

28 Carrington Street SUMMER HILL 2130 7th August 2011

Director, Major Projects Assessment Department of Planning & Infrastructure GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001 By email: <u>plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au</u> Dear Sir/Madam

RE: MP10_0155 Concept Plan - Allied Mills Site, 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill

I wish to lodge my objections to the above concept plan application presently on exhibition. I have lived in the vicinity of this site for over 25 years and while I support residential re-use and redevelopment of the disused mill at a scale and density commensurate with that of its surrounds, the concept plan does not do this appropriately, brings major traffic problems and introduces retail and commercial uses which are not warranted. I detail my objections below.

1) Height and Scale to Edward Street

The existing residential development in Edward St consists of single storey dwellings with the occasional being two storey (free-standing or semi-detached). Housing of this type predominates in the surrounding locality being the eastern side of Summer Hill and Dulwich Hill/Lewisham beyond Old Canterbury Rd.

The Concept Plan proposes terrace-style dwellings ('2-3 storeys') to Edward St which with roof-top levels could extend to four storeys in height. At community consultation events the applicant's architect has referred to 'attic' levels which would in reality be full floors rather than roof space conversions. Such an approach leads to excessive height, does not accord with Ashfield Council's DCP for Residential Development and is not in keeping with the established scale and character of Edward St or the locality (as the Land and Environment Court found when dismissing an appeal for terrace development of this type at 67-75 Smith St nearby – case no.10635 of 2008).

2) Mill Structures and Existing Tree Cover

There are inconsistencies in how the consultant reports submitted with the Concept Plan deal with structures of heritage significance. The main office building at the corner of Smith and Edward streets sits well in the streetscape and is considered by Rod Howard as a good example of 1960s commercial architecture but it is given no consideration in the Graham report and is replaced by new buildings in the

Concept Plan. The Smith St substation building is of no architectural merit having heritage significance only due to its actual use but is proposed to be retained and converted from that use to retail/commercial. This building should be demolished and the area landscaped. The Concept Plan also shows a new single storey retail building near the elbow entry to Smith St – this should not proceed and the area be retained as is (grassed with trees)

The group of four large silos is the most prominent on the site. Their corrugated iron extensions beyond the silo tops should not be used as a precedent for three (3)levels of modern glass clad structure to contain more units; the resultant height at 13 storeys is excessive. These corrugated iron additions should be removed, as is proposed for the six silo group, and not replaced.

There are significant tree plantings on the site and Howard has noted their high heritage significance. While the Concept Plan specifically notes the retention of the line of brushbox near Smith St, no such statement is made about the landmark tree at the corner of Edward St, nor the line of wine glass palms fringing the Smith St boundary (two vehicular access points are proposed here). This line of palms is intact and should be retained in its entirety. Other significant free-standing trees – palms, camphor laurels etc, should be plotted on the Concept Plan and retained; a number exist in the area between the canal and former goods line where no landscape assessment appears to have been done other than total removal (for a sizeable new building).

3) Proposed Retail and Commercial Floorspace

The DGRs for this Concept Plan require a detailed investigation into the impact of the proposed retail floorspace on surrounding centres including cumulative impacts with the adjacent McGill St Masterplan precinct and the 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd Concept Plan. The resultant Economic Impact Assessment report completed by Hill PDA for the applicant is deficient in many key aspects so that its findings and conclusions given in the Executive Summary are unsubstantiated. The report contains inadequacies in its collection of data, the analysis performed and consequently the inferences drawn.

The adopted methodology involves projections from 5 year old census data, trade areas which stop at Parramatta Road (notwithstanding the light rail's potential to bring custom from Leichhardt and Haberfield) and the use of similar assessments for 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd (which themselves contain errors and unsubstantiated conclusions). The report states that it intends to measure need and **undersupply** of retail floorspace (p32), presupposing that this is what exists.

The assumption that local residents do their everyday shopping at the five centres listed on p32 is incorrect – local knowledge and practice shows that Leichhardt Marketplace, Petersham and Dulwich Hill are availed of as they are readily accessible by car and in reasonable walking distance. There is no evidence that residents necessarily go to Burwood for higher order shopping – Sydney CBD is more likely.

While the retail floor space of nearby shopping precincts is calculated, turnover figures are only given for the malls (Ashfield Mall, Leichhardt Marketplace and Marrickville Metro) -the trading performance of each shopping centre/strip is not provided nor is it estimated. In the absence of data the report relies on

'anecdotal evidence' (p28) which appears to be the writer's observations on availability of parking, busyness, number of empty shops and retail mix. This is problematic when combined with projections from the census to conclude for example that Summer Hill 'is trading very well' and that gentrification 'has led to an increase to the expenditure available to residents who use the centre' (p28). Further unsubstantiated claims such as '...the area has gentrified strongly with younger urban professionals moving in. Many of these households are dual income and cash rich' (p36) are used as evidence of the need for more retail floor space – residents have more money so they will be looking for more shops to spend it in!! An alternative possible claim - that many 'younger urban professionals' are single income couples with a young child(ren) who are also paying off sizeable mortgages on inner-west boom houses – would be just as valid (yet there does seem to be a lot of mothers and babies at the coffee shops in Summer Hill on weekday mornings!!)

Section 6 of the Report states that retail spending would mainly come from local residents and new residents and workers in the proposed development. Suggested retail spend per capita average increase of 1.8% per annum (p38) may relate to CPI and inflation of food prices, not a propensity to buy more year by year. For discretionary spending the figure is currently falling with the increased propensity to save, economic uncertainty and the use of the internet to purchase direct at lower than shop prices. It is arguable whether up to 2,800 sqm of retail floorspace is needed at all, particularly if these shops are to be a collection of small speciality stores – boutiques are suffering elsewhere and does the locality really need/can it support any more cafes? At its highest the proposed development might support a small collection of convenience retail, as is provided for the similarly scaled Trio development at Camperdown. Besides, the adjacent BP service station at the cnr of Smith St/Carlton Cres contains a convenience store and residents and workers going to and alighting at the stations at Lewisham and Summer Hill will be passing the shops in these centres , a 5-10 mins walk from anywhere on the site.

The modeling undertaken in Section 7 of the Report indicates that all identified centres will suffer a reduction in turnover from the provision of the retail floorspace of the Concept Plan (table 14). Levels of significance are considered but again the Report relies on 'continued gentrification' as the factor that will lift retail spend for all centres over time. Again the Report relies on appearances ('Summer Hill appears to be trading well...at least 20% above target turnover levels') and a suggested capacity to absorb what are stated as 'strong and significant' impacts (p46) without any data in support. The Report seems to be saying that Lewisham (with over 20 shop premises, most in use as residences) is already 'dead' so that the few convenience retailers still operating are not worth consideration. Yet all Lewisham shops have now been rezoned Business under the Marrickville DLEP (which is awaiting the Minister's signature and gazettal) and this DLEP increases the densities of nearby residential zones. The Council has adopted an Urban Design Study to revitalise this neighbourhood centre. All this would be supported by the passing trade from future residents and workers of the Site.

The Draft Centres Policy (2009) and its forerunners focus on retention of existing retail/commercial centres, not the creation of new ones (unless justified). The retail/commercial floorspace proposed under this Concept Plan creates a **new centre** which is between 400 and 1500metres from five existing centres and the business uses on Parramatta Rd. Combining this floorspace with that proposed for the adjacent concept plan application at 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd means this centre would far exceed the

size of those in the vicinity. These existing centres cater for the needs on the locality and can easily do so for this Site – there is no evidence presented of any unmet demand for more retail floorspace; indeed a visit to Lewisham, Petersham and Dulwich Hill shows a number of shops are vacant or underutilised. . The Report identifies that an adverse impact will occur on these existing centres but dismisses the significance and/or suggests this will pass over time (as all centres will benefit from increasing retail spend year by year). The Concept Plan proposes up to 4,000sqm of commercial floorspace but nowhere in the Report is the need for or impact of such floorspace examined, except in so far as it creates on-site jobs (and presumably customers for the proposed shops!) (p49).

There is no justification for the retail and commercial floorspace proposed by the Concept Plan, while its provision would have major adverse impacts on existing centres in the immediate locality. These centres serve the needs of the local population and will readily do so for this Site – a new one is not required.

4) Traffic and Site Access

Section 4 (Existing Conditions) of the Arup TMAP report identifies the peak period congestion experienced on a daily basis at key intersections near this Site. The delays also impacts on the reliability of the **sole** bus service (Route 413) which passes by (note: the suggestion that other bus routes shown on Figure 6 are 'within viable walking distance' p16 is disingenuous). While the train, bus and future light rail provides public transport options, the actual size/type of retail shops and commercial offices would be a matter for a future DA in the Concept Plan was approved. Consequently, there should not be reliance on 'self-containment' and use of turnover of spaces rather than their on-site number.

Undertaking the forecast of traffic generation/distribution in Section 6 and adopting the suggestion that persons travelling to/from work located east of the Site would seek to use public transport, the Report shows there is a 'significant increase' (p30) in traffic at these intersections. The DGRs require the cumulative impact to be addressed, so the inclusion of the McGill St Master Plan and the variation proposed by the 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd Concept Plan application is appropriate. Despite some odd comments as to dispersal of traffic (6.4.2) given that all intersections near the site experience congestion and one or more have to be passed-through to get to others, the results in Table 17 for these key intersections (and others) speak volumes – DOS at or near 1.0 (at capacity) and for some over 1.0; seven are traffic signal controlled where the desirable maximum is 0.9. When level of service (LOS) is examined, many show at or near capacity and some intersections are failing in one or both peaks. This is the case for Old Canterbury Rd (OCRd)/Longport St/Railway Terrace and given that the RTA abandoned some year ago a road widening reservation (and sold properties already acquired) that would have allowed two northbound lanes to pass under the rail bridge and beyond to the north, no improvement is possible.

The Report on p43 identifies deficiencies in the Traffix report for the 78-90 Old Canterbury Rd Concept Plan. This does not inspire confidence in value of the intersection upgrades suggested by Traffix and examined by Arup in Section 6.5 of the Report. What is proposed either will not work, is long term and part of comprehensive redevelopment (involving multiple property ownerships) if and when it occurs or is linemarking to reflect defacto current use (left-turn lane Longport/OCRd) or in effecting an improvement exacerbates a remaining problem (right-turn lane OCRd/Toothill reducing northbound capacity to the south in OCRd to a single lane).

In examining the suggested access points to the Site, the Report accepts what the Concept Plan proposes (section 6.8) It is likely that there will be increases in traffic to and from the Site using Wellesley, Spencer, Carrington and Nowraine Sts, all streets with low current volumes of mainly resident's vehicles. These streets also link to Smith St and OCRd. Whether Edward St would warrant traffic signals at OCRd is a matter for the RTA not the Concept Plan applicant. It is obvious that through traffic in these streets west of the Site will increase dramatically to the detriment of the amenity of their residents.

The provision of a roundabout and raised central median in Smith St is similarly a matter for Ashfield Council's Local Traffic Committee to determine, not the Concept Plan applicant. A product of the left in/left out restriction to access at Smith St will be further congestion at the existing roundabout at Carlton/Grosvenor/Longport (as vehicles come to the Site from the south and west) or a forced use of the proposed Edward/Chapman roundabout (to head to the north and east from the Site) – in peak hours increased frustration and delay all round!!

The suggested new street intersection with OCRd just to the SW of the crest of the goods line rail bridge should be abandoned. This is an unsafe location given the sight lines, bridge crest and the fact that free-flowing traffic on OCRd tends to travel at some speed when not constrained by peak hour conditions – this is not addressed by left in/left out restrictions. Besides, the gradient required for this street to mount the rail bridge embankment in order to reach OCRd would be so steep that it would be impossible for motorists to use, as an inspection would clearly show!!

In conclusion, it concerns me that the overall planning assessment Report conducted by SJB Environmental Assessment in summarising or commenting on the other Reports prepared ,does not mention anything which is deficient let alone negative in the Concept Plan. Quotations from these reports when they appear add to the overall flavour of the SJB Report itself, that is, an endorsement of the Concept Plan in all respects. I consider the SJB Report to be of little value as a planning assessment.

It is necessary that the Department's consideration of this Concept Plan application proceed in conjunction with that for the Concept Plan at 78-90 Old Canterbury Road, Lewisham – the concept plans are each significant in scale, height and amount/type of development proposed, their sites adjoin and they are served by and have a cumulative impact upon the same local and main roads and public transport provisions.

Yours Faithfully

David Rollinson

PhD; MSc(Architecture)(Conservation); MA(Conflict Resolution); BA; Dip Urban Studies; Dip Town & Country Planning



The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001 July 2011

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 - 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

Traffic congestion-lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).

Scale and out of character with our village-this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.

Impact on local amenity – the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.

Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.

Lack of genuine community consultation – despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.

Combined impact with Lewisham Towers-nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which ispart of the same McGill Street precinct.

Retail impact on the Summer Hill village – the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

(

5/

Ē.

Name:

WILLIAMS

Email:

Address: 36 CARRINGTON ST, SUMMER HILL 2130



July 19, 2011

FROM

Jennifer Campbell 18 Wellesley Street Summer Hill NSW 2130

TO

Major Projects Assessment NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney, NSW 2001

Attention: Ms Amy Watson

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re Exhibition of Concept Plan Application for a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail Development of The Former Allied Mills Site – 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill (MP10 0155)

I a writing to register my strong objection to the Summer Hill flour mill development.

My two primary concerns are:

- 1. The creation of a "rat run" down heritage-zoned streets, thus the destruction of the gracious character of these streets as well as the destruction of quality of life for the people who live on these streets.
- 2. The detrimental impact of imposing up to 1000 new residents on an area that is already at and over capacity in terms of parking and traffic. (Added to the 2000 new residents proposed for the adjoining Lewisham Towers and McGill Street developments).

In particular, I am highly concerned about the creation of a "rat run" from the development down Wellesley Street, leading into Nowranie Street and into Summer Hill village.

Wellesley Street is a gracious and quiet street zoned a heritage area by Ashfield Council. The Allied Mills developer, EG Funds, proposes

Scanning Room

Department of Planning

Received 2.5 JUL 2011 Wellesley Street be extended into the Allied Mills development to become the main entrance and exit to the site.

In this circumstance, all that has to happen for a "rat run" to develop is for residents of the 290-plus proposed dwellings to drive straight out of the development and keep going. The course of least resistance (please refer to attached map and diagram).

As you can imagine, this proposal is highly distressing to the residents of Wellesley Street, some of whom have lived in the street all of their lives, others of whom have paid substantial property prices to live in a quality, quiet street in a pretty suburb with substantial heritage values.

Unfortunately, despite the proposal to turn Wellesley Street into the main entrance/exit from the development, *no traffic impact studies were* conducted on how this would affect Wellesley Street.

In addition, at community consultations the developer has been alarmingly candid about the dearth of solutions to the congestion that will be created by the proposal on Edward Street and Old Canterbury Road.

Traffic studies already conducted show that this intersection is already unacceptably congested at peak hour. It is no stretch of the imagination to see that Wellesley Street, along with Spencer and Carrington streets, will be used to access alternative routes on to the main thoroughfare of Old Canterbury Road. Quiet residential streets turned into busy thoroughfares.

My broader and equally strong concern is the negative and irreversible impact this development will have on the lovely and much extolled suburb of Summer Hill itself.

The village shopping centre, in terms of traffic and parking, is already at capacity. It is difficult to find a parking spot now, even during a quiet weekday. An additional 700-1000 residents as proposed by the construction of 290-plus dwellings (in addition to the 2000 or so proposed for the adjoining Lewisham Towers and McGill Street developments) would place intolerable pressure on the cherished village shopping centre and be a calamitous and irrepairable outcome for an historical, beautiful and well-loved part of Sydney.

Finally, I would suggest that any development of the Allied Mills site, at least in part, needs to incorporate substantially more green space.

The combined Allied Mills/Lewisham Towers and McGill Street developments will bring up to 3000 extra people into the area, and yet the entire Ashfield/Summer Hill/Lewisham area is extremely short of parkland.

I see very little land being turned over to green space in any of these three proposals. What looks like parkland down the centre of the concept plans will actually be the light rail line and not parkland at all, which is the impression you might be left with after viewing the plans.

The extreme scale of the Allied Mills project in relation to the suburb, the lack of consideration for the streetscape or heritage values of the area and the developer's total inability to answer the intractable traffic issues raised by the proposal are all highly valid reasons to reject this proposal, or at the very least to substantially downsize its scope.

In its current form, it is akin to imposing a whole new suburb on an area without any of the infrastructure to support it and no spatial scope to expand infrastructure.

What I would like to see:

- 1. A minimum 50 per cent reduction in the size of the Allied Mills proposal.
- 2. A main entrance/exit that utilises one of the thorough fares bordering the site, that is, Old Canterbury Road or Smith Street. And that doesn't utilise in such a major way a quiet residential street like Wellesley Street.
- 3. A traffic impact study conducted on how Wellesley and Nowranie streets will be affected by this development.
- 4. Urgent consideration be given to the construction of a traffic stopper into Wellesley Street from Edward Street.
- 5. Urgent consideration be given to the development's impact on parking in Wellesley Street (given that the vast majority of homes on this street, being built before the advent of the car, do not have off-street parking).
- 6. Workable solutions provided for the substantial traffic concerns already raised by traffic studies, including the effect this development will have on the already congested Old Canterbury Road.
- 7. Parkland incorporated into the development (which could go some way towards reducing the intense population density proposed).

- 8. Keeping the silo apartment blocks at the height of the flour mills. There is absolutely no need for the apartment blocks to be extended three storeys above the present silo height. At 13 storeys they will tower over the suburb and be utterly out of keeping and character with this quiet suburb.
- 9. To consider the combined impact on Summer Hill of the Allied Mills, Lewisham Towers and McGill Street developments.

Yours sincerely

brifkell.

Jennifer Campbell 0419 886554 18 Wellesley Street Summer Hill, 2130

cc Ashfield Council Director of Planning and Environment Mr Phil Sarin cc NSW Planning Minister the Hon. Brad Hazzard

THE COURSE OF LEAST RESISTANCE

How Wellesley and Nowranie streets will become a "rat run" to Summer Hill village for up to 1000 new residents at the Allied Mills development



*Ashfield Council heritage map, amended to show the traffic impact of the Allied Mills development in Summer Hill



The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

Traffic congestion – lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).

Scale and out of character with our village – this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.

Impact on local amenity – the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.

Limited greenspace – This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.

Lack of genuine community consultation – despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.

Combined impact with Lewisham Towers – nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.

Retail impact on the Summer Hill village – the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Email: C Address:

Name:

The australien. com. en esley St Summer Hill

Dr Justine Humphry and Sarah Nielsen 8 Spencer Street Summer Hill NSW 2130

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

July 18 2011

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

We are residents living within 200 metres of the proposed development. We have looked over the development application of the Former Allied Mills Site and attended the May community consultation sessions run by EG Funds Management. We have the following objections to the above Concept plan application:

- 1. Our primary concern relates to the scale of the development and the resulting impacts this will have on our daily living, especially the risk of passive surveillance from high rise buildings, reduction of solar access in the morning and increased traffic congestion.
- 2. We are concerned about the impact of the development on **existing wildlife**, particularly bird life and small mammals living along the green corridor of the planned light rail extension.
- 3. We are concerned about the impact of the development on the **local amenities** including increased pressure on essential social services already under strain such as school, childcare services, medical services and other community services.

Having attended the community consultations run by the developers and viewed the model, we are particularly concerned about the proposal to build 2-3 level townhouses on the northern end of Edward Street, where there is currently a 2 level building facility housing the offices of the former Allied Mills Flour site. From our back yard in Spencer Street, we are able to see the roof of this existing structure. Adding another storey will likely mean that we have less light in the morning (between 6am and 9am) and, if the top storey has windows facing the street, we will be overlooked directly into our backyard.

On the same matter of passive surveillance and access to light in the morning, we are concerned that the proposed 4-6 storey tower directly behind these townhouses and next to the existing causeway will almost certainly mean a decrease of light in the morning and the potential of being overlooked. Given that our back yards face east, morning light between 6am and 9am is a significant portion of the light we receive during the day.

Also of particular concern is the likelihood of significant traffic increases causing congestion during peak hours and over flow traffic throughout the day as a result of 1/the scale of the development and 2/the plan to use Edward Street as a main entry point for the residents occupying the northern end of the site (where the 2-3 level townhouses and 4-6 storey tower is



to be located) and 3/the plan to use one of the site's entrances accessed through the existing causeway on Edward Street as a 'drop off' point for light rail passengers. This third proposal seems especially contrary to the wishes of the local community to limit traffic congestion as a direct outcome of the development and represents a significant departure from the current use and character of the streets surrounding the site. To us, it seems to much more sense to make the access point for light rail drop offs accessible from Railway Terrace and/or Old Canterbury Road, the two main thoroughfares through which the light rail actually passes.

Finally, we would like to note the current imbalance that exists between the community and developers of the Allied Flour Mills site and the so-called Lewisham Towers site in terms of input into planning and development of this major site. The two sites together will have a very significant impact on the surrounding suburbs and communities but are being treated separately as development applications. This division makes it particularly difficult for the affected communities to have any effective input or a unified voice on matters that concern them. We believe the development and urban renewal of this whole site (on both sides of the light rail) needs to be treated wholistically to ensure the site is developed sustainably and to ensure the interests and concerns of the local communities on all sides of the two developments are sufficiently addressed.

Signature: VE HUMPHRY Name: (FA) justine humptry 2 gmail com Email: Saca



ASHFIELD & DISTRICT HISTORICAL SOCIETY Inc

The Society's Rooms are located at *Thirning Villa*, Pratten Park Arthur Street, Ashfield. Email address: adhs@optusnet.com.au P.O. Box 20 Ashfield NSW 1800

4 August 2011

Director Major Projects Assessment Department of Planning & Infrastructure GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001 By email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: MP10_0155 Concept Plan Former Allied Mills - 2-32 Smith St, Summer Hill

The Ashfield & District Historical Society expresses concern at elements of the Concept Plan where it feels that both historical and heritage considerations have not been appropriately resolved, as detailed below.

Over 30 members of the Society attended a tour of the site on Saturday 30th March 2010 at the invitation of the owner's planning and architectural team. This tour, for which the Society is particularly grateful, enabled members (many of whom have design and heritage qualifications and experience) to view (and comment on) the existing built and landscape elements of the site. The tour combined with research of the Society's historical records and an examination of the reports and concept drawings now submitted, informs the following remarks.

1) The Height and Scale of Development fronting Edward Street

An examination of the Society's records reinforced by the 1955 Water Board plan depicted on p27 of the AHMS report indicates that the housing on the eastern side of Edward St demolished in the 1960s/70s were a mix of single fronted cottages with some semi-detached and the occasional double fronted possible 2-storey free-standing houses. This is consistent with the remaining dwellings on this side of the street and corresponds to what exists on the western side of Edward St today. Indeed, it is broadly consistent with the type and scale of dwelling house stock that predominates in the Quarantine Ground Conservation Area that stretches to the west, as well as that found north of Smith St.

The Concept Plan proposes terrace-style dwellings which with roof-top levels could extend to 4 storeys. This is not in keeping with the existing traditional dwelling house form or height. The Land and Environment Court in 2008 (LEC no. 10635 of 2008) found that terrace-style development of this type was **not** in keeping with the established scale and character of nearby dwellings in Smith St and the Quarantine Ground Conservation Area in dismissing an appeal for residential development of the factory site at 67-75 Smith St.

2) Incorporation of Heritage Assessments into the Concept Plan

The Report prepared by John Graham & Associates makes numerous references to the 1998 Heritage Assessment Survey done by Rod Howard for the site's then owner Goodman Fielder. However there appears to be some inconsistency with how Rod Howard's identified levels of significance are dealt with by the Graham report as well as in the summary comments that are presented in the SJB Environmental Assessment Report.

Figure 22 and the accompanying table of the Graham report shows the Howard significance levels. For elements of 'moderate' significance, these are incorporated into the Concept Plan when it suits its overall design approach, rather than by seeking to include such elements per se. Howard rates the mill's main office building (item 4) at the corner of Smith and Edward streets as a good example of 1960s commercial architecture yet with no explanation or reason offered it is to be demolished. Somewhat perversely, the substation building (item 1) fronting Smith St (which has high significance only due to its **use** from 1922 as the substation for the functioning mill) with no aesthetic or architectural significance is to be retained but then converted from a substation use to a shop/office!!

Graham quotes Howard's overall statement of significance at p19 of the Report. Howard makes specific reference to the landscaping and plantings on the site. While the Concept Plan shows the line of brushbox and the prominent fig, it appears that the intactness of the line of wine glass palms is not assured. The Concept Plan does not depict other palms, camphor laurels and other significant specimens (some of which being located in the area between the canal and former goods line where a new building is proposed). As Howard states –'The landscaping is an important contribution to the locality forming the setting for a major commercial enterprise having long associations with the area'.

