



SUMMER HILL - One off street addresses

Fourteen (14) comment sheets were completed by residents.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing industrial site to mixed use urban precinct. • Existing buildings, retain views into and out. Opening up pedestrian and bike connectivity to Greenway. • Public space, greenway, park. • The nature it has is a cross grounds. • Unique architectural characteristics and space. • The trees and open space and heritage of the site. • Its present open space and large Elm tree on the corner of Edward and Smith Street. • Historical value, minimum traffic impact, industrial architecture, quietness, current open space and large trees. • Its green areas (including beautiful old tree in front) and lovely old industrial red brick buildings. • Is undeveloped nature. • Retaining the original main mill buildings. Open space around it. • Its sustainability features. Retaining green spaces. • Open space within a densely populated area. Heritage buildings (especially Mungo Scott).
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on local road traffic. 2. Impact on existing amenities. 3. Impact on primary schools. 4. Impact on childcare. 5. Untenable when combined with McGill Street development. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inappropriate scales of building. 2. Inappropriate scale of public space. 3. Need community facilities inc. 4. Authenticity this engagement with local needs and community. 5. Concern over homogenous design. 6. Traffic problems. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scale of development. 2. Overshadowing/light issues. 3. Traffic. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potential for openness. 2. Potential for interaction. 3. Relationship with Greenway? 4. Critical route for fauna. 5. Rugged architecture. 6. Water sensitive urban design. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Density and scale.



	Question	Comment
		<p>2. Integration with McGill precinct (plus combined impact)</p> <p>3. Traffic (already stressed)</p> <p>4. Sufficient public space.</p> <p>5. How it may impact on local community and local shopping precinct.</p> <p>6. Presentation of unique architectural aspects.</p> <p>7. More car parking.</p> <p>1. Extra traffic in area.</p> <p>2. Extra people in area particularly on transport.</p> <p>3. Loss of parking on surrounding streets.</p> <p>1. Increase in traffic.</p> <p>2. Overcrowding.</p> <p>3. Far too high.</p> <p>4. Too many units.</p> <p>5. Not enough green space.</p> <p>6. Infrastructure cannot cope with increase in residents.</p> <p>7. Where is car parking for proposed residents?</p> <p>1. Excessive height.</p> <p>2. Lack of open space.</p> <p>3. Increased traffic.</p> <p>4. Lack of road planning in and out of Summer Hill.</p> <p>5. High increase in population.</p> <p>6. The ugliness of proposed building.</p> <p>7. Lack of community facilities.</p> <p>8. Destruction of Summer Hill Village atmosphere.</p> <p>1. Traffic congestion.</p> <p>2. Concerned about its shops affecting our shopping centre in a detrimental way.</p> <p>3. Impact on schools, etc.</p> <p>1. Traffic impact.</p> <p>2. Density.</p> <p>3. Sustainability (size and impact).</p> <p>4. Environmental sustainability.</p> <p>5. Community impact by high increase in residents.</p> <p>6. Amenities to support increase in population.</p> <p>7. Open space.</p> <p>8. Sympathetic development.</p> <p>1. Inability to get out in peak hours.</p> <p>1. Traffic.</p> <p>2. Too high.</p> <p>1. Increase in population.</p> <p>2. Increase in traffic.</p> <p>3. Affect on local businesses.</p> <p>4. Parking problems.</p> <p>5. 'Project site' is too big – overdeveloped.</p> <p>6. Don't like large buildings being developed.</p> <p>7. How can local schools/pre schools cope with increase in population?</p>



	Question	Comment
		<p>8. New streets add to traffic congestion.</p> <p>1. TRAFFIC!!</p> <p>2. Over development of the site; in particular, in conjunction with the planned Lewisham Towers Site.</p> <p>3. Strain on local infrastructure.</p> <p>4. Strain on local schools.</p> <p>5. Possible damage to Summer Hill shops and loss of its character.</p>
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – sensible to utilise existing structures. Compliments existing scale of surrounding development on periphery, but 10 storey buildings at Longport Street end will have high visual impact! • No – would prefer highest buildings below dado of Mills building and more dense intense fabric at lower level with smaller scale public spaces. • Yes – but directly across from my house is a four storey building. • Yes – 3 storey walk ups are the worst of all worlds. • Yes – to a degree. 10 storey apartments sounds very large (too large) • Yes – minimises overshadowing. • Definitely not! This development is far too high and too many units. Not nearly enough community area. • The 'higher buildings' are 'too' high. All buildings should be no higher than original buildings. • No – while I like the concepts of the renewing the silos, Mungo Scott building etc. I regret the buildings on Edward Street and the 10 storey block on corner of Smith and Longport. • No. The higher buildings are 10 storeys high which is inconsistent with the local area. The size and density is not sustainable in Summer Hill. There is not enough open space on services on site to adequately support the population. • Higher buildings = 13 storey, 10 storey, 9 storey is overdevelopment stepping down o 2-3 for a few dwelling is better that it could be. • Do <u>NOT</u> agree with making the silos higher but <u>do</u> like the general stepping-down approach. • Yes, but I don't want so many houses and certainly don't approve of large multi-storey buildings in middle. 4-6 storeys, 10 storeys??? • Yes, it is a sensible use of the space. The 10-storey and adjoining buildings at the far north of the site are an eyesore and seemingly not in keeping with the rest of the concept.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – responsible approach to development in line with current thinking and vision to the future. • Yes – not at form shown. Would prefer higher development on towers and reduced scale



	Question	Comment
	sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<p>surrounding to preserve views and significance of mill to site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • Yes. The wooden silo timbers could be used for an inter-active physical area for young people. • Yes. Provided the development is sympathetic and not crowded and overdevelopment. • Yes – recycle and re-use are good concepts. • Agree with silos and historic building being preserved but no more buildings should be erected. • Yes – if silos and historic buildings are faithful to heritage of Summer Hill. • Yes. • Yes. • Yes. • Yes, except for those <u>ugly</u> additional 3 levels on the top silo and those outside stairs looking like 'fire exits'! • No. We don't need the increased population/traffic issues. • It is a good idea, though they should not be increased in height (silos). Also, avoid putting too many people/residents in there as it shouldn't be a high-rise ghetto.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – but 10 storey development from Longport Street into the site will be overwhelming. • Concerned about large scale expanse of greenway. • I guess so. • Yes. Provided there is plenty of ongoing detailed consultation. • It does support it but not to its best advantage given the density of the buildings bordering on the tram line. • Yes. • No. Not many people will use the Light Rail. It terminates at Central - most people want to go into the CBD. • No! The huge increase in population will negatively impact on Greenway corridor, Light Rail is great for the area. • Yes – although the light rail seems to be of limited use as a transport mode. • Yes. • Makes no difference. • Yes, generally. • We need the 'Greenway' because Ashfield/Summer Hill are so population dense – so increasing houses/traffic is not helping. 8-10 storey buildings along Greenway?? • The historic buildings do, to a certain extent. The high-rise at the north of the site don't as they will tower over the Greenway, casting it in shadow



	Question	Comment
		and definitely not enhancing the bucolic nature intended with the Greenway.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. The proposed development could have been much worse. It respects important heritage aspects of the site. • No. Worried it does not respond 'authentically' to local fabric structure order of green public space. • No. Too dense. • Yes. • To a degree. It's not a simple yes or no. Clearly the site will benefit from redevelopment. It is the scale and density of the development which is the concern. • Yes. • No. Too large and high. • No. Too high, ugly buildings, population growth will be too high and roads will not cope with increased traffic. • I liked many of the architect's ideas, though wish it was of lesser density. Worry about it becoming a historical-industrial pastiche in newer buildings. • No. The density of the development is too high – the design of 10 storeys is inconsistent and does not provide adequate open space or services. • No. The traffic congestion will be unsustainable it already takes 30 mins to negotiate the crossing of the railway line between 8.00 and 9.00. • No. See other comments. • No. We don't want 10 storey buildings in a village suburb. They're not needed. • No. Too many people and the traffic it will generate. Similarly, the buildings on the north corner are totally out of place and contrary to the stated aims of sensitive use of the site's existing buildings and character.
2.5	<p>Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I haven't looked at details of living on the site. I expect issues of noise/overlooking etc. have been considered. • Yes, see above. Prefer more dense fabric smaller scale public spaces that respond to broader Summer Hill public space hierarchy. Consider incorporating alternate uses/building types rather than high rise response. • The right density of development in the local community. • No. • Not enough community open space. • Green space, the lack of road structure and traffic control. The village nature of Summer Hill. • What to do about vehicles, traffic etc. • Yes. It does not recognise the ability of the community to support such a massive increase in population. The proposal will overdevelop the site when considered in conjunction with the McGill Street Precinct the impact will be



