

Geoff Turnbull -

Redwatch

Re PAC for SSD 15 7317 for Australian Technology Park (ATP)

Issues

1) Pedestrian movements - Assessment Report p35

The pedestrian movement report does not assess counter flow movements only movements to the new development. As people trying to move to the station along Lawson Street will attest strong counter flows of pedestrians create major problems.

The pedestrian study is incorrect when it says "all of the pedestrian flows associated with buildings 1 and 2 are unidirectional. This will minimise pedestrian conflicts and improve the level of service" (p10 Amended Pedestrian Study). From Innovation Plaza to Redfern Railway station this inward traffic will conflict with a growing movement of pedestrian traffic from Alexandria moving along the same route to Redfern Station. This has not been assessed. The pedestrian study has no figures for existing movements either into the site by existing tenants or commuters or through the site by existing commuters.

2) Public Benefit and Contributions

This needs to be reassessed

Mirvac purchased and wishes to hold on to the public domain because it adds value to its development. It is only prepared, through a VPA, to surrender that public domain to council if CBA are no longer their head tenant. This underlines the value of the public domain and the facilities to Mirvac for their development.

Mirvac have chosen to develop with maximum site coverage resulting with almost no private contribution to public domain and hence it needs the public domain to add the campus amenity needed by its tenants.

In that situation we do not believe the Environmental Assessment Report proportioning only 50% to Mirvac's private use is a fair representation of use. Existing use of existing court space will now be diluted by the use of these facilities by 10,500 new employees.

New mass planting and trees, New street/public furniture, New lighting, Ping pong tables, Work points, Public Art/Heritage interpretation, Bike racks, New seating, Raised concrete planters and External dining areas Total value - \$9,333,000

Sports Courts, Play Equipment/Space, Fitness Station, Precinct wifi, BBQs and CCTV Total value - \$2,760,000

Together \$12,093,000 @ 50% = \$6,046,500 - 20% (\$2,418,600) - 25% (\$3,023,250) more appropriate

3) Heritage

REDWatch shares the Heritage Office concerns about the way building 2 interacts with the Locomotive Workshops. We ask the PAC to relook at the issue of separation between these two buildings. It is our view that the public space buffer of approx. 12 m was an important design element in BEP that ensured separation between the heritage building and a new building and acted in lieu of a formal setback requirement. The effect of this was to not only provide separation

between the old and the new but this also further opened up the vista from Garden and Cornwallis street.

It is important to understand that this site was allocated a GFA of 42,000 and a height of 9 and 11 stories. These controls, if followed, effectively allow a 5 storey building across the entire site or a building at maximum height on an about half the site – or something in between.

Given the flexibility provided by the controls it is not unreasonable to expect the enforcement of the separation proposed by BEP2.

In our initial submission we also argued that a development more sympathetic to heritage could have opened up visits from the main pedestrian path through the site.

What is of major concern is that the current proposal seeks an extra 35% of GFA for this building (that is approx. 2 stories across the entire footprint) and this makes the height contrast between the new building and the heritage building much starker than was anticipated by the controls.

REDWatch asks the PAC to reconsider the separation between the two buildings and the facing height of the new building.

#### 4) Built Form & Variation of Planning Controls for GFA and Height under SEPP1

REDWatch objects to the proposed variation of the GFA of 4.9% and in particular to the 35% increase of GFA in Building 2.

Outline arguments from submission in terms of controls known at purchase, need for community certainty in controls and the implications for Buildings 1 and 2.