

From: [Angela Drury](#)
To: [Prity Cleary](#)
Subject: Weigall Sports Complex SSD- 10421
Date: Monday, 31 May 2021 11:39:53 AM

This is my response to the section on Views in the Response to Submission - which response included a statement that was not true claiming timely contact with the residents.

“Access to views and vistas can bring joy, wonder and calm to our daily lives. Designing, protecting and enhancing visual opportunities for all especially in urban settings, makes our communities a better place”. Jane Maze Riley of URBIS public web page

Jane M Riley attended **3 ill-chosen apartments** in the Dept of Housing complex at Lawson St Paddington to supervise photography in an apparent effort to prove that our cherished outlook, threatened by the SGS \$54 million monstrosity (aka SGS Sport facility), were insignificant

I had told the person from DCJ who arranged the visit clearly that I am located at the end & at the front of this building so my loss of view and light will be significant, but comparatively minimal to other flats.

I am concerned that the visit was designed to [REDACTED] misrepresent the view from my window as typical of the view the residents of these buildings stand to lose.

I told the delegation that the apartments necessary to view as a minimum are : Building 33 – flats 32 31 28 27 24 23 21 & 20 for view including distant green vista overshadowing and loss of light /sunlight - **Building 31 in particular – all of the flats .**

Jane Riley said twice during our discussion “ we contacted you all in March last year and no one bothered to reply”. I finally twigged , and said “Hold on – no one contacted me in March 2020, none of us knew then that the SGS plan for the monstrosity existed “ Oh, we contacted the LAHC and no response!!!

[REDACTED] that the residents were contacted was actually repeated in the Response to Submissions after Riley had been informed that it was untrue.

Note that the residents were not contacted at all by this mob in 2020 and then only 4 ill-chosen residents were contacted for the view analysis. What [REDACTED] are there in RtoS??

They said they were to visit “ all the flats on my floor” - inadequate, but in fact they visited only me and flat 32. Then they went, unannounced, to Flat 18 /31 - they were allowed entry but the resident felt intimidated. However she thought that since the DOH rep was present the visit was in her interest, she was very angry to be informed that it was not independent.

The Response to Submissions claims that the views affected are from bedrooms only when in fact for Block 31 ALL the aspects are from the living rooms .

Furthermore those whose outlook is from a bedroom which is in fact a de facto living room, the only room which receives winter sunlight and can be sat in without heating . (I am sitting in my despised back bedroom to write this)

With both my view and Flat 18/31 Jane Riley was at pains to prove that a tree viewed from our windows was evergreen and thus minimised the loss of vista (neither of us agree).

The visit to assess the views was obviously biased - bought & paid for - and negligently inadequate in scope. Riley's quote above is vastly hypocritical !

I request that an independent assessment of the loss of view be arranged

Yours sincerely

Angela Drury [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Graeme Allen](#)
To: [Prity Cleary](#)
Subject: Weigall Sports Complex
Date: Monday, 26 April 2021 6:16:11 PM

Prity

I have read through the responses to submissions received including additional material to support the Project.

On balance the only conclusion that can be reached is that building is the wrong scale in the wrong location.

Trust that the evaluation to be undertaken will be rigorous and uncompromising.

I am happy to provide further feedback as to the basis of my conclusions if this was acceptable to the Department.

Otherwise I will leave it in your capable hands!

Regards
Graeme Allen
Managing Director
Australian Urban Estate Pty Limited
M: [REDACTED]