	Question	Comment
		<p>massive. Not enough open space. Too many apartments. Not enough services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed roundabout in Smith Street will make the situation for the rest of Summer Hill much worse because it will effectively give residents of the new development priority of access to the roundabout at Longport Street. Car parking – 300 residences and only 300-400 car park spaces. Where will extra cars go? Most families have 2 cars? People <u>don't</u> use public transport enough. Traffic impact seems to be under estimated. The 'at capacity' state of local roads and intersections, heavy rail, buses and other public transit is not properly addressed, especially if the majority of people living there will use public transport to get to work, as was anticipated by the plan.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No! Too little thought given to higher private vehicle use than anticipated. Bus and trains are over crowded during peaks. Is there Government commitment for additional services e.g. City – Ashfield Shuttle. What about impact on local Primary Schools. No. They remain. They still remain. They have addressed them but not answered the issues. Yes. In a superficial manner. Development of more green space. My concerns about traffic have increased since it seems that the developer has failed to address it and instead 'hopes' its residents will not use a car. Yes. The information presented confirms these concerns – the traffic impact is unsustainable. Not at all. Frankly, the statement that residents will not notice an extra 1,000 cars was insulting. They still remain somewhat, particularly increase in cars. Your traffic studies are very light. SHAG studies showed much heavier use. It addressed them, but did not satisfactorily answer them. Many points were left up in the air and we can only speculate on the eventual outcome.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm disappointed in the proposed 10 storey development at Longport Street. I think it detracts from the overall proposal. Yes, listed at 1.2. It looks like I won't be able to turn right out of my property as you are putting in a road partition. Still have the density, scale and impact on local community issues. No.



	Question	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of visitor car parking spaces. More on traffic flow and its impact on air pollution. Community development e.g. schools. • Yes – how will the impact of this development be considered in conjunction with the McGill Street development. • Traffic is more than enough. • See 2.6C. • As mentioned earlier, the seemingly over-sized buildings on the north corner of the site mar many of the positive design aspects pertaining to the heritage buildings.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally favourable but what will it be like to live there? C.f. Public housing developments of similar scale! • A redevelopment of the site generally I support. • Taller in centre. Re-use. Green and public access. • Preservation of buildings. Link to Greenway and light rail. • Retention of heritage structures and mature trees. • A more moderate housing development of this industrial site has merit. Light rail access. • I think the overall concept is terrific and look forward to it. However, I don't know how they will deal with traffic and think the density needs to be reduced to go some way towards minimising the congestion problems – which are great. • Maintenance of the heritage buildings. • Lower rise development aspects. • I like it <u>except</u> for the additional levels on the silos and the traffic issues are very serious. • Impressive plan/most issues seem to have been considered. Green space, retaining silos and heritage points. Sustainability – is all well done but previous issues remain. • The seemingly sensitive use of the existing heritage buildings, the recycling of many of the existing materials and the open green space.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All presenters were very good and responded well to questions. I'll keep up to date through the website. • Social impact study/statement. • How does the McGill Precinct Project compliment this project? No decision should be made without judging both projects combined.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you get commitment from City Rail/Sydney Buses for increased services or more starting from Ashfield? • I'm not convinced that the developer/Local Council comprehend the impact of car usage/parking by residents and visitors on local roads.



	Question	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'm trying to dispel the suspicion that this was a cynical exercise in community consultation given the choice of midweek (rather/or as well as a Saturday session) <u>and</u> on State of Origin night! • N.B. Race goers at Carter Bay will be important users of the light rail. • <u>1.</u> I would like to be able to access the light rail stop <u>during</u> the construction of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site. <u>2.</u> Is consideration being given to affordable housing in this development? <u>3.</u> Both SHFM site and McGill Street sites and their impacts need to be considered together. • The size of this development is my main concern, together with the increase in traffic it will bring. There is no way this development in its proposed size is acceptable to the residents of Summer Hill. If the size was scaled down considerably residents would be much more accepting. The roads in the area are already to capacity (a fact acknowledged by the developers). What will happen to the beautiful large Chinese Elm tree on the corner of Edward and Smith Streets??? There's been <u>not</u> enough consideration of the proposed adjoining development making this whole area totally overcrowded. Lewisham Towers is so far away from Marrickville they don't understand its impact in Summer Hill. Suggest you consider a community garden area. • Increased population travel needs will not be met by bus or current train systems. Consider safety of light rail passage e.g. residents and children. • The silos are a beautiful landmark and I appreciate the care which seems to be being taken in preserving much of what is great about them. I was relieved to hear that the shopping area is no threat to our existing shopping area. I believe the developer needs to address more seriously the major traffic problems, which are already very difficult to deal with (peak hour bottlenecks etc) without the silo and McGill development. It's a local resident reliant on on-street parking, we already have great difficulty finding a park because of commuters from other areas parking in our streets to use the train. Concerned that this will be a problem with light rail users also. • The development of this site for residential use is an appropriate use of the site. However, the scale and size of the proposed development is not sustainable and will have a significantly negative impact on the local community. The density is too high and the local roads cannot sustain the predicted 1,000 cars per hour (Caulston Traffic Study 2011). There is not adequate open space to support the increased population. What about the services – schools,



	Question	Comment
		<p>childcare services, doctors? Where is the parking? Will there be adequate visitors parking?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The continual reference to the amount of traffic on an industrial site bears no relationship to the resident's experience of the amount of traffic generated. The assertion that the developer is 'planning' for 60% public transport useage is laughable. What was meant was that is what is imagined as a way of getting through the consultation process. The developers have no way of doing this unless they forgot the extra revenue of all those 'resting' not moving cars. I consider it '<u>delusional</u>' that you think the bulk of the residents will use public transport. Many need to go 'across country' by car. I've lived here for over 20 years and work in Annandale, about 5kms away. It used to take me about 30 mins by car to get to work in peak traffic with about 15 mins spent stuck in traffic along Trafalgar Street. I ended up changing my starting time to 10am (instead of 9am) to reduce the time I spent in traffic. All the new residents WILL make the traffic and congestion problems even worse than they are at present (which is terrible!) Increased traffic and its effect on the local area is a major concern. With the area already at maximum capacity around the peak hours, it would be horrifying to think that the increased number of people on the site could make this be something that happens for even more of the day. On top of that, one can only imagine how the gridlocked peaks would be affected. Also, why the need for such a large development at the north of the site? It is out of keeping with the positive ideas incorporated into the use of the historic buildings on the site. It also would be an eyesore at the gateway to our lovely suburb: 'Welcome to Summer Hill – cop an eyeful of this big ugly building'! Hopefully the design will be amended to modify this, thus enhancing the many positives inherent in the Concept Plan.

Carrington Street, Summer Hill

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents of Carrington Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The retention of the Mungo Scott (brick) building, the avenue of brush box trees and the cross green link from Smith Street (via McGill Street lands) to Old Canterbury Road. Keeping the Mungo Scott building. Parking under ground.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and access Retail floor space



	Question	Comment
	main issues? List in order of priority.	<p>3. Adequacy of open space 4. Height of buildings (to Edward Street) 5. Extending height of silos 6. Sufficiency of on-site parking 7. Public/private access</p> <p>1. TRAFFIC. 2. Rail network will not cope with additional level of passengers. 3. Parking – will push into nearby streets. 4. May only build on 36% BUT you're going up. 5. School Catchment – constrained already. 6. Childcare facilities. 7. Changing the nature of our community. 8. DEVELOPMENT of this scale.</p>
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is needed is a genuine 2 storey (not high pitched roofs with 'attic' level) to Edward Street, being terrace or semidetached with min 6 metre setback to street. If you didn't there would be MORE shadow. Is the proposed shadow in line with recommendations. Just because the current towers are there at their current height as an industrial zone, this is a residential area where this scale of development is NOT in keeping.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As far as the Mungo Scott building goes, for commercial in the main. The silos should be residential. I can see <u>no</u> need for retail floor space. Silo height allowed for industrial reasons and the fact it is an industrial zone. A residential structure with these heights is not in keeping. Question some of the social/historical relevant of keeping all the silos. Concrete silos only erected in the 1970's.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cross-site linkage Smith/McGill Street lands/Old Canterbury Road is good. But the site needs more open space – the light rail corridor is <u>not</u> 'green' space.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – If traffic generation uses can be removed/reduced i.e. retail and excessive commercial. 100% residential would support/revitalise Summer Hill Village and Lewisham shops.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing the height of the silo structures is not warranted – it detracts from the significance of those silo structures in themselves. Taking advantage of the 'height' of add on features of the silos to put in extra dwellings.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A project application for Site 1 has also been submitted under Part 3A – more detail is necessary for this as it is effectively a DA plan.



