

Initial Submission to EG Funds Management on the Summer Hill Flour Mill Project:

Residents since 1997

Some specific issues in terms of the merit of the Concept Plan in relation to the direct impact on the residences along the Eastern side of Edward Street- (32 to 38)

Can these be resolved without the need to compromise the development?

1. Original Concept Plans submitted to both Ashfield Council and the Department of Planning under Part 3A are misleading have no real recognition of the properties along the eastern side of Edward St:

- 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 upon residences
- Page 13 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)

Possible Future development argument is not relevant, as the properties are owned by many individual residents and businesses.

All this is relevant in that the this Concept Plan (And my understanding the updated one) has a road entering the site at Wellesley St and looping behind the residences to Old Canterbury Rd. At the moment these residences are private, single or split level and have backyards and living areas that would be adversely by being surrounded by traffic on 3 Sides that can be in operation 24 Hours a Day 7 Days a week. (Further indicated below)

2. Merits of the Proposed development site in terms of Traffic and Parking Issues around residences at 32,34,26 and 38 Edward St:

- The proposed southern car park entrance/exit onto Edward St do not align with Wellesley St according to current property boundaries in accordance with the concept plan.
- The southern car park entrance/exit on Edward St have never been a regular entrance to the car park area even when the Flour Mill was in full operation. The Main Entrance has always been further north. The current gate was only an exit for the staff car

park (Built in 2003) which at a peak had about 100 Cars Maximum and was not in full operation on weekends.

- The Current large scale underground car park entrance/exit, including visitor car park would be in direct line with the kitchen, living area of 34 Edward St and also within a few metres of the master and 2nd bedrooms of 34 Edward St. This will obviously this has a significant impact on our residence and living conditions.
- The height of the road around the properties would also be an issue.
- The Main entrance was always at the Northern End of Edward Street which according to the briefing received would be a logical entry exit point for the underground car park as this is linked to drop off and pick up point for light rail and also the commercial precinct which would therefore have minimum impact on adjoining residences, including those new ones proposed.
- This would also avoid the possibility of Wellesley St being used as a “rat run” and ensure a safer entry and exit to the site to stop people trying to cross to Wellesley St across a busier Edward St.
- The shifting of the proposed terraces along Edward St to align with the current properties beside starting at 32 Edward Street could increase possible development potential by at least 1 Terrace, possibly more.
- Current Plan for Traffic loop and parking does not take into account rear boundary of the properties along the eastern side of Edward St.
- Creation of Parking at rear of our property and associated issues with this in terms of noise, privacy and security.

Obviously there are issue in terms of traffic, on street parking around the area that impact on the residences.

- Loss of Current Street parking at all times day and night.
- Insufficient visitor parking and parking for light rail.

3. The merits of the loss of amenity to residences 32-38 Edward St due to new building overshadowing/overlooking.

- North: Overlooking and overshadowing by proposed 6 Story New Structure that does not currently exist in footprint of buildings and is into main bedroom and main living areas and back yards. This Building was glossed over in the concept plan presentation on Wednesday 25/5/2011 and also not labelled in the literature provided by EG Funds Management entitled "The Awakening." What is the merit of this new building given it will have a direct impact in residences already existing? Given the size and scope of the property why place it here when the residential floor space could be made up for elsewhere? At what height will this building start? Is it 6 Stories from Street level? Given the gradient of the land this is an issue for our residence in terms of living area and back yard.
- North East: Widening of Current Silo building structures decreases direct sunlight and depending on placement of windows balconies, overlooking into main bedroom and main living areas.
- East: Widening of Current Silo building structures decreases direct sunlight and depending on placement of windows balconies, overlooking into main bedroom and main living areas.
- South east: Overlooking and overshadowing by proposed new 6 Story New Structure that does not exist in the existing buildings footprint which will again look into main bedroom and main living areas. This Building was also glossed over in the concept plan presentation on Wednesday 25/5/2011 and also not labelled in the literature provided by EG Funds Management entitled "The Awakening." What is the merit of this new building given it will have a direct impact in residences already existing? Again, given the size and scope of the property why place it here when the residential floor space could be made up for elsewhere?
- From the shadow diagram on display at the presentation on Wednesday 25/5/2011 there are some SEPP65 Sunlight issues for the residences along Edward St.
- Light Pollution from what is currently a dark site, particularly, new Street Lighting and security lighting.
- Basically there are overlooking and overshadowing problems in a U shape around the residential property and other properties in on the eastern side of Edward Street.

- According to the concept plan presentation on Wednesday 25/5/2011 the argument presented that the large scale structures would be in the centre of the site. In terms of residences not within the boundary eastern side of Edward St this may be so. The residences that actually boarder the property have not been taken into consideration in regards to this at all.
All will have a significant impact.