3) Alterations/Additions to Roof of Main 4-Silo Structures

These silos are the most prominent structures on the site. They contain corrugated iron additions of varying heights and condition above the silos flat tops. These additions do not appear to have any assessed heritage significance. Notwithstanding it is inappropriate to remove these structures for the sole purpose of adding modern forms which while circular in no way complement the silos finished form.

If the corrugated iron additions need to be removed to facilitate the residential conversion of the silos, they should not be replaced.

The Society requests the Department in its assessment of this Concept Plan act to require such modifications as will ensure that any resultant approval is responsive to the Society's comments, given the major significance of this site to the history and heritage of this part of the inner west of Sydney.

Yours Faithfully

David Rollinson Preident, Ashfield & District Historical Society Inc

July 2011

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

By email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sirs

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10 0155 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- □ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- Limited greenspace -- This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will \Box duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Meid Dayle

Name:

Email:

Address: / 27-29 Smith St, Smile Hill, 2130 Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard at <u>office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au</u>

(106)

Diary from Agnes Yi to Amy Watson on 02/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Agnes Yi (object)

Email Details

Received	1:56PM, Tue 2nd Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 02/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Object

Interactions

🍰 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Agnes Yi agnes_yi@yahoo.com

🍰 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

> I am absolutely opposed to the proposed development of the former Allied Mills site as it is currently proposed by the developers. The scale of the developmment is far too large. Of course I understand that the developers would like to maximise their profits as much as possible but I am sure they can make significant profits from this project without resorting to building tower blocks of up to 13 storeys, Apart from the detrimental impact such an overdevelopment will have on the local amenity, there is no doubt that it will place significant pressures on local infrastructure. From my own personal experience the two local schools in Summer Hill (both the public and Catholic school) are at capacity. The two rail stations within walking distance to the site are small and would not be able to take much more. As for Ashfield station it is already filled to capacity during commuting times. I am very supportive of the light rail but the carrying capacity of light rail is significantly less than heavy rail so there is a transport issue here. On the issue of the light rail, as the private developers will significantly benefit from the light rail, they should be made to contribute to the cost and on-going maintenance of this new public transport infrastructure. No doubt they will add a further premium to the sale price due to light rail. And of course the impact to traffic would be horrendous. PlanningNSW should visit Smith Street and Carlton Crescent on a weekday morning between 8am and 10am, from 3pm to 6 pm and on a Saturday late morning to early lunch. It is virtually gridlock. These roads are single lane and I can not see how adding more vehicles attached to such a high density development can not but cause total gridlock and chaos. While old Canterbury Road at the site's vacinity is 2 lanes in parts, it is already gridlocked at these times. With a proposed high density development there should be more open and green space. I do not necessarily believe it must be open to the public unless it is on public land - if it is private property then I do accept that the open/green space does not have to be accessible to the public - but having more open and green space would improve the amenity of such a high density development. I am also very concerned about the proposed retail component of the development. This area is already very well serviced by retail - all within a 5 km radius. There is of course the main street of Summer Hill, Ashfield Mall, 2 malls in Leichhardt, the main street in Haberfield and Five Dock and then Westfield at Burwood. Do we need more retail when the negative impacts will outweight any possible benefit. It will kill the main street shops and again exacerate already existing traffic problems. And then there is the "Lewisham Towers" proposal which is so close to the former Allied Mills site and will only exacebate all the problems associated with the proposed development. These two sites should not be considered in isolation otherwise the planning process will ignore the cumulative impact these developments will have. On a side issue and please excuse me if I have missed anything in the library of documents submitted by the developers but I strongly believe that the developers should be required to build this development with sustainabalility in mind. Where are the proposed solar panels? What about rain water tanks or the use of "grey water" for some of their plumbing? I appreciate PlanninngNSW has a difficult task in balancing the interests developers who must make money from this project and the interests of the local community. A balanced approach that allows for the redevelopment the site with care and sensitivity will yield significant profit because in the end they are not just making money from the development itself, they are also making money from the amenity the local community currently offers. However as far as I can see what they are proposing is merely a more expensive version of the silo tower blocks that were built in Ashfield. Not only did they destroy the amenity of Ashfield but any economic benefit that the developers spruiked from the developments did not last. A number of businesses have failed in the commercial spaces, People still like to shop in the main street. While I do not know the occupancy rate of the residential units, perhaps PlanningNSW should investiage that aspect to counter any pressure from the developers who will invariably overstate the "need" for such high density residential development. The tower blocks in Ashfield are just a few years old and they already look tired and neglected. I hope we learn from these planning mistakes. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

(107)

Diary from Jean Burns to Amy Watson on 02/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Jean Burns (comments)

Email Details

Received	4:48PM, Tue 2nd Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 02/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Comments

Interactions

🔏 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Jean Burns jeanburns1@hotmail.com

🍇 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

Overall I support the development and consider that the architects have walked a difficult line balancing the need for sensitive development of the site i.e. in keeping with the surrounding area, with the need for developers to gain maximum return on a significant investment - particularly for the people whose funds they are managing.

I would like to share some concerns I have regarding the development;

Traffic impact - this has been discussed at length, and I am not sure if there is a solution that would meet all needs. However, the peak hour traffic heading to and from the city is currently a major issue from around 7am to around 9.30 am and about 4pm to 7pm. The traffic issues will be exacerbated by this development and all consideration needs to be given to minimising traffic problems.

Height of the proposed new buildings. The new high rise buildings are, I think, planned to be 11 storeys at the highest. I believe this will significantly impact on the area and will be too imposing. If this height was reduced to say 9 storeys, I think the impact would be less overpowering.

Proposed height of the silo building. I understand that the current height of the silos is being taken as the height of the small structures on top of the silos and that this means one of the silos will be built to 13 storeys. I think that this is not a true representation of the current height of the silo and to increase the building to 13 storeys is unacceptable. The development down the line at Dulwich Hill did not seem to increase the height of the silos and from what I have seen the building includes a smaller structure on top of the silo which appears to be apartment/s. If this more modest sized structure on top of the silo was considered for the Smith St site, I think it would be more appropriate and more acceptable to local residents.

Relationship between Allied Mill Site and McGill St Project. I would like to be assured that these two important developments in the Summer Hill area are being considered in the same planning forum. Both these projects will have a significant impact on the local area and, whilst they are situated in separate LGAs, the impact will be across LGAs and they need to be considered together - particularly in relation to impact on traffic.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments

Jean Burns

(108)

Diary from Sarah White to Amy Watson on 26/07/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10 0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Sarah White of scarywhite@iprimus.com.au (object)

Email Details

Received	8:11PM, Tue 26th Jul, 11
Status	Actioned on 26/07/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Object

Interactions

Contacts (1)

Inbound email from:

Sarah White - scarywhite@iprimus.com.au scarywhite@iprimus.com.au

🔏 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

I object to this concept plan on the basis of the following:-

Traffic congestion - lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars per hour in peak hour (independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt and Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield council). Congestion of the Old Canterbury Road, Railway Terrace junction is already beyond tolerable levels during peak our and these developments right on that corner will give the traffic little alternative routes to disperse.

Limited greenspace - this development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipalit in NSW.

Combines impact with Lewisham Towers - nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale, design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact to existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precint.

(109)

Diary from Gillian Reffell to Amy Watson on 29/07/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Gillian Reffell of NA (comments)

Email Details

Received	2:21PM, Fri 29th Jul, 11
Status	Actioned on 29/07/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Comment

Interactions

🌋 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Gillian Reffell - NA ggmk@optusnet.com.au

3 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

Main points:

* This development should reconsidered jointly with the nearby development on Old Canterbury Rd by both Ashfield and Marrickville Councils together. Joint consideration would assist avoiding overdevelopment in terms of residential density and commercial floorspace.

*Traffic generation is a major issue. Titles to residences and car spaces should be sold separately to discourage car ownership. Street parking in the immediate vicinity should be limited. More than one space should be made available for carshare services.

* Density of residential development should be moderated to reduce impacts on the low scale surrounding residential areas and local facilities.

*Open space / garden areas appropriate for the number of residents should be provided on the site to avoid over pressuring existing limited open space areas.

Current sheds on top of the silos should not be included in the calculation of the height of the development.

*New local facilities should be obtained for the good of all locals. I think the development should construct a bikeway under Parramatta Rd so that the current bikeways on either side of the road are connected directly.



Diary from Janne Thorburn to Amy Watson on 30/07/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10 0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Janne Thorburn (object)

Email Details

Received	9:11PM, Sat 30th Jul, 11
Status	Actioned on 30/07/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium

Class Object

Interactions

🌋 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Janne Thorburn shippingnews@dodo.com.au

🔏 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

Although we agree that a redevelopment should happen on the site we strongly object to the massive scale of the project.

Not only are we very worried that our peaceful street could become a busy thoroughfare into the main carpark, but also that the surrounding streets that are already gridlocked at morning peak hour will become a carpark themselves.

- The 13 storey tower will look out of place and will be looking directly down on us. When we bought our house 10 years ago we valued the privacy of our home and backyard, and still do.
- Where will families go for medical/child care and schooling? We understand that the local Summer Hill Public School is already at capacity having only recently completed building and filling 2 new classrooms.

Lastly, the combined impact of the proposed adjacent Lewisham Towers does not seem to have been outlined or referred to by the developers, like the elephant in the room.

Given the effort it takes for the average punter to erect a fence in this area we would be very suspicious of a Council to allow such a development on this scale.

Yours faithfully Janne & Chris Thorburn

Diary from Andrew Hosking to Amy Watson on 24/07/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Andrew Hosking (object)

Email Details

Received	1:46PM, Sun 24th Jul, 11
Status	Actioned on 24/07/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Object

Interactions

🎄 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Andrew Hosking hosko@hotmail.com

🔏 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

My position is that the development should not proceed without more serious improvements to nearby roads and intersections, because it is clear to me as a local resident that local roads already exceed capacity on most days. The additional traffic pressure placed on local roads from this development is not acceptable in my view, and will probably lead to additional expensive tax payer funded road projects in coming years.

The proposed traffic generation figures are very low and the proposed intersection upgrades will be inadequate in my view. The volumes noted in the Transport Management and Accessibility Plan for the City bound Carlton Crescent AM Peak hour trips intersections are unexpectedly low, and not typical at all in my experience. Approaching and then trying to drive east along Longport street during the morning peak is usually a "Nightmare". A possible reason is that the week when the traffic figures were counted was a quiet week. Perhaps due to a study vacation week at Sydney Uni.

Sydney University - Study vacation Monday 7 June to Friday 11 June http://sydney.edu.au/future_students/domestic_undergraduate/admissions/semester_dates/2010.shtml

It is my belief that the developer should pay for the necessary local road improvements, or provide an innovative incentive (or dis-incentive) to encourage occupants of the development to use public transport instead.

Diary from Linda Morris to Amy Watson on 05/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Linda Morris (object)

Email Details

Received	3:25PM, Fri 5th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 05/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Object

Interactions

💲 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Linda Morris Imorris@smh.com.au

🚴 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

> The Department of Planning and Infrastructure, GPO BOX 39 Sydney NSW 2001

I wish to object to the redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site – reference number MP10_1055 at 2-32 Smith St, Summer Hill, 2130:

It is my strong opinion that there should be no rezoning permitted of this site for residential development. The inner west of Sydney is starved of light industrial sites such as the former mills to meet the city's long term planning objectives for manufacturing and commercial employment to remain based inside the city circle.

Slowly the inner west is being emptied of industry due to residential infill and it is important that sites such as Allied Mills which have existed in this small suburb for many decades be preserved as a single jobs centre. Any requirement for medium density residential development can be satisfied by a sympathetic redevelopment of the Old Canterbury, Lewisham site next door. On site residential development will automatically limit the type of businesses

will only limit the types of businesses that can utilise the precinct. A revitalised Mills Site could house commercial and retail tenants, artist studios and workspaces and small manufacturing firms. Along the site's western perimeter this vibrant mix is already evident. An employment hub based along the light rail corridor would help guarantee the viability of the light rail extension and ensure patronage at its two ends. Without residential towers, the Allied Mills site is big enough to provide commuter parking.

If residential rezoning is approved, I have serious misgivings about the ability of the existing road system to cope. The developers concede traffic will worsen along Railway Terrace have yet have not made any attempt to ameliorate the inevitable congestion and have not made enough parking available on site for either residents or light rail commuters. Inevitably, cars will spill out in to residential streets.

What's more the redevelopment is out of scale and character with Summer Hill and Lewisham, which are ranked as villages within the planning structure. The entrance tower of ten storeys would loom over the one and two storey dwellings of Summer Hill and Lewisham and the extra three storeys stacked on top of the silos for penthouse apartments is all about maximising profits, not sympathetically working to the existing template.

Thank you, Linda Morris

51 Kensington Rd,

NOW GOYERWINENT Dianning & Infrantiuch Planning & Intraeliverure The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001 OPMEN Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

June 2011

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ Limited green space This development has limited green space, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers** nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- □ **Retail impact on the Summer Hill village** the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature: 🗂 Name: Linda Morris Email: Morris@Smh.com.au. Email:

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard and Ashfield Council

Diary from Lindsay Baker to Amy Watson on 07/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Lindsay Baker (comments)

Email Details

9:27PM, Sun 7th Aug, 11
Actioned on 07/08/2011
0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Medium
Comment

Interactions

🌋 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Lindsay Baker lindsaytheresa1@yahoo.com.au

🐊 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

Amy,

I would like to provide comment on the development application as provided in the following points.

1. Privacy Loss - The view from the silos will directly impact upon the amenity of my rear yard and the back part of my house with a loss of privacy that we currently experience. I have two small children and this is a major concern.

2. Silo extension is too high - The existing height of the silos (the 4 pack) should not be extended for additional floors up to 13 storeys. I understand that the justification for the additional floors, as provided in the community information session, is that they will be no higher than the current silos, including the mechanical hoist rooms. This is very misleading as the hoist room is currently quite small and off to one side. The silos should be kept at their current height without the extension into the mechanical hoist area. This has successfully been done on the Waratah Mills in Dulwich Hill.

3. Coordination with the McGill St Development - The adjacent development has not adopted the Hassell Master Plan and its current proposal far exceeds the FSR's proposed in the Hassell Master Plan. This needs to be addressed by the Department of Planning.

4. Impact upon traffic in the close vicinity - The roads in the area are already at capacity at peak hours in the morning and afternoon. The additional number of cars added will be disastrous for traffic in the area especially around Edward Street and Old Canterbury Road and at the corner of Smith Street and Edward Streets. Lights should be installed at the corner of Edward Street and Old Canterbury Road to try to alleviate some of this congestion during peak hour. At present it is very difficult to get onto Old Canterbury Road during peak hour due to the bank up of traffic from the corner of Old Canterbury Road and Carlton Parade and the lights at Toothill Road. This will be further adversely affected by the McGill Street development.

Overall the development seems appropriate yet I do not understand how 13 storeys can be justified in any manner. There are simply no developments of that scale within a 5km radius of this proposed development.

Regards, Lindsay Baker

Diary from Alexis Evans to Amy Watson on 08/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Alexis Evans (object)

Email Details

Received	1:06PM, Mon 8th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 08/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Object

Interactions

👗 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Alexis Evans evans.dexs@gmail.com

🗸 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

. . . .

I strongly object to this Concept Plan. Please see attached:

1. Detailed list of my concerns; and

2. Newspaper article outlining, what I believe to be, the view of our community.

Attachments (2)

70.29 KB

Article.pdf

Former Allied Mills Site_2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill . Jobs . MP10_0155_Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development . Web Submissions 62.94 KB

Objection - Amy Watson.pdf

Former Allied Mills Site_2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill . Jobs . MP10_0155_ Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development . Web Submissions

Inner West Courier



The developer's controversial vision for the Summer Hill flour mill site. Image: HASSELL

AUSTRALIANS were divided at the polling booths but Summer Hill and Lewisham residents stood united against massive developments.

A community referendum was held on Saturday at three polling booths in Summer Hill and Lewisham to vote on the development plans for the McGill St precinct and the Mungo Scott flour mills.

An overwhelming 94 per cent of 1500 concerned residents who took part were opposed to the scale and scope of the developments.

A spokeswoman for the Summer Hill Action Group said they were swamped by concerned residents.

"What's alarming is that these two sites are being developed separately even though they're right next to each other," she said.

"The community aren't aware of this and so there was lots of interest on Saturday."

Together the developments include more than 760 units, multiple high-rise buildings and extra traffic generated on to already heavily commuted roads.

The spokeswoman predicted the community dissent toward the developments would grow to become a key state election issue for Inner West residents.

The Courier reported on the developer's masterplan for the mill site in Tuesday's edition.

Developer EG Funds Management presented the masterplan to Ashfield Council last week.

It includes three new streets, up to 300 dwellings, 2500sq m of retail space and 4000sq m of commercial space.

http://www.whereilive.com.au



All times AEST

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

By email: amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following:

 Traffic congestion – there is a lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).

The development relies on the unconfirmed plans for a Light Rail. Even if the Light Rail goes ahead, it is likely to be expensive to travel on and does not reach the demanded destination of the heart of the Sydney CBD.

There is also no plan to align the delivery of the Flour Mill development and congestion solutions together. Summer Hill is already at capacity and the general traffic and congestion needs to be resolved first.

- Scale and out of character with our village <u>this is a gross over-development of the Mills site</u>. The
 proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and
 two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining
 villages. It will also mean many residents (including myself) will lose their backyard privacy, which I find
 utterly distressing.
- Combined impact with Lewisham Towers no one is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct. I find this to be a manipulative and petty strategy by developers, which needs to be addressed immediately.
- Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare, parking and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.

Yours sincerely,

Alexis Evans 18 Spencer Street SUMMER HILL NSW 2130

evans.dexs@gmail.com 0405 788 874



The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_105S 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- □ **Traffic congestion** lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers** nobody is considering the combined impact (Increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- □ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ **Limited greenspace** This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2rd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ **Retail impact on the Summer Hill village** the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

LORRAINE EVANS Shu Shu @ netspace.net.au Name: Email:

July 2011



Diary from Jason Balgi to Amy Watson on 08/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Jason Balgi (object)

Email Details

Received	9:27PM, Mon 8th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 08/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Object

Interactions

🎄 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Jason Balgi jason_balgi@yahoo.com.au

🍰 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

August 7, 2011

Director Major Projects Assessment Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001 plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au Dear Sir/Madam, Application No MP10_0155, 2-32 Smith St, Summer Hill



From:	Graeme Robinson <graeme.robinson@optusnet.com.au></graeme.robinson@optusnet.com.au>
To:	<amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au></amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC:	<office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>, <linda.burney@parliament.nsw.gov.a< th=""></linda.burney@parliament.nsw.gov.a<></office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>
Date:	12/08/2011 12:50 pm
Subject:	Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055

Dear Sir / madam,

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

fð Traffic congestion ¡V lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).

 $f\check{o}$ Scale and out of character with our village ¡V this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.

f dimpact on local amenity iV the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.

 $f\delta$ Limited greenspace iV This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.

 $f\delta$ Lack of genuine community consultation ;V despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer; s own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community; concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.

fð Combined impact with Lewisham Towers ¡V nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.

*f*ð Retail impact on the Summer Hill village ¡V the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Graeme Robinson 22 Nowranie St Summer Hill NSW 2130

NOW COURT MARNIE Palanning & Intrastructure 688. A # The Department of Planning and Infrastructure SIMENT AND June 2011 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001 Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site MP10 1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- ☑ Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- Limited green space This development has limited green space, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature: Graeme Robinson @ ophsuet. com.au Name: Email:

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard and Ashfield Council



29 Sloane Street,

SUMMER HILL NSW 2130

10 August, 2011

The Secretary,

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure,

GPO Box 39

SYDNEY NSW 2001

Your Ref: MP10_0155

Email: amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam,

Concept Plan - Former Allied Mills Site - 2-32 Smith St., Summer Hill

Thank you for your letter of 27 June last.

I wish to confirm my objection to the scale of the current proposed development of the former Allied Mills Site, despite having a further opportunity to attend a community presentation by the owners and development team.

It was apparent from the views expressed by the residents at the recent meeting that it is the scale of the development which is the greatest cause of our concern. It was accepted the site must be developed and many indeed look forward to an appropriate result having regard to the area in which it is situated and to the surrounding existing housing mix.

The major concerns remain:

- 1. Height of the development up to 13-14 storeys in part by adding extra storeys on top of the existing silos.
- 2. Scale of the development is out of character with the village of Summer Hill. Many of the local one and two-storey homes have heritage listings.
- 3. Traffic congestion It would be unrealistic to expect that the influx of possibly 800 new residents in this development would not bring with it a corresponding increase of motor vehicles. As a local resident I have experienced increasing time delays in morning and evening peak times simply travelling from Sloane Street to Smith Street. The roundabout a Longport Street is clogged with traffic during this time. This situation is without any further real development occurring in the area during the last 23 years of my residency.
- 4. The proposed volume increase in new residents must have an adverse impact on the local amenities – schools, childcare etc.

- 5. Our village is in need of more green space due to the already densely populated area. This could be facilitated by a reduction of the proposed density of the development.
- 6. The proposed development of the Lewisham Towers project in close proximity to the Mills development has the possibility of creating a ghetto like pocket in the area due to their combined overdevelopment of these sites.

The opportunity to develop the Mills site should not be squandered. It is an opportunity to create a unique development which compliments the existing suburb and feature the old silos and heritage building. Overdevelopment of the site as is currently proposed will not serve the existing residents' investment in a suburb which has strong community awareness and a real concern for the future of the area.

The lack of real community consultation has been disappointing and limited.

I believe I echo the hopes of very many of the residents of Summer Hill and surrounding areas that an acceptable compromise can be proposed to satisfy the needs of the development group and the hopes of the residents for an appropriate development of our Mills heritage site and not a high rise eyesore.

Yours sincerely,

Jeanette Tancred


Dear Sirs

Re: the redevelopment of the former Allied Mills Site – MP10_0155 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

There is much to commend in this Concept Plan for the Ashfield Mill site, but equally there are areas that are not favourable. This is not the only development proposed in the area. On the other side of the Light Rail / Greenway corridor, the Lewisham Towers – another large development on part of Marrickville Councils' McGill Street Precinct, is also under consideration.

With this in mind I object to the following elements of the Allied Mills site:

Height of buildings: although the silos are a landmark the suggested replacement of the flimsy top layer to create 10 to 13 storeys is excessive and sets an unwelcome precedent for other projected developments. Residential building heights in general are out of keeping with existing dwellings in the area, despite initial promises that this would not be so.

Traffic generation: The advent of a possible 800 extra residents will inevitably increase the traffic flow to an unacceptable level. The local roads are already grossly overcrowded in peak hours and at weekends. Bus, Train and the coming Light Rail will not ease this problem.

Commercial and retail spaces: are excessive given the proximity of services in Summer Hill and surrounding suburbs.

Greenspace: The lack of adequate greenspace – private & public – is disappointing. Its representation in the diagrams – Dark green for the development, faded green for the Greenway and hoped for park area in the McGill Street Precint site, is disingenuous. How much of that faded green corridor between this development and the Greenway / Light Raii will be financially supported by the Developer?

The fate of the Mill site is unavoidably connected to the proposed Development, also under consideration by your Department, for part of the McGill Street precinct on the other side of the Greenway. It would seem sensible and reasonable for these developments to be considered together in the interests of satisfactory regional outcomes on residential density and traffic problems.

Yours sincerely,

Miss M.I. Rea 64 Old Canterbury Road, LEWISHAM NSW 2049

Department of Planning Received 1 1 AUG 2011

Scanning Room



1

July 2011

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 - 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion-lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
 - Scale and out of character with our village-this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
 - Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
 - **Limited greenspace** This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
 - Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
 - **Combined Impact with Lewisham Towers**—nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which ispart of the same McGill Street precinct.

Retail impact on the Summer Hill village – the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with aiready extensive retail provision.

Signature: e that dug Name: angane. harding e grait con. 209 old caperbury rd puturent HELL Email: Address:

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard



364 July 2011

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

By email: plan comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear 5irs

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills 5ite - MP10_0155 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- If Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield / Council).
- Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of / Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- \Box Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Name: Jamara Ruicens

Email: tamararuicens@ bigpond.com

Address: 128 Victoria St, Dulmch Hill NSW 2203

-Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard at office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au



July 2011

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

By email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sirs

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

1 object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council),
- \square Scale and out of character with our village - this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- IV Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The etommunity's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Antonia Jones Antonia & Brett

Name:

Email:

Antoniajones 6 ozemail.com.au TOOTHILL ST , Lewisham , NSW, 2019

Address:

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard at office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au



Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 - 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

Lobject to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

Traffic congestion—lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt &Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).