	Question	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1.</u> The capacity of the bus and rail services to meet expected demand. <u>2.</u> The new Old Canterbury Road (bridge abutment) access → the safety is questionable. What does the RTA think? (as Old Canterbury Road is a SM Road) <u>3.</u> Filtering via local streets (viz Wellesley, Carrington, Spencer) and the increased aggravation of queuing traffic in Smith and Carlton Streets. Not sure if I believe all the 'traffic' findings.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believe a residential development is appropriate for the site but not on the current scale.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Area Traffic Management in this precinct. Expected pressure on schools, childcare facilities.

Dover Street, Summer Hill

Three (3) comment sheets were completed by residents of Dover Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The green space, the potential to open the site to the community, creative re-use of existing historic buildings. Potential green space; proximity to public transport; the iconic main silo as a feature of the local landscape; the potential community use of currently closed off space. Light rail – need more stops.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Restoration. Re-use. Access. Connection to existing community. Use of green space. Amenity. Traffic control. Divorce from the Lewisham Towers. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Respect for the existing structures. Consideration of open space. Community availability. Public transport availability (light rail). Diversity of residential pricing. Traffic control. Green space. Retail opportunities. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Transport. Cars. Too many units.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – also reference to the 'envelope' of the existing development. The stepping down is sensible and in keeping



	Question	Comment
	height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	with the scale of the area.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – especially if for example the Mungo Scott building references its heritage with perhaps displays or a working bakery. • Yes – it's important to maintain and redevelop historic buildings, rather than demolishing them or letting them stand empty.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – a consideration will be the time tabling of the light rail which is woeful at present. • I think it's key to develop a sense of life and movement adjacent to the light rail and greenway. Lack of community interface will leave the area open to stagnation and disrepair. • Yes.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – especially water recycling and solar. Two thumbs. • Yes – the concept plan incorporates new residential, retail and commercial spaces into a currently under utilised zone. • Yes.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use – look to Davis, California re useable plantings etc. like fruit trees. • More emphasis should be placed on community <u>usage</u> of open space. • No.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partly. • Some. I'm still unclear on the mix of availabilities of residential areas. • Will Bus services be altered?
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of metals – asbestos etc. and thorough documentation of the existing and historic use. • More community use space – sporting areas, picnic grounds etc. is needed.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am an ardent supporter of the concept – the detail is important to me. • Re-use and redevelopment of historical spaces; influx of new residential and commercial opportunities to the area.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Especially services for the aged and community groups.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see the removal of the extra storeys from the height of the silos. The bulk is in appropriate. I am also concerned that 10 storeys on Smith will impair the view to St Andrews spire from the city – the rail and elsewhere as one enters Summer Hill. That spire is an icon!!



Edward Street, Summer Hill

Four (4) comment sheets were completed by residents of Edward Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact they are empty and quiet and no trucks entering or exiting. Keen for the urban renewal. Redevelopment of site → industrial to residential. 'New' public access to more space. Open space is valuable. Not over development due to economic/commercial reasons. Heritage, flora and fauna. Camphor laurel trees. Privacy.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Over crowded shopping and parking at Summer Hill Village. Height. Density of buildings. Height at Edward Street. Overshadowing with extra floors. Tunnel effect of Edward Street. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overlooking/overshadowing. Parking/ Car park <u>impact</u>. Traffic / urban <u>noise</u>. Light pollution. <p>All quite equal concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Height of buildings. Crowding/congestion. Transport issues. Summer Hill Village – already very busy. Our home! – in the shadows. On some plans – our home's not there! Noise. Security of our home – road at side/back. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No direct consultation with us and 3 other land owners on eastern side of Edward Street. Significant loss of privacy to our property. Significant overshadowing to our property. 24/7 roadway at rear of our property. Extreme traffic congestion Edward Street. Loss of on street parking for residents. Noise, dust etc while construction taking place. Disturbance to our lives and amenities.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. Most of Edward Street is one storey with space between structures. Sense of openness. No. Because the Concept Plan does not take into consideration the residences that actually border the site. Too high in Summer Hill environment. Tall (silos) buildings (seem to have extra height planned?) over shadowing existing buildings – Residential issues adds new issue (privacy) Absolutely not. How can you increase the height



	Question	Comment
		on 4 stack silo with no consideration of our property directly underneath. Overshadowing, lack of privacy.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not oppose some development. I oppose the height and density – bring height down. I oppose the possibility of Summer Hill Village. Yes, but not new high rise (4-6 storey) buildings in the footprint. Yes. If designed effectively/sympathetically appropriately. Not packing in lots of other residences. I do not support the dual use for the building.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to be easy access to light rail and greenway to public. Some of the public spaces do but some issues with parking. Greenway – very narrow!? Exciting concept – link to Cooks River/Bay great.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. Too high at Silos and tunnel effect in Edward Street. Edward Street is mainly 1 storey. No. Because of issues already stated. Overshadow/Overlook/Traffic, noise issues/Parking/as a resident the Concept Plan is deceptive. No – not entirely. Reservations – inconsistent/plans/maps have been produced. No. it is an over development for the site and community of Summer Hill.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ashfield area one of highest densities area in Sydney. Not enough open space as it is this only adds to the number of people and cars. Yes. Residences on Edward Street that border the Flour Mill Site. No recognition whatsoever. Local homes which back onto enormous silos – privacy? To be residential rather than original use. Yes. No consideration given to land owners on southern side of Edward Street, design of roadway at rear of these premises, overshadowing of property, loss of privacy.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, a lot of assumption made on people using public transport. Did not address extra children at local schools. Information so far inconsistent so very wary! No. didn't even touch upon it. It was a good PR exercise only.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density, traffic, height. Extra children and Summer Hill shops, parking issues. People driving into Summer Hill and parking in local streets. Yes. Concept Plan/Certain Buildings. We are now more determined to fight for our privacy, be directly involved in consultation.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to go onto site and access the light rail. Silos/Green spaces – 2 storey (not 3 storey)



	Question	Comment
	support?	terraces on Edward Street. New large building outside the current footprint. Car park entrance and exit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space. Public use of land. Industrial → residential ✓✓ Development of the northern end of site only.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome of meetings and questions and that our voice is heard. Extra buildings outside current footprint of buildings and heights. Car park entrance and exits. What are the exact plans for land owners on southern side of Edward Street?
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guys, I am for the development but really want to make sure that my residence (which clearly will have major issues with the development) has the clear concern listened too and therefore some changes take place in design. Regards. N.B. Planning principles assessing impact on neighbouring properties must be applied. Note: Patburn v NS Council (2005) NSWLFC444 and other LEC cases. New road behind properties on southern side of Edward Street will directly affect existing residents yet other new road proposed have been planned so they will not affect residents of the site.

Grosvenor Crescent, Summer Hill

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents of Grosvenor Crescent.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage. Mungo Scott buildings, trees, silos.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic. Heritage. Too much high rise. Traffic. Not enough green space. Lack of services for increased population. Design not fitting with architectural heritage. Affect on local habitat of existing fauna. Impact of McGill and Summer Hill project in totality. Environmental impact.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. No – the higher buildings will be a blight on the landscape and do not compliment the existing heritage buildings.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. The proposed design of the conversion does not



	Question	Comment
	residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	compliment the current local architecture of Summer Hill. It looks too contemporary and flashy!
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • It will allow people to access it easily on foot but not by car – it will cause congestion on the already choked roads.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. But concerns about traffic. • No. The scale of high rise buildings is too extensive creating too much shade in green spaces. The population housed will generate too much traffic and crowded streets from parked cars.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. • Serious undertakings to make the concept plan sustainable and green.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remain. • Issues still remain!
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aesthetic of the high rise design.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The additional parkland is excellent. • Preservation of existing trees and modest renovation of the Mungo Scott building.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic data would be useful. • Environmental effect on existing flora and fauna.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like the site to be developed but on a much smaller scale. The design should be dictated by sustainable building methods and should be a model of sustainable living.