Once I see the new concept plan in full I am sure that I will have some other issues. I am disappointed that EG Funds Management have not engaged with the residences that are located on the boundary of the development in the concept plan stage and therefore resolve some issue before the plan progresses. I question the merit of aspects of the proposal that have clearly not taken into account the residences concerned and could easily be adjusted so as not to impact greatly.

I am for the development in principle.

In essence, I am only applying my understanding of planning principles in set down by judgements in the Land and Environment Court in regards to this.

Pafburn v North Sydney Council [2005] NSWLEC 444

Planning principle: criteria for assessing impact on neighbouring properties

The following questions are relevant to the assessment of impacts on neighbouring properties:

- How does the impact **change the amenity** of the affected property? How much **sunlight, view or privacy is lost** as well as how much is retained?
- How **necessary and/or reasonable** is the proposal causing the impact?
- How **vulnerable** to the impact is the property receiving the impact?
- Does the impact arise out of **poor design**? **Could the same amount of floor space and amenity be achieved for the proponent while reducing the impact on neighbours?**
- Does the proposal comply with the planning controls? If not, how much of the impact is due to the non-complying elements of the proposal?

Regards,

From:

Posted At: Thursday, 26 May 2011 2:28 PM

Posted To: Sydney Email

Conversation: feedback on Summer Hill Mill Site - for Matt Pullinger

Subject: feedback on Summer Hill Mill Site - for Matt Pullinger

Y'day was my first exposure to the detail of Summer Hill site, tho I was a council rep on Greenway project.

Really thorough coverage yesterday. Despite the inevitable traffic tensions, the presentation and solid comprehension of all aspects of the site was excellent.

Good to see Michael Easson there in person too.

I partly attended as I wanted to compare with the standard of work (questionable term) being done on planning, design and consultation for ex Balmain Tigers site. Development proponent is abysmal in every aspect ..right through from calling the development "Rozelle Village" to appalling presentations by so called specialists in their team.

For Summer Hill Mill site, with Superannuation funds management being the key financing component I would think there is a case for providing a solid 'key workers' housing allocation (the nurses-police-fireman argument), but tying one-car per dwelling to those dwelling numbers, thereby trimming back on Ashfield's over-generous rates (in the modern era). No doubt some challenges to write that sort of administration into legalese – but what an opportunity and EG could claim some leadership there if they chose to.

Apart from the parking allocation being still a little high I reckon, every other aspect of design is on the money

Am sure it will get through as it really looks like quality.

You would cringe at the debasement of planning and architecture that the Rozelle community is being served up for the old Tigers site

Best wishes with next stages

Regards

Sustainability Consultant

From:
Date: 27 May 2011 3:16:49 PM AEST
To: Mark Syke <msyke@egfunds.com>
Subject: **Objections to the development**

I was unable to attend the community consultation sessions this week but I have strong objections to this development on the basis of both the number and height of the proposed residential buildings, and the severe effect on the local traffic situation that will result from bringing so many extra residents into the area. I realise that the existing silos already create a high rise effect, and I think it is reasonable to redevelop those into apartments, but to build further multilevel apartment blocks will create excess in terms of population density. Together with the proposed development of the nearby industrial precinct, which also proposes high rise apartment blocks, the area will become like Chatswood and Bondi Junction, which I and many other long-standing inner west residents DO NOT want. Despite the light rail being extended to Dulwich Hill, these developments will bring a huge increase in the number of cars on the inner west roads, which already cannot cope with the volume of traffic at most times of the day and early evening. People will still use their cars, as the light rail does not go everywhere they need to go.

I will try to attend further consultation sessions but I would appreciate these views being carefully considered, as I am sure they are held by many other local residents.

30/05/2011

Rosemarie Sheppard

From: GreenWay Coordinator: .
Sent: Thursday, 26 May 2011 1:19 PM
To: information@summerhillflourmillproject.com.au; Mark Syke
Cc:
Subject: The GreenWay and the Summer Hill flour mill development

Dear Mark

Thank you for talking to me this morning regarding the Summer Hill Flour Mill development. Your proposed development has significant frontage to the GreenWay Corridor containing the Inner West light rail, GreenWay Trail and the GreenWay biodiversity corridor, all of which is due to be completed by the Department of Transport in late 2012. The GreenWay corridor will open up a host of new transport and lifestyle opportunities in the region. The GreenWay connects two other iconic Sydney paths: the Bay Run path and the Cooks River path, and it will equally enhance the livability of the communities that it passes through. Once this development is complete it is highly likely that the land will be handed to the Councils to be managed as the GreenWay Corridor. We are currently holding community consultation around future governance so that we can have a management entity in place by completion of the asset which embraces the community and council partnership of the GreenWay.