July 2011

- Scale and out of character with our village-this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
 - **Limited greenspace** This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers**-nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which ispart of the same McGill Street precinct.
 - Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

2 Resertate Street, Dutwich Hill NEW 2203

Signature:

Name:

Wthyfury ANNETTE HAGLERM

Email:

Annette Anguerry haggerrys @ ophishet can an

Address:

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard

PERSONAL DEDAILS INCI FOR PUBLICATION





By email:plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sirs

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt &Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
 - Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
 - **Impact on local amenity** the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers Adevelopment which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision

Signature	3 J 2 2 2	(Att to	Department of Planning Received
Name:	FRANCESCA LILLS	Colerte Na	1 0 AUG 2011 Scanning Room
Email:	francescawills @gmacil		
Address:	8/21 Henson St, S	ummer Hill 21	30

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard at office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au

By email: amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- □ Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- □ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- □ **Retail impact on the Summer Hill village** the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature: SM Name: Stephen Mikulic Email: Stephen.mikulic@jhg.com.au

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard at office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au



Diary from Callantha Brigham to Amy Watson on 11/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Callantha Brigham (object)

1

Email Details

Received	10:48PM, Thu 11th Aug, 1
Status	Actioned on 11/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Object

Interactions

🎄 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Callantha Brigham callantha@hotmail.com

🍰 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

Comments on the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mill Site

I have reviewed the submission made and provide the following comments.

Built form / Urban Design Figure ground of the development (and adjacent Lewisham development) is inappropriate relative to dense fabric of adjacent areas. While the Allied mills site

Diary from Craig Sandwell to Amy Watson on 11/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Craig Sandwell (object)

1

Email Details

Received	8:15PM, Thu 11th Aug, 1
Status	Actioned on 11/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Object

Interactions

🌋 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Craig Sandwell csandwell@trinity.nsw.edu.au

🚴 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

I am objecting to: 1. New Street around my residence that is not needed. 2. New Street entrance that will impact on my residence. 3. Overshadow and loss of privacy around my residence. 4. Loss of security. 5. Light Pollution. 6. Car Park entrance that will impact on my residence. 7 Inaccuracies in the concept plan. 8. Parking issues-

Details in attached PDF

Attachments (1)

4.459 MB

Craig and Anni Sandwell.pdf

Former Allied Mills Site_2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill . Jobs . MP10_0155_ Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development . Web Submissions

(27)

Submission in Response to the Concept Plan for:

Former Allied Mills Site - 2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

From: Craig and Anni Sandwell 34 Edward Street Summer Hill 2130 csandwell@trinity.nsw.edu.au m. 0408967274 w.95816066

Firstly I would like to state that EG Funds Management have not spent any time consulting directly with the few property owners that actually live on the boundary of the site. We have attended the Public Briefings. Though they are not obliged too consult directly under the current guidelines, some consultation before finalising the concept plan would have been helpful, given the direct impacts on our residence.

The site is big enough for the issues raised below to be addressed without any significant cost and without any loss of development potential as no reduction in properties is needed, just a consideration of current residences and a movement of entrances, car parks, new streets and some buildings away from existing houses.

Issues with the original concept plan submitted to the Department of Planning submitted in August 2010 as it contains the following errors:

- Page 2 Illustration from Wellesley Street, Residences not shown
- Page 3 Master Plan residences portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties)
- Page 5 Illustration from Wellesley Street Residences not shown
- Page 7 Illustration has residences portrayed as Medium Density housing
- Page 8 Strategies do not take into consideration residences
- Page 9 Figure 5- Mention of Multiple private ownership, but no display of residences or their boundaries
- Page 10 Figure 6 -has the properties as 6/4/and 3 Story Buildings with no recognition of the properties as they stand.
- Page 11 Figure 7 -properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties)
- Page 12 Figure 8-properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties) and no recognition of traffic impacting residences

- Page 1.3 Figure 9- properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties or usages)
- Page 14 Figure 10- properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties) and no recognition of traffic impacting residences
- Page 15 Figure 11- No display of current properties and no recognition of traffic impacting on residences
- Page 16 Figure 12- properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties or usages)
- Page 17 Figure 13- properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties or usages)
- Page 18 Figure 14 properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties or usages)
- Page 19 Figure 15 properties are portrayed as already changed and developed into Medium density housing (No display of current properties or usages)

Issues with the following aspects of the Revised Concept Plan- Dated March 2011

1. Errors in the site boundaries:

The site Boundary depicted in concept plan drawings of northern boundary of 32 Edward Street adjoining LOT – DP 9561124 **are all in error**. They have the new street butting up against the residence 32 Edward Street. As can be seen from Attachment 2 The Site Survey a driveway of over 3 Metres in width is between the 32 Edward Street and the proposed development footprint boundary. This has an impact on the supposed alignment with Wellesley Street and is deceptive. This error is repeated obviously on the following pages and figures of the

Concept Plan: Page: 8 Figure: 1.5, Page: 15 Figure: 2.B & 2.C Page: 16 Figure: 12.1 Page: 21 Figure: 3.1 Page: 22 Figure: 3.2 Page: 23 Figure: 3.3 Page: 26 Figure: 3.4 Page: 27 Figure: 3.5 Page: 29 Figure: 3.6 Page: 40 Figure: 3.7 Page: 41 Figure: 3.8 Page: 43 Figure: 3.9 Page: 54 Figure: 4.2A Page: 58 Figure: 4.4A

Page: 59Figure 4.4BPage: 63Figure: 4.1

2. <u>New Streets</u>

Public Domain: Page 22 of the Concept Plan, Figure 3.2, Point- 11 This indicates new public streets that will surround our property at 34 Edward St. This will create issues for us:

- 24 Hour traffic and pedestrian noise near bedrooms and living areas
- Lack of privacy for our property with 2 extra public streets.
- Decreased security for our property (Surrounded by public access that has never previously existed)
- 3. New Road Entrance

Access Strategy: Page 43 of Concept Plan, Figure 3.9 The proposed new street entry of Edward Street creates issues:

- A new street entrance on Edward Street is suggested, where **no street entrance has existed before**.
- It will be less than 5 Metres from our residence and will therefore reduce safety from our drive, restrict Parking outside both 32 and 34 Edward Street. (RTA Restrictions on Parking near a 4 way intersection are 10 Metres)
- In our 15 Years in residence this driveway was only ever used as an exit to a car park for Mill workers on weekdays and occasionally weekends and used by less than 40 cars a day morning and afternoon.
- Why is the road needed here when an entrance can easily be created where closer to Smith Street, which will service the whole site? This is where the main Mill entrance was and it has no issues with potential cross traffic to Wellesley Street.
- 4. Under Ground Car Park Entrance:

Illustrative Concept Plan: Page 21, Figure 3.1, Point 7 Basement Plan: Page 29, Figure 3.6 Page 37 Page 43, Figure 3.9 The Proposed Underground Car Park Entrance will create a number of issues:

• **Noise;** from cars entering, exiting down and up into the basement car park; Braking, acceleration, tyre squeak, turning; Secure underground car park opening and closing.

This is all close to bedrooms and living areas in our residence.

- Lights; Any cars leaving the car park will shine lights directly into windows of 34 Edward Street Summer Hill
- <u>Overshadow of and loss of privacy from development</u>: Sun Study Pages 47 - 49 There are clear breaches of overshadow guidelines for 34 Edward Street ion the current proposal. View Analysis Page 66

The proposed new 6 Story Buildings, as well as the Silo Conversions that will increase height and width will surround 34 Edward Street with High Rise and will also significantly reduce amenity. This clearly noted in the before and after images on page 66. NB: the lack of representation of residence along Edward Street in the **after** image. They have been removed and replace with some medium density housing.

Compare current image below to sectional image on page 37:



It is clear that the residences will be surrounded and houses and yards will be overlooked by all the proposed development.

6. Parking:

The proposed development will undoubtedly restrict street parking along Edward Street for residents. This is a significant change in lifestyle. If a new street entry is next to our property then this will further restrict parking.

7. Light Pollution:

The new Apartments as well as streets and parks will need to be lighted and will create significant light pollution into bedrooms and living areas for our residence. The suggestion is that: 1) New Street from Edward Street to Old Canterbury Road be removed; 2) The basement car park entrance be located on the Northern Side of the property- not facing our bedroom windows and living areas; 3) The 6 Story new buildings to the south east and north east of 34 Edward Street be relocate elsewhere on the site; and that the over shadow and privacy issues be addressed.

Regards,

Craig and Anni Sandwell 8/8/2011



Diary from Tamara Winikoff to Amy Watson on 11/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Tamara Winikoff of No Lewisham Towers Ltd Residents Action Committee (object)

Email Details

Received5:33PM, Thu 11th Aug, 11StatusActioned on 11/08/2011Time Spent0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)PriorityMediumClassAnonymous Object

Interactions

🤱 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: <u>Tamara Winikoff</u> - <u>No Lewisham Towers Ltd Residents Action Committee</u> t.winikoff@visualarts.net.au

👗 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

> The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

11th August 2011

Re: MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of Former Allied Mills Site, 2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill, for the purposes of Mixed Use Residential, Commercial & Retail development.

This objection is lodged on behalf of the No Lewisham Towers Inc (NLT) Residents Action Committee that was established to monitor and influence the proposed development of the Lewisham estate that is contiguous with the Allied Mill site. NLT is not opposed to development per se, but rather is opposed to gross over development and bad planning. Our community is already one of the most densely populated in Sydney.

Many of our members have attended the community consultation meetings conducted by EG Property Group, the developer of the Allied Mills site, and have reported favourably on some aspects of the design of this proposed redevelopment. There is a deal of architectural merit associated with the Mills development and while there has been a significant effort made by the EG Property Group to confer with the community, too few citizens have had the chance to understand the scale of development that is proposed.

It is enormously frustrating for the community that these two adjacent projects have been considered separately, notwithstanding the obvious logic that they should be considered together. When the amount of development of these two sites are considered together, there is almost an entire new suburb being proposed in 1/10 of the space of our suburb.

In consequence, NLT joins with the community to register its opposition to the development on the following grounds:

- Traffic congestion. To say that buses, the railway, and future light rail will handle the increased demand for travel does not show understanding that the vast majority of journeys are not work related journeys. Government figures show that these are up to 75% - 80% of all journeys. The routes and timetables are designed around peak hour travel, not travel for the whole of life. Thus there will be increased demand for car travel in an area that cannot cope with it. The current road network and public transport resources are stretched to the limit of their capacity with traffic congestion choking existing streets throughout the peak hours around the site. Ashfield & Marrickville Councils have commissioned traffic studies that estimate an additional 1000 vehicles per hour will be generated by this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development. There has not been increased investment in traffic and transport infrastructure that can support both this and the Lewisham estate developments. There clearly needs to be significantly more work, more transparency, and improvements delivered on traffic and transport

before the local community can accept such major development as proposed in the area. The applicant

August 2011

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

By email: amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 5mith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- □ Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Fails to address the impact of additional traffic channelled into the roads in Summer Hill, particularly Junction Road and Smith Street and side streets including heavy vehicles.
- □ Provides inadquate measures to ensure car use is limited to the parking spaces provided given the high estimates of onsite employment, use of the light rail, use of retail and very large residential numbers.
- □ Does not appear to provide for feeder bike paths connecting the development and Summer Hill village / station to ensure safety bicycle access to the greenway.
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- □ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity. The likely demand for services from the residents in the development should be identified and addressed, particularly medical, sporting venues, cultural areas, schools, playgrounds etc.
- □ Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW. Greenspace provided needs to be maximised in its usefulness and properly maintained. There is already huge pressure on sporting fields, picnic areas and other recreational areas.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked. Despite being registered on a contact email list after missing out on the first consultation the developer has not provided me with any direct information and has relied on advertising.
- □ **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers** nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard at office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au

- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.
- □ **Other** The development should follow best practice accessible development standards for the retail and residential facilities as well as public areas.

Signature:

Name: Freya Hartley Email: <u>freya.hartley@yahoo.com.au</u>

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard at office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au



Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 - 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion-lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt &Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- Scale and out of character with our village-this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys)is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- $\sqrt{-1}$ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- Limited greenspace— This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers**-nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which ispart of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Oproaetley.

Name:

EithERING DER BRUNDLEY

Email:

Address:

160 OLD CANTERSURY Pel SUMMER HILL NSW 2130

Department of Planning Received 1 2 AUG 2011

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard

Scanning Room



Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 -2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130 I plyest to the ternicht This application on the following grounds -A passed this absaul quertaupilment will absolutely constitute the celowedly cho but State Read (Bla lander bary Red) and the disheeld leaned Red (Carttern Greant / Smith St read labout) (a) Local residents and state far pagers will pay for eventual station resumptions of an eventual states read construction a revision traction of the read construction a revision of the read construction of the and possible clearlenging of an already impossible roundabout. Chibing of the reads will extend mening traced to the city grown Summary Hill by about 10 ynewates a the return warning book by about 16 5 minutes Based in soco calueles cachieng, the for hear Liecelugs pro year) the asenual accurring cost is \$4. 3 million. Capitalised a Sh they represents a tow million subside to the developer is to will sell they to a fet with the construction and, The coordien emissions spoon the even trend time, runs completely contribut to legic and the interests of all except the aboutpers (c) Faral usudents stand to scantually lose their gights to enstruct partiang Many creating residences were built provide the and sprad (d) introduction of motor actuales and do not have affitient harburg. The state good in the must 1990's sold properties in Ohl tunkiling the The state good in the must 1990's sold properties in Ohl tunkiling the and its cate timesity on the basis that they cooked as the properiod (2)fer grown traffic flours sizhet re A SREADLEY CLERCE S LREADLEY ોંડસંદા છે. Siski HO ON CANTERBARY R. SUMMER HILL NSW Address. $\swarrow/3_{
m o}$

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard



Diary from Katharine Young to Amy Watson on 12/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Katharine Young (comments)

Email Details

Received	9:12AM, Fri 12th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 12/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Comment

Interactions

🍰 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Katharine Young katharineyoung@hotmail.com

🍒 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

I generally support the redevelopment of the site and preservation of existing heritage and significant fabric. In it's current form, the proposed Concept Plan does not achieve many of the DGRs, and also fails to achieve several of the developers aspirations outlined in the EA documents. Primary areas of concern are outlined below:

Dedication of public land



Diary from Heather Gidding to Amy Watson on 12/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Heather Gidding (object)

Email Details

Received 10:14AM, Fri 12th Aug,	11
Status Actioned on 12/08/2011	
Time Spent 0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)	
Priority Medium	
Class Object	

Interactions

👗 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: <u>Heather Gidding</u> hgidding@kirby.unsw.edu.au

🔏 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

Thank you for the opportunity to comment of the development of the former Allied Mills site in Summer Hill. I am not opposed to development in the inner west, especially along existing public transport corridors, as this is far better than encroaching on arable farm land further west. However, I believe the scale of this development is beyond what can be supported by the area. In particular, I am concerned about additional traffic congestion, as roads such as Longport St are already above 100% capacity at peak hour and even on the weekends (as acknowledged by the developer at a community forum). Most importantly, the height and scale of the development is out of character with the neighbourhood. I believe local planning regulations should be followed and a height limit of 4 stories be adhered to. I understand the concrete flour mills are already at a height above this, but currently they do not contain apartments with views of surrounding backyards, such as mine. I am especially concerned that the developers want build to the height of the structure above the concrete towers, let alone to the height of the containers.

I urge you to consider the issues relating to height, population density, and traffic congestion associated with this massive development (especially in conjunction with the development in McGill St precinct) and seek that the scale be reduced. Sincerely H Gidding

Summer Hill

Diary from Nicola Radford to Amy Watson on 12/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Nicola Radford (object)

Email Details

Received	10:34AM, Fri 12th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 12/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Object

Interactions

🔏 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Nicola Radford radford.nj@gmail.com

👼 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

My husband & I are opposed to the planned development of the former Allied Mills site due to the following reasons:

Traffic - the current infrastructure fails to cope with the current volume of traffic in particular the commuter traffic on Old Canterbury Road. Barker & Hathern Streets struggle to cope with the volume of traffic creating bottlenecks in the traffic flow. This situation will be worsened by adding the intended number of additional residences coupled with the fact many households will run more than one vehicle

Parking - current level of parking often does not allow us to park outside our home, this situation is likely to worsen due to the increased number of vehicles requiring parking around Edward Street & the surrounding area. Many residences such as ours do not have off street parking & struggle with getting children in & out of the car when parking is not available in close proximity to our homes.

Impact on Summer Hill village - Summer Hill can boast of a true village feel. This is likely to be lost with the introduction of a new retail area in the proposed development. This is likely to result in a downturn in trade for those business owners in the village which may be unsustainable in the long term

Impact on local schools - concern whether the local schools have the resources to cope with the increase in residents in this school zone

Scale & density of the project



Diary from Rob Evans to Amy Watson on 12/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Rob Evans (object)

Email Details

Received	10:53AM, Fri 12th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 12/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Anonymous Object

Interactions

🔏 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Rob Evans rob-evans@netspace.net.au

🏭 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

I strongly object to the existing Concept Plan application on the basis of the following:

* Traffic congestion



Diary from Robert Wildman to Amy Watson on 12/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Robert Wildman of n/a (comments)

Email Details

Received	12:42PM, Fri 12th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 12/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Priority	Medium
Class	Comment

Interactions

🚴 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Robert Wildman - N/A rwildman@optusnet.com.au

🍇 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

I applaud the re-development of this site in general and look forward to increasing the size of our vibrant community. I also believe we have to consolidate our sparse urban areas for the sake of public transport and the provision of public infrastructure. Having said that I have a few problems with the current proposal. 1. Traffic, of course. All indicators from all the independent studies suggest a much increased traffic load on the small streets in this area. With the proposed entrances and exits and the number of proposed dwellings I think we will just have more gridlock. I am not too affected by this as I ride a bicycle to work but there just doesn't seem to be enough allowance for the increase. 2. Scale: The proposal looks like it will add something like 350 units. This means somewhere between 500-800 additional people which is a lot. 3. Load on Community Facilities: With this many additional people, the new kids will have to go to an already overcrowded school. As well they will shop in Summer Hill and probably drive so the lovely small village atmosphere will be destroyed by cars 4. Green Space: The diagrams show green space along the railway line which is think is a furfie. The other thing is the amount of access to the light rail station - it looks as if we will be hemmed in by buildings. 4. Design: About 500 metres down the railway line towards Dulwich Hill is the other mills development (Waratah Mills). This was done a number of years ago and was done very tastefully in brick and not too much stainless steel. The whole development feels comfortable in its surroundings. This is much more of a steel and glass development and doesn't really fit in as well with the surrounding community (see attachment of housing in the area). 5. Combined Developments: Probably the biggest contention with this development is the fact that there will be the other development across the line. This outrageous proposal should be considered, if possible, in concert with the Summer Hill Mills development so that we get a much better scale and style to the development in the area. My other points are well covered in other submissions. I apologise but I will have to attach the photos to another submission as the file is 7.6mb. Thanks

Attachments (1)

7.137 MB

Summer Hill General pdf

Former Allied Mills Site_ 2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill . Jobs . MP10_0155_ Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development . Web Submissions



















Diary from Alex Lofts to Amy Watson on 12/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Alex Lofts of Ashfield Council (comments)

Email Details

3:26PM, Fri 12th Aug, 11
Actioned on 12/08/2011
0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Medium
Comment

Interactions

🔏 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Alex Lofts - Ashfield Council the.lofts@bigpond.com

🔏 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

Cr Alex Lofts

Context

As a local resident and Councillor (for Ashfield Council East Ward) I have been engaged in public discourse regarding this proposal since August 2008. I have engaged in hundreds of conversations related t this proposal.

It should be noted that the following submission is not on behalf of Ashfield Council but is personal, forwarded as a resident and as representative of the views of other individual residents. Nor am I writing on behalf of local resident groups, specifically the No Lewisham Towers group and the Summer Hill Action Group, from whom you would have received separate submissions.

The community interest and concern about this and the Lewisham Estate proposal has been pronounced. There has not previously been anything on this scale envisaged in this area.

Unlike the Lewisham Estate proposal, the community does see some merit in the Flour Mill proposal. Most support a re-zoning to mixed residential/ commercial as desirable. The adaptive re-use of heritage buildings is generally supported. The permeability to the site that would result is noted. The amount of open space is acknowledged but the lack of active space is a cause for some concern. I take the present architects to be genuine is their desire to see a sustainable

Cr Alex Lofts

Context

As a local resident and Councillor (for Ashfield Council East Ward) I have been engaged in public discourse regarding this proposal since August 2008. I have engaged in hundreds of conversations related t this proposal.

It should be noted that the following submission is not on behalf of Ashfield Council but is personal, forwarded as a resident and as representative of the views of other individual residents. Nor am I writing on behalf of local resident groups, specifically the No Lewisham Towers group and the Summer Hill Action Group, from whom you would have received separate submissions.

The community interest and concern about this and the Lewisham Estate proposal has been pronounced. There has not previously been anything on this scale envisaged in this area.

Unlike the Lewisham Estate proposal, the community does see some merit in the Flour Mill proposal. Most support a re-zoning to mixed residential/ commercial as desirable. The adaptive re-use of heritage buildings is generally supported. The permeability to the site that would result is noted. The amount of open space is acknowledged but the lack of active space is a cause for some concern. I take the present architects to be genuine is their desire to see a sustainable 'authentic' development constructed on this site. If it were not for the traffic issues which many see as having no workable solution, given the dual proposals of the Four Mill and Lewisham estate, the community does, I believe, want to see a proposal similar in concept but reduced in scale, height and density. The planned densities (despite the acceptable FSR), the height of some buildings, resultant traffic and strain on local community facilities is a significant concern, in this context. The issues are exacerbated when one considers the Lewisham estate proposal, with higher densities and large commercial and retail elements.

For this and other reasons, both proposals need to be assessed together, as the combined impact may not be sustainable.

The Mill proposal itself, represents a generational opportunity for good planning outcomes, that is, for orderly planning and development in accordance with the Department of Planning's own planning strategies.

While planning decisions need to be made objectively and without any political influence, in a democratic context, community views need to be considered. If planning strategies are to maintain coherence and acceptance beyond the political/electoral cycle, the public must see that such strategies have credibility. The future growth of Sydney does need to be planned. The 'Centres Hierarchy', the South Sub-Regional Strategy and, locally, the McGill St Precinct Master Plan, the dMEP and the Ashfield Strategic Plan, are instruments designed to promote orderly sustainable, development. The Summer Hill Flour Mill proposal must be seen to conform with these policies.

In reference to the above, it is important that the Ashfield and Marrickville Council submissions be acknowledged, in that the PAC should consider all of the listed documents in its determination, as well as the reports from Council planning staff, which are in accord with the expectations of the our residents. Further, the impacts of the Summer Hill Flour Mill proposal and the Lewisham Estate proposal should not only be considered in reference to each other but together, by a common Planning Assessment Commission with the same chair and members. The public should be allowed to attend.

Past planning has been marred by poor design, the lack of infrastructure to support resultant densities, inadequate provision of open space and pursuit of profit to the determent of demonstrable community benefit. The result of two large developments could unfortunately repeat such errors.

Specifics

Traffic and Accessibility

Ashfield and Marrickville Councils have commissioned Colston Budd Hunt Kafes P/L to conduct a detailed assessment of traffic impacts on the immediate and surrounding areas. This study indicates that the Flour Mill development would generate 300 traffic movements per hour in the peak period. If the Lewisham Estate proposal is included, the number of traffic movements rises to 732 per hour. However, one does not have to be an expert to know, as local residents know, that the key intersections of Carlton Cr/Smith St/Longport St (the roundabout) and Old Canterbury Rd/ Railway Terrace, are already beyond peak hour capacity. Long queues and delays already occur on all access roads leading to these intersections.

An independent study is by the RTA is required. Both Ashfield and Marrickville Councils contend that, given the potential for future development of the McGill St precinct, the Mill site and other industrial lands, The RTA should be commissioned to conduct a study of potential regional traffic impacts of the both the Summer Hill Flour Mill proposal and the Lewisham estate proposal, as well as the development of other urban renewal land in the McGill St Precinct.

Public Transport Access

Permeability of the site is not adequately detailed, specifically access to the light rail stop More detail needs to be developed around pedestrian paths and accessibility.

Bus services in this area already do not cope with existing loads and improvement in these services must be implemented.

Access to both Summer Hill and Lewisham stations will need to be improved, especially as the footpath along Railway Parade Lewisham is narrow and below accepted safety standards for significant pedestrian traffic.