Herbert Street, Summer Hill

Four (4) comment sheets were completed by residents of Herbert Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green spaces. • Appreciate the heritage role. Aware of the greenway staying active. • Heritage and iconic nature. Existing green space. • Its big and open, not full of buildings.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<p>1. Increase in traffic.</p> <p>2. Increase in people on already overpopulated area with infrastructure already at capacity – roads, supermarkets, trains, schools, medical facilities etc.</p> <p>1. Scale of development too large.</p> <p>2. Traffic issues.</p>



	Question	Comment
		<p>3. Impact of increase population on schools. How will SHPS manage the increase numbers.</p> <p>4. Childcare.</p> <p>5. Social housing.</p> <p>1. Visual impact.</p> <p>2. Traffic.</p> <p>3. Growth in population.</p> <p>4. Lack of facilities e.g. childcare.</p> <p>5. Community Consultation.</p> <p>6. Impact on local community.</p> <p>7. Protect heritage nature of buildings.</p> <p>8. Limited green space.</p> <p>1. Interaction with whatever's approved for McGill precinct and Lewisham Towers.</p>
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. I propose no high rise development at all to be consistent with the current housing density and style in the area. Principally yes, but 8-20 storeys are too high. 4-6 maximum. No. 10-13 storey buildings are not in keeping with the urban landscape of Summer Hill. Nor is the proposed 'design' sympathetic to heritage nature of our unique suburb. OK, but how will interact visually with McGill site and the Lewisham Towers.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a low priority for me in assessing the development. Yes. But the increase in 'solid size' converting the gantry to solid building is too much. Preserving these buildings is imperative. Putting additional levels on the silos and overpopulating the site with far too many buildings is directly undermining this. OK.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a minor factor in the plan that is far outweighed by the negative impacts of this number of new people, dwellings, cars etc. I support the greenway approach. Towering, visually unsympathetic buildings over the Greenway undermine what the Greenway stands for.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. I believe the high level density of development is completely out of character and inappropriate for the area. No. Large buildings – they are too tall. No. Horrific traffic implications, unsympathetic design for heritage suburb, overshadowing heights, no amenities e.g. childcare, limited green space, limited parking facilities. Possibly.



	Question	Comment
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More traffic will be attracted to the area to use the light rail etc. resulting in even more congestion. • Height is far too high. Design is simply not in keeping with the heritage nature of our unique village. Limited green space for potential number of residents. • Interaction with McGill Site.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Increased impact on already stressed infrastructure as previously mentioned. • Not significantly. • Despite raising these concerns at many previous occasions (Council meetings etc.) the issues are simply <u>NOT</u> being addressed. • No. still concerned with traffic from McGill/Towers.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. From the picture shown on the presentation the silos appear to be higher than 10 storeys – at least 12 storeys. • When will this be completed in relation to the light rail? • Lack of <u>genuine</u> community consultation I have not received any updates or information from EG Funds/Urban Concepts etc. despite <u>living</u> in Summer Hill.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None. • Amount of green space. • I support the move from industrial to mixed use, <u>but</u> only if the scale of the development is appropriate. At present it clearly is not.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next steps particularly for more community input and what the State Transport Authority's input into the traffic planning. • All areas. You have made a commitment to consult with the community – ensure that this is done authentically. Keep us informed and take on board our concerns – it is the fabric of our community that you are changing forever.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The predications of impact and increased pressure on already stressed roads, rail, retail (only 1 supermarket in the area), schooling, medical facilities and other infrastructure have all been completely under estimated. Any local resident will tell you how completely congested the roads and train infrastructure are currently without any increase. Even the unrealistically low estimated increase in those factors is too much. You try and catch a train from Summer Hill station or drive through the Old Canterbury Road and Longport junction currently at peak hour. Smith Street is also at gridlock at peak hour currently. There is <u>no</u> room for any further traffic. This is overdevelopment. It is not viable in this suburb.



	Question	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I can understand that the presenters have had a significant night of unhappy residents but I found Belinda's behaviour counter productive to assisting the community in working through this initiative. Other suggestions: lower the heights of the buildings to be less intrusive. Principally a development of this area will need to be done but it is too intrusive to the community of Summer Hill. In addition to the information I have provided I will email my additional comments.

Kensington Road. Summer Hill

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents of Kensington Road.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1.</u> Heritage – built form/spaces/landscape. <u>2.</u> Site = gateway to Summer Hill. Open space. Proximity to public transport.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resi mix in terms of affordability and cultural and age brackets mix. Are we white washing the area? 2. Combined impact of both developments – McGill and Mills. 3. Traffic implications. 4. Need some landscape ownership – veg patch. 5. Are we really complimenting Summer Hill Village? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic. 2. Inclusion of affordable and social housing. 3. Height and scale of buildings. 4. Green space. 5. Overshadowing. 6. Wind tunnels. 7. Lack of community buildings e.g. community centre, childcare etc.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand logic and need for transit orientated development but are you over-reacting to meet developers bottom line – keep silos and lower surrounding development resi to create 'village feel'. No, the height and scale of tallest buildings are too large. Silo development particularly bulky, (I refer to extra floors).
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. Better to give buildings a function and breath life back into them. Don't have a strong view on this. The cynic in me thinks allowing silo to be re-used gives a reason for a 13 storey apartment block.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See note on general comments over-leaf. Not sure. Seemed to be cursory detail of greenway in explanation given tonight i.e just that it won't be built on. What will be impact on the Greenway during demolition and building.



	Question	Comment
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – still concerned about traffic and affordability. I have a young family but we have to move way out to afford a bigger place. • Still learning because a lot of talk was of 'aspiration' and possibility when in reality the bottom line will drive the ultimate design.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is this development designed for – mix? i.e. if there are families – need play areas etc. 'place making' VIP. • Allotments, childcare centres, community gardens, disability access, playgrounds.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – fleshed out in discussion. More research/refinement required. • Partly addressed.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gentrification and lack of social and affordability. Could we reduce green space to enable reduction of height and bulk?
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green space. 'Aspiration' to green star rating. 'Looking' at affordable/social housing. I would prefer commitment.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this development change Summer Hill boundary? Many young families have bought into area to get kids into Summer Hill Primary School which is excellent. Will not bide well if we are kicked out of boundary. • The real rather than aspirational commitments. More detail on traffic assumptions e.g. Andrew alluded to cumulative effect of back up traffic at intersections but glossed over this. Time frame for development from start to finish. More information about thinking around affordable/social housing and how community can support this.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>1.</u> Can you walk across light rail? Or will the corridor be fenced? Your graphic makes it look like a green corridor but in reality will it be a separator rather than a connector? <u>2.</u> Are there any safety issues with the 'public spaces for multiple uses' as presented by architect? Useable, well defined spaces preferred to left over spaces. <u>3.</u> Should do a joint presentation on both sites – need to understand the combined not in isolation. <u>4.</u> Grades at Hawthorne Canal and road seem problematic – safety/levels etc – a more innovative response to this edge required. • Thanks for opportunity to comment. Am I correct in thinking silos will be equivalent to 13-15 storeys. Would like some creative options and thinking around affordability and social housing e.g. for each 25 dwellings donate 1 to affordable (sell below market) or to social housing. Utilise current funding/policy opportunities from Federal Government that encourages private investment in affordable, key worker and social housing. I was



	Question	Comment
		disappointed that Hassell really didn't understand concepts of affordable and social housing given that the concept plan is about a <u>residential</u> development.

Moonbie Street, Summer Hill

Four (4) comment sheets were completed by residents of Moonbie Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>1.</u> Silos and mill buildings. <u>2.</u> Old trees especially dwarf palms near Smith Street. <u>3.</u> Open space. • Heritage and the open area of the site. • That is it an historic precinct. • The Mungo Scott building.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proximity of 'Lewisham Towers'. 2. Traffic especially Canterbury Road. 3. Height/density of new buildings. 4. Not enough green open space. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic access. 2. Over development. 3. Lack of green space. 4. No need for extra retail. 5. Excess height. 6. Rain water storage/run off. 7. Waste collection access. 8. Public access. <p>In general, the <u>SCALE</u> of it is too big.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too many units/people. 2. Too much traffic. 3. Too many buildings over 4 storeys. 4. Development not sustainable i.e. no solar elec/H₂O, no rainwater tanks? 5. Not enough community facilities. 6. No liaising with McGill precinct. 7. Insufficient green space. 8. PARKING! <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of open green space contributed by developer. 2. Scale. 3. Bulk. 4. Traffic management.



