commitment to further community consultation remains.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height is the issue, will it trigger your decision about a Part 3A application. 	<p>The decision about the approving body will be made based on which is the most appropriate body to be the consent authority.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you thinking that you will run into the same concerns as Kiaora Lane project? Have you spoken with Brett Sullivan? 	<p>We are aware of the Kiaora Lane project, but have never spoken to Brett Sullivan. We do not know enough about the detail of that project to comment on it.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The value of northern apartments would be more desirable. What are your thoughts about windows/balcony treatments on this elevation? 	<p>North facing property generally attracts a premium in residential. The design of the building will be carefully considered to provide maximum amenity to the building occupants, but at the same time relate well to surrounding properties in terms of overshadowing, overlooking and view loss.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What height would you envisage for the northern face? 	<p>The heights of specific building elements has not yet been determined, and will be further developed following community consultation, at which point design options will be presented for community comment. However there would appear merit in reducing the height and bulk of the northern wall of the property, and increasing the set back in areas. These issues will be looked at</p>



COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
	in more detail in the forthcoming design process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you actually been into number 45 Cross Street and looked back onto the Hotel? We would be pleased for Ashington to go onto our site, particularly the pool area. 	<p>We have viewed the relation to 45 Cross St from the existing building, but have not been into 45 Cross St. We would welcome the opportunity to look from 45 Cross St, this will greatly assist us in the design development process.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the egress/ingress arrangements change? Would you add a second ingress point? 	<p>The carpark entry is currently from the adjacent 45 Cross St. We will review the option to locate the carpark entry on our property, however are aware that councils generally do not like adding further carpark entries to streetscapes, as it reduces on street parking.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the northern part be the highest part of any new building? 	<p>The heights of specific building elements has not yet been determined, and will be further developed following community consultation, at which point design options will be presented for community comment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will you move the building forward or keep the existing setback from Cross Street? 	<p>The alignments of specific building elements have not yet been determined, and will be further developed following community consultation, at which point design options will be presented for community comment. Generally urban design principles and councils DCP would suggest that a consistent street frontage should be maintained.</p>



3.0 3pm INFORMATION SESSION

3.1. List of Participants

Name	Address
BASSERABIE, M	5/23 Wentworth Street, Point Piper
BINETTER, Gary	6/31-33 William Street, Double Bay
GOLDBERG, Graeme	27 Knox Street, Double Bay
JOEL, Alexandra	6 Court Road, Double Bay
KOLMAN, V	45 Cross Street, Double Bay
LEWIS, Morley	D'Aliccia Shop 2, 20-26 Cross Street, Double Bay
MASON, Philip	PO Box 1684, Double Bay
MESCHITSCHEK, Maja	5/3 Darling Point Road, Darling Point
MIDDLETON, Caroline	Unit 3 The Gallery Cross Street, Double Bay
PRIOR, Greg	Double Bay Marketing PO Box 419, Double Bay 1360
RANDALL, Roy	16 William Street, Double Bay
STEWART, John	2 Court Road, Double Bay
SATOMI, Oliver	6/31-33 William Street, Double Bay
TEELING, Barry	12/3 Wyuna Road, Point Piper
THAUNG, Hpone and Rhem, TJEN, Nico	99 Manning Road, Double Bay
YOUNG, Malcolm	10 Pine Hill Avenue, Double Bay

3.2. First Thoughts

At the outset of the information session each participant was asked to identify the thoughts that first came to mind when they heard about the redevelopment of 33 Cross Street. The answers given by participants at the 3pm session are presented below.

FIRST THOUGHTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I liked the existing attractive façade. It adds to the streetscape, the arches, columns reinforce its classical style. It has a quality finish. I would like a similar style of architecture maintained.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am concerned about building height over heritage cottages in Transvaal Avenue. This is a destination point in its own right. The low rise of Transvaal Avenue together with Cross and Bay Streets makes the existing development unsympathetic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree with previous comments. Building is too high by 1 storey. I agree that a neo classical style is pleasant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building should be setback on upper storeys more than it is. Must try and keep Cross Street a sunny and pleasant pedestrian environment.



FIRST THOUGHTS	
•	The height of the existing building is fine and its neo classical style is fine. A hotel must be kept on this site.
•	I like the style of the existing building and the entrance/stairs. With any new development Cross Street must remain a sunny and pleasant alfresco environment.
•	Streetscape needs to be more interactive. No issue with height.
•	The existing entrance is forbidding and dark. The height stops sunlight. We would prefer the existing building to be lower and for any new design to facilitate solar access.
•	A hotel should be retained on this site.
•	I like the colonnades, it gives the existing building a European feel. We must keep a hotel on this site.
•	The existing building is tired and dilapidated.
•	Over 25 years the activity and connectivity of Cross Street has decreased. This site provides the opportunity to activate Cross Street with Cafes etc.
•	I would like the overall bulk of the existing building reduced and a higher degree of activity. There needs to be an increase in solar access for the site to become more inviting. Need to look at rear treatment and make more attractive.
•	The existing building looks like a hotel. It is too high for the area and should be lower to increase light.
•	We don't need anymore units. We need a larger hotel. Resident 45 Cross Street, if building goes higher we will lose our privacy.
•	The existing building is cold. It needs a more welcoming building/façade.
•	No incentive to walk on that side of Cross Street. We need shops and cafes to increase activation of the frontage and to make the building more welcoming.
•	Resident of William Street. Façade on walkway is shocking/unattractive. Arcade is a disaster. The existing trees in Cross Street are beautiful and should be highlighted as part of the project.