Although peak hour heavy rail services are very crowded, I have previously stated that I do not believe they are at capacity. This statement has been challenged by residents with whom I have discussed this matter who claim trains are already overcrowded.

Heritage

The Ashfield council submission contends that more detail needs to be submitted regarding the retention of heritage. I believe this should also include aboriginal heritage.

Our officers have also asked that a study according to the 'Burra protocols' be undertaken

While heritage is mentioned in the documents submitted by EG Properties, I was unable to find a Conversation Management Plan and this should be part of any proposal for this site.

Sepp 65 and Architectural Vocabulary

I note that SEPP 65 is currently under review. However, one of the flaws with this policy is that while the present architects have integrity and are highly regarded, once the concept plan is signed off, the quality of the project they envisaged may not be realised if other architects are employed, or if the site is sold with an approved concept plan. For this reason it is important that more detail regarding the architectural vocabulary of the proposed buildings be required before any approval is given, if such eventuates. Obviously the materials used, finishes and other aspects of the building to be constructed are important in how any development relates to its surrounding context as part of the Summer Hill 'village.'

Yours sincerely,

Cr Alex Lofts,

Ashfield



Diary from Lee Carpenter to Amy Watson on 12/08/2011

Diary against Annex Website Submissions for job #4210 MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Online Submission from Lee Carpenter (object)

Email Details

Received	5:34PM, Fri 12th Aug, 11
Status	Actioned on 12/08/2011
Time Spent	0:00:00 (hh:mm:ss)
Prioríty	Medium
Class	Object

Interactions

🝰 Contacts (1)

Inbound email from: Lee Carpenter leecarpy@hotmail.com

🖓 Staff (1)

Email to: Amy Watson

too big, roads won't cope, school won't cope etc.

I believe it will shadow our house, our natural light comes through window on Smith Street, directly opposite the development.

As +'s, the inclusion of the light rail and the taller buildings in the centre and away from existing houses makes sense.





Parents and Citizens Association

July 2011,

Summer Hill P&C Moonbie St Summer Hill 2130

Mr Sam Haddad , Director General Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO BOX 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Haddad,

The Summer Hill Parent and Citizens Association would like to raise a number of concerns about the proposed development of the Summer Hill Flour Mills and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development.

Concerns have been raised at our P&C meetings about the following:

- 1. Both of these proposed developments lie within the school boundary of Summer Hill Public School. At present Summer Hill Public School is working at capacity at around 750 students. The possibility of an increase in the number of school age children within the boundary presents significant difficulties for a school that has little playground space to 'expand'. With the proposed addition of over 300 dwellings at the sites, we ask the Minister to indicate how these difficulties would be addressed.
- 2. Road safety around the school has always been an area of concern. The traffic implications, particularly for Old Canterbury Rd, from these proposed developments suggest an increase of over 1000 cars during peak hour. We ask the Minister to indicate how these safety concerns will be addressed.
- 3. The two proposed developments are very close together, but fall under the jurisdiction of two different local councils; Ashfield & Marrickville respectively. The Summer Hill P&C ask the Minister to give assurances that the two sites will be considered collectively rather than independently.

The Summer Hill P&C understand that the concept plan for these developments is currently on exhibition by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and would like our concerns to be registered.

Yours Sincerely,

Elizabeth Campbell P&C President

> Moonbie Street Summer Hill 2130 Phone: (02) 9797 8160 (02) 9799 2280 Fax: (02) 9716 8003 Email: summerhill-p.school@det.nsw.edu.au



I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- □ **Traffic congestion** lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ **Limited greenspace** This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers** nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:	
Name:	
Email:	

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard

August 12, 2011.

Director, Metropolitan Projects, Major Projects Assessment, Department of Planning and Infrastructure, GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

Email: plan_comment@planningnsw.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Major Project - MP10_0155 - Former Allied Mills Site - 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill

As long-term Lewisham owners/residents we object to the above Concept Plan for which an Environmental Assessment is currently on exhibition.

For many Summer Hill and Lewisham residents, and as for us, the issue in its context is not the development of the Mills site, but the overdevelopment of the site and we specifically object to:

The impacts of overdevelopment of this site - on existing community amenity, and on the stresses this overdevelopment will have on urban infrastructure (locally and regionally) and for the hastening effect this overdevelopment will have on inner Sydney's rapidly disappearing surburban and industrial heritage.

1.0 Background

It is noted that the Director-General's Requirements (DGR's) for the above project were issued for a Concept Plan application and a Stage 1 Project Application for the above major project on December 16, 2010.

The DGR's followed an earlier submission and a Preliminary Environmental Assessment by SJB Planners (NSW) Pty Ltd on behalf of EG Funds Management Pty Ltd on August 27, 2010, and a subsequent declaration on October 28, 2010, by the then Minister for Planning, Tony Kelly, MLC, that the proposal is. .."therefore a project to which Part 3A of the Act applies" under the State Environment Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005.

Your attention is drawn to the declaration contained on page 6 of the Environmental Assessment_Final submission, signed by Scott Barwick, May 6, 2011, certifying that he has prepared the contents of the Environmental Assessment....and to the best of his knowledge that "it is true in all material particulars and does not mislead nor by presentation or omission of information, materially mislead". **See - Clause 2.3 - Ownership and Legal Property description** - page 12 of the EA where it is stated without any equivocation or ambiguity that:

The Land is owned and controlled by EG Funds Management. The landholding subject to this concept plan application comprises the following legal descriptions.

- Land owned by EG Funds Management and within the Ashfield LGA. Lots x18 follow.
- Land **owned by EG Funds Management** and within the Marrickville LGA. Lot 1 DP900501.

Surprisingly however, the Concept Plan Application - a Major Project Application required to be lodged with the Director-General under Section 75E of the EP&A Act (1979) and lodged with the DOPI only quite recently on May 10, 2011, <u>discloses</u> for the very first time that EG Funds Management Pty Ltd <u>does not own the lands</u> making up the development.

If EG Funds Management Pty Ltd is merely the lobbyist for the project and/or the proponent of the Concept Plan Application then the onus surely reverts to the DOPI to ensure the veracity and accuracy of all the information it has before it, particularly in light of the issuance of the DGR's based on the 'omission of information' or material particulars likely to mislead as demonstrated above.

Further it is arguable in light of the above that a more rigorous scrutiny should be applied to determine the veracity of statements made by the individual who prepared the EA making up the Concept Plan application unless and until they can be sufficiently and independently verified.

(Unfortunately though - even the Concept Plan & Architectural Drawings component -- clearly shows EG Funds to be the owners of the lands of the Mills site thus potentially leading to a "compromised" appraisal of the plans).

Further, there is no doubt that public and community perceptions exist that EG owns the site:

After all, that is how they have consistently presented themselves to others in the public domain, including but not limited to, the media, to the community, in brochures and during the public consultation process, in surveys, in consultation with key stakeholder groups and in consultations/presentations with Ashfield and Marrickville Councils.

That EG Funds represents third-party interests and **does not own the land** ought to have been disclosed particularly in light of some contentious issues surrounding the the light rail extension/GreenWay approvals processes and the almost certain deleterious impacts this development in conjunction with the adjoining Lewisham development will have on the existing communities of Summer Hill and Lewisham.
2.0 Background to the Concept Plan

It is notable that in the voluminous amount of documentation that accompanies the Concept Plan Application that one of the most revealing documents is the Economic Impact Assessment by Daly Research Systems (Attachment 8) "Evaluations of Economic, Demographic and Social Factors in determining the planning classification of the (Mills) site", written in August 2008, and part of the Preliminary Environmental Assessment that was submitted to the Minister in a short submission letter to seek Part 3A status for the Mills project.

This report advocates, according to the un-named author, **compelling arguments** as to why the Mills site should be zoned as a mixed use classification "which could include residential and commercial activities that would contribute towards both the dwelling targets (contained in the Metropolitan Strategy) and the job targets outlined in the Sub South Regional Strategy for the Inner West". (Page 3)

The report writer without revealing any credentials then asserts by reference to Economic Development and Employment Lands (Page 3) that:

"There is little or nothing in the education of planners provided by the various University Planning Schools that qualifies planners to engage in **economic development programming**. There is very little in the EP&A Act that engages planners in the role of promoting economic development". While the writer acknowledges the Australian Planning Institute damning it with faint praise he slams the Metropolitan Strategy planners later concluding:

"The (South) Sub Regional Strategy does not display **any real understanding** of a phenomenon (declining manufacturing) that will progressively change the nature of employment lands through to 2031". (Page 4).

Later, the report writer finds that Summer Hill:

"...has experienced a period of gentrification from the 1990's to the present day. It is now a sought-after area in the Inner West. The Allied Mills site is large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new dwellings, which could contribute to the primary strategic need of reversing the declining trend (of population). The heritage status of the building complex would be in accord with the revised status of the area. It would also be in accord with the large conservation area adjacent to the Mills site". (Page 13)

A cynic could be forgiven for concluding at this point that the DRS report of 2008 provides the core elements and justifications to underpin a later sales pitch to the DOPI as well as to the community for an increased intensity of development of the Mills site so as to obtain maximum economic yield by paying nothing more than 'lip service' to the **existing surrounding context** of **the site**.

But like all aggressive sales pitches, it gets worse.

"The most logical development is the proposal by Metro Transport Sydney (MTS) to extend the existing light rail system to Summer Hill. The additional line would be built at no cost to the government and would provide an alternative to the congested Inner West road links for people in the Lewisham, Petersham, Haberfield and Dobroyd Point areas (as well as Summer Hill)".

And worse still as the report continues:

"The economies of the proposed (light rail) extension stand up to critical appraisal, but are contingent on one important condition: That the Summer Hill site produce sufficient new dwelling units to boost the required population demand for the new (Light Rail) service". (Page 14)

This is a very telling acknowledgement by the report writer implying that the approval of the light rail proposal to Summer Hill may at this time **have been dependent** on intensifying development densities at the Mills site and elsewhere along the light rail corridor not because of any demand pressures but rather to justify <u>potential patronage levels to offset the marginal nature of light rail extension proposal.</u>

It is notable today, as we undertand it, that the Light Rail Extension, began life as a separate and unexpected Part 3A State Significant Major Project under the Department of Transport, and it was allegedly approved without a patronage analysis assessment negating the requirement for a safety audit. This in turn has led to a portion of the GreenWay (part of the same project) being diverted up a quiet residential surburban street - Weston St, Dulwich Hill - of which the consequences - legitimate safety concerns and the compromising of a portion of the GreenWay vision - are self-evident.

More disturbingly, what are the consequences that the Inner West communities of Summer Hill and Lewisham are being asked to shoulder as a result of the Implementation of the DRS writer's **"economic development programming"** proposals?

In reality, it is arguable that the Summer Hill Mills proposal offers the community little more than – yet another series of multiple high-rise towers – "softly" packaged up as a heritage inspired/urban renewal precinct development, that will in all likelihood desecrate the existing and authentic heritage character, the low-rise scale and the existing community amenity that the current residents of these areas place so much value on right now.

3.0 The Concept Plan

The DOPI describes the concept plan proposal as:

"Concept Plan application for a mixed use residential, retail and commercial development to be constructed in 4 stages including re-use of 6 existing buildings and structures and new building envelopes ranging from 2-11 storeys in height accommodating approximately 280-300 dwellings, 2,500 – 2,800 sq metres of retail space, 3,500 – 4,000 sq m of commercial space, atgrade and basement parking, public open space, new public streets and associated infrastructure works". This concept plan application comprises:

- Land use type/s.
- Maximum floor space.
- Maximum building height.
- Locational elements streets/roads, buildings, car parking.
- Buildings to be retained.
- Documentation to provide design guidelines for any future Project Application
- A "Statement of Commitments" in the EA a list of the works the developer will undertake as part of the project.

It is noted that the Summer Hill Mills development adjoins an adjacent mixed-use development Part 3A Project – 78-90 Old Canterbury Road, Lewisham. (MPO8_0195).

3.1 Overview

It should be re-stated that in this submission we do not oppose the redevelopment of the Mills Site as a mixed use development and believe it represents a unique opportunity for urban renewal providing that urban renewal is undertaken in a sympathetic manner that is sustainable and compatible with the adjoining local communities and context.

However, we do oppose the scale (or overdevelopment of the Mills site) and the impacts that will flow on to the adjoining communities resulting from an approval of this current concept plan application.

We are also of the view that the concept plan application does not address all of the Director-General Requirements (DGR's), and these objections are outlined in some detail below.

4.0 Built Form – Height, Bulk and Scale

It should be noted that the former Flour Mills site is contained within both the Ashfield LGA and the Marrickville LGA.

4.1 The Marrickville LGA part of the proposal, on the north-western corner of the site, between Hawthorne Canal and the Light Rail corridor, is proposed to have part 8, 5 and 10storey residential flat buildings erected upon it with a building footprint that occupies most of that part of the site.

- Buildings are accessed off a **proposed roadway** which connects with Smith Street, Summer Hill.
- Despite the passage of the Marrickville DLEP 2010 and DCP, this site remains with a zoning of IN 2 (Light Industrial).

In recognition of the Marrickville part of the Mills proposal, EG Funds' – Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Newsletter 2 – May 2011, titled "the awakening" says:

"The Summer Hill Mill site has been master planned as part of a wider precinct that includes the McGill Street area (sic)....While the two sites are in different ownership, responsible development dictates that they be designed in unison to reflect a common set of design principles. This will ensure that a complementary and integrated design outcome is achieved which is essential if this new precinct is to become a valued addition to the existing urban fabric". EG Funds.

While that neat turn of phrase promises much – the fact remains that the Concept Plan proposes a part 8, 5, and 10-storey building envelope within the Marrickville LGA site, seeking approval on the basis of reference to the Marrickville Council McGill Street masterplan and those parts of the McGill Street masterplan area with a 9-storey building height plane.

It is further argued in part **5.1.13** in the EA that the proposal supports the McGill 5t masterplan. However, this masterplan shows **NO CONTROLS** for this site.

The current Marrickville draft DCP (which reflects the McGill Street masterplan) requires a maximum part **4/5/6 storey height limit** for buildings along Canterbury Rd, where there is an **urban design interface with the public realm.**

 It follows therefore that this should be the MAXIMUM HEIGHT for the proposal along Smith Street, and not a maximum of 8 – 10 storeys.

In any event, it is not clear from the DGR's why or how a masterplan in a different municipality, with some "broad brush" building envelopes should be relied upon in this EA and the Concept Plan – Architectual drawings, to satisfactorily address the DGR's.

Clearly, the DGR's have not been met and we specifically object to the applicant selectively cherry-picking parts of another municipality's plan rather than addressing a "common set of design principles...to ensure a complementary and integrated design outcome is acheived". EG Funds newletter – May 2011.

Again despite the DGR's, a Visual and View Analysis to and from the site from key vantage points of a high 'industry standard' has not been provided. Nor has any use been made of a SIMURBAN model (a photorealistic 3-dimensional model) to assess proposed tall building height impacts or to justify those heights. We object to the omission of an adequate Visual Impact Assessment.

Disappointingly, there is no appropriate assessment of the impact on this part of the Marrickville site of the excessive building heights on the existing locality:

- For example, one key viewpoint vista is down Smith Street looking east toward the former Flour Mills site. While the middle 5-storey part aligns with the axis of the vista down Smith Street to give a distant 'mid-level' rise visual impact, it is likely that the taller 8 & 10 storey parts will be able to still be viewed, resulting in a profound change in character and scale for the area.
- Other viewpoints exist from residences within the Ashfield LGA which are within close visual proximity to the proposal, and which are to the west of the proposal providing further examples of the inadequately addressed visual impacts: An 8-10 storey proposal will have an alien change in character and perceived scale for the self-evident low rise typology of these places.

In our view these 8 & 10 storey buildings are totally incompatible with and incongruous to those in the immediate and surrounding locality and do not adequately address the DGR's.

- At present, the iconic 6-storey Mungo Scott Flour Mill building (to be retained in the Concept Plan) dominates the skyline from all vantage points from Smith Street and it should continue to do so without competition if heritage (one of the essential components of the Concept Plan application) is to be both acknowledged and respected.
- In addition, the massing, combined with the overall scaling-up of the heights of these buildings, will dominate the locality and will forever frame the existing entrance to the Summer Hill suburb when entered from the east. To the immediate west of these proposed buildings lies the heritage conservation zone of Edward Street.
- In addition, the massing and bulk of the proposed buildings with the building footprint
 occupying most of this site, also reveals that the spatial arrangement of these buildings
 has the potential to compromise the useabillity of the public and private open spaces
 depicted, with overshadowing of these areas (and lower floors of the residential
 buildings themselves) for most periods of the day in any season. The eastern side of the
 GreenWay corridor could be deprived of all afternoon sun. (Refer Architectural Plans).

4.2 The Ashfield LGA part of the proposal in the Concept Plan application includes:

- Residential Flat buildings (of 2-3 storeys) in the northern and southern parts of Edward Street except for the middle part that has a gap containing a new wide street (due to parking bays located on both sides) flanked by 4-6 storey buildings.
- A line of 4-storey buildings to the NW of the site behind the Edward Street buildings.

- Retention of some historic buildings the Mungo Scott building and some silo structures with the rentention of the most western silo structure, to which a new 11-storey residental building is proposed to be attached.
- The retention of the southern silos structure with the addition of **3 residential levels** (replacing existing roof plant areas) and having external fire stair extrusions.
- Demolition of the former timber silos building (adjacent to the Mungo Scott building) to be replaced with a new 9-storey residential building.
- Areas of open space dispersed around the site some with deep soil planting others paved to act as potential 'urban spaces'. This will include potential for access to a future light rail station and the GreenWay.
- Internal streets and footpaths to service the development and potentially make it permeable to the public.

4.2.1 Floor Space Calculations:

In passing it should be noted that the amount of floor space for the Summer Hill part of the proposal has not been specified. Instead the EA gives figures for both the Marrickville and Ashfield part of the proposal. While the concept plan application states that the proposal will have a **floor space ratio between 1.4 and 1.6:1** there are no detailed plans submitted for the site to enable that FSR assessment to be **independently verified**.

We strenously object to that omission and note the DRG's - **3.1 Land Use** – requires the concept plan application to "*provide a justification for the amount of residential and non-residential floorspace being proposed*".

Your attention is drawn again to the declaration signed by the EA writer on page 6 of the EA – Final submission - and we suggest that while the EA submission simply asks for approval for the amount of floorspace proposed based on the acceptance of the overall design concept for the site, that this response manifestly fails to meet the DGR's as specified.

To repeat again – there is no allocation, statistically, of floorspace distribution between Ashfield and Marrickville LGA's thus ensuring no independent verification can be made of the figures provided. That is a totally unacceptable response to the DGR's.

4.2.2 Staging Plan

The development is proposed to be staged into 4 parts, seen in the Hassell's staging plan page 41 -Indicative Staging Plan - showing locations for how the development will be staged. It is noted on that planthat Stage 1 will form a Project Application that will be lodged concurrently with the concept plan application. No Project Application has been lodged.

In reality, this staging plan means that individual parts of the development site will be able to be constructed separately and be sold and developed individually (similar to a subdivision plan).

Despite the DGR's – Clause 19 - a very general staging plan only has been submitted. It does not go into the complexities of how the development will be staged, for example, how shared open space will be implemented, how internal and external infrastructure works will be staged and implemented and so on.

This creates complexities and uncertainty for how each development stage will share the burden of providing the various infrastructure located on other parts of the site or external to the site. Each of the development stage/s will have to be able to identify the parts of the site to be used for private or open space for example.

It is incumbent upon the DOPI (in the absence of the applicant doing so) to ensure these matters are adequately resolved prior to the approval of this concept plan application as required under the DGR's.

4.2.2 Flooding/Stormwater/Drainage

The applicants' own consultant's report (Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Pty Ltd) notes that there are a number of severe flooding issues to be addressed from the Hawthorne Canal, with flood levels around 1.5m deep within the site adjacent and around the stormwater canal. This will have an effect on the ground level use of the Mungo Scott building and on the public accessways to and from the the Light Rail Station and the GreenWay.

We are concerned that the Concept Plan application does not adequately address the potential flooding impacts required under the DGR's through appropriate flood mitigation measures.

In addition, water sensitive Urban Design measures have not been adequately or comprehensively addressed as per the DGR's. Other issues remain unresolved in the concept plan application both external and internal to the site for example the existing stormwater network.

4.2.3 Road/footpath/infrastructure within the site

The applicant's EA states that the present site owners intend to dedicate to Council internal roads and footpaths as that is desirable to allow the site to be permeable and accessible to the public etc.

It is also desirable to allow public access to the light rail station and the GreenWay (on State Government owned land). However, there is also no explanation of who will take future ownership of land for public access and maintenance and so on, despite the DGR's.

Furthermore, the applicant's "Statement of Commitments" is relatively vague on how the above will be resolved — and in our opinion given this does not adequately address the DGR's 4.2 and 4.3 - the concept plan should not be approved without a detailed and satisfactory resolution of these matters.

It is also concerning that only general reference is made for the potential future light rail station and Greenway and it is noted that no specific dimensional and noted locations are identified on the Concept plans separately. There is also no explanation of who will take future ownership of land for public access?

4.2.4 Road Infrastructure External to the site.

The applicant's traffic consultant maintains that the following works are required to minimise traffic impacts:

- Traffic lights at the intersection of Edward Street and Old Canterbury Rd
- A roundabout at the intersection of Smith Street and Edward Street.

The "Statement of Commitments" is vague on when and how the above will be constructed and who will pay for that.

There is also little indication in the applicant's traffic report of how:

- 'Rat runs' through local streets will be prevented.
- Repairs to roads during construction and calculations for compensation costs to Council.
- Costs for implementing any resident parking schemes if required.

All of these issues require far greater clarity and require resolution before a Concept Plan is approved as they are critical infrastructures issues, affecting both adjoining communities in the short as well as the medium to long-term.

4.2.5 Public Open Space/s

The Ashfield LGA is now the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.

The site plan showing the potential area for public open space (as distinct) from private open space) is surprisingly limited in our opinion.

The proposal makes reference to the public having the right to access land within the Flour Mills site but does not specifically detail how this will be achieved.

Instead, the applicant offers this: "Statement of Commitments" – "Public Domain: Public access will be provided through the site providing access over and through the open space from Smith Street affording access to the Lewisham Light Rail Station. The access will include the use and enjoyment of the open landscaped areas of Smith Street and the proposed urban plazas around the reused buildings that are to provide ground floor active uses".

These statements are simply vague and and unacceptable as considerably more clarity about the ability and right of the public to access land within the Summer Hill site including access to the light rail is necessary.

Attempts by the applicant to defer the sorting out of the detail of these issues to the Project Application stage along with the landscape open space and landscape concept themes is also unacceptable and runs contrary to the DGR's (Public Domain-Open Space).

The proviso of public open space in particular needs to be clearly committed to by the applicant otherwise there is a likelihood of diputes in the future staging process (for eg, a strata corporation may later refuse to allow public access to their 'open space').

The most likely and obvious example of that occuring is with the proposals design for a type of small 'private park' of approximately 4,500 sq m (the equivalent of 9 modestly sized housing blocks) to the NW of the Mungo Scott building between Smith Street and the Hawthorne Canal. This area provides a unique and rare opportunity for future public open space and this most certainly is a relevant matter for consideration at the Concept Plan application stage since the DGR's (Public Domain – Open Space) requires resolution of the matter for linkages to the future light rail station and GreenWay and, connectivity to the proposed park to the east of the site within Marrickville (See McGill Street Masterplan).

In addition the concept plan application includes the provision of buildings within this open space which could be used for commercial/retail purposes. The specific use of these buildings has not been defined or detailed in the proposal.

Finally the matter of dedication of public open space should be addressed in accordance with the DGR's prior to any concept plan approval.

5.0 Urban Design

The Flour Mills site needs to primarily respond to the urban design conditions within the Summer Hill Precinct with which it has the prime interface.

Issues arising for the concept design include:

• The absence of any details for footpath/verge treatments along Edward Street. It would be desirable if this area was wide enough to take a continuous line of trees.