	Question	Comment
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size of new buildings to north of site makes it crowded, reduces open space and obstructs views from apartments in the silo and mill buildings. No, possible overshadowing. No, I think the whole development should be at the same height as the surrounding village of Summer Hill and Lewisham, except of course for the already existing mill buildings. 2-3 storey height of Edward Street is appropriate however, the height and density of the new towers is inappropriate and not supported in being too dense/tall at 10 storeys.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completely support – as long as the 'adaptations' do not overwhelm and disguise the huge and stark industrial buildings. Yes. Yes, to some degree, but the 3 extra storeys on our beautiful silos are <u>hideous</u>. I don't think the development is environmentally sustainable. Adaptation is supported, however the additional construction above the silos in lieu of the existing gantry is not appropriate.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Probably OK. No. No guarantee that light rail will provide transport. Somewhat.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In between yes and no. New buildings need to be smaller to provide more green open space for recreation. No. Over development and traffic under estimated. No. People's concerns were basically rebuffed! Referendum was not 'believed'. Still no budging on your part to reduce the (scale) of development.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion and high density buildings. TOO BIG. This major concern is being ignored. The provision of green public accessible space and social impact.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are continuing problems. No! No. I feel that EG will perhaps listen, but will not budge. This is not true consultation. Traffic management is not addressed and issue remains.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. Same as always, as listed in 1.2.



	Question	Comment
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention of key industrial infrastructure. Retention of major trees. Edward Street terraces. None. That the brick "Mungo Scott Ltd" building will be left largely in tact, at least on the outside. Retention of Mungo Scott building, silos, Brush Box Avenue.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any others as they become available. Traffic management. Provision of park space. Public car parking for retail/commercial, light rail.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main problem is the hideous over development proposed for the McGill Street precinct. Also, the site is very low – do flood data exist for this point? We would welcome the opportunity to present the findings of our community referendum to you, in which 94% of 1,500 voted NO to this scale of development. This referendum and it's results were featured in the 'Inner West Courier' and need to be taken seriously. Inadequate developer contributed public green space. No social impact study especially impact on schools. Adjoining roads at capacity concerned about additional cars. Oppose the height of towers at northern point. Oppose the provision of a round about on Smith Street. The assumption 61% of residents will not drive is inconsistent with current average of 48%.

Smith Street, Summer Hill

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents of Smith Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green spaces, connectivity between Summer Hill and Lewisham, public access, heritage preservation. Heritage, green space, consistent with surrounding area.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic. Impact on the village. Retail shops. Accessibility. Size of tallest building (10 storeys) Transport facilities. Look and feel vs. current village look. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion. Level of expected increase in population. Concurrent development Lewisham Towers. Building height. Retail development – increase flow of traffic. Lack of functional green space.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale is too big for the area.



	Question	Comment
	the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not support any development incurring 10 storey residential building in Summer Hill, regardless of building height at Edward Street. Maximum of 5 storeys is just.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, issues on the commercial uses (must be in line with the current small shops in Summer Hill). I support their usage of the site is redeveloped, however, I think the top 3 levels on silo is an eyesore.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. Within constraints, yes.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. Scale of the project is not suitable/viable for the suburb. No. Too large a development not of keeping with character of area. A smaller development is certainly justified, but a significant degree smaller.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and roads, number of people living in the area that will generate the project. 1. Traffic – repeatedly underestimated by developer given Lewisham Towers. This, together with over population will ruin the fabric of this great suburb. 2. Insufficient infrastructure – schools, roads. The serenity of Summer Hill VILLAGE it is not a main thoroughfare (albeit busy at times). It's essence is impaired forever with possible overdevelopment.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In some aspect, no clear traffic and public transport impact issues. They remain. Unfortunately traffic consultant could not attend. I don't believe plans have been revised sufficiently. I truly don't believe that concerns are being listened to.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	No response given.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green areas. I agree development is needed. I am not selfish enough to not allow others to enjoy this fine area but the excessive nature of this, given significant infrastructure issues will be to the detriment of the area.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	No response given.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For what it is worth (alas I fear my concerns will not be truly listened to) the community information session was appreciated. As stated before, I don't object, and am not selfish enough to keep Summer Hill to myself and my family.



	Question	Comment
		However, the entire ambience, fabric and essence of Summer Hill will be irrevocably impaired by the scale of this (and the other) development. The local infrastructure (roads, schools, day care) will not cope. Adding retail will only deepen the overuse of the site. The combination with Lewisham Towers which I know is a separate development will damage the locality long term. Thank you.

Spencer Street, Summer Hill

Five (5) comment sheets were completed by residents of Spencer Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space with no high rise windows, lots of birds and few people. • Original Mungo Scott building. Nothing else. • Its empty. No high rise windows. • Urban renewal of the site. Links to the light rail. • Existing trees, open space, industrial heritage mills, wildlife.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<p>1. Losing private backyard. 2. Too many cars. 3. Too many people.</p> <p>1. Dislike idea of 10 storey building. 2. Car parking. 3. Traffic.</p> <p>1. Overcrowding. 2. Overcrowded public transport. 3. Overcrowded roads. 4. Too many cars. 5. Loss of backyard privacy. 6. Noise. 7. The dominating high rise. 8. Ugly design, does not reflect heritage atmosphere - too modern. 9. Disagree with high rise silos.</p> <p>1. Being overlooked in backyard (additional 3 floors on existing mill. The 4 pack silo's) 2. Parking in local streets. 3. Needs to be high class finishes.</p> <p>1. Traffic. 2. Being overlooked (by buildings as well as people). 3. Scale/increase in population. 4. Loss of existing greenery/trees/wildlife. 5. Loss of open space without potential to be used by the public.</p>
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, because all of these will have windows looking down on our small houses and backyards over the road. • Keep 2-3 storey height everywhere, not just



	Question	Comment
	you support this design response? Please explain.	<p>Edward Street and particularly NO 10 storey building at Smith Street intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absolutely <u>NOT</u>. 2-3 storey is too high for a frontage and I completely disagree with the proposed 'higher buildings' altogether. Street frontage is o.k. and site is generally o.k. except for the additional 3 floors on the flour mills to the south (the '4 pack') ← hoist structure should not be counted. Yes I do – however, there is at least one 4-6 storey building quite close to Edward Street (behind town houses next to Causeway). This seems inappropriately high to me.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, we need to solve our population problem without putting us all on top of each other. The only heritage building is the Mungo Scott Ltd building. I agree with adapting it to a 'public space'. I disagree with the modern proposed designs I have seen. I also disagree with adapting it to a residential and commercial use. Yes, similar to Waratah Mills but need to retain existing height levels of the silo's (excluding the hoist structures). I do support this approach but am concerned about the addition of a tower next to the central silo where the existing smaller silos (six pack) are located.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, we need quick walking and biking tracks directly to the City not just for recreation. It sounds good, but I don't think it will be sustained. I am concerned about the safe access to the proposed light rail. Will the public access 'the Greenway corridor' to the light rail be secure and brightly lit in the development? Yes, good access point to the greenway. I do not have a good sense of how the Greenway will look and work as a potential user of the corridor. The plan lacked details and was too abstract.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. It's too big and far too high. No. The size of the buildings will be too large for the amount of cars that will be allowed per unit. No. These designs are too modern for surrounding buildings. Also too high for the height of the surrounding residential homes. It is too dominating and will cause massive overcrowding. Yes. I respect Hassell as a competent architectural firm with principals. No. Though I support renewal of the site and am not opposed to mixed residential and commercial use, the plan is currently an over development of the site in an already highly densely populated



	Question	Comment
		area.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its neighbours. • It is too far fetched to be feasible. • <u>1.</u> The height will destroy the privacy of surrounding backyards. <u>2.</u> Summer Hill Station will not cope with the increased population. Most peak hour trains bypass Lewisham Station therefore everyone will go to Summer Hill Station to catch an express. The development does not benefit from two train stations because the stations are on the same train line. Even if new residents went to Lewisham Station instead of Summer Hill Station they might not get on the actual train because of the already overcrowding of Summer Hill Station. The public transport needs to be fixed as is. It <u>must</u> be fixed and functioning before any development begins. This includes the light rail being complete before building development. <u>3.</u> The 'public space' that is proposed by the development; as it is privately owned will the environment be kept presentable and clean? • Height for the southern flour mill increased by 3 floors is an issue. Height should not exceed current level of the actual mills. The hoist structures should not be included in the height limits. • The plan does not sufficiently address height concerns of local residents, traffic concerns and a community need for more park space/green space (current reserve for park is insufficient – see general comments). There is also significant wildlife in the land/site that do not seem to be addressed by the Concept Plan.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. • They were not addressed, they were just quickly mentioned but not discussed by the speaker. • Yes, but my issue still remains with the height increase of the '4 pack'. • Unfortunately not – the issues remain. I support renewal of the site but the plan falls short in a number of areas.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will repeat and say I object to a 10 storey building at Smith Street intersection. It will block my view of the City. • I am now very concerned about the traffic and the 'concept plans' naive belief that people won't drive. There will also be surrounding parking issues and it is ignorant to believe that this won't happen. Is there visitor parking within the development? • Co-ordination with development adjacent now that they have ignored the Hassell master plan. • I now have an additional concern about the use of the road in location of existing Causeway, to be used for dropping of light rail passengers as



	Question	Comment
		this will generate significant traffic from surrounding suburbs. I was not aware of added 3 storeys to tower attached to silo (where six pack is).
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping the trees and putting in local food production areas. • Only development of original Mungo Scott Ltd building. • None – I would prefer that it didn't exist. • FSR is appropriate, I note McGill Street has double this. • I support the broad vision of renewing this unique heritage site for mixed use (with a view to creating a space that locals and residents can enjoy and which contributes to the Greenway project).
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in noise. The co-ordinated timing of the availability of the light rail, improved public transport and the completion of the development. • Need some better photomontages to show scale of development from Edward/ Wellesley Streets. • * the exact height (and storeys) of the tower (4-6 storeys) next to the Causeway and behind town houses and whether windows from apartments will overlook gardens/houses in Edward and gardens in Spencer Street. * the exact traffic calming/traffic management additions proposed as part of the development including whether the traffic lights proposed at end of Edward Street includes pedestrian crossing. * which trees will be preserved and which removed. * details of kids playground in park.



