

OBJECTION TO MODIFICATION REQUEST TO CONCEPT APPROVAL AND PROJECT APPROVAL
FORMER RACHEL FORSTER HOSPITAL
MP_07_0029 MOD 1 & MP 09_0068 MOD 1 – D508/18

As a long time Redfern resident, I object to the modifications to the concept and project approval of the former Rachel Forster Hospital in Pitt Street Redfern for the following reasons:

1. It sets a dangerous precedent for any future development to also disregard planning regulations.
2. It is clearly a grab by the developer for valuable inner city property, as it is only providing a maximum of 28% of the total new residents as dedicated affordable rental housing; possibly less as this maximum is not guaranteed.
3. The claim that the modification is “considered compatible with the desired future character of the area” is a subjective observation clearly at odds with residents and City of Sydney council objections to this modification. According to whose desires and vision does this perceived future character of the area align? Why is this vision accepted as a given? What recent community consultation gives validity to assertions of “desired future character”? What precisely is the definition of this “desired future character” and where is the demonstration of how this modification is compatible with it? This is a statement without evidence or justification so therefore cannot be used to support the modification.
4. The increased provision of car parking spaces is “unlikely to cause adverse traffic or on street parking impacts”. This comment is breath taking in its ignorance and has clearly been written without any actual investigation to support it. As any local resident is aware (and a site visit would confirm) the intersection of Pitt and Redfern Streets at peak traffic times morning and night already sees a long line of cars attempting to turn out of Pitt Street onto an already jammed Redfern Street. Bringing more residents with cars onto Pitt Street will only exacerbate the problem. Where is the evidence to support the claim of no adverse traffic impacts, when simple observation at peak times demonstrates the opposite?
5. Further to point 4, traffic impacts have been assessed based on reports from the RMS dated 2013, which are therefore woefully out of date and predate the flawed traffic projections of the impact of the Westconnex interchange at St Peters which will see tens of thousands of vehicles pour into Alexandria, and then Redfern on a daily basis, as a result. It is unacceptable to justify modifications based on information that is 5 years old and that has been publicly acknowledged as profoundly flawed regarding the Westconnex traffic generation estimates.
6. The modification request states that “impacts can be mitigated or managed” but fails to provide any details as to how they will be mitigated or managed. It is a nonsense statement with no evidence or plan to support it, and therefore must also be rejected as baseless justification for the modification.

Yours sincerely

Alexa Wyatt