- No front gardens for the low-rise apartments proposed along Edward Street. These should have a minimum 5m deep front soil zone for gardens and trees which does not have any basement car parking below it.
- This is important given a front garden setting is the urban design typology of the western side of Edward Street (which is also a heritage conservation zone) and is, in any event, good urban design practice. Deep soil planting is also a requirement under the Residential Flat Design Code.
- The 4 to 6-storey buildings in the 'middle zone' of buildings proposed along Edward Street, comprising one 6-storey building setback approx 20m from the Edward St boundary and another part 4, part 6-storeys on the boundary with Edward Street are in visual proximity to properties on the western side of Edward St (which are within a conservation area) and these medium-level density buildings are problematic.
- Despite the DGR's there has not been any Visual Impact Assessment equal to an appropriate industry standard to assess impacts, or to justify these taller building heights. Such as analysis would have examined the location of key viewpoints, the degree of visibility of structures, degree of compromise on the existing neighbourhood character, and whether there is an intrusion on resident privacy.
- An alternative lower impact urban design option along Edward St would be to have a continuous line of low rise buildings, to respond to the typology of the heritage housing along Edward Street, and with a minimal gap between buildings for a footway, framed by tree planting, leading to the middle of the site - with any other buildings behind this limited to 4-storeys not 6-storeys.
- Roadway access off the southern part of Edward Street would minimise "traffic nuisance' in the middle area of Edward Street that will result from the design option proposed of a new wide street, flanked by 6-storey buildings and that will result in more traffic entering and exiting this part of Edward Street. Impacts likely to arise from this street location include traffic noise and car lights affecting existing houses directly opposite.
- Despite the historic buildings, and adjacent conservation areas and that the community
 consultation sessions revealed that the character of the area and the compatibility of
 the character of new development have high importance for local residents, there is an
 absence of any basic detailed "architectural vocabulary' for the site. This is normally an
 urban design consideration in such circumstances. Instead, the concept proposal only
 indicates generic themes with slabs of concrete and glass infill.

6.0 Heritage Concerns & Impacts

The Heritage Impact Assessment of the proposed rezoning and development of the Summer Hill Mills Site (John Graham & Associates, Mar 10, 2011) makes it clear that there are a number of heritage issues associated with the Summer Hill Flour Mills development, namely:

- Ashfield Council has deferred its determination of whether the Summer Hill Flour Mills development site at 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill is a heritage item under section 68(5) of the Local Government Act.
- The Summer Hill Flour Mills development site is to the immediate east of the Quarantine Ground Conservation Area.
- The Hawthorne Canal which runs through the Summer Hill Flour Mills development site is a heritage item in the Ashfield LEP.

In 1998 and 2005, the cultural significance of the Summer Hill Flour Mills site was carried out for Ashfield Council by Rod Howard Conservation Pty Limited. It concluded that the Mungo Scott Flour Mill was significant for a number of reasons (refer to page 4). Further, Ashfield Council's Heritage Study review of Areas Zoned 2(a) of 2003, assessed it as:

Rare aesthetic and scientific significance and having *associative* historic and social significance.

In these circumstances, it is clear that the redevelopment of the Mills site presents a unique opportunity for sympathetic and appropriate urban renewal.

However, we respectfully disagree with the conclusion of John Graham in his report commissioned by the applicant, that the planned Summer Hill Flour Mills development is exemplary in the understanding and respect it pays to the culturally significant fabric of the site.

The areas to be retained under the Concept Plan application are shown on small scale drawings (pg 40 figure 3.7) and include the Mungo Scott building and some silo structures and very little else of any substance.

For the structures being proposed to be retained and conserved, there is generally an absence of detailed architectural and landscape documentation to give certainty as to what will in fact be conserved, for example:

- There are no adequate, large sized, measured, drawings of the buildings.
- There are no adequate, large sized, measured, open space curtilages prescribed around the historic buildings.
- The large wooden silos building to the south of the Mungo Scott building is proposed to be demolished on the basis that it is not capable of re-use due to its very fragile structure eg parts of it consist of timber poles and corrugated iron cladding. However, despite suggesting another structure will be put in its place, no designs have been put forward for this.

 Noting the previous Flour Mills use, there is no architectural explanation of how this cultural significance will be translated in the design for the building and landscape fabric in the proposal.

We note that the DGR's require that the EA "provide a Heritage Assessment of the site and a Statement of Heritage Impact for the proposal undertaken in accordance with the Burra Charter Assessment procedures".

Neither of the two John Graham reports have been undertaken in accordance with the Burra Charter Assessment procedures indicating complete disregard by the author and applicant to the DGR's.

It is with irony that we note, that the Mungo Scott Flour Mill "Machinery and Equipment Heritage Assessment" completed in September 2008 for Allied Mills by Godden Mackay Logan actually assessed the cultural heritage significance of the machinery and equipment still within the Mungo Scott building to a much higher standard and level and in accordance with the Burra Charter that the applicant's commissioned heritage consultant, John Graham, who produced the heritage reports attached to the final EA report.

Elsewhere the EA is extremely vague in its assurances regarding the conservation of heritage items and buildings. The architectural concept plans also lack detail. The practical reality is that the most significant buildings such as the Mungo Scott Flour Mill, that has significance in the locality as a prominent visual landmark as well as cultural and historical significance will simply be overshadowed with the overall scaling-up of heights dominating the locality to the clear detriment and detraction of Mungo Scott Flour Mill and silos. Furthermore, the silos will not remain a most prominent and iconic landmark.

In our view, the Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment does not adequately address the issues outlined in the DGRs particularly in the absence of strong urban design principles for proposed buildings to relate and have a sympathetic scale and form to heritage items on the site and to the adjacent heritage conservation area.

As such an approval of the plan would not lead to a quality development of this historic site. In short, it is not a plan for respecting the culturally significant heritage values implicit within the site nor for respecting the character and amenity of the heritage conservation zones in the locality. Thus for current local residents, future residents and users of the Mills site it fails to deliver a sympathetic scale and form not just to heritage items within the site nor is it a model of any desired future character for the surrounding locality.

It is imperative that the Summer Hill Flour Mills site have heritage listing and controls protecting the historical structures on the site equal to that found in the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan.

7.0 Negative impacts on local amenity

The Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment proposes the provision of 280-300 dwellings. Please note that without independent verification of proposed floor space ratios which are unable to be accurately determined due to the applicant failing to provide the amount of floor space for the Summer Hill part of the proposal, the EA's figures will have to be taken with some caution at face value.

On the basis though that there is an average of 2.49 people per dwelling in Ashfield municipality, this amounts to a total of over 800 new residents. This represents almost a 20 per cent increase in Summer Hill's population.

The scale of this development alone will have significant and negative impacts on local amenity but taken together with the proposed adjacent Lewisham development there is an almost entire new mini-suburb being proposed in $1/10^{th}$ of the space of the existing suburb.

As a result, the densely populated area within which this development is planned (Summer Hill) already has its infrastructure stretched to the limit especially schools and related resources. The proponents have clearly not set out the impact on existing community facilities, resources, open space and public utilities among other considerations.

This proposal must not be approved without adequate consideration of how it will and can provide the necessary additional community resources to support it, particularly quality open space, new childcare and kindergarten places and new school places to cater for the expected growth.

The cumulative impacts of this development together with the Lewisham development is one key aspect that neither of the proponents have been prepared to address, either publicly or in their documentation.

8.0 Economic Impact Assessment.

The applicant's consultant's report indicates that there will not be a significant effect on trade in the existing Summer Hill Village centre arising from the Flour Mills development. Nonetheless, it predicts a potential 5% short-term decline in trade, but they argue that this will be absorbed with a 13% Summer Hill Village Centre Growth rate between 2010 - 2018.

The consultant says though that the impact on the small strip neighbourhood village of Lewisham will be more significant.

In terms of the impacts arising from development of the Flour Mills and the McGill Street masterplan the impact on the Summer Hill village, they say, increases to a decline in trade of 7.5%.

Clearly the big unknown is whether the revised Lewisham Estate concept plan and whether it will include a small supermarket. If it does the impact on the Summer Hill Village will be more significant at around a 17% decline in trade.

The economic modelling shows that the introduction of a new supermarket into the immediate locality of Summer Hill could have a very significant impact on local trade and reinforces the need for restrictions to be applied on the Mill's proposal to prevent the establishment of a supermarket on this site.

If as most Summer Hill and Lewisham residents say that they wish to keep the character of the local Summer Hill village centre then it would be advisable that any retail tenancies on the Mills site should be required to be limited in their scale and size to reflect the communities legitimate concerns about the Summer Hill village centre.

8.0 Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD)

The documentation submitted is very generalist in nature in relation to the architectural design and building science for the development and of how specific devices will be used as part of that design.

In short the documentation was considered to be disappointing with only minimal standards being aspired to -a further indication, if you like, of much being promised but little being delivered.

9.0 Detailed Environmental Site Assessment

This consultant's report was notable, aside from its length, in its failure to include Workcover records relating to the site history and its industrial uses over time, among other deficiences and for some lingering questions that remain about issues of contamination on the site and its remediation in accordance with SEPP 55.

10.0 Traffic Impacts

The DGRs clearly request a Traffic Management and Accessibility Plan from the applicant. In our view, the traffic impact study submitted by the applicant (Arup, August 2010) provides no credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment will generate.

Ashfield Council recently commissioned an independent traffic assessment of the combined impact of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and the Lewisham Towers site. This study undertaken by Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes (the *Colston Study*) and finalised in May 2011, estimated that the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and Lewisham Towers developments would generate an extra <u>1,000 cars per hour</u> during peak hours. With the combined generation of 1,000 cars per hour in two directions, the Colston Study concludes that:

this is a significant volume of additional traffic in an area where there are already a number of traffic constraints.



The intersection of Railway Terrace and Old Canterbury Road is noted at being at "full capacity now" with no mitigation measures being suggested.

© Hassell. Reproduced for the purposes of criticism and review.

The independent Colston Study concludes that there are a "number of traffic issues" associated with the proposed developments of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and the adjacent Lewisham Towers. The applicant has not sufficiently addressed any of these issues.

Furthermore, despite acknowledging that the local roads have severe traffic flow problems at peak hour, the applicant's traffic consultant's report (Arup, August 2010) does not address:

- 1. How "rat runs" through local streets in Summer Hill can be prevented
- 2. How the cost and construction of proposed traffic lights at the intersection of Old Canterbury Road and Edward Street and a roundabout at the intersection of Smith Street and Edward Street will be managed and by who?

Access to Old Canterbury Road

The SJB Planning Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report clearly recognises that while the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site enjoys a frontage to Old Canterbury Road, it does not currently have any direct vehicular access onto this road (page 6). A review of the Hassell Summer Hill Flour Mills Site Concept Plan suggests that there is to be one main street through the development. This road will have access onto Old Canterbury Road to the north of the Inner West proposed light rail corridor.

We are concerned that this approach is extremely dangerous and presents significant health and safety issues given that:

1. Traffic would be entering and leaving the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site at a blind spot in the corner of Old Canterbury Road

- 2. This area of busy road is at the top of a small incline, but at the bottom of the Old Canterbury Road hill, where not surprisingly, traffic accelerates
- 3. Traffic entering onto Old Canterbury Road from the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site will need to climb an extremely high ramp to get onto Old Canterbury Road with little or no visibility of traffic on Old Canterbury Road
- 4. It is somewhat unclear from the plans in the Concept Plan whether in fact the applicant owns or controls the area of land where the high ramp onto Old Canterbury Road from the site is located.

Parking

The Hassell Masterplan Rezoning Proposal (July 2010) suggests that parking for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment is limited to the following:

- Edward Street = 65-75 spots
- Old Canterbury Road = 25-3S spots
- Smith Street = no spots
- Mills = 450 550 basement spots

This totals 60-90 on-street parking spots and 530-680 basement spots. In circumstances where the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment could attract a population of 880 residents and no doubt attract people who drive and park at the proposed light rail stop at the site, it is difficult to see how such limited parking will be sufficient.

11. Public Consultation Process

We do not propose to comment at any length about the limitations that concerned individuals encountered with the somewhat dysfunctional arrangements for consultation as established by the DoP aring from Part 3A of the EP&A Act.

However, in relation to this project, the community consultation process undertaken by the proponent, might best be described as "limited, selective, marred by controversy and conducted in some instances in 'bad faith'.

Attached please find 3 PDF files that disclose questions (posed by community members to the proponents) most of which those in attendence felt remained unaddressed and unanswered.

12. Conclusion

On the basis of our objections articulated above, we believe that there are numerous parts of the Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills development that require a greater degree of due diligence, and more rigorous scrutiny than that exercised so far by the DOPI.

In our opinion, the EA together with the the Concept Plan – Architectural Drawings - quite clearly have not addressed all the Director General Requirements outlined above in addition to leaving many matters of some significance unresolved. This Concept Plan therefore should not be approved.

Finally, and most critically, we request that the combined impacts of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment be assessed in conjunction with the adjacent Lewisham Towers development and that the cumultative impacts of both projects combined should be urgently addressed and that both projects should be jointly considered before the Planning and Assessment Commission in a public hearing.

We are therefore of the opinion that the DOPI should refuse this Concept Plan Application given the number of matters that are lacking in detail and clarity throughout the application itself so that better and further consideration can be given to the matters that remain unresolved at this time.

Yours sincerely,

Lewisham, Sydney. NSW.

NB: While we have no objections to the publication of this submission on the DOPI website realting to this project we would like our names, address and email to be with-held for legitimate reasons of safety and security.

Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Community Consultation Session - Record of Comments Wednesday 25 May, 2011 - 4.00-6.00pm



9 June 2011

Dear Participant,

Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Wednesday 25 May 2011 – 4.00-6.00pm

On behalf of EG Funds Management I would like to thank you for participating in the Community Consultation Session held on the 25 May 2011 to present the Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mill Site.

We are pleased to forward to you the **draft** Record of Comments raised during the question and answer session.

The Record has been issued as a **draft**. If you would like an amendment made to the Record please advise Urban Concepts via either mail, email or facsimile **by close of business Tuesday 21 June 2011**. Our contact details are set out below.

Once the draft Record has been finalised Urban Concepts will then issue the final Record and it will be placed on the project website and be included in the Consultation Report that we will issue to the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

On behalf of Urban Concepts, EG Funds Management and the consultancy team I would like to thank you for your participation and I look forward to your ongoing involvement in the community consultation process for this project.

Yours faithfully,

Belinda Barnett Director, Urban Concepts

CONCEPT PLAN FOR THE SUMMER HILL FLOUR MILL SITE CONTACT DETAILS:

Mailing Address: Summer Hill Flour Mill C/- Urban Concepts PO Box 780 North Sydney NSW 2059 Tel: 02-9964 9655

Fax: 02-9964 9055

Email: rosemarie@urbanconcepts.net.au



DRAFT

Record of Comments

Arising from the

Summer Hill Flour Mill Site

Community Consultation Session

Held on Wednesday 25 May 2011 at the Artists Exhibition Centre 4.00 – 6.00pm

Prepared for The Approval of the Session Participants

> Prepared by Urban Concepts

> > Issued 9 June 2011



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 misunderstanding and advise that it has not been deliberate.



Community Consultation Session

Urban Concepts advises that 53 people participated in this Session. It is noted that due to the size of the venue, the number of participants was limited.

Comments Recorded during Question Time

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

	COMMENT/QUESTION		
01	Large proportion of residents in Summer Hill without parking have you considered not providing all residents in the development with car parking.		
02	What is the Ashfield Council parking rate? Is this more generous than Marrickville Council.		
03	What is the expected number of apartments on the site? How many people does that equate to?		
04	Between the 2 developments (Lewisham Towers and Summer Hill Flour Mill project) how many cars are we talking about?		
05	If the garage space is provided, then if the cars are there people will use them. Providing storage space is better than providing car parking spaces.		
06	Maximise parking otherwise people will park on the street. Concerned because people don't like parking underground and your parking is in a basement arrangement. Where will visitor parking be and have you got enough.		
07	There is a cross section of opinion regarding this development. I have lived here since 1975 and there is a diversity of people, a whole range of people and ages – older/children. Places need to accommodate a range of housing options to cater for this diversity. Especially for older people so they can stay in the community. If you maximise the diversity then not everyone will leave/come home at the same time, parking, traffic congestion and public transport usage will be spread across a day.		
08	The Concept Plan indicates two access points. How do I get out into Smith Street will there be lights? Edward Street accessing Canterbury Road – how will people enter the road network at this point?		
09	What is the impact of this development on services in this area (Schools etc)? Has a social impact study been done? You are adding more housing beyond simply building in the existing buildings. Have you investigated this area of impact? Have you considered a childcare centre within the site?		
10	Concerned about development contributions to public green space as opposed to publicly accessible green space – what is the percentage of publicly accessible green space? It appears to be inadequate given the density and limited supply of publicly accessible open space in the rest of Summer Hill. Where is the provision for a play ground in the design?		
11	The Greenway Corridor is not provided by the development – are you making any contribution towards it. How will it interface with the development?		
12	Your presentation stated that 48% of residents presently take public transport how does this increase to 61% because of your development?		
13	Can you give me examples of other EG Projects like this that you have successfully done.		
14	What guarantees can you give the community that once you have the Concept Plan approval that you won't look to increase the density like Green Square and the Ashmore Precinct Erskineville.		



	COMMENT/QUESTION
15	Will you guarantee the density stays as is?
16	I live in Grosvenor Crescent have you assessed traffic impact from this point?
17	Proposed construction what will the impact be on the traffic? Have you considered this?
18	Is the Council involved in the construction management?
19	I note that roads are at capacity and the future public transport projection of 61%. However, given your acknowledgement of the bottleneck on Railway Parade are you prepared to lobby the State Government to address Railway Parade and to put more trains on the rail line? Are you going to attempt to bring any solution to these existing issues?
20	You can appreciate our concerns – being the cumulative impact of the Flour Mill Site and the Lewisham Towers - McGill Street Project. The State Government should be looking at both developments as a whole not as isolated developments.
21	Have you considered incorporating active open spaces into this development? These Local Government Areas have the lowest amount of sporting facilities – you have no active/sporting facilities incorporated – will you reconsider this.
22	 Concerned about construction impacts. 1) Construction traffic. 2) Construction impact from flour dust, how will you clean this up. 3) Asbestos removal.
23	 I want to address the Greenway Corridor. Two key components to the corridor. 1) Biodiversity 2) Movement corridor How does the proposal respond to the corridor in terms of biodiversity and wild life movement? How will you manage public access disturbance and construction disturbance on the corridor? What do you mean when you say that the development addresses the corridor? Can you explain this terminology?
24	Do the statistics on traffic generation just address journey to work?
25	If this site is a tourist attraction how will people come here – by car! Have you considered additional traffic movements such as these in your traffic study.
26	We know who EG is – you arrived on site with mauve banners. Now we can't see the trees that we once enjoyed seeing. I am a resident of Edward Street. Your banners are insensitive on our streets. We used to look at green now we look at your signs. Can you please look at this.
27	I am concerned about your flexible interpretation of building envelope in respect to the silos. You are squeezing another 3 storeys onto the top of the silos that don't presently exist. This is creating a very imposing structure from Edward Street. From these apartments people will look directly into my property. I will loose my privacy. You are building these towers but with the additional storeys and the addition of fire stairs the silos are becoming a bulky and high structure. You have a good site, but what are we getting back. No sporting facilities/parking and traffic issues and low amenity.
28	The extra 3 storeys on the silos is too greedy and detracts from the impact of the development. The incorporation of fenestrations will detract from the Silo form. To replace the gantry on the top with another three storeys is not right. It is a slender frail structure – this is not right. You are being greedy.



	COMMENT/QUESTION		
29	You have done some great work compared to the development proposed on the other side of the		
	rail line. The new 10 storey building will also detract from the visual impact of the flour mills, silos		
	and the Mungo Scott building. Why does this form need to be so high?		
30	I understand how you have tried to concentrate the higher building forms - but there seems to be		
	a difference from looking at the model and the night time visualisation - not quite clear. Can you		
	explain?		

Subject	Summer Hill Flour Mill Rezoning		
Date	9 June 2011	Job No/Ref	220640

Parking Provision Rates

The current Council DCP parking rates are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Council DCP Parking Rates

Land Use	Ashfield Parking Rate	Marrickville Parking Rates
Multi-Unit Housing in Residential Zones	 1 space per unit Additional space for every five 2-bedroom units Additional space for every two 3-bedroom units 1 visitor space for every five dwellings 	 I space per dwelling I visitor spaces per 4 dwellings
Commercial Premises	1 space per 40m ² GFA	1 space per 45m ² GFA
Retail Shops	1 space per 40m ² GFA	1 space per 45m ² GFA

The DCP rates for residential and visitor parking are considered appropriate given the need for residents to garage a car which may not be used for journey to work and given the desire to allocate all on-street car parking to visitors and deliveries to the mixed uses in the precinct.

The proposed site uses result in a requirement for 545 parking spaces as shown in Table 2.

Precinct within which	Required Parking Spaces				
development is located	Residential		Commercial	Detail	Tatal
	Resident	Visitor	Commercial	Retail	Total
Marrickville	83	21	0	0	104
Ashfield	242	41	95	63	441
Total	325	62	95	63	545

Table 2 Required Parking Provision by Precinct

Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Community Consultation Session - Record of Comments Wednesday 25 May, 2011 - 7.00-9.00pm



9 June 2011

Dear Participant,

Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Wednesday 25 May 2011 – 7.00-9.00pm

On behalf of EG Funds Management I would like to thank you for participating in the Community Consultation Session held on the 25 May 2011 to discuss the Concept Plan.

We are pleased to forward to you the **draft** Record of Comments raised during the question and answer session.

The Record has been issued as a **draft**. If you would like an amendment made to the Record please advise Urban Concepts via either mail, email or facsimile **by close of business Tuesday 21 June 2011**. Our contact details are set out below.

Once the draft Record has been finalised Urban Concepts will then issue the final Record and it will be placed on the project website and be included in the Consultation Report that we will issue to the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

On behalf of Urban Concepts, EG Funds Management and the consultancy team I would like to thank you for your participation and I look forward to your ongoing involvement in the community consultation process for this project.

Yours faithfully,

Attachan

Belinda Barnett Director, Urban Concepts

CONCEPT PLAN FOR THE SUMMER HILL FLOUR MILL SITE CONTACT DETAILS:

Mailing Address: Summer Hill Flour Mill C/- Urban Concepts PO Box 780 North Sydney NSW 2059 Tel: 02-9964 9655

Fax: 02-9964 9055

Email: rosemarie@urbanconcepts.net.au



DRAFT

Record of Comments

Arising from the

Summer Hill Flour Mill Site

Community Consultation Session

Held on Wednesday 25 May 2011 at the Artists Exhibition Centre 7.00 – 9.00pm

Prepared for The Approval of the Session Participants

> Prepared by Urban Concepts

> > Issued 9 June 2011



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 misunderstanding and advise that it has not been deliberate.



Community Consultation Session

Urban Concepts advises that 82 people participated in this Session. It is noted that due to the size of the venue, the number of participants was limited.

Comments Recorded during Question Time

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

	COMMENT/QUESTION
01	Have you given any consideration to a green star rating for this project?
02	What is the residential use compared to the commercial/retail usage of this site.
03	How are the adjacent streets protected from overflow car parking and visitor parking? What about the impact of commuter parking for people that are accessing the light rail. Have you considered the additional impact of these traffic movements in your studies?
04	Have you given consideration to British/Dutch style allotments – garden lots? There is a significant opportunity to provide cultural and interactive landscaped spaces.
05	What communication will you be having with transport and traffic organisations and how will this be co-ordinated across the authorities to increase public transport usage.
06	We held a community referendum on Election Day. We asked "do you want this scale of development in our community"? 94% of residents who participated voted NO. How do you respond to us?
07	I am one of the five residents who live adjacent to your site on Edward Street. Why were we not included in the original Concept Plan and why is this the first consultation that we have been involved with for this project? Your original Concept Plan was deceptive in terms of how our 5 private residences were dealt with.
08	What is your justification for putting 3-4 storey terraces along Edward Street, what about the ring road and the exit/entry points?
09	Traffic study is based on a series of assumptions – what happens when these assumptions are not realised?
10	I am a resident of Wellesley Street it looks like it will become a doorway to your development. What are the real changes that I can expect to see? What percentage change will I experience?
11	What are the numbers we are talking about in terms of new residential population? What will the impact be on local services/schools?
12	Where will people park who want to use light rail. Do you have commuter car parking?
13	Have you considered the current capacity constraints on the rail network at the present time? How do you propose to overcome these?
14	Drop offs for light rail will generate a lot of traffic movements. Have you considered these?
15	People will use local streets (Carrington and Morris) to avoid congestion. Have you considered this impact?
16	What impact will your development have on childcare/schools needs/demand/supply?