	Question	Comment
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I support this redevelopment but the one key issue I have is the increase in height of the southern silo (the '4 pack' – the hoist structures are not the same scale as the 3 additional floors!! Keypoint. This will obviously be the big selling units/penthouses but if these were to be removed or limited to one additional floor the whole development would be appropriate. I like the Hassell master plan for the adjacent site but the developer on that site has generally ignored this plan and significantly increased the density of this development. I know this is not your issue. In addition to concerns/issues previously raised, I believe the park on Smith Street is poorly located and too small. Smith Street is a busy street and is close to other busy streets. All the parks I have enjoyed most and wanted to revisit are protected from busy thoroughfares in some way – either through size of park or quiet location. I believe that a better plan would maintain some parkland along Smith Street but would make/set aside a large park area off Edward Street expanding out from the existing Causeway and car park and providing access through this park to the Greenway and light rail. This would make a real public park of significance and would also address at least some of the concerns about adding traffic/cars to Edward Street. The exit and entry points for cars to the site should be from Smith Street and Old Canterbury Road with pedestrian and bike access from Edward Street.

Wellesley Street, Summer Hill

Three (3) comment sheets were completed by residents of Wellesley Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The silos. The coming Greenway. Milling building and silos – proximity to light rail. Old site with land and space.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic in Wellesley Street. Congestion in Summer Hill Village. Parking on nearby streets. Rat run through nearby heritage conservation area. Number of units being built is overkill – the scale is too large for the area – it will kill Summer Hill. Half the number of units and it will work. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of re-use of existing. Off street parking provisions. Density of development. Balance of open space to maintain light. Minimisation of shadow over internal areas. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion.



	Question	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Parking congestion. 3. Height of building. 4. Density of number of people on site. 5. 2 developments at once at 2 local govts. 6. Over development of an old quiet suburb. 7. Traffic increase. 8. Commercial development/shops increase.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • Yes – maintain sympathy with adjacent streetscapes i.e. 2 storey terraces – prevents the sense of overbearing developments if higher structures are staggered back. • Keep it low rise.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – recognises historical aspects of buildings – provides a diverse mix of styles to keep visual interest. Maximises opportunity to minimise carbon footprint. • I don't support the over development and density proposed on this site.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – development of buildings does not ingress into current space. Access is emphasised via Smith Street. • Too little greenway for the number of people added to Summer Hill and surrounds.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – extent of open space – public community areas seems appropriate – areas seem balanced with separation between building. • No. Too dense – people, traffic, pollution.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not to my mind. • Yes. Lower the level of height and density of the development.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – the traffic situation has not been addressed. It seems to have been identified as a major problem but with no solution offered. • Yes. • No.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. • Still not convinced that parking overflow from non residents will be controlled. How is Wellesley Street protected from being a rat run? • See 1.2
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The architecture, although a concept seems appealing. The plan seems coherent – but traffic still impossible to solve. • Heritage reuse of building. Scaling back of development height from Edward Street i.e. tallest buildings in centre. • None



	Question	Comment
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to know if and when you will consider reducing the scale of this in some ways appealing project. Current time frame for development progress.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please don't destroy the precious Summer Hill Village or the beautiful heritage conservation area of Wellesley, Spencer and Carrington Streets. The area doesn't need transforming – the village is already congested. Moderate renewal and development sympathetic to the capacities of the area is what is required and is what would be warmly received by the local council and community. Thanks.

DULWICH HILL - One off street addresses

Five (5) comment sheet were completed by residents.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification for light rail. Even though there are tall structures on the site it still offers an open skyline. The Mungo Scott building and silos offer an insight into the working class history of the inner west. Heritage aspects – particularly the brick building. Openness – used to audit Allied Mills, so spent time there. Interesting vision of re-use of site.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Massive traffic increase. High density development. Building heights. Impact on Summer Hill <u>village</u>. Cars parking. Added strain on trains during peak hours. Safety of children. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings heights – too high. The density of redevelopment. Too many new structures. (Vehicle) Exit/entry points badly positioned on Smith Street. Not reasonable to pack that many people into high density living with no social amenities included: e.g. childcare, doctors, schools and recreational spaces. Not enough dedicated park/play ground areas. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Transport issues (Canterbury Road to bridge) Parking – spillover to areas in Lewisham/Summer Hill. Transport interruption during construction. Integration of Lewisham Towers proposal. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – OCR. Traffic – Lewisham Station. Heritage significance. Traffic – Greenway, local parks.



	Question	Comment
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on parking in nearby streets. 2. Lack of parking provided within site. 3. High population density.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Not at the heights proposed. This is a rubbish leading question. It is an insult to the intelligence of the residents and participants of the consultation. • The reality is it is still too much, too high, too dense. It might look good on paper but transferred to everyday living it means people looking into your home, your privacy invaded. A visual eye sore on Summer Hills unique landscape. • Yes. As long as the heights don't increase to more than what is existing. • Would have liked to see main silo retained.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this a question or a sales pitch? • As I stated in the original questionnaire in 2010. Yes I agree but for the use of the public. It should be a community centre and park land. • Yes. • Yes – silo can be seen from as far away as Petersham Station overpass – same <u>stark</u> attractiveness needs to be retained. • Yes, <u>but</u> with fewer influx of population density for residential and commercial/retail.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lot of green in the concept. I can't see how it can be realised. • Too many people in one space. It will lead to dumping of rubbish caused from high density living situations [No sense of community pride]. • Yes – as long as there is enough planting and trees. • Not sure about access across main streets, Longport, OCR etc. Hopefully bike track widened from 3 metres.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Impact of increase in numbers of residents in village and traffic implications. • No. <u>1.</u> Too many new buildings. <u>2.</u> Height problems. <u>3.</u> Density of structures. <u>4.</u> No sensitivity shown to surrounding streets/suburb. <u>5.</u> Not enough skyline/green space!! • Yes.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The massive increase in load on local streets and inadequate peak hour public transport. • Building height and density – stop being so greedy! • Still concerned about traffic – particularly how this will work with McGill Precinct. Already a big problem.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. these issues remain and I now realise that the residents are being conned. • Nothing has changed. Stop thinking about



	Question	Comment
		<p>making money and instead think about creating a community. Build it in your back yard!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No – old statistics.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That Marrickville Council and Ashfield Council do not have more say in this outrageous proposal. Yes.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability. Green space. Heritage retention. Retaining existing structures and trees.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A genuine study of the traffic impact and justification for such a high density development. * Garbage collection – where will the 500 bins be collected/emptied/stored. Recycling centre – where is it? * Clothes lines for drying laundry to reduce the need for dryers and therefore electricity usage. *How will you prevent the site from turning into a slum like area – too many people crammed in one place! * Sufficient garbage bins placed around communal areas. * Sufficient smoking (used butts) bins placed around communal areas. * Recycling bins. Consideration of transport together with McGill Precinct.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You are about to change the dynamics of a sound community minded/spirited suburb. Your development will dramatically undermine the 'village atmosphere' of Summer Hill. This development is better suited to a CBD location, not a quaint inner west suburb. I grew up in a small country town as a child where everyone knew your name. When I shop in Summer Hill I know the shop owners by name as they know myself and my family. It is unique to find such a location in this city, it offers a 'step back' from the 'rat race' because everyone has a community spirit. Your development will devour the 'humility' in this area and it will be the demise of a community that yearns to be friendly and inviting. The cramming of an extra couple of thousand people and their vehicles into the area will devour the 'good nature' of Summer Hill and it will become another hovel of city living where there is no friendship only fighting over parking spaces. Please stop being greedy and show restraint. Traffic, traffic, traffic.