3.3. Comments Recorded during Question Time

The following comments were recorded during the facilitated question and answer time.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there 2 options. It seems to me that you have decided to demolish. It does not work reducing the number of hotel rooms. A 60 bed hotel is not good for the future of Double Bay. We need tourists, we need people to stay. 	<p>We believe a better outcome can be achieved by demolishing and rebuilding the building. We understand the concerns of retailers and the wider community in terms of retaining a hotel in Double Bay, and that is one of the key reasons why we see the rebuild option as a better outcome, as it is feasible to retain a hotel in that option. The current hotel is 144 rooms. It is not feasible to retain a hotel of that size in this location. In a rebuild option, a hotel of 60-80 rooms can be feasible. From a land economics perspective, hotels are worth significantly less than residential or retail.</p>



COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When you say that some parts could be higher what do you mean – how high? 	<p>The heights of specific building elements has not yet been determined. We believe a better public domain can be created by lowering much of the current building, and in fact having no building at all on parts of the site. With the existing floor space retained however this will mean that while parts of the building are lower than the existing building, some elements will be higher. Following this Information Day the specifics of the design will be further developed and presented to the community for comment in the next phase of the consultation process.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you go to 25 levels? How? 	<p>We currently and have never had any intention to lodge an approval for a building in excess of 20 storeys as has been reported by some.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you are going over controls what is the point of that? 	<p>The DCP controls were written approximately 20 years after the existing building was built. The current building is significantly in excess of the controls for the site. It is unrealistic for council to write controls for the site that are so different from the existing building. It is not economically feasible to build a building in accordance with the controls, and this will be the case for any other property owner in a similar situation. We believe a better outcome can be achieved by rebuilding the building while retaining the existing floor space, however if this approval cannot be achieved, the existing structure and building form will be retained and refurbished, and the property will remain non compliant with the controls.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why will you get your plans through? 	<p>We believe we can design a building that will be viewed as a high quality and successful outcome by the community and approving bodies.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How high would you like to go? 	<p>We believe a better public domain can be created by lowering much of the current building, and in fact having no building at all on parts of the site. With the existing floor space retained this will mean that parts of the building are taller than the existing building. The height of these elements, and the location of them needs to be carefully designed. It is a balance between creating high quality public space at ground level, reducing the bulk of the podium elements of the building, and modifying the height and location of taller elements so as not to overshadow or overlook, and to minimise any view loss of surrounding properties. This design process can only begin in detail following consultation with the community to understand the relationship to those surrounding properties, and the opportunities and challenges they provide. Following the initial Information Day more detailed concepts and options will be developed, and these will be presented to the community in the near future.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where is all the parking for this project? 	<p>The existing building has 173 carspaces. With either a refurbishment of the existing building, or a new building, this is an adequate number of spaces. If the building is rebuilt it will include a</p>



COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
	hotel and additional retail, and less residential (around 30-40 units), so the effect on parking will be less, and more spaces will be available for casual and short term parking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DCP allows for height of 16.5 m and this was deliberately put in place and you are now looking to go higher. If you go higher how does this embellish the village atmosphere? There is a complete disconnect here. 	The existing building is 28.5m – well in excess of the DCP. We believe that height in itself is not the only issue that needs to be considered. There are many examples of well designed tall buildings, and poorly designed short buildings. Height is a critical factor, but it must be looked at together with public amenity, ground plane activation, connectivity, bulk, economic factors and overall design excellence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the difference between bulk and height? 	Bulk entails a combination of height and site coverage. For example, a taller, thinner building is less bulky than a shorter building with greater site coverage.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hand drawn plan you showed had a certain amount of open space. To preserve the existing floor space what height would you need to go to? 	The hand drawn sketch is around 50% of the site area. Simplistically if the existing floor space ratio is a bit over 4:1, if 50% of the site is open space, the buildings will be around 8 levels if they cover the rest of the site equally.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What % of street level space would be open (50%) in the plan you showed. 	Around 50%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In my view, you are presenting us with a failing choice. You are asking us to accept that you have a right to the existing floor space. I believe you have the choice to retain the existing building or to build a new project that complies with the DCP Controls. 	It is not economically feasible to rebuild the building in a manner that complies with the DCP. We have acknowledged that retaining the existing building and refurbishing it is an option open to us.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would not want any part of the building to go higher than the existing main roof line. 	This view is noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it mean no hotel if you refurbish? 	The current format of the hotel is not feasible. If the building was refurbished rather than rebuilt it similarly would not be feasible to retain a hotel component, as the current building design has too many deficiencies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the next building (45 Cross Street) comply with the DCP controls. 	We do not know the situation of that building in detail, but understand that it was approved under an amendment to the current DCP rather than complying with it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What about the carbon footprint. Have you considered the green implications? It is a perfectly good building why do you want to pull it down? 	The current building is quite poor in terms of environmental performance. A refurbishment of the building would offer little opportunity to remedy this. A new building presents significant opportunity to incorporate new technology and design techniques to dramatically reduce the environmental impact on the building.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you get the increased height on this site, won't this create a precedent for Double Bay? I cannot follow your argument that it won't set a precedent. If you ignore the controls why won't others? Sites could be consolidated to create a large site. I am concerned we will end up like Darling Point which is blighted by towers. 	There are no other sites in Double Bay that we are aware of with circumstances similar to this property other than possibly the council owned carpark, for which this development can set a precedent. However what we are proposing is to investigate replacing a building with obvious deficiencies with a new building that offers opportunities to dramatically enhance public amenity. We think that is a precedent that has some merit.



COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	ASHINGTON RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be noted that Ashington has the right to undertake a residential conversion of the site without giving back any of the public benefits they are offering. Perhaps we should keep a more open mind. 	<p>This view is noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You need the views of more retailers. What you have said today won't help the commercial viability of the centre. This centre needs people. Retailers need trade. 	<p>Letters were sent to all retailers in the Double Bay area, and an invitation to the Double Bay Chamber of Commerce to attend today's sessions. We have also had several discussions with the Double Bay Chamber of Commerce over the past several months. The views of retailers are critical to the design process and your view is.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I thought the provision of pedestrian space was not optional. Do you only get 2.5:1 if you provide pedestrian area? 	<p>This interpretation is not in accordance with our planning advice.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Live directly adjoining the building and I prefer demolish and rebuild. What is your ultimate development? 	<p>This view is noted. The final form of the development is still subject to design following the community consultation process, however we believe that the best outcome can be achieved by retaining the existing area, but rebuilding in a form that addresses many of the current buildings deficiencies and creates better public amenity. Similarly a new building could be a higher quality building and incorporate a hotel which would be economically better for the area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am very disappointed that you have made it clear that an FSR of 4.1 is to stay on the site. 	<p>This comment is noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You have indicated that you want to go higher. I want to see a design. Part of the problem is that it is hard to conceptualise what you are talking about. If you just do some simulations that would help. 	<p>In the design process it is critically important to base the design on sound assumptions. The current process is aimed at starting the process with the right assumptions so that design can move forward in the right direction. Following community consultation, the design will be developed based on that feedback, and a series of options will be presented for comment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you have in your mind what style might apply to the architecture – because this is just as important as bulk and height? 	<p>The style of architecture has not yet been determined in terms of "look". Good architecture responds to the surroundings and the site conditions presented, so the "look" of the building will not be determined until later in the process.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What would happen if damage occurred to surrounding buildings? 	<p>Any damage that is caused to surrounding buildings as a result of the development will be rectified at our cost.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residents indicated that they did not receive a newsletter. 	<p>These comments are noted. Ashington used Australia Post's database to mail over 8,000 letters. We will investigate any flaws in this process.</p>



4.0 COMMENT SHEETS RECEIVED BY POST FROM THE INFORMATION DAY

The following comment sheets were received by post after the Information Sessions:

1. *We believe that this project may bring more life to Double Bay in future; but at the same time will inconvenience many of the residents, shop owners, and the local restaurants.*

The Demolition of such a huge building will cause damage to the construction of adjoining buildings. The noise and the mess caused by demolition will damage the business of coffee shops and the restaurants in this area, exactly like the present situation with the demolition of Stamford Plaza Hotel in Knox Street.

If you talk to the residents, the shop keepers and the restaurateurs in Knox Street, Knox Lane, Bay Street and even Cross Street, you will realise how much it is affecting other people's lives and businesses. This project should be done with more consideration for the residents and business owners of Cross Street and adjoining side streets and lanes.

2. *I am the President of the Double Bay Residents Association. The views expressed on the feedback Questionnaire are personal and not necessarily those of the Association.*

I can confirm however, that the Association would like to have an ongoing dialogue with Ashington if the developer wishes to proceed with a new development in Cross Street.

*Contact Details:
Double Bay Residents Association
PO Box 1684
Double Bay NSW 1360
Telephone (02) 9327 5580*



5.0 COMMITMENTS GIVEN BY ASHINGTON

The following undertakings were given by Ashington during the Information Sessions:

- To provide Matthew Baileys details to participants.

Matthew Bailey
Tel: 9239 0899
email: matthew.bailey@ashington.com

- That if any damage occurred as a result of the development Ashington would repair the damage at no cost to the residents. If the rectification works of that damage were so disruptive as to make the dwelling uninhabitable, Ashington would pay to accommodate the affected resident in a hotel for the duration of the rectification works.
- Commitment not to design a tower with 25 levels.
- To come back to the community in 6-8 weeks with a range of development options.
- That two information days would be held prior to lodgement of a final design and that the preferred design would be presented to residents before being lodged.
- To go onto the site at 45 Cross Street to better understand resident concerns.
- To consult with residents of 35-39 William Street concerning the Galbraith Walkway and the interface of the development with this site.