	COMMENT/QUESTION			
17	Is 313 the maximum number of units that can be built on this site?			
18	Why did you go to the State Government and not to the local councils seeking approval for this application?			
19	Have the cumulative impacts of the development been considered with the McGill Street Precinc (Lewisham Towers) development?			
20	You haven't convinced me about the traffic. It isn't just the underpass that is the problem. There are a series of constraints in the network. Roads are at capacity at peak hours, and traffic might choose other routes creating further problems in the area.			
21	It looks like a great development. I would like to live there.			
22	How are you treating, if at all, the underpass? There are some bottlenecks.			
23	The challenge for this development is that it is not possible to consider the impact of this development in isolation from the McGill Street (Lewisham Tower) Precinct.			
24	There was an independent traffic report commissioned by Marrickville/Ashfield Council which indicated that the Flour Mill and McGill Street Precinct will generate 1,000 vehicles per hour. Can you explain how the combined impact of the development has been considered?			
25	I want to address your traffic figures for Smith Street. The figure is below 5,000 vehicles which is too low. This is insulting.			
26	You say that 61% of residents will go by public transport. Well how will they if they all have car spaces.			
27	Why are you putting a 10 storey building in front of the Mungo Scott building?			
28	Bulk and height of silos, why are you increasing the original form? I have a problem with overall height and bulk of development.			
29	The road on the south side that accesses onto Canterbury Road is where the Greenway comes out. You will create a pedestrian/cycle conflict. Have you considered this?			
30	'Authenticity' as a guiding principle to the Concept Plan – can take a long time. Can you interpret this and give examples of how this has been achieved in other developments that you have worked on.			
31	Will affordable/social housing be incorporated into this development?			
32	What is the justification for the 3 storey building height on Edward Street? You say the existing terrace houses, but there aren't any. Please review height to 1 storey which is what exits there now.			
33	You call the terraces 2-3 storey but are they 2 or 3 storeys fronting onto Edward Street. They will dominate.			
34	Have you considered traffic controls on Edward Street, if traffic lights are not put in then you will need a right hand turn.			
35	This is a total over development.			



	COMMENT/QUESTION
36	Concerned about light rail going through the Greenway. Appreciate that this development will open up the site.
	What precautions are there for the safety of pedestrians in these green spaces in regard to lighting and security?
37	What allowance have you made for visitor parking?
38	This would be a wonderful development if it was in Campbelltown. Too much development in an area with narrow streets. Public transport is full, schools are full. We cannot cater for this new population. I have a garden with views to the silos. I am now going to see apartments. This development will destroy our village character.
39	We have one architect on both the Flour Mill and McGill Street schemes. How do we get away from the 'humungous development'? You talk about 'authenticity' but this needs small interventions. How do we achieve this with large public spaces and buildings, need for more small scale spaces and places.
40	You do not appear to have provided any community facilities. Will you develop these or other community facilities? Have you considered affordable housing and childcare.
41	Does anyone promoting this development live within walking distance of this site? I am very concerned about how this level of development is maintained and managed. It is not sustainable. Traffic will be well over capacity.
42	Traffic controls on Old Canterbury Road, how will you achieve traffic signals if this is a RTA controlled Road?
43	Where the 'administration building' is on the site - why are you putting a 10 storey building?
44	If 94% of the people of Summer Hill are against this development, how can you justify proceeding?



The following questions were taken on notice as the session had finished. These questions were written on the flipchart by participants.

QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE			
01	If the project were ultimately, over time become unviable, the existing use of the land remains industrial? If so, could the site revert to a pure industrial activity – with associated truck/commercial movement?		
02	The speaker stated that they had conducted a poll of Summer Hill residents. This is not a large community \rightarrow therefore a <u>census</u> of local residents needs to be conducted, to gauge beliefs and feelings.		
03	We chose to live in Summer Hill >30 years ago because of its village style. This development destroys this.		
04	What is the environmental impact of the development on existing local flor and fauna?		

Subject	Summer Hill Flour Mill Rezoning		
Date	9 June 2011	Job No/Ref	220640

Parking Provision Rates

The current Council DCP parking rates are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Council DCP Parking Rates

Land Use	Ashfield Parking Rate	Marrickville Parking Rates
Multi-Unit Housing in Residential Zones	 I space per unit Additional space for every five 2-bedroom units Additional space for every two 3-bedroom units I visitor space for every five dwellings 	 1 space per dwelling 1 visitor spaces per 4 dwellings
Commercial Premises	1 space per 40m ² GFA	1 space per 45m ² GFA
Retail Shops	1 space per 40m ² GFA	1 space per 45m ² GFA

The DCP rates for residential and visitor parking are considered appropriate given the need for residents to garage a car which may not be used for journey to work and given the desire to allocate all on-street car parking to visitors and deliveries to the mixed uses in the precinct.

The proposed site uses result in a requirement for 545 parking spaces as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Required Parking Provision by Precinct

Precinct within which development is located	Required Parking Spaces				
	Residential			Datati	Total
	Resident	Visitor	- Commercial	Retail	10131
Marrickville	83	21	0	0	104
Ashfield	242	41	95	63	441
Total	325	62	95	63	545

Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Stakeholder Session - Record of Comments Thursday 26 May 2011 – 12.00-2.00pm



9 June 2011

Dear Participant,

Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Thursday 26 May 2011 – 12.00-2.00pm

On behalf of EG Funds Management I would like to thank you for participating in the Stakeholder Session held on the 26 May 2011 to discuss the Concept Plan.

We are pleased to forward to you the **draft** Record of Comments raised during the question and answer session.

The Record has been issued as a **draft**. If you would like an amendment made to the Record please advise Urban Concepts via either mail, email or facsimile **by close of business Tuesday 21 June 2011**. Our contact details are set out below.

Once the draft Record has been finalised Urban Concepts will then issue the final Record and it will be placed on the project website and be included in the Consultation Report that we will issue to the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

On behalf of Urban Concepts, EG Funds Management and the consultancy team I would like to thank you for your participation and I look forward to your ongoing involvement in the community consultation process for this project.

Yours faithfully,

Belinda Barnett Director, Urban Concepts

CONCEPT PLAN FOR THE SUMMER HILL FLOUR MILL SITE CONTACT DETAILS:

Mailing Address: Summer Hill Flour Mill C/- Urban Concepts PO Box 780 North Sydney NSW 2059 Tel: 02-9964 9655

Fax: 02-9964 9055

Email: rosemarie@urbanconcepts.net.au



DRAFT

Record of Comments

Arising from the

Summer Hill Flour Mill Site

Stakeholder Session

Held on Thursday 26 May 2011 at the Artists Exhibition Centre 12.00 – 2.00pm

Prepared for The Approval of the Session Participants

Prepared by Urban Concepts

Issued 9 June 2011



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 misunderstanding and advise that it has not been deliberate.



Stakeholder Session

Urban Concepts advises that 25 people participated in this Session.

Comments Recorded during Question Time

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

	COMMENT/QUESTION				
01	On the application to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure are you after a Stage 1 and project approval. Will EG Funds Management retain its involvement in this site or will you get the approval and then sell out of the site.				
02	There are flooding issues on this site. Have they been considered and do these make a differenc to the Concept Plan?				
03	You mentioned publicly accessible spaces, who will own and manage these?				
04	Council has nominated this site for affordable housing provision, is this still the case?				
05	There is an intent to do affordable housing.				
06	Ashfield and Marrickville Councils commissioned a traffic study which has been sent to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. It is important to have a cumulative study (Lewisham Towers and Flour Mill) that assesses all impacts and capital works required.				
07	The traffic data on the presentation includes McGill Street but does it include the Lewisham Towers development?				
08	Comment: Sydney Water will make its requirements known to your specialist Stormwater Consultant, APP, regarding our flooding concerns, we will comment at that point.				
09	Greenway Steering Committee. Potential for this site to be iconic – Director General requires you to achieve best practice in water sensitive urban design and sustainability. How will you determine whether you have achieved this?				
10	To what extent will the two sites (Flour Mill and McGill Street Precinct) be assessed in a co- ordinated way. This is a critical issue to the Greenway Steering Committee. Will there be a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) and who would it be negotiated with and to what extent will it include works that extend beyond your precinct.				
11	Marrickville Council - Ken Hawke commented – Council has been lobbying for cumulative assessment. Marrickville Council asked for a VPA on the McGill Street and is seeking affordable housing, open space/traffic measures, and street parking provisions.				
12	Phil Sarin – Ashfield Council has not formed a view at this stage. Our comments are reflected in the DG's Requirements. The Department of Planning and Infrastructure has taken on board our views.				
13	Biodiversity. Greenway corridor originally established as a biodiversity corridor, how do we ensure that this biodiversity occurs.				
14	You have 300 residences proposed. Many may have 2 vehicles. How many car parking spaces will there be and how many visitor spaces?				
15	Biodiversity corridor concerns. Good leaving brush box trees but we need more areas of connectivity. There is a lot of habitat there at the moment that will be cleared. What will you do with fauna/flora that is displaced?				
16	I understand that you will stage this development. How many years before you start?				


	COMMENT/QUESTION
17	What are the major hoops that you need to jump through before you get approval.
18	From the two meetings that you have had, what level of support do you think you have?
19	Do you think you are getting support from the Councils?
20	Some people have described this site as iconic. It will be great. But I do have concerns regarding height, density and traffic issues which are related to density. Are you going to amend plans and listen to resident concerns about traffic?
21	My personal view/heritage view is that the upward extension of the silos adversely impacts on the silos heritage value. You are taking the height to their upper most point the additional levels are out of context. I also agree that Lewisham Towers height is not appropriate.
	Traffic concerns Old Canterbury Road – it does not flow.
22	Lights at Edward Street may be an advantage but won't these add more cars further slowing down traffic flows on Old Canterbury Road? It would be better to reduce the apartment numbers. The roads here are too narrow to cope with traffic generation and the associated congestion. We already have extensive congestion after 7am of a day. The development will also impact on parking at Summer Hill Village.
23	Councillor Loft. I support 'Go Get, light rail and Greenway'. People do not want to see the extensions to the Silos. People recognise that the site should be developed and that it should not be industrial. If you could take on board active sporting needs and maintain dialogues with Greenway Groups, bicycle groups and SHAG.
	Tuon taccept argument that neavy rains at full capacity.
	If you want this broadly accepted, need to modify the development to some degree.
24	Contamination. Have you looked at this? What impact will it have on open space?
25	What community facilities will there be.
26	Visitor parking you said 1 to 5 is that 1 to 5 residents/apartments? I have friends at Liberty Grove and their visitors have to park in the shopping complex at Rhodes. I am concerned that 1 to 5 is not enough and we will get parking overflow in local streets.
27	Along the Edward Street side you have 3 storey terraces. On the Bill Buckle site the public was very critical about 3 storeys even with the third storey designed as an attic.
28	You will have families. Will there be a playground? There is a deficit in this area of children's playgrounds. Because you will have families you need to think about this.
29	What is the rational for buildings being taller on the northern side?
30	Bike Marrickville. Surprised by 1% usage figure and future 2%. This seems appalling when other cities are targeting 30% - US/Brisbane. This needs a co-ordinated approach to address this issue.
31	What is the anticipated timeframe for the occupation of Stage 1?
32	Will the Part 3A process amend Councils LEP?



Comment taken on notice and forwarded to EG Funds Management and Urban Concepts on Friday 27 May 2011.

"Thanks for facilitating a good community consultation session today. We covered some useful ground.

The additional point that I was hoping you could take into account in your write-up was about place making/place management and the important contribution that public art/community culture can make to this process.

There is no reference to public art in the DG's requirements for the Flour Mill site, which is an oversight in our view. The GreenWay Steering Committee has recently developed a draft GreenWay Arts and Community Culture Strategy which we will send in to you (I don't have an electronic copy to hand). There is great potential, we believe, for the Flour Mill/McGgill Street development precinct to become a showcase for best practise public art and also community arts/culture. It would be good to see this factored in to your concept development early in the piece.

I'd also like to reiterate the three points which I made at today's session:-

1. best practise sustainability and water sensitive urban design. Both of these "concepts" are identified in the DG's requirements to be addressed by the Flour Mill development. They are typically vague about how this expectation might be realised, which puts the onus on the developers to develop up some specificity. As discussed today, there's great potential for the precinct to show-case best practise in these two important areas, but we need to work out what the objectives are and how they might be implemented and evaluated on your site. The GreenWay Steering Comittee's draft guidelines for major developments adjoining the GreenWay contain some recommended approaches (and are referenced in the DG's requirements). We'll forward a copy to you.

2. holistic assessment of both sites. The GreenWay Steering Committee has witten to the Planning Minister in the last month requesting that the Department of Planning demonstrate how it intends assessing the two sites "as one" for some key issues eg traffic, sustainability, water sensitive urban design, social and economic impacts, connectivity with the GreenWay etc. In our view it's imperative that the two councils join forces with the Department of Planning and work with both developers to achieve this aim. We acknowlege that there are some challenges associated with this, but the significance of the site, its potential off-site impacts and the broader issues at stake warrant a bold and holistic assessment of opportunities and challenges involving all the key stakeholders. This would include both developers, the three planning authorities (Marrickville, Ashfield, DoP), the GreenWay Steering Committee and USP Project team, and the various state entities with assets in the precinct/GreenWay corridor eg DoT, Sydney Water, RTA, RailCorp . We badly need a "whole of Government" approach here!

3. on-going place management of the public open space elements of the site and the Greenway - The development is potentially an iconic place making opportunity. The GreenWay Steering Committee, however, is concerned about how we might leverage resources from these two developments to fund the on-going operation and maintenance of the "place" after it is developed (ie) the public domain and GreenWay elements which form such a vital component of the "total package" to be assessed by the State Government in due course. The GreenWay Working Group is discussing with the four Greenway councils options for resourcing on-going place management of the GreenWay corridor and its associated open space areas, including those contained on your development site. The negotiation of a VPA for the development precinct (both the Flour Mill and McGill Street sites) seems to provide a perfect opportunity for these broader issues to be factored into the "public benefit" negotiations.

Summer Hill Flour Mill Project Stakeholder Session - Record of Comments Thursday 26 May 2011 – 12.00-2.00pm



As discussed with Mark Syke and Matthew Pullinger after today's session, the GreenWay Steering Group would be interested in a presentation/workshop about the master plan in the lead-up to, or during the public exhibition process.

One final point regarding UTS'ongoing interest in the site. Michael Easson and I discussed this briefly today today. For three years UTS has been using the GreenWay and the Flour Mill/McGill St precincts as a master planning case study for our Masters in Planning students. Typically 6 students work intensively for 5 weeks to produce a master plan for the sites. Some excellent ideas have been developed in previous years by the students. There may be an opportunity to look at ways of using the students' work to stimulate discussion about some of the broader urban design, active transport and sustainability issues relating to the Flour Mill/McGill St development scenarios and the Greenway as a whole. We'd be happy to dicuss ideas further with you and the Flour Mill consulting team, if it is of interest."

Subject	Summer Hill Flour Mill Rezoning		
Date	9 June 2011	Job No/Ref	220640

Parking Provision Rates

The current Council DCP parking rates are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Council DCP Parking Rates

Land Use	Ashfield Parking Rate	Marrickville Parking Rates
Multi-Unit Housing in Residential Zones	 I space per unit Additional space for every five 2-bedroom units Additional space for every two 3-bedroom units I visitor space for every five dwellings 	 I space per dwelling 1 visitor spaces per 4 dwellings
Commercial Premises	1 space per 40m ² GFA	1 space per 45m ² GFA
Retail Shops	1 space per 40m ² GFA	1 space per 45m ² GFA

The DCP rates for residential and visitor parking are considered appropriate given the need for residents to garage a car which may not be used for journey to work and given the desire to allocate all on-street car parking to visitors and deliveries to the mixed uses in the precinct.

The proposed site uses result in a requirement for 545 parking spaces as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Required Parking Provision by Precinct

Precinct within which	Required Parking Spaces				
development is located	ated Reside	ential	Commercial	Retail	Total
	Resident	Visitor	Commerciai	Retail	IOTAI
Marrickville	83	21	0	0	104
Ashfield	242	41	95	63	441
Total	325	62	95	63	545

12 August 2011

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

By email: <u>plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au</u> Copy to: <u>office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au</u>

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_0155 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

The Summer Hill Action Group (*SHAG*) is made up of a number of local residents who reside in Summer Hill and its surrounding suburbs in the Inner West. As a group, we are united in our concern about the proposed development of the Former Allied Mills Site in Summer Hill (the *Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment*).

By way of background, the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site occupies part of an industrial precinct in Summer Hill. It was formerly the Allied Mills flour mill. The land to the west, north-west and south is zoned for residential use only. The Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment adjoins an adjacent site, referred to for the purposes of this submission as the *Lewisham Towers* site (MP08_0195 Mixed Use Development 78-90 Old Canterbury Road, Lewisham).

The Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site has high levels of cultural significant. Indeed, Ashfield Council's Heritage Study review of Areas Zoned 2(a) of 2003, assessed it as:

Rare aesthetic and scientific significance and having associative historic and social significance.

In these circumstances, the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Mills site presents a unique opportunity for urban renewal in a sympathetic manner that is sustainable and compatible with the local community. As a broad proposition, we do not oppose the mixed use development of the site. However we do oppose the scale of the current Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment Concept Plan application, particularly in light of the adjacent Lewisham Towers development, on the basis of the issues outlined in this submission.

Executive summary

We refer to the above Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment, for which an Environmental Assessment is currently on exhibition, which is described on the Department of Planning's website under Major Project Assessments as:

Concept Plan application for o mixed use residential, retail and commercial development to be constructed in four stages including re-use of 6 existing buildings and structures ond new building envelopes ronging from 2-11 storeys in height accommodating approximately 280-300 dwellings, 2,500-2,800m2 of retail space, 3,500-4,000m2 of commercial space, at-grade and basement porking, public open space, new public streets and associated infrastructure works.

The Director-General's Requirements (*DGRs*) for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment were issued for the Concept Plan application and a Stage 1 Project Application for the above major project on 16 December 2010.

SHAG's members object to the Concept Plan application on the basis of the issues outlined in this submission. We are also of the view that the Concept Plan application does not address all the Director

General Requirements. By way of overview these include the following significant issues which have not been adequately addressed by the applicant:

- Adding to existing traffic congestion The traffic impact study submitted by the applicant (Arup, August 2010) provides no credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment will generate. It is estimated that the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and the proposed adjacent Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1,000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- 2. Scale and out of character with Summer Hill and adjoining villages the Concept Plan is a gross over-development of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site and the proposed excessive heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- 3. Negative impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- 4. Lack of public space opportunities to expand public space should be explored, particularly given that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in New South Wales and the lowest percentage of green space per capita.
- 5. Lack of genuine community consultation despite overwhelming community opposition despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the applicant's own survey that they wanted to be informed about the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment, community consultation has been extremely limited and arguably, quite disingenuous. Many in the local community are concerned that their legitimate concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked. It is noteworthy that <u>94 per cent of the 1,500 Summer Hill and Lewisham residents</u> who took part in a community referendum opposed the scale of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development.
- 6. Flooding despite the threat of serious flooding, appropriate flood mitigation measures have not been put forward.
- 7. **Ownership** there are some genuine questions about whether the ownership of the Summer Hill Flour Mills site is as has been represented.
- 8. Combined impact with Lewisham Towers there is an overwhelming need to consider the combined impact (including for example, increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development given they are clearly part of the same McGill Street precinct. This issue is implicit in many of the concerns highlighted above.

These issues are discussed in more detail below.

1. Adding to existing traffic congestion

The DGRs clearly request a Traffic Management and Accessibility Plan from the applicant. In our view, the traffic impact study submitted by the applicant (Arup, August 2010) provides no credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment will generate. The area around Longport Street and Old Canterbury Road is already gridlocked at peak hours.

Ashfield Council recently commissioned an independent traffic assessment of the combined impact of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and the Lewisham Towers site. This study, undertaken by Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes (the *Colston Study*) and finalised in May 2011, estimated that the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and Lewisham Towers developments would generate an extra <u>1,000 cars per hour</u> during peak hours. With the combined generation of 1,000 cars per hour in two directions, the Colston Study concludes that:

this is a significant volume of additional traffic in an area where there are already a number of traffic constraints.

The intersection of Railway Terrace and Old Canterbury Road is noted at being at "full capacity now" with no mitigation measures being suggested.



© Hassell. Reproduced for the purposes of criticism and review.

The independent Colston Study concludes that there are a "number of traffic issues" associated with the proposed developments of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and the adjacent Lewisham Towers. In our view, the applicant has not sufficiently addressed any of these issues.

Furthermore, despite acknowledging that the local roads have severe traffic flow problems at peak hour, the applicant's traffic consultant's report (Arup, August 2010) does not address:

- 1. How "rat runs" through local streets in Summer Hill can be prevented
- 2. How the cost and construction of proposed traffic lights at the intersection of Old Canterbury Road and Edward Street and a roundabout at the intersection of Smith Street and Edward Street will be managed and by who?

Access to Old Canterbury Road

The SJB Planning Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report clearly recognises that while the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site enjoys a frontage to Old Canterbury Road, it does not currently have any direct vehicular access onto this road (page 6). A review of the Hassell Summer Hill Flour Mills Site Concept Plan suggests that there is to be one main street through the development. This road will have access on to Old Canterbury Road to the north of the Inner West proposed light rail corridor.

We are concerned that this proposal is extremely dangerous and presents significant health and safety issues given that:

- 1. Traffic would be entering and leaving the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site at a blind spot in a corner of Old Canterbury Road
- 2. This area of busy road is at the top of a small incline, but at the bottom of the Old Canterbury Road hill, where not surprisingly, traffic accelerates
- 3. Traffic entering onto Old Canterbury Road from the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site will need to climb an extremely high ramp to get onto Old Canterbury Road with little or no visibility of traffic on Old Canterbury Road
- 4. It is somewhat unclear from the plans in the Concept Plan who owns or controls the area of land where the high ramp onto Old Canterbury Road from the site is located.

Light rail

It appears that one of the overall justifications for the excessive scale and density of Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment is the Inner West light rail proposal extension to Dulwich Hill (and possibly beyond). In this context it is therefore surprising that the applicant makes only very general references to the Inner West light rail proposal – there are, for example, no specific dimensions or specific notated locations identified on the applicant's plans. There is also no reference or detailed explanation of future land ownership of land for public access to the light rail station.

Finally, despite the implicit reliance on the light rail proposal, we have been unable to find any detailed patronage studies of the Inner West light rail proposal nor a comprehensive safety assessment of this project to ascertain what sort of transport solution (if any) it may provide in the context of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and adjacent Lewisham Towers development.

Parking

The Hassell Masterplan Rezoning Proposal (July 2010) suggests that parking for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment is limited to the following:

- Edward Street = 65-75 spots
- Old Canterbury Road = 25-35 spots
- Smith 5treet = no spots
- Mills = 450 -550 basement spots

This totals 60-90 on-street parking spots and 530-680 basement spots. In circumstances where the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment could attract a population of 880 residents and will no doubt attract people who drive and park at the proposed light rail stop at the site, it is difficult to see how such limited parking could be sufficient.

2. Heritage and design concerns

The DGRs clearly require that the applicant address the height, bulk and scale of the proposed development within the context of the surrounding residential areas (including heritage areas and buildings) and the Marrickville Council McGill Street Masterplan and Concept Plan for the Lewisham Towers development.

The Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report submitted by SJB Planners states (page 8) that the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site is adjoined by land to the west, north-west and south zoned only for residential purposes, and that:

Existing residential development to the west in Edward Street is characterized by detached dwellings of one and two storeys in height and which are located within a heritage conservation area.

The small group of industrial buildings to the south of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site (which are fronting Edward Street) is described by SJB Planners (ibid) as a mix of two and three storey buildings interspersed with single storey cottages.

The Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment (as described in the SJB Planning Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report, pages 10-11) provides for:

- New five to ten storey residential buildings in the north eastern corner of the site on Longport Street
- New nine storey residential building to the south of the historic Mungo Scott building
- New six storey residential building in the south of the site
- New four to six storey residential buildings to the east of the Edward Street terraces
- New two to three storey terraces fronting Edward Street
- Additional three storey structure on the top of the iconic silos

This amounts to a total of up to 330 dwellings (one to four bedrooms), 3,500-4,000m2 of commercial space and 2,500-2,800m2 of retail space. We note that as far as we can tell, none of these dwellings have been allocated as "affordable housing", despite a clear request in the DGRs to identify the proportion of housing to be allocated as such.

Further despite being required under the DGRs to do so, the applicant has not submitted an adequate Visual Impact assessment. Therefore there is no appropriate assessment of the impact of the excessive building heights on the existing locality. However, based on the Visual Impact Assessment conducted by Richard Lamb in relation to the Lewisham Tower development, the context of the locality is such to constitute single and two-storey attached and detached dwellings of late 19th/early 20th century styles and vintage.

In our view, particularly the series of 8 and 10 storey buildings on the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site are totally incompatible with, and incongruent to those, in the immediate and surrounding locality, with the exception of the iconic Mungo Scott Flour Mill Silo itself which dominates the skyline and should continue to do so without competition. The massing combined with the overall scaling-up of heights of buildings dominates the locality and compromises the usability of the public and private open spaces depicted, with overshadowing of these areas (and lower floors of the residential buildings themselves) for most periods of the day in any season. The eastern side of the Greenway corridor could be deprived of all afternoon sun.