Denison Road, Dulwich Hill

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents of Denison Road.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space. Views – aspects. Feels like a space where people can have privacy and meeting points, easy



	Question	Comment
		movement and consideration of children's' use as well as elderly.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Size – there can't be too many dwellings. 2. Traffic. 3. Parking overflows. 4. Connectivity to McGill Street Precinct. 5. Enough <u>useful</u> open space. Not sterile – maybe has community gardens. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public Access. 2. Public gardens/trees. 3. Interesting features. 4. 'Warm' i.e. sun penetrates. 5. Interesting architecture. 6. Friendly space.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 storey height should be the maximum on Edward Street. No excuses. The new buildings that are not formed from existing structures are too high. Try 4-5 storeys. • In theory yes, but adding storeys to the top of the towers is taking height of silos to new levels.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, but see my point in 2.5. • Yes. I like the recycling aspect and the maintaining of an older building/s.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As long as it links in with McGill Street Precinct on the other side. • How many 'pit stop' cafes can the city hold? I think the Greenway should be separated from this 'intersection' because of the range of uses – shoppers, bicyclists, walkers, inhabitants.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe. It's critical that the units are not an ugly/boxy design and are interesting as built features. • No. I think it is too intensive land use i.e too many residences. I would like lower impact, lower level housing and consideration of businesses already existing in the area 'less is more'.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'cultural leanings' of the community. This plan is merely flats and shops – nothing new or special about that. Why not make it a real destination and include a theatre space or art gallery in one of the older buildings that you plan to refurbish/redevelop. You might then get more critics/skeptics on side. • I don't want the characteristics of some of the historic buildings to be 'buried'. Preserving – yes. Blocking – No.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, it has helped. But who cleans the whole site?
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two silos should <u>NOT</u> have extra storeys added. I now believe this has been addressed.



	Question	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the site 'brought together' to be a joint space for locals and tourists.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linkage to McGill Street Precinct keeping the 'avenue of brush box trees'.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where are the cars going? Does 'diverse' mean residential/retail/commercial, or does it mean a range of housing options, or a range of housing inhabitants? Would a wheelchair be able to move around the site? How about an elderly person wanting to hold onto a hand rail to walk.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You really should be gunning to add cultural amenities – that in itself may remove some opposition. Cultural amenities include: *Theatre *Cinema *Art Gallery. Likewise, what about <u>PUBLIC</u> tennis courts? Not convinced that 61% of journeys will be on public transport. Residents will have cars – their visitors will need to drive and park somewhere. What if on a Saturday, just 5 dwellings have parties – traffic chaos and a parking crash.

Victoria Street, Dulwich Hill

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents of Victoria Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The industrial heritage and the views of the silos on the skyline. Open space and green space. Industrial heritage.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic problems. Industrial heritage. Density of residences. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of open space. Maintenance public space. Maintain industrial heritage. (to the extent realistic) Ensure road traffic does not increase. Provide more residences. Make good use of light rail.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – maintains the skyline. However, I would prefer 2 storey on the edge. Yes, with higher buildings next to open space (as seems to be the case) well back from the street.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. A financially sustainable way to preserve them. It would be good to have some public interpretation materials and access to the buildings to some extent (in foyer?) Yes. I've seen the Waratah Mills site in Dulwich Hill redeveloped with great results.



	Question	Comment
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light rail – yes. Greenway – not sure – not enough information on this yet. Yes. Good mixed use.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. I think it sounds great but I am still not confident about the impact on traffic. Yes.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be good to have some public access to the rooftops so that we can enjoy the view e.g. café/restaurant/roof-top bar. Please also consider suitability for elderly residents who might want to live there.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still uneasy about traffic, especially with the McGill Street development too. Yes.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surrounding infrastructure of roads is poor and will not support the combined impact of both developments. Yes. I'm concerned about the interactions with the McGill Street development and traffic volume increases.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of it – but I don't support McGill Street. Retention and use and rejuvenation of the old mill buildings, the mixed use, the open and green spaces, public access. Looks great!
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of community use space – what, how much. Some multi-purpose, hireable space would be good e.g. for yoga classes, parties etc.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looks like a good and interesting development, subject to reservations about traffic.

LEWISHAM - One off street addresses

Four (4) comment sheets were completed by residents.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage. Community involvement. The Mungo Scott buildings. Historic buildings and green space. Industrial look.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Transport. Height issues. Overshadowing of greenway. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Extra traffic.



	Question	Comment
		<p>2. Burden on public transport especially heavy rail. 3. Lack of co-ordinated planning with McGill Street site.</p> <p>1. Grid locked traffic on main roads. 2. Inadequate public transport. 3. Pressure on schools and health facilities. 4. Parking. 5. Increased traffic on local streets.</p> <p>1. Traffic. 2. Height. 3. Lack of affordable housing. 4. Less commercial.</p>
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep all to 4-5 storeys and silos only be kept height. It doesn't matter, the 13 storey (4 pack silo) will overshadow the other buildings on the site. Generally yes, but dislike the very tall building (10 storeys?) located next to the roundabout – this is the entrance to Summer Hill and it is an inappropriate height. Partly, 13 storey building on Longport Street doesn't sit in centre of site.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. No. I believe that the development is only retaining the silos to support the argument to building at the existing height. Yes it is important to keep these buildings as they are a landmark. For residential but not commercial/retail. Sustainability of local shops very important particularly as existing shops are in walking distance from site.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passenger corridor – yes. Don't like height near greenway. Yes – good access to the light rail for the whole community.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. Community consultation. No. The development is too big and will bring too many more people to what is already an overcrowded municipality. It will overwhelm the small village of Summer Hill especially once the McGill precinct and Lewisham Towers go ahead.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan makes no reference to improving the road network with the exception of new traffic lights at Edward Street and Old Canterbury Road. The traffic flow at the Edward Street/Wellesley Street intersection. There will definitely be increased traffic flow into what are now quiet local streets. Yes, adjoining proposed developments that will



	Question	Comment
		increase impact of community and should be considered.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – transport. • No. <u>1.</u> There will be significantly more road traffic. <u>2.</u> Rail transport will not be addressed. <u>3.</u> There is no co-ordination with the McGill Street site. • The issues remain. The architect and developer admitted that they have no control over the planning and funding to address the issues we've outlined in 1.2. • No. Traffic issues not resolved – traffic congestion on weekend considered.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic management. • Insufficient visitor parking. • Incorporation of affordable housing and universal housing concept.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban redevelopment. • Retention of the Mungo Scott building for commercial support. • Retaining the historic buildings and the open green areas. We support the redevelopment in general – this is expensive, wasted land and the additional housing is definitely needed.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration with McGill Street site. • I'd like to see the details of the traffic study.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for conducting the session. • Until there is an integrated overarching plan which includes the developers, architects but most importantly local and state governments you will never get real community support. We understand and support the need for the redevelopment of this site and the plans look reasonably sympathetic (though the development is too big in our opinion). However, as we have seen in so many other parts of Sydney, the development will be built then the architect and developer will leave and the local residents (both old and new) will be abandoned and left with grid-locked traffic, inadequate public transport, over-stretched public facilities such as schools, doctors, parking, roads etc. Unless the community gets some level of guarantee and commitment from local and state governments that there will be on-going planning and very importantly, adequate funding, to address these issues there is no way we can wholeheartedly support this development. The plans are beautiful but we can clearly see the future that awaits our community because of them and it is more negative than positive, unfortunately. • Thank you for the opportunity.



Summer Hill Street, Lewisham

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents of Summer Hill Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental considerations, blending Summer Hill and Lewisham precincts. Open space.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic congestion on Old Canterbury Road. 2. Increase traffic on residential streets. 3. Over development of McGill Street. 4. Increase in residents and the impact on local amenities i.e. schools. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very high density – not enough green space. 2. Too tall. 3. Extra traffic congestion. 4. Existing silos top floors extensions. 5. Of 1/3 (2/3 buildings) space only ½ is green. More green space needed.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If it takes into consideration actual building heights in the street which are predominantly single storey buildings. In principle but would like to see single storey to maximum 7 storey rather than proposed 13.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. I am supportive of maintaining the heritage buildings and the concept designs look like they will improve the community access to this space. Yes. Without the additions on top storey.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears to incorporate the Greenway and light rail plans I have seen in the past. It is so tall it will cast shadow on greenway a lot of the day.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. Too dense not enough green space.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public green space insufficient. Buildings too tall.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density, open space, traffic issues remain.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community centre such as library or similar to benefit greater community.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water recycling/sufficiency. Maintaining Mungo Scott building. Eco waste disposal.



