

Luke Murtas - Online Submission from Philip Cross (object)

6

From: Philip Cross <philipcross@gmail.com>
To: Luke Murtas <luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 06/08/2010 08:09
Subject: Online Submission from Philip Cross (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: Pacific Highway development letter.pdf

I object to the development on the basis of the arguments included in the attached letter.

Name: Philip Cross

Address:
58 Edward St
North Sydney

IP Address: - 129.78.32.21

Submission for Job: #3741 MP09_0214 - Concept Plan approval for a 32 storey mixed use retail/commercial development
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3741

Site: #2181 177-199 Pacific Hwy, North Sydney
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=2181

Luke Murtas

Planner

P: 02 9228 6382
E: luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au

Powered by Internetrix Affinity

The Hon Tony Kelly
Minister for Planning, Infrastructure and Land
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Minister Kelly

Re: Project Application MP 09_0214 at 177-199 Pacific Highway, North Sydney
Submissions on 177 Pacific Highway Concept Approval Application:

I write to voice my concern over the proposed oversize development at 177 Pacific Highway and seek your assistance in refusing this size of development. I do not oppose development in the CBD but I do oppose oversize ones that ignore the Council Planning framework. My comments are as follows:

1. Height and Massing
 - a) The building is too large for the site. It exceeds the heights in the draft LEP and will have major impacts on the residential area from its size.
2. Setbacks
 - a) There should be setbacks on both northern and western sides. If there is no setback on the highway we will get a canyon effect. Council has had setbacks for years to stop us getting dark wind-blown canyons in place of worker and resident friendly streetscapes.
3. Overshadow/Solar Access
 - a) These will affect my way of life in Edward St- major amenity impact by material loss of sunlight to Edward, Oak, Lord, Short and Mount Sts including houses, blocks of apartments, Mackillop Museum and Shore Prep School and playing fields. Further mapping of impacts should be done outside the 9.00am winter solstice figure. Part of the draft 2009 NSLEP was undertakings that there would be no adverse shadowing impacts on residential or Special areas. And these aren't just immaterial but quite marked for the winter months.
 - b) Special Areas- Donbank and 101 Pacific Highway park and Miller St Special Areas. As the applicant points out public open space in Nth Sydney is very limited. Which is why it is so core to protect the limited solar access that workers and residents enjoy in the Special Areas. Increase in overshadow to Donbank is an absolute prohibition under the NSLEP. The scale of the application should be refused on this ground alone.
4. Wind

There will be major wind impacts from a west facing building. Cold southerly and sou'westerly winds will be channeled even more down to the highway and cast to

the eastern side of the building as well. Pedestrians already get blown off their feet in Miller St and on the Pacific Highway. North Sydney sits on the prow of a south facing hill and gets a lot more wind than the city.

5. Public Open Space

The proposal is just a glorified enclosed foyer. In current form it is not a public benefit. It is an enclosed private space. North Sydney needs open spaces generally and particularly outside office hours and this space won't contribute much more than to the immediate inhabitants of the building. It should be left open and established as a Special Area as receives northerly sun. With appropriate tree cover to the west to prevent wind impacts.

It should also be tied in with a green zone linking the other Berry St and Miller St open areas to provide a green artery through the CBD.

6. Traffic

This is a heavily congested area and particularly the right hand turn from Pacific Highway to Berry. It already backs up down the Highway during morning and evening peaks. And this has increased since 100 Pacific Highway and 16-40 Mount St came on line. An increase of 26 vehicles per hour will add to the gridlock and danger here. And as Council's Traffic Engineer states these are conservative figures. When combined with loading dock use a sub-arterial road will be severely impacted. A dual width loading dock entry will also impact on the activation of the streetscape and disconnect the building from Miller St.

There have been many pedestrian accidents on Berry Street already and this will make it more dangerous.

7. Part 3A

Is it really a Part 3A development? What is the "state significance" of another commercial building in the North Sydney CBD. It should be subject to the usual planning controls and integrated as part of a holistic approach to planning and not an ad hoc aberration.