The GreenWay Steering Committee is the strategic decision making committee that is guided by the GreenWay Vision and the GreenWay Master Plan and Coordination Strategy, which was adopted by all 4 GreenWay Councils in 2009. The Committee has representatives at a Councillor and staff level from all 4 councils, representatives from the Friends of the GreenWay, Inner West Environment Group, ASHBUG and 4 elected community representatives. It is essential that the GreenWay Master Plan and Coordination Strategy, the GreenWay Revegetation and Bushcare and Plan and the current Department of Transport Plans are fully considered at the earliest planning stages for this development. The GreenWay Sustainability Project is a \$1.83 million, grant funded project undertaking a fantastic range of projects within the corridor including developing a future governance model with Macquarie University for the GreenWay asset.

The relationship of the Flour Mill development to the Lewisham Estate development and how both these sites interact with the GreenWay and light rail need to be fully considered. The values of the GreenWay need to be enhanced by developments and not compromised by them. Likewise the GreenWay trail and biodiversity corridor will offer unique benefits for any new residents in a Flour Mill development. It will be a significant positive selling point.

My colleague Lauren McIver and myself look forward to meeting with you to discuss the proposal for the Summer Hill Flour Mill site at a mutually acceptable time. To find out more about the GreenWay and its stakeholder please visit our website at www.greenway.org.au. You can also register to receive GreenWay News: a monthly round-up of news and events in the GreenWay catchment that is sent to over 1000 local residents.



From:
Date: 22 May 2011 9:08:57 PM AEST
To: Mark Syke <msyke@egfunds.com>
Subject: Information Night - Summer Hill Flour Mills

To whom it may concern,

I write with regard to your advertisement in the recent Inner West Courier inviting local residents to an information night about the proposed development at the Summer Hill Flour Mills site.

I am unfortunately unable to attend the meeting as I will be in Perth on business, however I wish to register my significant interest in hearing more about the development - as a concerned resident, homeowner and local of Summer Hill for the last 10+ years.

I am assuming that a presentation will be made to people attending the meeting, and I would be grateful if you could please send me a copy of the presentation, together with the minutes of the meeting (via email).

Firstly, I would like to make it clear that I think it is a positive step that the old Flour Mills site is being developed, It is a lovely historic site and I think (if done the right way) development of the site will add to the charm and quality of what is one of the nicest areas to live in Sydney.

However, I am gravely concerned over the scale and size of the proposed development and the impact that the enormous increase in residents and cars in what is a very small geographical area will have on our local shops, services, roads, open spaces, childcare facilities and schools.

I am deeply concerned that the development does not bring any new real essential services to the area, and therefore will only cripple our already 'at capacity' local facilities. The intention to develop the site with a number of 10+ storey high rise buildings in a suburb that has only low to mid level buildings, seems totally incongruent to retaining the integrity and character of the historic site and the heritage standing of the suburb.

23/05/2011

Due to the narrowing of the roads around the train line and the era of the street layout, it is already a very high traffic area. I drive to my workplace in Rosebery and it can regularly take me up to 45mins to reach Petersham in the morning peak - a distance of less than 2kms.

I can see nothing in the proposed development that takes responsibility for a solution to this extremely significant issue. How do you propose to manage the massive increase in road traffic to the area, with the significant increase in residents?

Our children are 2 and 6 years old. There is currently no childcare facility in Summer Hill for children under 3 years old and for both of our children, I had my name on waiting lists at Childcare centres in surrounding suburbs before we had even told family of my pregnancy!

The only long day care option for pre-school aged (3+) children is the Summer Hill Childrens Centre. My 6 year old son was lucky enough to get a spot there - however I had my name on the list there from 6 weeks pregnant - and as it was, we were still unable to get a full time place for him. Where do you suggest the new residents of the development will be able to get childcare for their children?

Our son now attends Summer Hill Primary School and it too, is at maximum capacity levels. They are already unable to take children who live in the immediate vicinity just outside of the current catchment, and the Flour Mills development falls into the catchment for the school, yet no consideration has been given for how these new resident children will be accommodated into existing facilities.

The residents of Summer Hill are predominantly middle income professional people, many with young children, the current proposed development seems to completely disregard the services required for these kind of families - namely - childcare, open space, recreational facilities and schools.

I am significantly concerned over the lack of foresight and sustainability that the current proposed development offers, and I look forward to receiving more information from you after the information night, on how you intend to manage the many significant challenges that the current development raises.

