



23 June 2011

Dear Participant,

**Summer Hill Flour Mill Project – Final Record of Comments
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 final Record of Comments raised during the question and answer session. We advise that we received two requests to amend the draft record and these amendments have been made. The amended text is indicated in underlined italic font.

The final Record will 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



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 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.



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 difference 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>I see traffic as the major concern of this development.</i> I support 'car sharing 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. I don't accept argument that heavy rail is at full capacity. <u><i>There is also a need to demonstrate greater community benefit by including childcare, more active open space, affordable housing etc.</i></u> 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 rationale for buildings being taller on the northern side?



	COMMENT/QUESTION
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/McGill 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 Committee'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 written 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 acknowledge 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.

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. 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 discuss ideas further with you and the Flour Mill consulting team, if it is of interest."