Summary:

This application clearly breaches prohibitions in the North Sydney planning controls. I respectfully submit that it should not have been accepted by yourself in the first place. It has marked adverse impacts on adjoining residents as well as CBD workers. It defeats the planning (and related undertakings to all residents) aims of graduated interface between the residential and CBD areas, and creates a wall of building on the north eastern edge of the CBD area.

Yours sincerely

(7)

Luke Murtas - Online Submission from John Maitland (other)

From: John Maitland <jmaitland@teece.com.au>
To: Luke Murtas <luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 06/08/2010 09:03
Subject: Online Submission from John Maitland (other)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Height and mass too large for site. Shadows will affect quality of life of local residents, workers and school children. Proposal for public open space appears to be of a "private" rather than "public" character. Development should be subject to the usual planning process and controls and I question the "State significance" status conferred on this project. "Canyon effect" deplorable.

Name: John Maitland

Address:
PO Box 1110
North Sydney NSW 2059

IP Address: if3.teece.com.au - 203.217.22.34

Submission for Job: #3741 MP09_0214 - Concept Plan approval for a 32 storey mixed use retail/commercial development

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3741

Site: #2181 177-199 Pacific Hwy, North Sydney

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=2181

Luke Murtas

Planner

P: 02 9228 6382

E: luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au

Powered by Internetrix Affinity

Luke Murtas - Online Submission from angus finney of Edward Precinct (object)

From: angus finney <angusfinney@yahoo.com; edwardprecinct@gmail.com>
To: Luke Murtas <luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 06/08/2010 15:30
Subject: Online Submission from angus finney of Edward Precinct (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: Submissions on 177 Pacific Highway Concept Approval Application.pdf



Please see the attachment. Sent by the Chair on behalf of Edward Precinct.

Name: angus finney
Organisation: Edward Precinct

Address:
15 Riley St
north sydney
2060

IP Address: bc1-ext.massmutual.com - 63.66.112.5

Submission for Job: #3741 MP09_0214 - Concept Plan approval for a 32 storey mixed use retail/commercial development

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3741

Site: #2181 177-199 Pacific Hwy, North Sydney

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=2181

Luke Murtas
Planner

P: 02 9228 6382
E: luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au

Powered by Internetrix Affinity

The Hon Tony Kelly
Minister for Planning, Infrastructure and Land
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Minister Kelly

Re: Project Application MP 09_0214 at 177-199 Pacific Highway, North Sydney
Edward Precinct Submissions on Concept Approval Application:

I write on behalf of Edward Precinct. This Precinct covers roughly from the north side of Shore School up to Hazelbank Road. As a result this Precinct will bear a lot of the adverse impacts from this proposal- most notably in terms of shadowing and solar access but also in the abandoning of the tapered or umbrella building mass approach to the CBD residential area interface. Detailed comments are as follows:

1. Height and Massing

- a) The applicants heights are taken from consolidation of both 173 and 177 Pacific Highway sites. They have selected the height from the 173 site and moved it up the highway. This makes a mockery of Councils planning strategy. We believe that the applicant is being misleading in claiming this height for the bulk of the 177 site. RL195 applies mainly to 173 Pacific Highway. There is only an RL 190 for the south end next to 173 Pacific and only RL 85 for the northern portion.
- b) Heights are part of the overall plan for the whole CBD (and in fact have not been out for community consultation as the 2009 draft LEP has not been exhibited yet). Ad hoc applications like this defeat purpose of the LEP and urban planning. If this proposal is accepted it will leave a stranded block between the two major sites on the highway. Council's strategy of incentives to amalgamate the two blocks is intended to avoid this poor planning outcome.
- c) This is not the centre of the CBD unlike 100 Mount and 77 Walker (Shopping World) but the northeast corner and highpoint of the CBD. Degrades or destroys the tapering to the residential areas and defeats purpose of NSLEP.
- d) The proposal creates a wall from the west view. And a very long wall. The proposal document only gives a visual of the narrow perspective. This will establish a wall to the CBD from the residential areas. No taper to the west. And none to the north.
- e) The applicant uses conjurers tricks on moving bits of height from here and there and suddenly, hey presto, you have a building the size of this.
- f) We understand that some undertakings were given in the 1990s in relation to 6-10 Mount Street by its' developers- also the Winten Group- that the upper floors of 6-10 Mount would not be subject to overshadow. Now the same group is turning round and taking this early morning sun away from the northfacing units in 6-10 Mount St.