	Question	Comment
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too tall. Not enough green space of trees. Canterbury Road traffic grid lock in peak will be worsened. Too many dwellings. Extra bulk on top 3 floors of silos will be unsightly and highly visible from Summer Hill Street.

HABERFIELD - Waratah Street

One (1) comment sheet was completed by resident of Waratah Street.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The industrial heritage of the mill site as well as its surrounding open space. I love the significant and authentic state and the vista throughout the whole area.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage. Appropriate use/variety. Sustainability. Access to public transport. Traffic management. Architectural quality. Maintenance of original trees. Adequate parking.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – this is appropriate. The Edward Street homes should not be confronted with tall buildings opposite them.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to maintain the silos and other industrial heritage by making/giving them a use – i.e. residential. Without a <u>use</u> they will be left to be demolished by neglect.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, it is an exciting prospect that people will be able to use the corridor for access and recreation. Thank you.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	Response not given.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OH & S concerns regarding the light rail going through the site –adequate fencing at some points, lighting and security.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in	Response not given.



	Question	Comment
	Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	Response not given.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	Response not given.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	Response not given.

ASHFIELD - One off streets

Two (2) comment sheets were completed by residents.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The heritage buildings – Mungo Mills and Silos. The heritage trees. The passivity of the existing site. The views of the buildings from the rail. The existing admin building (I think you should document it before demol). Retention of the old buildings. Giving/keeping enough open space on the site.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The three <u>greedy</u> extra storeys on top of the 4 pack. The northern 10 storey building will spoil rail views, its too aggressive. The massive density of the adjacent McGill Site. The generation of traffic at the intersection Canterbury and the Railway street. The impact on Summer Hill and Lewisham. the fact that the McGill Street sites narrow little 'park' is just a wretched token. Hassells did do the McGill Street master plan so you must take some of the responsibility for what is an appalling adjacent site – which <u>must</u> be considered in combination with your otherwise commendable one! <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion. Congestion at Summer Hill and Lewisham Railway stations. Congestion at Summer Hill shopping centre. 10 storey building on edge of the block. Lack of schools in the area.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actually it doesn't as you have a 10 storey building at the north end of the site. Which I dislike. I do intensely dislike the fact that those top three storeys are added to the top of the 10 storey silo 4 pack – that's a corrugated thin, structure and not an actual part of the silo 'drum' – that addition looks bad – too greedy – I thought you Hassells/EG were above that. In principle of course 2.1 is yes – correct. Yes, except for the 10 storey building on the border.



	Question	Comment
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of course I commend and absolutely support reuse of both the heritage brick buildings and of the silos – but – the 'argument' for the addition of those top 3 storeys to the 4 pack silo is bogus, greedy – you <u>cannot</u> compare that 'black' 3 storey drum and additional structures both sides as in any way equivalent to the narrow corrugated iron clad square framework with pitched 'hat' roof. Yes. As a reference to our past and looking towards a future.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes – from your EG/mills side yes. From the McGill Street site Lewisham side I have to say <u>no</u>. They have placed a road (street in your semantic language) all along the perimeter of their site adjacent to the greenway/light rail. I hope that it will work in together.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I cannot comment to yes/no – in comparison to the McGill site your scheme is <u>very</u> commendable – a fine design team. In essence very clearly the better developer and even rare (as a fund manager/super base). No. I believe it is an overdevelopment for the infrastructure currently in place.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Except for the issues I have raised, no. Within the commercial context that you work I had always expected the best of you and candidly within that context, I believe you are achieving it. Would that <u>this</u> scheme was reflected on the far side of the rail and that Hassells had designed the scheme throughout (without their uber greedy developer that is).
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No – they remain. The issues remain.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme in general. I would prefer that the northern building be as its shown on the model and appears to be on the PowerPoint plans – but <u>not</u> how it is shown on the 'night time' perspective colour image shown looking from the north of the site along the green/rail corridor where that building complex reads like 'The Toaster' wall (to draw a parallel). Retention of old buildings. Open space.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please support the biodiversity plan for the greenway corridor that should be possible by including liaison with the Greenway Group who are involved with Ashfield Council – contact Bruce Ashley who is one of the representatives bruce@bike-it.com.au
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the developers have done a good job in their designs, retention of buildings etc. The



	Question	Comment
		problem is the lack of infrastructure to cater for this development and the other developments on the other side of the railway: - roads congestion – railway congestion – schools congestion – Summer Hill shopping centre congestion.

ROZELLE

One (1) comment sheet was completed by resident.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iconic landmark, provides a sense of place.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal is reasonable. 2. <u>Must</u> maximise the public transport 'gift' it has inherited. 3. Affordable housing component must be delivered and not as tokenism. 4. Sustainability components especially H₂O + energy + waste) need to not be eroded as project proceeds i.e. genuinely decent % of total resi units. Ensure revegetation works truly adhere to local perseverance where native species are proposed.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, appropriate for shade equity reasons (i.e. protecting existing amenity of current dwellings) as well as other good design reasons.
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes 100%.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes the fit seems appropriate. Just make sure that the development assists in providing a sense of safety around the light rail stop i.e. 24 hour. Feel safe place to be.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest energy balance modeling (at even a coarse level) may well support co-generation as a viable option – possibly with energy (elec or heat) exchange between McGill Precinct and Flour Mill site. Resist the 'jump' directly to P.V. as the (iconic) response to greenhouse gas emissions.
2.6A	Has the information presented today	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally yes. Still keen to know how a really



	Question	Comment
	addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	progressive response to transport (reduced vehicle impacts) plus energy, water plus waste can be ensured and not trimmed out down the line.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	Response not given.
2.6 C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally all.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	Response not given.
	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling is the average across all the site, this feels too generous. Well organised consultation if EG have shaped this (rather than arms length) that is encouraging. The level of attendance and interest is strong and that's very good for proponent going forward. Am aware of another Part 3A nearby where proponents have utterly failed to properly engage – this stacks up well by comparison. The scale of existing mill buildings, the proximity to greenway and western rail line and ability to adapt heritage to contemporary setting all make this an exceptional opportunity – let's make it shine.

Unknown addresses

Two (2) comment sheet were completed by residents of unknown address.

	Question	Comment
1.1	What features do you value most about the Summer Hill Flour Mill site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing trees, low density, small footprint of existing structures. Retention of silos.
1.2	When you think about the redevelopment of the Summer Hill Flour Mill site what are your main issues? List in order of priority.	<p>Concerned about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in road traffic. Increase in rail traffic. Lack of green space. Density. Incorporation of retail. Incorporation of commercial uses. Scale too big for 'village'. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Densities too high. Traffic increase (traffic already grid locked). Building heights of blocks. Extra 3 storeys on top of silos. Impact on Summer Hill Village.
2.1	The Concept Plan concentrates the higher building forms in the centre of the site and the stepping down to buildings of 2-3 storey height at the Edward Street frontage. Do you support this design response? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Happy with height immediately adjacent to Edward Street. Do <u>not</u> support increased height of silos or heights of blocks to 10 storeys (should be 3-4 storey).
2.2	The silos and historic buildings are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No – doubtful architectural or historical merit in



	Question	Comment
	proposed to be adaptively reused for residential and commercial uses. Do you support this approach from a heritage and sustainability standpoint? Please explain.	<p>silos and existing buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, except heritage significance is ruined by extra 3 storeys on top.
2.3	Do you consider that the Concept Plan supports and reinforces the Greenway corridor and the light rail to their best advantage? Please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – afternoon shadowing caused by height in development. • No – the buildings are too high.
2.4	<p>After learning more about the Concept Plan do you consider that it will promote a suitable design and land use response for this site?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. You are taking/reducing amenity in Summer Hill without giving anything back to the community. • No. Overdevelopment.
2.5	Are there significant design or land use considerations that the Concept Plan has failed to recognise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gridlocked local roads and this proposal will further worsen this.
2.6A	Has the information presented today addressed the issues you identified in Question 1.2 or do these issues remain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
2.6B	Are there other issues that you now have with this site and its redevelopment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The combined impact of the Lewisham Towers site and the Mills site.
2.6C	What elements of the Concept Plan and proposed site redevelopment do you support?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-use of heritage buildings.
2.7	Please identify any other areas or details that you would like to receive information on about the Concept Plan that were not covered in today's presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the inevitable increased traffic could be managed on the already gridlocked roads.