



23 June 2011

Dear Participant,

**Summer Hill Flour Mill Project – Final Record of Comments
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 final Record of Comments raised during the question and answer session. We advise that we received one request for amendments to be made to the draft record. These amendments have been made as requested and are identified in the text with an underline italic font. We also received a query regarding the inclusion of responses from the panel and the survey questions. This query together with our response is detailed at the end of the Record of Comments.

The final Record will now be uploaded onto the project website and will 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



FINAL

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 23 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 Precinct (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 <u>exists</u> 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 → 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 <u>flora</u> and fauna?

Additional question received by email 9 June, 2011

'Will the responses from the panel and comments from survey questions be included in the final document?'

Response issued by Urban Concepts and EG Funds Management on the 14 June, 2011 as follows:

'The final Consultation Report will include a response from the proponent to the issues raised at the Consultation Sessions and the answers to the survey questions. The consultation report will be made available on the website and will be forwarded to the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure.'

Thank you for your participation and interest in this project'.



23 June 2011

Dear Participant,

**Summer Hill Flour Mill Project – Final Record of Comments
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 Final Record of Comments raised during the question and answer session. We advise that we received 5 responses from participants incorporating both amendments and additional comments. The requests for amendments have been made and are identified in the text with an underlined italic font. The additional comments are reproduced at the end of the Record of Comments.

The final Record will now be uploaded onto 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



FINAL

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 23 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	<p>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?</p> <p><i><u>I am concerned at the extra congestion that will be added to the morning traffic peak in Smith St caused by the proposed roundabout at Edward St. This will give defacto priority to traffic leaving the Flour Mill site less than 100 meters from the severely congested roundabout at Longport St. Currently there is an excessive delay between 7.30 and 9.00 with traffic queued back towards Lackey St. The entrance of the large volume of extra traffic from the Flour Mill Site will severely hamper exit during this time for the rest of Summer Hill. This is in addition to the added congestion from the Lewisham Towers site which will worsen the morning congestion in Smith St because of its impact on Longport St.</u></i></p>
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.



	COMMENT/QUESTION
	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. <i>After asking the question twice, a guarantee was given that the development would not change.</i>
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? <u>What i recall as actually saying could probably more accurately be recorded as:</u> <u>- good to see that the proponent has seen the greenway vision as a key principle/issue for proposal</u> <u>- there are two key elements to the GreenWay: 1. active transport corridor and 2. biodiversity/wildlife movement corridor</u> <u>- the active transport corridor component is largely being addressed with the GreenWay Trail and</u>



	COMMENT/QUESTION
	<p><u>NSWTI/State government proposals</u> <u>- but great challenges remain for maintaining existing habitat and establishing new biodiversity/wildlife movement corridor, and concerned that this aspect has not been adequately dealt with as yet, in what appears will be a very urbanised future for the locality</u> <u>- concerned that Council and proponent in the Precinct plan and proposal have misunderstood the term "development should address the GreenWay", Rather than the original intended use of the term in my comments to Council to mean "development should take into account.." this appears to have been interpreted/used as "development should face onto the GreenWay" (resulting in the unacceptable imposition of new internal roads being placed alongside potential habitat sites)</u></p>
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 lose 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.
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?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

1. Additional comment received 12 June 2011 by email.

'As you are aware, I attended the consultation session on Wednesday 24 May. Because of other commitments, I was not able to stay for the entire question session and therefore did not have an opportunity to voice my concerns, but was keen to have them noted.'

In addition to those very real concerns raised by residents at the session, I would like to make some comments on the Light Rail, which, it seems, is to be the saviour for this development and that of the adjoining proposed Lewisham Towers. Most people will NOT use the Light Rail mainly because - (1) it's more expensive than City Rail; (2) it's slower than City Rail; and most importantly (3) the Light Rail terminates at Central, where people have to then change and either take a bus into the city (or wherever), or walk around to the City Rail platforms to catch another train (and pay an additional fare) to their destination in the city/eastern suburbs/north shore - in morning and afternoon peak hour people are definitely not going to do this and fight their way through hordes of people all trying to get to work. The



majority of people will either use their car, or head for either Summer Hill or Lewisham stations, and the trains coming through these stations during rush hours are already to capacity. And as openly admitted by the developers, the roads in the area are also already to capacity.

The scale and height of this development (together with the proposed adjoining Lewisham Towers project) is totally inappropriate and unsustainable for the area.

Also, why did the developers choose to hold the session at such a small venue thereby limiting the number of people who could attend and therefore not having an opportunity to voice their concerns? The Ashfield Town Hall would have been much more appropriate, allowing many more people to attend and have their voices heard.