2. Setbacks

- a) Nil setback on Pacific H'way above foyer. Leads to dominance, wind issues, increased overshadow to residential and Special Area (Donbank).
- b) Tapered setback on Berry- is not 8 ms as claimed but appears to be from 1 to 8 ms along the site.

3. Overshadow/Solar Access

- a) Not immaterial- major amenity impact on Edward, Oak, Lord, Short and Mount Sts including houses, blocks of apartments, Mackillop Museum and Shore Prep School and playing fields. Further mapping of impacts should be done outside the 9.00am winter solstice figure. Part of the draft 2009 NSLEP was undertakings that there would be no adverse shadowing impacts on residential areas. And these aren't just immaterial but quite marked for the winter months. No shadowing is provided for the time pre-9am. We would request that modeling is done for this timeframe as it appears that the Precinct will lose a lot of winter light at this time as well as shadowing that the 9am map shows.
- b) Special Areas- Donbank and 101 Pacific Highway park and Miller St Special Areas. As the applicant points out public open space in Nth Sydney is very limited. Which is why it is so core to protect the limited solar access that workers and residents enjoy in the Special Areas. Increase in overshadow to Donbank is an absolute prohibition under the NSLEP. The scale of the application should be refused on this ground alone.

4. Wind

As pointed out by the UDEP there will be major wind impacts from a west facing building. Cold southerly and sou'westerly winds will be channeled even more down to the highway and cast to the eastern side of the building as well. Calls for evergreen trees have other deleterious effects eg winter shadowing. Having no setback for the upper stories may lead to even higher velocities in the overhung footpath.

5. Public Open Space

Just a glorified enclosed foyer. In current form it is not a public benefit. It is an enclosed private space. North Sydney needs activation generally and particularly outside office hours and this space won't contribute much more than to the immediate 177 inhabitants. Suggest it be left open and established as a Special Area as receives northerly sun (when not blocked by 20 Berry). With appropriate tree cover to the west to prevent wind impacts.

Linking a genuine open space here along Berry Street through to the open forecourt of 77-81 Berry via the open space on the corner of Miller and Berry Streets would provide a much stronger urban planning result. In conjunction with the Miller Street Special Area it could create a green artery for the CBD.

6. Traffic and Parking

This is a heavily congested area and particularly the right hand turn from Pacific Highway to Berry. It already backs up down the Highway during morning and evening peaks. And this has increased since 100 Pacific Highway and 16-40 Mount St came on line. An increase of 26 vehicles per hour will add to the gridlock and danger here. And as Council's Traffic Engineer states these are conservative figures. When combined with loading dock use a sub-arterial road will be severely impacted. A dual width entry will also impact on the activation of the streetscape and disconnect the building from Miller St.

Colston Budd did the studies for the 16-40 Mount Street development and came up with the same "not statistically significantly" approach. Shore School are now having to meet Council as their buses are no longer able to safely pick up boys on Mount St. We have

also had a lot more vehicles using Edward Street as a through route, the numbers of disabled and illegal parkers has markedly increased, and residents amenity has dropped as a result. A building of this scale and being close to ten minutes walk from the station will get a lot more of this behaviour. We don't support increasing the amount of parking as a result, but for planners to ensure that the larger buildings are grouped down near the station.

7. Part 3A

Is it really a Part 3A development? What is the "state significance" of another commercial building in the North Sydney CBD. It should be subject to the usual planning controls and integrated as part of a holistic approach to planning and not an ad hoc aberration.