Within the context of the existing locality, the visual impact and the compatibility of the Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment is inappropriate. Obvious improvements include:

- a. Setbacks of buildings, particularly from Edward Street
- b. Lowering of the height of the buildings, particularly the 10-13 storey buildings and reducing the built in height of the silos. It is clear that these buildings are far too high.

These issues also negatively impact on open space and access to sunlight.

It is also relevant to note that part of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site is within Marrickville Council area, namely the north-western corner of the site. The Concept Plan proposes part 8, 5 and 10 storey residential buildings in that area and such building footprints occupy most of that part of the site. In Part 5.1.13 of the applicant's Environmental Assessment, the applicant argues that the Concept Plan supports the Marrickville Council McGill Street Masterplan. However, it is curious to note that the Masterplan (which was done by Hassell, the same company retained by the applicant to create the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment Concept Plan) shows no controls for this site at all. Furthermore, we would argue that the Marrickville Council McGill Street Masterplan which is clearly in a different municipality should not influence urban design conditions within the Summer Hill precinct.

Heritage concerns

The Heritage Impact Assessment of the Proposed Rezoning and Redevelopment of the Site (John Graham & Associates, July 2010) makes it clear that there are a number of heritage issues associated with the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment, namely:

- a. Ashfield Council has deferred its determination of whether the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site at 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill is a heritage item under section 68(5) of the Local Government Act
- b. The Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site is to the immediate east of the Quarantine Ground Conservation Area
- c. The Hawthorne Canal which runs through the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site is a heritage item in the Ashfield LEP.

In 1998 and 2005, the cultural significance of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site was carried out for Ashfield Council by Rod Howard Conservation Pty Limited. It concluded that the Mungo Scott Flour Mill was significant for a number of reasons (refer to page 4). Further, Ashfield Council's Heritage Study review of Areas Zoned 2(a) of 2003, assessed it as:

Rare aesthetic and scientific significance and having associative historic and social significance.

In these circumstances, it is clear that the redevelopment of the Mills site presents a unique opportunity for sympathetic and appropriate urban renewal. We respectfully disagree with the conclusion of John Graham in his report commissioned by the applicant, namely that the planned Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment is exemplary in the understanding and respect it pays to the culturally significant fabric of the site.

In fact, the Concept Plan is extremely vague in its assurances regarding the conservation of heritage items and buildings. The practical reality is that the most significant buildings such as the Mungo Scott Flour Mill will simply be overshadowed. The overall scaling-up of heights dominates the locality to the clear detriment and detraction of Mungo Scott Flour Mill and silos. Furthermore, the silos will not remain as a prominent and iconic landmark. Indeed for those structures that the applicant proposes to retain and "conserve" there is a notable absence of detailed architectural and landscape documentation in order to determine what will in fact be conserved. In particular:

- 1. There is no architectural explanation of how the cultural significance of the site will be translated in the design for the building and landscape of the proposed redevelopment
- 2. There is no provision of appropriate and adequately sized drawings of the historic buildings within the site
- 3. There are no designs put forward for this structure to replace the demolished large wooden silo building to the south of the Mungo Scott Flour Mill building.

In our view, the Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment does not adequately address the issues outlined in the DGRs and as such its approval would not lead to a quality development of this historic site. Furthermore it would be prejudicial to the redevelopment of the balance of the McGill Street precinct, particularly when it is taken in conjunction with the Lewisham Towers development. In short, it is not a plan for good amenity for current local residents, future residents and users of the Mills site and is not a model of the current or any desired future character for the surrounding locality.

It is imperative that the Summer Hill Flour Mills site have heritage listing and controls protecting the historical structures on the site equal to that found in the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan.

3. Negative impact on local amenity

The Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment proposes the provision of up to 300 dwellings and the SJB Planning Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report states 330 dwellings. On the basis that there is an average of 2.49 people per dwelling in Ashfield municipality, this amounts to a total of over 820 new residents. This represents almost a 20 per cent increase in Summer Hill's population.

Yet there is a notable absence of a study on the impact of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment on existing services or utilities or on the demand for future services and utilities. One such area is education.

Education

On a conservative estimate that 0.49 of the 820 new residents at the Summer Hill Flour Mill redevelopment are children, this would amount to 162 children, most of whom will be at pre-school or school age.

The Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site is currently zoned within Summer Hill Public School, a school that already has a large population of close to 730 students and 28 classes.¹ Given Summer Hill Public School's excellent results on the My School website, it will no doubt attract parents with school aged children to reside at the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment. However, quite simply the Summer Hill Public School does not have the capacity to take on another 162 students: which would represent between 6-7 new classes.

A similar problematic situation has transpired in the nearby suburb of Rhodes, where the number of school aged children living in recently built developments has forced the Department of Education to consider relocating or building a new school.²

http://www.summerhill-p.schools.nsw.edu.au/sites/swsRepo/3129/asset/2011/2/19eb9eeb2dddce7a012e69620e47611a.pdf.
 See article at: http://inner-west-courier.whereilive.com.au/news/story/school-size-concern/.

<u>Childcare</u>

There is currently only one long day care facility in Summer Hill, which is the Summer Hill Children's Centre at Moonbie Street. The Centre accommodates only 40 children between the ages of 3 and 6 years. We understand that the Centre currently has close to 300 children on its waiting list for 2011. Needless to say, the vast majority of these will be turned away despite the fact that many have full-time working parents and live within Summer Hill or neighbouring suburbs.

Summer Hill and its surrounding localities are clearly already deficient in childcare facilities. The addition of 162 at the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment will only exacerbate the situation. Put simply, there are simply no childcare services for young children available in Summer Hill or surrounding areas to accommodate the number of children that are likely to reside in Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment.

4. Lack of public open space

As you are no doubt aware, Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in New South Wales and has the lowest percentage of green space per capita. As such, the area of the proposed "private park" to the north west of the Mungo Scott building creates a unique opportunity for future public open space. The benefit to the community of creating public open space in this land is immense.

There also needs to be considerably more clarity about the ability and right of the public to access land within the Summer Hill Flour Mill site, including access to the proposed light rail. Current statements in the "Statement of Commitments" such as:

"Public access will be provided through the site providing access over and through the open spaces from Smith Street...."

are simply vague and not acceptable. The proviso of public open space needs to be clearly committed to by the applicant otherwise there is a likelihood of disputes in the future (for example, a strata corporation as part of the site refusing to allow public access to their "open space").

5. Lack of genuine community "consultation"

Last year in an unprecedented community referendum, 1,500 Summer Hill and Lewisham residents voted overwhelmingly against the scale of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and Lewisham Towers. Held over the Federal election weekend in August 2010, some <u>94 per cent of the 1,500 Summer Hill and Lewisham residents</u> who took part in the community referendum opposed the scale of these developments.

More recently, SHAG has been involved in collating over 1,000 community objections to the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment in the form of individual letters to the Department of Planning. These have also been supplemented by individual letters from local residents opposing the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment.

On the applicant's website³ they state that:

Community attitudes are important to EG Funds Management and community consultation is a key component of the development projects we undertake...

³ http://www.summerhillflourmill.com.au/.

Yet it is clear that the "community consultation" in relation to the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment has fallen well short of genuine and transparent. We strongly disagree with the statement in the SJB Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report (page 18) that:

The proponent is committed to continue the consultation undertaken to date and to continue to engage with the community and community groups.

Rather, throughout this process the applicant has continued to suggest that the Summer Hill Community supports the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment based on a small survey its representatives conducted in April 2010. In short, this survey is flawed on the basis that:

- 1. It was conducted well in advance of the publication of the current Concept Plan, namely April 2010.
- 2. Only a very small sample of the population, namely 580 respondents, was interviewed.
- 3. The question asked of respondents was whether they *supported a change in the use of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site from industrial to mixed use.* This question simply goes to whether the community supported urban renewal of the site, not whether they supported the current scale of redevelopment proposed for the site.

However, this flawed survey highlights the extent of the concerns held by the local community in respect of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment. The Community Consultation Report (page 19) states that residents had the following concerns:

- Over half of the people surveyed considered the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Hill to be a <u>major issue</u>
- Table 3.4 cites the following concerns articulated by residents:

40% traffic congestion	
29% development size/ type/ design	
20% loss of living amenity/appeal	
16% insufficient parking	
15% overcrowding of area	
13% negative impact on local business	
11% noise/ air pollution	

- The concerns about the redevelopment's cost to the Summer Hill community focused on four key areas:
 - Increased traffic increased traffic, road closures, poor access for residents, longer travel times and quality of life disruption
 - Scale and design of buildings building height, amount of commercial space and building design not keeping in character with surrounds
 - **Overcrowding and loss of living amenity** loss of privacy and quietness, loss of village/ neighbourhood feel, charm of area, fewer green and open spaces
 - No parking and negative impact on existing businesses
- 88 per cent of the community surveyed wanted more additional services or facilities such as more open space, parks, facilities for children, community centre.

Another example of the applicant's lack of genuineness regarding community consultation is illustrated by the "community consultation newsletter" referred to in the applicant's Community Consultation Report.

This newsletter was allegedly distributed to 2,400 residents and occupiers in the "resident catchment notification area". However large numbers of Summer Hill residents claim never to have received such a newsletter (including many of the signatories to this letter). Finally, the "community consultation" sessions run by Urban Concepts on behalf of the applicant in May 2011 resulted in many local residents being refused entry due to the small size of the venue.

The applicant's more recent "community consultation" draft record of comments highlight extensive community concern across many of the issues raised throughout this submission.

Indeed not surprisingly, there have been a number of media articles regarding the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment which reinforce the high levels of genuine community concern regarding this proposal. See at **Appendix A** copies of the following recent media articles:

- 1. Brooks, M "Unanswered Questions" Letters to the Editor, Inner West Courier, 2 June 2011, 9.
- 2. Ward, A "Grounds for Mill meet anger" Inner West Courier, 31 May 2011, 7.
- 3. Muranda, L "Planning law changes welcome", Inner West Courier, 26 May 2011, 6.
- 4. Brady, F "New suburb fear", Inner West Courier, 25 November 2010, 1.
- 5. Brady, F "Residents urged to take notice", Inner West Courier, 25 November 2010, 4.
- 6. Ward, A "Government to decide mills' fate" Inner West Courier, 2 September 2010, 3.
- 7. Grove, J "Scale down these plan", Letters to the Editor, Inner West Courier, 2 September 2010, 9.
- 8. Ward, A "Residents stand united" Inner West Courier, 26 August 2010, 3.
- 9. Ward, A "Mill plan grates" Inner West Courier, 24 August 2010, 1.
- 10. Ward, A "Locals grind teeth over mill plan" Inner West Courier, 24 August 2010, 9.

6. Flooding mitigation

Briefly, we note that the applicant's own report (Meinhardt Infrastructure & Environment Pty Limited, July 2010) notes that there are a number of severe flooding issues to be addressed from the Hawthorne Canal. However, we are concerned that the applicant has not adequately addressed these in terms of design. With flood levels approximately 1.5 metres deep within the site adjacent and around the stormwater canal, this needs to be addressed through appropriate flood mitigation measures.

7. Ownership

The SJB Planning Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report states (page 6) that:

EG Funds Management controls land described as the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment Site....

Land owned by EG Funds and within Ashfield LGA Land owned by EG Funds and within Marrickville LGA

[emphasis added]

Indeed throughout many of the documents in the applicant, EG Funds Management is described as the applicant for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment. Further we note the Political Donations Disclosure Statement is filed by Mark Syke of EG Funds stating that no donation had been made within two years of the Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment.

We are somewhat confused that property searches for the 19 parcels of land that make up the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment site confirm that the properties are in fact owned by *Australian Executor*

Trustee Limited. It is not clear to us how this separate legal entity is related (if, in fact at all) to EG Funds Management.

Furthermore, there is no doubt that both public and community perceptions exist that EG Funds Management owns the Summer Hill Flour Mills site. This has been reinforced through media, community brochures, consultation with the community, presentations to Ashfield and Marrickville Council and indeed in the advertising banners that were constructed around the site for a period of time.

8. Conclusion

On the basis of our objections articulated above, we believe that there are numerous parts of the Concept Plan for the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment that need further detailed examination by the Department of Planning. Moreover the Concept Plan quite clearly has not addressed all the Director General Requirements outlined above and therefore should not be approved.

We believe that the Minister for Planning & Infrastructure has the unique potential to reinforce the excellent precedent set in the Barangaroo Development review in the context of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment and Lewisham Towers. That is, to engage strategic planners from outside New South Wales as part of the Planning and Assessment Commission in order to assess these developments jointly. We would urge that this approach be applied across the board to any of the transitional Part 3A projects that have been referred to the newly formed, but as we understand it, yet not constituted Planning and Assessment Commission.

We believe that the appointment of strategic planners that are not resident in New South Wales, to the proposed permanently elected members of the Planning and Assessment Commission may better reflect the legitimate concerns of the communities of Summer Hill and Lewisham who feel the developments have been 'foisted upon them' without any considerations of the consequences to the fabric and amenity of the existing residents and of their communities.

Finally, and most critically, we request that the combined impacts of the Summer Hill Flour Mills redevelopment be assessed in conjunction with the adjacent Lewisham Towers development jointly considered before the Planning and Assessment Commission in a public hearing.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require additional information.

Yours sincerely

Signed below on behalf of the Summer Hill Action Group which includes (but is not limited to):

Sabiene Heindl 6 Herbert Street Summer Hill NSW 2130 Manfred Fahr 6 Herbert Street Summer Hill NSW 2130 Susan Terravecchia 12 Moonbie Street Summer Hill NSW 2130

Vanessa Liel 24 Seaview Street Summer Hill NSW 2130

Ellen Lloyd-Shepherd 4 Short Street Summer Hill NSW 2130 Leigh Ringrose 12 Moonbie Street Summer Hill NSW 2130

Andrew McCutcheon 24 Seaview Street Summer Hill NSW 2130

Neil Lloyd-Shepherd 4 Short Street Summer Hill NSW 2130

	well as into solution to gets into every cell of the plant as well as into soil, killing soil life. - Michele Margolis	well as into soil, killing soil life.		inner	innervestcourier.com.au
2	YOUR SAV	Send letters to Letters Inner West Courier, 181 First Aye, Five Dock, NSW 2046 OR fax 9018 3522 OR email to editor@innerwestcourier.com.au	st Ave, Five Dock, NSW 2046 OR fax	90 <u>1</u> 8 3522 OR email to editor@innerw	restcourier, com au
⊇ ┲╬ҵ ╒ ฿ӫӹ + ӟӊҵ + t s t s s s t s f f f f f f f f f f f f	Uranswered questions lattended the meeting the other night arranged by the developers of the mill site in Summer Hill. I must admit I was left completely aghast by the four-man panel sent along to convince us that this was a "great" thing for our community. The guy who spoke about the traffic issues convinced no-one but himself that this won't have a devastating effect on the roads in and around the development. The devilopment. The devilopment. The guy who was part of the planning process came across as arrogant. If his claim is tota that he lives in the local area, he should hang his head Management is appropriate for who? Certainly not the people who ive in the local area. Could I like him to answer a very simple question: appropriate for who? Certainly not the people who live in the local area.	The former flour mill at Summe the second they possibly justify this development in the local area are against it, they were speechless. When I asked the question, how could they possibly justify this development in the local area are against it, they were speechless. Why? Because they can't justify it! If they had one ounce of character among them, they dorop the 3A Development proposal and let the local council, and therefore the local people, have their say on what is appropriate for this development. Call me a cynic but somehow I don't think that will happen. Mat Brooks, Summer Hill	The second secon	 poison was being sprayed centimetres from my food plants; and no-one had informed me or asked if it was OK. It is not OK to spray poison in our suburbs. Roundup is not safe and is residual. It gets into every cell of the plant as well-known that tests for its so-called safety have been falsified. There have been no long-term tests on health effects of its use and the reason i was given for its use as opposed to hammely properties that would not be stray prouse would be put on a "list" of properties that would not be stray or straying calendula, which is an edible companion plant. This man was not given a mask and it was the time of morning when mothers, some pregnant and the school. Council workers are at risk as are pregnant would not be straying calendula. When any property - spraying calendula. When any strong when mothers, some pregnant and the school. 	ingredient: glyophosate – exactly the same as Roundup. Who do they think they are kidding? If you are concerned about this, a few of us would like to do something about it. Contact me via email. Michele Margolis@gmail.com Inner West Seed Savers Permaculture Diary and Calendar interwest Seed Savers Permaculture Diary and Calendar interwest Seed Savers Permaculture Diary and Calendar Poin the debate online at interwest Courter is COR THE RECORD The Inner West Courter is committed to publishing news and information accurately. Should we fail to meet this standard, our policy is to prounpity set the record straight. Corrections will be published when material in a report could a dottor in a significant factual mistake, or when it material in a report could when material in a report could believe a correction or clarification is warranted should erroi in set of to meet this or unfairness. Readers who believe a correction or clarification is warranted should erroi in set of to meet an or contention or clarification is warranted should erroi in set of to meet

•

•

(

·|· '[†]



Jury for those who missed out. "(At the sessions) there were many different views; some positive things and some obvious

concerns," he said. "Traffic was the most significant concern."

Ashfield councillor Caroline Stott said that along with the adjacent Lewisham Towers proposal, Summer Hill would no longer be a village. "300 dwellings may be what the

veloper would like to make a offt, but it's at the expense of . local community, she said "The developers are not taking nto consideration the comnunity's voice," Sabiene Heindl from SHAG said.

Mr Syke said the consultation process was not over yet. "We will consider the comnents and submissions and how

ve best address the issues raised," fr Syke said. "This might include some mendments to our proposal."



wappende for the future of the Summer Will From Will site (main) are causing plenty of debate at consultation meetings (inset)

WHERES THE PROPOSAL AN

- Recent changes to Part 3A mean the Planning and Assessment Cammission (PAC) will determine the application rather than the Minister for Planning.
 The formal public exhibition of the
- application by the NSW Planning and htrastructure Department is expected to cammence in June.
 - The developer must then respond to submissions before the department undertakes its assessment and the PAC makes its final decision.

THE SHEEL BLOCKER

- At the intersection of the western railway line, the proposed light rail and GreenWay corridor between Summer Hill and Lewisham.
 - The heritage buildings and concrete silos to be re-used.
 - Three new streets.
- Up to 300 dwellings ranging in height fram two to 10 stareys.
 - 五2500sg m of retail space. 国 4000sg m of commercial space.

RESIDENES WAN GONGER

- Will exacerbate aiready constrained itaffic problems on surrounding roads.
 in the standard standa
- Lack of collaboration with other major, adjacent developments — the McGill St site and Lewisham Towers.
 - Elimited open space and no plans for park or other amenities, such as childcare and schools.
 - The scale of the proposal is not consistent with current heritage and village nature of the area.



INNER WEST COURIER; Tuesday, May 31, 2011

innervestcourier.com.au	 W.L.Y. L.S. 659 WING 523 (G. Canada Bay Council Canada Bay Council Residential and retail development at the former Five Dock Bowling Club, 186 Great North Rd, Five Dock. Strathfield Triangle, Parramatta Rd, Strathfield. Strathfield Triangle, Parramatta Rd, Strathfield. Demolition of existing Powerhouse Buildings at Breakfast Point. Vaoallands North Precinct, Breakfast Point. 	Point. McDonald College redevelopment, 17 George St, North Strathfield. Residential development containing affardable housing, 27 Leeds St, Rhodes. Strathfield Council
C S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S		a - Sg g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g g
MENIS X	LAUREN MURADA LOCAL Councils are rejolcing as the new Coalition State Government has lived up to its promises and abolished Part 3A planning laws. A number of large-scale developments have been shown the door by the State Government and will now be decided by local councils. Projects that have progressed too far, however, will be determined by the Government's independent Planning Assessment Commission.	through the Part 3A system. Through the Part 3A system. Mappy about the law reversal and looked forward to getting better outcomes for the community. "Tt's important that local government has a role to play with large develop- ments and that the communities aren't

- Residential and commercial development, 330 Parramatta Rd, Homebush West.
 - independent Planning Ássessment Decisions to be made by Commission
- residential development at Breakfast Point. 🔯 Canada Bay Seashores Precinct
 - 🖾 Majors Bay residential development, Hilly St, Northcote St, Bennet St, Edwin St, Mortlake.
- Project application for five buildings, 40 Walker St, Rhodes.
 - 🕸 Columbia Precinct, 2-20 Parramatta Rd and 11-13 Columbia Lane, Parramatia.
 - E Former Allied Mills Site, 2-32 Smith St.

Summer Hill

The Allied Flour Mill site at Summer Hill

がたまたたけ



ŝ

the area should be determined by coun-cils," he said. Ashfield's major project is the residential development of the for-

<u>mer Allied Mill Site in Summer Hill, will</u>

be determined by the Government.

occur in their backyards," he said. Ashfield Mayor Ted Cassidy said he

disenfranchised and have input into what kind of development is going to

"It's great that the Part 3A has been

was happy about the result.

overturned by the new government and we have always said that development in Strathfield Mayor Tony Maroun said yrojects were once again determined by it's appropriate that these planning cal government.

1341 (ł ł (<u>1</u> ((_a

R,

ļ ł 18 ł 1

ž ġ,



Inner West Courier 25/11/2010 Page: 1 Section: General News Region: Sydney Circulation: 52892 Type: Suburban Size: 762.00 sq.cms Frequency: -T-T---

Page 2 of 2

Residents urged to take notice



From Page 1

"The State Government's decision to assess the Summer Hill Mills development under Part 3A threatens to take away critical decision-making from our community and its locally elected representatives," spokeswoman Sabiene Heindl said.

"We call on the State Government and the Planning Minister to ensure that the concerns of our community in terms of the scale of the development, traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure and green space are heard."

Ashfield councillor Alex Lofts wants the State Government to assess both developments as one precinct. "It is important that both developments be assessed together, especially as the Lewisham estate's number of units is much worse," he said.

A public meeting about the Lewisham proposal will be held in St Andrew's Church Hall, 2 Henson St, Summer Hill between 4pm and 6pm on Saturday, December 4. Tom Uren will speak at the meeting. It is being organised by the No Lewisham Towers residents group. Residents have until January 7 to comment on the Lewisham development. For more information visit majorprojects.planning.nsw-.gov.au

MEDIA MONITORS



Inner West Courier 25/11/2010

Page: 1 Section: General News Region: Sydney Circulation: 52892 Type: Suburban Size: 762.00 sq.cms Frequency: -T-T----

Page 1 of 2

New suburb fear

Fiona Brady

LEWISHAM and Summer Hill residents are being urged to take notice as the NSW Planning Department decides on two of the biggest developments in the area's history.

In both suburbs, email, poster and letter campaigns are already swinging into action as critics of the Lewisham Towers and Summer Hill Flour Mill developments try to get residents' attention.

They claim that if both develop-

ments get the go-ahead it would have the effect of parachuting a new suburb between Summer Hill and Lewisham.

The No Lewisham Towers lobby group chairwoman Tamara Winikoff said her message to residents was "the time is now" after the Lewisham application finally went on public exhibition on the Planning Department's website last week.

Ms Winikoff urged people to write to the Planning Minister Tony Kelly and the State Labor MP for Marrickville Carmel Tebbutt expressing their concerns about the project and the planning assessment process.

It will be decided by the Plan-ning Assessment Commission under Part 3A - which means local councils will play little part in the decision-making process.

"The fact that they are even accepting it as valid to be dealt with under Part 3A doesn't follow the urban design standards that have been set by the state and squeezes the community out," she said.

The Summer Hill Action Group learned this week that the Flour Mill development would also be assessed under the part 3A process.