The developers at the consultation stated that they wished to listen to what the local residents had to say - I sincerely hope that they meant this and will take on board the residents very real concerns.

Concerned Resident'

2. Additional comment received 10 June 2011 by email.

'Thank -you for your corresspondence.

These issues listed are not a true reflection of some of the points raised at the consultation sessions.

The first point raised by myself was to do with the nature of the forum itself.

I highlighted the fact that this was not actually a consultation process and that it was an information session only. Consultation occurs prior to decisions being made and concepts being decided on.

As a resident of Summer Hill I have not been consulted in any way whatsoever in regards to my thoughts on this project prior to attending this meeting.

I want this point noted as I dont want the State Govt authorities hoodwinked into thinking that "Consulation" has occurred when in fact it has not. I want this point noted in the comments please and feel a little insulted that you left it out.

Secondly, there is no mention of the point I raised in relation to the impact of the construction process on the community. We were told at the first session that it could take upto 10 years and I asked if the developers had considered the impact of the construction process to which I was told "NO" and that I had "raised a relevant point".

Could you please insert this into the list of concerns and re-circulate to everyone as this is again a critical point which you neglected to insert. I am extremely dissappointed in this process and your inability to truthfully keep minutes and subsequently report on issues raised.

Could you also please after amending the "concerns" circulate to everyone for comment and then highlight the variations to the document when you receive further feedback as I know you will based on this effort'.

3. Additional comment received 10 June 2011 by email.

'In relation to the questions/comments, why has the responses to the questions not been captured and detailed? I feel the comments and commitments given by the panel as Reponses to the questions should also form part of the public record.

As an example, my question was number 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.

After asking the question twice, a guarantee was give that the development would not change. I would like this commitment documented'.



4. Additional comment received 26 May 2011 by email.

'Yesterday afternoon we attended the consultation held by the developers who put forward their plans for the Summer Hill flour mill site.

We are two of many residents of Summer Hill who are deeply concerned about the sheer height and scale of this proposed development. If you take into consideration this development in conjunction with the connecting proposed Lewisham Towers development (and they CANNOT be viewed separately), it's clearly obvious that the area will just not be able to cope with the extra volume of traffic nor the volume of additional residents. The developers have openly admitted that the roads in the area are already to capacity so how do they expect the currently choked roads are going to cope with the additional volume of traffic?

The Light Rail, it seems, is to be the saviour in all this!! But we would like to make a few comments on this. Most people will NOT use the Light Rail mainly because - (1) it's more expensive than City Rail; (2) it's slower than City Rail; and most importantly (3) the Light Rail terminates at Central, where people have to then change and either take a bus into the city (or wherever), or walk around to the City Rail platforms to catch another train (and pay an additional fare) to their destination in the city/eastern suburbs/north shore - in morning and afternoon peak hour people are definitely not going to do this (check out the present peak hour usage of the Light Rail on week days). The majority of people will either use their car, or head for either Summer Hill or Lewisham stations, and the trains coming through during rush hours are already to capacity. On numerous occasions on our way to work in the city we have not been able to get onto a train at Summer Hill station and have had to wait until a train with some room comes in, sometimes making us late for work.

Another issue which one of the residents brought up was the total lack of space for children. Where are they expected to play? In the street, on the railway track? What about the inclusion of more PUBLIC green space, not just for proposed new residents, but for the residents already living in the area, and space for activity e.g. tennis courts, swimming pool for everybody? Wouldn't it make sense to include space like this and reduce the number of dwellings? As pointed out by a local resident at the consultation, the PUBLIC green space which the developers would make available is absolutely minimal and not be able to be used for any activities. And what about the beautiful Chinese Elm tree which grows on the corner of Edward and Smith Streets? - there was no mention of preserving this beautiful tree which must be many, many years old.

And what about the inclusion of a Community Garden? Many new developments are including such gardens - not only is this good for the environment, it would be good for the residents giving them an area for activity (not to mention saving money by being able to grow their own food!)

The developers at yesterday's consultation stated that they wished to listen to what the local residents had to say about this/these developments. We sincerely hope that they meant this and will take on board the residents very real concerns.

Concerned Residents'

5. Additional comment received 27 May 2011 by email.

'Good information session yesterday – thanks for that. A good role up and the right panel to have there. Only comments :

Matthew's presentation was comprehensive and showed solid appreciation of, and response to the site.

Even with time slipping it would have been good to take a 5 minute break at end of Part 1 – people needed to stand and move around for a moment ahead of question time (2hours in a seat is genuinely a killer for anyone) – that might have taken the edge of some of the tension around traffic. (traffic consultant probably unreasonably squeezed for time also)

I think the proposal is well thought out and am confident that with modest adjustment it will get approved.'