Summary:

This application clearly breaches prohibitions in the North Sydney planning controls. We respectfully submit that it should not have been accepted by the Minister in the first place. It has marked adverse impacts on adjoining residents as well as CBD workers. It defeats the planning (and related undertakings to all residents) aims of graduated interface between the residential and CBD areas, and creates a wall of building on the north eastern edge of the CBD area.

We request that the Minister exercise his discretion in refusal of the Concept Plan application.

Yours sincerely

Angus Finney
Chairperson
Edward Precinct
North Sydney

Luke Murtas - Online Submission from Julie Jones (object)

9

From: Julie Jones <julie@bermand.com.au>
To: Luke Murtas <luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 06/08/2010 16:52
Subject: Online Submission from Julie Jones (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: 177 Pacific Highway Concept Approval Application.pdf

This application represents gross over-development of the site. It presents a very large massed shape to the west, significantly increasing overshadowing of residential areas. It is out of context with other towers in the area. No attempt has been made to grade the interface between commercial and residential properties.

No public benefit is to be gained by an enclosed foyer that is only open during business hours.

This section of the Pacific Highway is already prone to wind tunnelling and the Berry St/Pacific Highway intersection is frequently very cold and windy at present. This building will have a major negative impact on the amenity of this area, by significantly increasing wind effects.

Of further major concern is the traffic impact that will be felt in an area that barely functions with current flows. Entry/exit off Berry St would be hugely problematic. It is an highly congested stretch of road, being a major feeder to the freeway. In addition there are vehicles negotiating drop-offs (especially taxis) and multiple lane changes. This is further impacted by high pedestrian volumes. A safer entry point may possibly be off the Highway from the south bound direction only, similar to the Northpoint vehicle access. This section of the Highway, south of Berry St, carries the lowest traffic flow of anywhere in the immediate vicinity. However, it may still be too close to Berry St, thus further compromising the intersection. Also to be considered is the amount of pedestrian traffic to and from the bus stops on the opposite side of the Pacific Highway. The concept proposal appears to underestimate the pedestrian volume here.

Name: Julie Jones

Address:
24 Edward St
North Sydney
NSW 2060

IP Address: cpe-58-172-129-3.nfcz1.ken.bigpond.net.au - 58.172.129.3

Submission for Job: #3741 MP09_0214 - Concept Plan approval for a 32 storey mixed use retail/commercial development
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3741

Submissions on 177 Pacific Highway Concept Approval Application:

1. Height and Massing

- a) The applicants heights are taken from consolidation of both 173 and 177 Pacific Highway sites. They have selected the height from the 173 site and moved it up the highway. This makes a mockery of Councils planning strategy. Applicant being misleading in claiming this height for the 177 site. RL195 applies to 173 Pacific Highway. There is only an RL 190 for the south end next to 173 Pacific and only RL 85 for the northern portion.
- b) Heights are part of the overall plan for whole CBD. Ad hoc applications like this defeat purpose of the LEP and urban planning. If this proposal is accepted it will leave a stranded block between the two major sites on the highway. Council's strategy of incentives to amalgamate the two blocks is intended to avoid this poor planning outcome.
- c) This is not the centre of the CBD unlike 100 Mount and 77 Walker (Shopping World) but the northeast corner and highpoint of the CBD. Degrades or destroys the tapering to the residential areas and defeats purpose of NSLEP.
- d) The proposal creates a wall to the west view. Walling off the CBD from the residential areas. No taper to the west. And none to the north.
- e) The applicant uses conjurers tricks on moving bits of height from here and there and suddenly, hey presto, you have a building the size of this.

2. Setbacks

- a) Nil setback on Pacific H'way above foyer. Leads to dominance, wind issues, increased overshadow to residential and Special Area (Donbank).
- b) Tapered setback on Berry- is not 8 ms as claimed but from 1 to 8 ms along the site.