🛾 To Page 4



Ashfield councillor Alex Lofts wants a proposal for the Summer Hill flour mill site assessed together with the Lewisham development

				Auroration 0.0010 0 +
500 words or less or a poem no more than 16 lines. Email entries to enter@write4fun.net. For details visit write4fun.net.	The presented the masterplan to Ashfield Council last week. It includes three new streets, up to 300 dwellings, 2500sq m of retail space and 4000sq m of commercial space.	Do the developments concern you? Tell us what you think at innerwestcourier.com.au	S C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	
Check out our gallery of the Wests Tigers cheerleader at innerwestcourier.com.au	traffic generated on to already heavily commuted roads. The spokeswoman predicted the community dissent toward the developments would grow to be- come a key state election issue for finner. West residents	The Courter reported on the developer's masterplan for the mill site in Tuesday's edition. Developer EG Funds Manage		Cuti Special model Big Family Q ^{IN} with built-in thermometer, factory- fitted hotplate, electronic ignition and side tables. ademark of Weber Stephen Product Co. Australia.
courage and enunusiasm. "He is my inspiration behind this now, I really want to win it for him," she said.	"What's alarming is that these two sites are being developed separately even though they're right next to each other," she said. "The community aren't aware of this and so there was lots of	Interest on Saturday." Together the developments in- clude more than 760 units, mul- tiple high-rise buildings and extra tiple high-rise buildings and extra 2)55	DGF DGF E S Special model baby 0* writhsi	
phere at the games, the camarad- erie with all the boys and all the extra work they do in the com- munity," she said.	Lewisham to vote on the develop- ment plans for the McGill St precinct and the Mungo Scott flour mills. An overwhelming 94 per cent of 1500 concerned residents who took part were opposed to the scale and	scope of the developments. A spokeswoman for the Summer Hill Action Group said they were swamped by concerned residents.	THERS DAV y any 2 pairs an	Balmain Village Balmain Village Shop 2, 269-271 Dari Dha 98-10 www.jazma.c
Big League Tures, a, who is variants a terminal disease. Big League magazine holds the competition every year and this	Alex Ward AUSTRALIANS were divided at the polling booths but Summer Hill and Lewisham residents stood united against massive develop-	A community referendum was held on Saturday at three polling booths in Summer Hill and COMMERCE	We can't breat to accurate We will be and by a sector we define Immediate Contract Filling Food for propertional	

•

,

ບ≋ ⊻

т

\$1.20 INCL. GST INNER WEST EDITION TUESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2010 innorwestcourler.com.au PROPERTY ALIVE



Taxed Reconstruction (data dan de Strumman Millement, 1999)



Afex Ward

:

{

RESIDENTS remain distressed by

RESIDENTS remain distressed by a developer's musterplan for the Summer Hill flour millisite, Last Tussday night, developer EG Punds Management presented the plan for one of the largest develop-ments in the Asthicid municipality. The proposal includes three now

avoors, un to Suittheoffings, 2500su tu of retail space and 1000sq m of commorelal space

Mill plan grates

interchal space. The original Mango Scott building and the concrete siles are planned to be reused in the development. It's a very special and strategically

Important site so we won't be ensing its character but using it as a centre-piece for the development." Matthew

Pultinger, from flasself, the company that is designing the site, sold The location is at the interseethe location is at the intersec-tion of the western railway line, the proposed light rail and GreenWay corridor between Summer Hill and

Lewisham. Councillor Lyoff Rennedy sold he

was worrled about the factease in

traffic on already congested wards,

"The actualles heet of thesis the protelent with traffic and there seems to be nothing proposed to alleviate that." he said.

"A 9 per cent increase on the small-er needs will have an exponential hu-pact on the traffic queeding on those timete

An Asin'ield Council Spokesman said h was working with Marrickylle

The Stander Hill Action Group spokeswomm solid there was a lack of collaboration between the mutistic and the Lewisian Travers site. "No only is laking responsibility for the whole site." Sheath, "This could double the population of Summer Hill and there seems to be no indication of boar theo will be supported." how they will be supported."

fer Çele's Anistadr And saided there has been been been the first first first sector. . • Mangara Dan Italian Italian ······························ ggana Balla 14 Sum Londina - 7 Balls, Park For arrange in Antonia for the second statement of the second statement of the 1997 In grander black from Balk 1997 Ball 1997 BALL 1997 BALL 1997 BALK 1997 BALK 1997 BALK 1997 BALK 1997 BALK

http://images.cdn.realviewdigital.com/djvu/FPC/Inner_Western_Suburbs_Courier/24-Au... 24/08/2010 - REWS

The Achilles heel of this is the problem with traffic and there seems to be nothing proposed to alleviate that — Crival Kernedy

Locals grind teeth over mill plan

Alex Ward

a developer's master plan for the RESIDENTS remain distressed by Summer Hill flour mill site.

Funds Management presented the Last Tuesday night developer EG velopments in the Ashfield municimaster plan for one of the largest de-lity, including three new streets,

space and 4000sq m of commercial up to 300 dwellings, 2500sq m of retail

and the concrete silos are planned to The original Mungo Scott building be reused in the development.

piece for the development," Matthew "It's a very special and strategically important site so we won't be erasing Pullinger from Hassell, the company its character but using it as a centrethat is redesigning the site, said.

At the meeting, Ashfield councillors The site is at the intersection of the western railway line, the proposed ight rail and GreenWay corridor beand residents raised their concerns. Cr Lyall Kennedy said he was worween Summer Hill and Lewisham



a digitally enhanced image of how the flour mills may look.

Main image: HASSELL

ried about the increase in traffic on already congested roads.

An Ashfield Council spokesman "The Achilles heel of this is the problem with traffic and there seems to be nothing proposed to alleviate hat," he said. "A 9 per cent-increase on the smaller roads will have an exponential impact on the traffic queuing on those streets."



co-operatively with Marrickville confirmed the council was working Council on traffic matters.

The Summer Hill Action Group ration between the mill site and the was worried by the lack of collabo-Lewisham Towers site.

"It (both sites) needs to be treated as a precinct," a group spokeswoman Mystery of baby girl's body puzzles police

"This could double the population trastructure and facilities would not She also said the surrounding insupport an influx in residents. for the whole site."

be no indication of how they will be supported," she said. "The figures just of Summer Hill and there seems to

"EG purchased the Allied Mills site EG Funds Management bought the realising it was a significant urban Hill Public School are already full." site from Allied Mills in, 2007.

renewal opportunity available in the Inner West," EG Funds Management CEO Adam Geha said.

			антана. Антанала	
We want developments that will enhance the existing community fabric and amenity and not destroy it - Jillian Grov	ments that existing c and destroy it - Jillian Grove			
			inner	innerwestcourier.com.au
Volt: SV	s to: Letters, Inner West Courier, 181 F	Send letters to: Letters, Inner West Courier, 181 First Ave, Five Dock, NSW 2046 OR fax 9018 3522 OR email to editor@innerwestcourier.com.au	9018 3522 OR email to editor@innerv	vestcourier.com.au
Your win inspires others Congratulations to the residents of Learnington Ave on their successful			s definitely anada Ba	including floor space ratio breaches (before the local environment plan
tight against the demointion of their buses.			continue to experience traffic con-	is conveniently changed), which measures infrastructure impacts.
Let's nope this inspires more people to oppose the developments planned in Summer Hill and at			this situation is for new public transport infrastructure to be pro-	The only beneficiaries of this appli- cation are developers, or specu-
Marrickville Metro. If enough members of our com-			Government, both local and state,	ations as they were originatly called. Andrew Woodhouse
munity stand up to be counted there is no reason why we can't stop the		Protestors at	need to ensure that where develop- ment is to occur, it meets new sustainability criteria.	President, Australian Heritage In- stitute
Belinda Cole Marrickville		Ave, Ave,	The Rhodes West master plan, with controls aimed at discouraging car	
Scale down these plans		Newtown, Ne	white ship and encouraging use of public transport, car share schemes walking and cooling to	Comment on all our stories at innerwestcourier.com.au
e use part in the community refer- endum conducted by concerned Summer Hill and Lewisham resi-	hance the existing community fahric	this week.	sponds perfectly to this scenario.	
dents on election day and was genuinely surprised by the numbers		figures from NSW Planning) and a population of 11,000.	Mayor, City of Canada Bay Good design does count	FOR THE RECORD
combined impacts of the proposed developments on both sides of the		The current master plan will provide for 400-430 additional dwellings	ILS about time Cr Victor Macri was told (Courier, August 25). He tries to Sweep away design objections to the	The <i>Inner West Courier</i> is committed to publishing news and information accurately. Whenever we feal to most
Proposed light rail extension. Community consultation has been very limited and moderners used		arid about 1000 extra people - an increase of 8 per cent which is fully permitted under the existing clan.	proposed bulbous Marrickville RSL saying design is of course subjective	this standard, our policy is promptly to set the record straight Corrections will be within to do the second straight corrections will
stunned to see the scale and scope of the plans under consideration	achieved under the existing p	ning controls.	but no-one's views count. He is wrong	significant factual mistake, or when it materially changes the meaning or
per cent of r rent plans fo	be the best way that the City of Canada Bay can provide the ad-	by the State Government, the De- partment of Education already	Design excellence is measurable by examining use of materials, spatial	significance of a report Clarifications will be published when material in a report could had a subjection.
to be scaled back so that the developments are sustainable in terms of traffic transport	ditional local infrastructure which is needed including more open space,	needs to provide an additional school in the area, even if the	context, street facade, fenestration, height, bulk, heritage impacts and	reservent actual to serious misunderstanding or unfairness. Readers who believe a correction or
space and local amenities.	ure upgraded community centre, and a range of other improvements.	Knodes West master plan does not proceed.	dard Vitruvian principles of design	ctaritication is warranted should the editor, John Bilic, on
want developments that will en-	Even without the Rhodes West master plan, at Rhodes we will still	So fet's not confuse the issue as to whose responsibility it is to build	or used in contant and other major cities. On all counts this mega-project fails	enur gunder west cour let . com. au, phone 9018 3500, or write to The Editor, Inner West Courier, 181 First Ave. Five
	in the second			Dock, 2046.

.

+

1

.

ŧ

1.

Received and addime contact number. Letters as short as possible and include your address and daytime contact number. Letters are subject to editing and cannot be rehumed

,

Puzza and Incky door prizes. Call Camille to book a place on 9716 1843 or email camillec@ashfield.nsw.gov.au.	community to comment on our proposal. These will need to be considered in the finalisation of our concept plan and by the Department of Planning in its assessment and determination of Ashfield Mayor Ted Cassidy the project." Ashfield Mayor Ted Cassidy Marrickville Mayor Sam Askandar about appealing to Askandar about appealing to Moads Minister David Borger to ₿	uuct a regional traffic study methods in the last in the second method in the last in the second method in the last in the second method in the second in the second method in the second in the second method in the second
Ferformances are on October 22 and 23. Visit benhur.com.au or call 132 849 for details.	development proposal that is as- sociated with wider issues like the GreenWay and light rail extension and the McGill St (Lewisham Mr Syke said the decision would wr Syke said the decision would "We have consultation." We have considered com- development concept for the site," "A Part 3A process will necessi- tate further community consul- tation and opportunities for the	
Pezzutti can hardly believe that he bezer Mr	the decision arose from complexities dealing with both "Both councils have different "Both councils have different "Both councils have different attitudes to development in this precinct and there are wider precinct and there are wider be considered," he said. "We feel that the Department of the area as one precinct in a more "It's difficult for Ashfield Coun- cil to deal in isolation with a	H F I E L D 100 Am - 1200 Pm 100 Am - 1200 Pm
_	Council of this at the meeting last Tuesday. "EG's decision not to get rezon- ing permission via the council is "If we'd been able to keep this "If we'd been able to keep this within council we really could've screwed them down to something acceptable and got a result for the "We now have to prepare for the "We now have to prepare for the BG Funds Management planning and design director Mark Syke said	TOSTRATH Vourbusines 2592010 (200 275e92010 (200 275e92010 (200 2900 (200 295e92010 (200 295e92010 (200 295e92010 (200 295e92010 (200
Alex Ward	opers of the Summer fills site have bypassed ouncil and gone to the runent for approval. ds Management has fanning Department to le proposal a major fer part 3A of the bial Planning and As- rt 1979. offs notified Ashfield	S BULS IF ESS VORTON CONTROL C MEW to Terrave Seise Ferformanne Bile & Marteing Terrave Seise Ferformanne Sile do tryourself market resarch techniques Mow to Terst an felez Sinnie do tryourself market resarch techniques How to Terst an felez Sinnie do tryourself market resarch techniques How to Create an effective web presence that will help GROW your business Brow to Terst an effective web presence Sin Sintess Jor Starr Vear Own Sintesi Business Brow to Terst an effective web presence Brow to Terst an effective web presence Brow to Terst an effective so the site of the source of the sour

٢.,

..

...

N25 . .

.

1 .

ł

ASTRUM NSW GOVERNMENT Planning & Intrastructure TAND The Department of Planning and Infrastructure June 2011 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001 Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Wills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130 I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

Traffic congestion – lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).

Scale and out of character with our village – this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.

Impact on local amenity – the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.

Limited green space – This development has limited green space, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.

Lack of genuine community consultation – despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.

Combined impact with Lewisham Towers – nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.

? D Retail impact on the Summer Hill village – the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Name:

Email:

e: Glenn Holdstock g. holdstock & bigpord.com

Copy to the Minister for Planning, Brad Hazzard and Ashfield Council



Seite 1

From:	glenn holdstock <g.holdstock@bigpond.com></g.holdstock@bigpond.com>
То:	<amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au></amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC:	Alex Lofts <the.lofts@bigpond.com></the.lofts@bigpond.com>
Date:	15/08/2011 11:27 pm
Subject:	comments on The Summer Hill Mill

Dear Ms Watson,

I acknowledge that the date for community submissions may have passed, but nevertheless, I do hope that our views and feelings can be registered to the community consultation process.

My wife and I, and family members, live in 31 Edward Street Summer Hill. We have been following the progress of the Mill redevelopment for quite some years, way back when the flour transport trucks were trundling up and down our street, when the Mill was a going concern.

We have attended meetings and consultations, and are in agreement with what seems a significant majority of locals, that thew overall scale and size of the redevelopment is too large.

There is an alarming shortage of recreational space. There is no junior sporting field, such as the nearby Darryl Jackson cricket ring. There needs to be one.

That traffic generation will be horrid, and how Edward, Smith Longport Streets and New Canterbury Road will cope with an enormous quantitative upward shift the morning grid lock, is beyond imagination. The inevitable street parking brought on by new residents and their visitors, will park out the streets around the site, weekdays and weekends.

There needs to be a lot more planning for on-site parking, clearly. The whole issue of traffic and parking may be exacerbated by the light rail (if it eventuates), but overall the light rail will be a good thing for the community. The dilemma of it all.

Our community has made submissions on these foregoing issues.

We, however, have an altogether different concern.

You see, the view from the towers, once they are residential, will look directly into our house; including bathroom, shower, toilet, main bedroom and front room, and our downstairs dining and family room. I have less anxiety about the view on to the back yard.

Some people think this amusing. Until, that is, I ask whether they would mind someone peeping in on their family members (ie their wife, mother or young children) taking a shower. I note that women take this concern more seriously than most men, for whatever reason. I also understand there are a few near neighbours with the eastern side of their home also exposed to the redevelopment, and I hope they have raise their concerns about people looking in.

Some people have suggested we put up frosted glass windows, or dark reflective covers, or curtains, or even baffles bolted at angles to the exterior wall. (Seriously !)

The point is that we do not need these additions currently, as no-one can see into our residence, and like-wise, we cannot see out to our neighbours' privacy.

The odd thing is that we have a frosted window upstairs (south side)

so as to not enable us to look into the nextdoor upstairs flat bathroom. Which is fine.

But it seems that for the Mill redevelopment, it is suggested WE install frosted glass etc so others can't see in.

Should not the planning law be applied equally, in that case ?

Why shouldn't, in that case, all west facing windows of the

development be frosted, and balconies deleted, to avoid seeing in to our privacy ?

(Oh, and please don't suggest it is a fair distance, from tower to our place, unless you too are unfamiliar with binoculars)

Can you explain this apparent planning law anomaly, please ?

Do you offer a solution ? Is there one ?

Are the developers obliged to make good this disturbing situation, which is entirely of their making.

We would welcome you or any officials to come and see for yourself the visual intrusion about to confront us, with scores, if not hundreds of new windows, all possible "Peeping Toms", on our family going about the normal things of life within the privacy of our home.

Ms Watson, human nature being what it is, I simply put it to you, would YOU feel comfortable with hundreds of windows able to perve directly and undetected, on to you and your loved ones in your bedroom, shower and toilet ?

We thank you and NSW Planning for the opportunity to report our concens.

Yours sincerely

Glenn and Dianne Holdstock 31 Edward Street SUMMER HILL NSW 2130



Fax: 9228 6455

Re: Former Allied Mills Site - 2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill

MP10_0155 – Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you to make a submission on the Former Allied Mills Site – 2-32 Smith Street Summer Hill. (MP10_0155 - Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site for the purposes of a Mixed Use Residential, Commercial and Retail development).

I am not opposed to development on that site on principle, but I am opposed to this particular development, primarily because 1 feel that buildings of eleven stories are completely inappropriate in this area of predominantly onc- and two-storey buildings.

I also note that the long-nosed bandicoot assessment dates from 2009. In the last few years there have been increased sightings of long-nosed bandicoots in the Inner West, particularly Dulwich Hill, so the report's findings of no evidence of long-nosed bandicoots may well be out of date at this point.

I don't know what plans there are for the preservation of trees on this site, but I hope that whatever development takes place preserves as many of the trees on that site as possible. This site has many large established trees, which are not that common in this immediate neighbourhood. It would be terrible if they were all chopped down at the ouset without any effort made to preserve them, simply because it was easier and cheaper for the developers.

Regards,

Ne t

Samantha Kent 3/34 Joseph Street Ashfield, NSW 2131

Fleet Summer Hill NSW GOVERNMENT Planning & Infrastructure NSW 2(30 1 2 AUG 2011 DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT AND SYSTEMS PERFORMANCE RECEIVED Ph. 9798-7283 Mob. 0404-973-011 Re Application MP10-0155 To Whom it May Boncern Please find attached my submission regarding the above project. Pardon "But I wish to protect The puctures 16-0r tox ptyn up. Both the on a the sictures ane Thomas y on Your Caitfully NSW GOVERNMENT & line for Pianning & infrastructure 1 5 AUG 2011 DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT AND SYSTEMS PERFORMANCE RECEIVED

SUBMISSION FOR APPLICATION MP10-0155. 2-32 SMITH STREET SUMMER HILL. [ALLIED MILLS SITE].

As the representatives for EG Funds pointed out at their presentation, the whole development proposed for the old Allied Mills site aims toward enhancing inter-action with the surrounding community. My submission shall be confined to this interface and to the future of the outdoor aspects of the project

The intention to make it accessible to the neighbourhood but not amenable to use by through traffic is appealing. The use of the spaces between the existing heritage buildings as small linked plazas is attractive and the relationship to the new station is interesting.¹

My proposal is about emphasising how "open space" is to be used, rather than consisting just of what's left over after the haggling. The existing horticultural heritage, such as the venue of brush box trees can be combined with understorey and ground cover native plants of local provenance. Practical uses such as outdoor laundry hanging spaces and sport areas [e.g. basketball rings] need to not only be set up in the beginning but defended afterwards. With the current love of using gardens for food production being likely to continue, the land title involved, the ongoing management and the promotion of the general culture involved also need to be explicitly laid out for these shared spaces if the scheme is not to be undermined. A positive value must be assigned to these amenities are to flourish. The allotments often seen in Northern Europe offer a good example. The owners of private gardens would be welcome to join in promotions such as ordering special consignments of plants.

As the issue of pedestrian safety has loomed large during the Light Rail survey, my proposition is that the cycle and pedestrian issues involving the area near the Longport Street Roundabout [and Old Canterbury Road] are very significant, involve many more people and will define the whole area for many years to come. The area was, in past years, one of the state's major accident black spots. The construction of the roundabout during the 1980's improved the situation and, more recently, the mature palm in the centre of the roundabout² and the pedestrian refuge on Longport Street have improved but it is still a dangerous "blind" bridge³ with traffic from many directions to be considered. There is a very strong case for providing an underpass below Longport Street building upon the work already done as part of the Greenway project.

The traffic section of the preparatory documents place an emphasis on what happens at peak hour. From the point of view of

¹ See picture 1 from Dept of Transport Environment Assessment for the light rail Ch.6

² Pictures 2 & 3.

³ Pictures 4,5,6 & 7. Note the oncoming taxi in picture 5.

SUBMISSION FOR APPLICATION MP10-0155. 2-32

SMITH STREET SUMMER HILL. [ALLIED MILLS SITE]. strollers or dog walkers, this is the easy part because the cars are waiting in an orderly line. The traffic is much less predictable on evenings and weekends. My stroll around the area was taken at leisure, on a sunny day and without any bicycles, prams or strollers, mobility problems, baggage or pets to consider. There was no fresh broken glass or new rubber marks on what is meant to be a pedestrian area on this particular day but it happens often. However, I had to watch carefully and move smartly to get across.⁴

The relationship to the area to the north of Longport Street has, in past times been derelict and considered dangerous with vandalism on an epic scale. The work already done in establishing the cycle way, the off-leash area for dogs,⁵ the planting of now mature forest trees and the more recent Cadigal Reserve plantings have made the area very much safer.

The issue of child safety is particularly important. When a family lives in an apartment, even infants can become "stir crazy" and need to be taken for a stroll. Later on, there is an interest in nature and "exploring". The ruggedness of the area fits in well with this sense of adventure. It is during this period that cognitive and risk-management skills develop.

A major problem is that the safe travelling range of older children is so limited. It is highly likely that the provision of sporting facilities within the development will be mentioned soon. The age at which youngsters can move safely from "a" to "b" determines the nature of the whole district. If the development becomes a destination or meeting place of any kind, the same thing applies.

The Turpentine Ironbark Forest community is dominated by trees with very vigorous roots which cannot be safely planted in an urban development⁶. However, both from an experiential and from a biodiversity viewpoint, the urban and the habitat aspects can be linked. Already the area houses long-nosed bandicoots, micro-bats and provides a significant staging post for bird migrations.

The steep area leading to Longport Street is very moist and can support rain forest plants.⁷ Its management is crucial to managing the hydrology of the area as a whole, as well as having great habitat and amenity potential, there is ample scope for some creative inter-action between the engineers and the biologists.

⁴ Pictures 8,9 & 10.

⁵ Picture 11.

⁶ Picture 12.

⁷ Pictures13-18.

SUBMISSION FOR APPLICATION MP10-0155. 2-32 SMITH STREET SUMMER HILL. [ALLIED MILLS SITE].

So, given the amenity and safety of the projects neighbours over an extended area and the work ready done for the Greenway, I trust that the DOPI will look favourably on any aspects of their proposals that will further promote a valuable link between hitherto separated communities.

Thanking you, Yours faithfully, Clare Felton.

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$




















Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- □ Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- □ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ **Limited greenspace** This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers** nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail

provision. 1/ Duy de Signature: / N.DRYSDALE ndrysdalenumber one dixonalive.com.ay \$/123 SMITH ST. Name: Email: Address



Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- □ Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- □ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ **Limited greenspace** This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ **Combined impact with Lewisham Towers** nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature: Name: Email: 9 Manchester St Dulwich Hill Address: NSW 2203



Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- I Lack of genuine community consultation − despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- **Retail impact on the Summer Hill village** the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail

provision. Signature: Fait Name: Faithen by a hotmand. Com Email: Address: uniner



July 2011

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT AND BY STEMS PERFORMANCE RECEIVED

1 6 AUG 2011

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10_1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- □ Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- □ Impact on local amenity the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ Limited greenspace This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Name:

Email: Maris, real griand, Zon Address: 64 did Canvertsury Road LECOSIAM 2043

NERIE, Rea.



The Department of Planning and Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Objection to the Redevelopment of the Former Allied Mills Site - MP10 1055 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill NSW 2130

I object to the above Concept Plan application on the basis of the following (as indicated):

- Traffic congestion lack of any credible plans to deal with the very substantial increase in traffic and congestion that this development will generate. It is estimated that this development and the proposed Lewisham Towers development will generate an extra 1000 cars/hour in peak hour (Independent study by Colston, Budd, Hunt & Kafes, May 2011 commissioned by Ashfield Council).
- □ Scale and out of character with our village this is a gross over-development of the Mills site and the proposed heights of the tower blocks (10-13 storeys) is completely out of character with the local one and two-storey dwellings (many of which are heritage), that are characteristic of Summer Hill and adjoining villages.
- Impact on local amenity – the addition of over 800 new residents (330 units x 2.49 people/ dwelling average in Ashfield) in this development simply cannot be accommodated by local schools, childcare and other amenities, many of which are already at capacity.
- □ **Limited greenspace** This development has limited greenspace, a concern compounded by the fact that Ashfield is already the 2nd most densely populated municipality in NSW.
- □ Lack of genuine community consultation despite 62 per cent of the Summer Hill community confirming in the developer's own survey that they wanted to be informed about this development, community consultation has been extremely limited and not at all genuine. The community's concerns are simply being ignored and overlooked.
- □ Combined impact with Lewisham Towers nobody is considering the combined impact (increased traffic, scale and design, overcrowding and loss of living amenity and negative impact of existing local businesses) of this development and the adjacent Lewisham Towers development which is part of the same McGill Street precinct.
- Retail impact on the Summer Hill village the excessive retail elements in this development will duplicate and squeeze out local small businesses in an area with already extensive retail provision.

Signature:

Name:

er ed Email: Address: CANTEREURY ND WICH tes