Kind Regards

From: .
Sent: Sunday, 29 May 2011 12:32 PM
To: Mark Syke
Subject: f

Dear EG Funds Management,

I passed my card onto Michael Easson (at his request) at the Community Consultation meeting on Wednesday 25th May at the Artists Exhibition Centre and was informed that someone would be in contact.

I have a list of issues that are significant in terms of the concept plan and the development (which I support in principle!) and would like to be consulted before you proceed to the full design stage as some of my concerns, from my reading of Planning Laws and Land and Environment Court Case Law would need to be addressed and may be better addressed now before design/plans keep proceeding.
(Save me and yourselves time and money)

I would also like access to the new concept plan which incorporates the Solar Study as mine is one of the residences that the development fails to meet SEPP guidelines on.

30/05/2011

From:

Sent: Thursday, 23 June 2011 7:06 PM

To: Rosemarie Sheppard

Subject: Re: Summer Hill Flour Mill Project 7-9pm

Thanks Rosemarie

I didnt respond to the comments as Ive been on holidays. I am sympathetic to views of residents who are adjacent but they bought next to an industrial site. It was never going to become green space. I think that the overall plan is good and will provide considerable amenity and the access to the Greenway is a real plus. I dont see why the developer should be responsible for the local school being full!

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 4:49 PM, Rosemarie Sheppard <rosemarie@urbanconcepts.net.au> wrote:

Dear Participant,

Please see attached final Record of Comments for the Summer Hill Flour Mill Project.

Kind regards

Rosemarie Sheppard
Executive Assistant
Urban Concepts
Level 8, 15 Blue Street
North Sydney NSW 2060
PO Box 1554, North Sydney NSW 2059
Tel: 02-9964 9655
Fax: 02-9964 9055

Attention:

This is an e-mail from Urban Concepts. This e-mail is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient please delete the message and notify its sender. No-one else may read, print, store or copy this message or its attachments. This is a private communication and is not intended for public circulation or for the use of any third party, without the prior approval of Urban Concepts.

It is the receiver's duty to scan all messages and attachments before downloading them onto any computer system. Urban Concepts does not accept responsibility for any virus, defect or error.

27/06/2011

8 July 2011

Major Projects Assessment,
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39,
SYDNEY, NSW 2001

Attention: Director, Metropolitan & Regional Projects South

Sent via email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sir,

RE: The Former Allied Mills Site – 2-32 Smith Street, Summer Hill
Application No MP10_0155

As invited I submit this correspondence to register my support for the proposed redevelopment of the above site into the proposal as currently lodged by the Proponent, EG Funds Management.

I, along with my family am residents of Summer Hill and have been since 1990. We well remember the former industrial use of the site by Allied Mills and look forward to the proposed re-use of the site to a predominately residential function. We currently live in Wellesley Street and have seen the dynamic changes the occur in a vibrant living community such as that in Summer Hill and while some may argue that such changes as proposed would be detrimental, we hold the view that in time Suburbs adapt to new circumstances and find their own balance to maintain harmony between the different uses and interests of their Community.

When the Proponent first proposed their redevelopment of the Allied Mills Site, I and my wife were excited by the prospect afforded to us in an adaptive re-use of an otherwise unfriendly industrial site. The proposed change from an industrial application into a residential community capitalised upon the existing structures as well as introduced additional dwellings, green open spaces and attracted a light rail stop and thus resulted in a Proposal that has character, atmosphere, facilities and an ambiance sympathetic to its historical past while still relating to the needs of a modern development.

I have viewed the current plans presented to the Community by the Proponent at their information evenings and we believe that the proposed Development will provide a unique opportunity to reside in a residential development that will support its own community atmosphere and will have a style and character that cannot easily be achieved or recreated from a blank canvas. There are only a handful of examples in Sydney where such industrial sites have been redeveloped into a residential activity and retain such significant amounts of the existing fabric. Indeed there are many that have removed all significant traces of their former life and often have left merely a cheap, token acknowledgement of their former life and function. The fact that the Proponent has chosen to retain so much of the existing features and integrate them into the fabric of their Development is a credit to the design team's commitment to architectural style and demonstrates their professionalism.

Were this development to ultimately fail to proceed there is a real concern that some other form of permissible industrial activity could resume on the site along with it's associated industrial noise, truck movements and the potential to detract from the benefits and success of the light rail stop currently about to commence construction at the location to serve the extension from Lilyfield to Dulwich Hill.

We whole heartedly support the Development and recommend the approval sought by the Proponent for this site.

Please contact the undersigned should you require further details.

Yours faithfully,