3. Overshadow/Solar Access

- a) Not immaterial- major amenity impact on Edward, Oak, Lord, Short and Mount Sts including houses, blocks of apartments, Mackillop Museum and Shore Prep School and playing fields. Further mapping of impacts should be done outside the 9.00am winter solstice figure. Part of the draft 2009 NSLEP was undertakings that there would be no adverse shadowing impacts on residential areas. And these aren't just immaterial but quite marked for the winter months.
- b) Special Areas- Donbank and 101 Pacific Highway park and Miller St Special Areas. As the applicant points out public open space in Nth Sydney is very limited. Which is why it is so core to protect the limited solar access that workers and residents enjoy in the Special Areas. Increase in overshadow to Donbank is an absolute prohibition under the NSLEP. The scale of the application should be refused on this ground alone.

4. Wind

As pointed out by UDEP will be major wind impacts from a west facing building. Cold southerly and sou'westerly winds will be channeled even more down to the highway and cast to the eastern side of the building as well. Calls for evergreen trees have other deleterious effects eg winter shadowing.

5. Public Open Space

Just a glorified enclosed foyer. In current form it is not a public benefit. It is an enclosed private space. North Sydney needs activation generally and particularly outside office hours and this space won't contribute much more than to the immediate 177 inhabitants. Suggest it be left open and established as a Special Area as receives northerly sun (when not blocked by 20 Berry). With appropriate tree cover to the west to prevent wind impacts.

Linking a genuine open space along Berry Street through to the open forecourt of 77-81 Berry via the open space on the corner of Miller and Berry Streets would provide a much stronger urban planning result.

6. Traffic

This is a heavily congested area and particularly the right hand turn from Pacific Highway to Berry. It already backs up down the Highway during morning and evening peaks. And this has increased since 100 Pacific Highway and 16-40 Mount St came on line. An increase of 26 vehicles per hour will add to the gridlock and danger here. And as Council's Traffic Engineer states these are conservative figures. When combined with loading dock use a sub-arterial road will be severely impacted. A dual width entry will also impact on the activation of the streetscape and disconnect the building from Miller St.

There have already been numerous pedestrian accidents on Berry. This increased traffic snarl will no doubt make a dangerous road even more dangerous.

7. Part 3A

Is it really a Part 3A development? What is the "state significance" of another commercial building in the North Sydney CBD. It should be subject to the usual planning controls and integrated as part of a holistic approach to planning and not an ad hoc aberration.

Summary:

This application clearly breaches prohibitions in the North Sydney planning controls. It should not have been accepted by the Minister in the first place. It has marked adverse impacts on adjoining residents as well as CBD workers. It defeats the planning (and related undertakings to all residents) aims of graduated interface between the residential and CBD areas, and creates a wall of building on the north eastern edge of the CBD area.

Luke Murtas - Online Submission from diane jackson (object)

10

From: diane jackson <angusfinney@yahoo.com; >
To: Luke Murtas <luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 06/08/2010 16:46
Subject: Online Submission from diane jackson (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: Attchmt to Pers sub.pdf

We have lived in Waverton near the CBD for 12 years or more. And there are a range of people who have lived here for up to 90 years and are still in the same house (Pat and Joan on Edward St). We all understand appropriate deveopment but this scale is way outside anything that has been considered under the planning instruments. And it will have direct adverse consequences on our lives. We will all lose sun from the southern end of Edward Street. And using the 9am time will not give you a clear indication of how much impact there will be. Our backyard may get overshadow, Pat and Joan's front room where they sit in the sun of a morning will lose it for possibly up to an hour (if we had sufficient shadow details we could tell you more exactly).

Please either refuse or scale back the proposal. It is poor, ad hoc planning which whiteants what Council planning is in place.

