Pemulwuy Concept Approval (MP 06\_0101 MOD2), State Significant Development (SSD) application

8135, Pemulwuy Project Approval (MP11\_0089 MOD1)

Objection from a local resident - 29 November 2018

I have lived in Thomas Street, Darlington for the past 25 years . My

disappointment with the Pemulwuy project and the process is also felt by others in my community

* 94% of the submissions to the Department opposed the project

I make reference to the 18.10.2018 Assessment Report and other documents of interest.

**Shadowing**

On page 5 of the report “The Department’s assessment concludes the increase in height of

the Precinct 3 building …from 8 to 24 storeys…would not have an adverse impact on

amenity in terms of overshadowing, overlooking, impact on views”.

The report includes very low-quality shadowing impact illustrations to support this assertion

At 9 am the illustration shows very long shadows stretching South over Little Eveleigh St. At midday the shadows move over onto the Eastern side of the station. Looking at these diagrams you would be forgiven for thinking Caroline St, Hugo St, Louis St, Eveleigh St, and Abercrombie St would not be impacted by any shadowing. Unfortunately, this is not true and an example of the many distorted facts contained in the report.

As shown by the fact that 171 of the 183 submissions opposed the project in its current form. Page

70

To distort the facts, the assessment report only includes mid-winter shadowing illustrations.

This is a deceptive time of year to illustrate the impacts of shadowing due to the angle

of the sun.

The full impact of the shadowing on the neighbourhood should also consider the nature of 1900’s terraces that make up the majority of the buildings in the conservation area. These terraces are already very dark, and the shadowing from a 24-storey

Generated using <http://shadowcalculator.eu> high rise will have large impacts on natural light, and the quality of life for residents.

**Bulk and Height**: Nearby 18-Storey Buildings

The developers have tried to convince the community, the City of Sydney, the

Department of Planning, and the IPC, that a building of such bulk and height in a

low-density area is appropriate.

“The Department acknowledges the Pemulwuy Precinct does not currently contain

tall buildings and there are currently no tall buildings in this locality, on the eastern

side of the railway corridor. However, on the eastern side of the railway corridor,

approximately 100m to the south-east of the site, there are four existing (and one

proposed) 18-storey high-density mixed-use developments”.

Such justification for the bulk in height is a grave untruth. The eastern side of the railway tracks is a distinctly different area in terms of road width, business zoning, traffic, and overall environment. Regent St and 7 Page 49 Gibbons St are both 4 lane high traffic commercial roads, featuring a supermarket, bars, shops, apartments and offices.

The nearest residential terrace to the 18-storey building at Lawson Square is 79 Wells St, approx 77 metres away (see below). This is very different from the proposed 24-storey student highrise being less than 20 metres away from 2-storey terraces.

This should be considered with the fact that Wells St has mixed-zoning being home to the Tram and Rail Union building and a bar, so is not directly comparable to the quiet residential conservation area surrounding Pemulwuy.

**Subsidised’ student accommodation for Aboriginal students**

The report mentions precinct 3 will: “Provide of 110 beds within the student accommodation made available for ATSI students at subsidised rates” 10

However, at the IPC meeting with the Applicant (13 Nov 2018), Ms Tutuila contradicted this

promise of 110 beds by commenting “For indigenous students, 100 beds.”

Also, the report fails to mention the rate of subsidy, what styles of accommodation

the 110 beds will be, nor any commitment to the 99-year timeframe. Within precinct three,

233 beds are proposed to be studio apartments, 74 twin rooms, and 43 5-bedroom cluster

units.11 Will Atira or the AHC commit to providing details on what type of accommodation will

be made available at subsidised rates?

The rate of subsidy is also an important missing piece of information. Atira

accommodation fees are prohibitively expensive, far exceeding the market price for similar

private rentals. For example, a studio in Atira’s Melbourne La Trobe street is $519 a week!

Another unanswered question is how will the subsidised student accommodation be

guaranteed during the 99-year lease? What happens if Atira sells the business to another

student accommodation provider? What happens if there are not 110 Aboriginal students

interested in the offer (which may not be attractive)?

**International students and car ownership**

The assumption the students will not be driving cars is the key argument for Precinct 3

While statements stating “students generally don’t own cars” may be true for the average local student, the same cannot be assumed for the well-heeled international residents of Atira properties.

**Pedestrians and Traffic**

The report states “The proposal would not result in adverse traffic or car parking impacts.”

and “The proposal would not generate additional pedestrian footpath movements that would

exceed footpath capacity surrounding the site.”14.

Both Lawson Street and Caroline Street are unable to deal with the existing pedestrian traffic, let alone any increase. I often witness pedestrians on Caroline St being forced to walk on the road as the footpaths are of inadequate width. Telegraph poles and bins block the already narrow footpaths. Pedestrians, especially those with prams and in wheelchairs already have no choice but to use the road.

Table 18 of the report states that the pedestrian traffic will increase in Caroline Street by a

factor of 1000% (10x). It claims this “ will not cause an exceedance in comfort

levels for pedestrian routes… ” 15

Contradictorily, the report notes there is no proposal to do anything about the paths nor the

roads. How can already inadequate footpaths be thought suitable for a 10 x increase in foot traffic. This proposal means pedestrians will have no choice but to share the road with an large

increase in car traffic.

Neither AHC or Deicorp have adequately consulted with the community regarding this departure from the original proposal.

Also, as covered in the media, AHC is not a registered affordable housing provider and not obligated to provide affordable housing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. It also does not have

support of the local community.

Providing aboriginal housing in the area is vitally important, and should be the primary focus of any development in the area.

I urge the IPC to oppose this proposal.