Regards

Diane, Angus, Cole and Erica

Name: diane jackson

Address:
15 Riley St
north sydney
2060

IP Address: bc1-ext.massmutual.com - 63.66.112.5

Submission for Job: #3741 MP09_0214 - Concept Plan approval for a 32 storey mixed use retail/commercial development

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3741

Site: #2181 177-199 Pacific Hwy, North Sydney

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=2181

Luke Murtas
Planner

P: 02 9228 6382

E: luke.murtas@planning.nsw.gov.au

Powered by Internetrix Affinity

The Hon Tony Kelly
Minister for Planning, Infrastructure and Land
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Minister Kelly

Re: Project Application MP 09_0214 at 177-199 Pacific Highway, North Sydney
Submissions on 177 Pacific Highway Concept Approval Application:

I write to voice my concern over the proposed oversize development at 177 Pacific Highway and seek your assistance in refusing this size of development. I do not oppose development in the CBD but I do oppose oversize ones that ignore the Council Planning framework. My comments are as follows:

1. Height and Massing
 - a) The building is too large for the site. It exceeds the heights in the draft LEP and will have major impacts on the residential area from its size.
2. Setbacks
 - a) There should be setbacks on both northern and western sides. If there is no setback on the highway we will get a canyon effect. Council has had setbacks for years to stop us getting dark wind-blown canyons in place of worker and resident friendly streetscapes.
3. Overshadow/Solar Access
 - a) These will affect my way of life in Edward St- major amenity impact by material loss of sunlight to Edward, Oak, Lord, Short and Mount Sts including houses, blocks of apartments, Mackillop Museum and Shore Prep School and playing fields. Further mapping of impacts should be done outside the 9.00am winter solstice figure. Part of the draft 2009 NSLEP was undertakings that there would be no adverse shadowing impacts on residential or Special areas. And these aren't just immaterial but quite marked for the winter months.
 - b) Special Areas- Donbank and 101 Pacific Highway park and Miller St Special Areas. As the applicant points out public open space in Nth Sydney is very limited. Which is why it is so core to protect the limited solar access that workers and residents enjoy in the Special Areas. Increase in overshadow to Donbank is an absolute prohibition under the NSLEP. The scale of the application should be refused on this ground alone.
4. Wind

There will be major wind impacts from a west facing building. Cold southerly and sou'westerly winds will be channeled even more down to the highway and cast to

the eastern side of the building as well. Pedestrians already get blown off their feet in Miller St and on the Pacific Highway. North Sydney sits on the prow of a south facing hill and gets a lot more wind than the city.

5. Public Open Space

The proposal is just a glorified enclosed foyer. In current form it is not a public benefit. It is an enclosed private space. North Sydney needs open spaces generally and particularly outside office hours and this space won't contribute much more than to the immediate inhabitants of the building. It should be left open and established as a Special Area as receives northerly sun. With appropriate tree cover to the west to prevent wind impacts.

It should also be tied in with a green zone linking the other Berry St and Miller St open areas to provide a green artery through the CBD.

6. Traffic

This is a heavily congested area and particularly the right hand turn from Pacific Highway to Berry. It already backs up down the Highway during morning and evening peaks. And this has increased since 100 Pacific Highway and 16-40 Mount St came on line. An increase of 26 vehicles per hour will add to the gridlock and danger here. And as Council's Traffic Engineer states these are conservative figures. When combined with loading dock use a sub-arterial road will be severely impacted. A dual width loading dock entry will also impact on the activation of the streetscape and disconnect the building from Miller St.

There have been many pedestrian accidents on Berry Street already and this will make it more dangerous.

7. Part 3A

Is it really a Part 3A development? What is the "state significance" of another commercial building in the North Sydney CBD. It should be subject to the usual planning controls and integrated as part of a holistic approach to planning and not an ad hoc aberration.

Summary:

This application clearly breaches prohibitions in the North Sydney planning controls. I respectfully submit that it should not have been accepted by yourself in the first place. It has marked adverse impacts on adjoining residents as well as CBD workers. It defeats the planning (and related undertakings to all residents) aims of graduated interface between the residential and CBD areas, and creates a wall of building on the north eastern edge of the CBD area.

Yours sincerely