

21 August 2015

The Hon. Rob Stokes, MP  
Minister for Planning  
office@stokes.minister.nsw.gov.au

Dear Minister

### **Crown Sydney Hotel Resort (SSD 6957)**

Barangaroo should be a world class extension to the central business district that provides new and much needed public space including green open space and brings the harbour back to the community. The proposed Crown Sydney Hotel Resort will do little more than privatise prime land in Barangaroo South, create traffic congestion, shadow other areas of the site, block views and vistas of the harbour and create wind tunnels. The proposal would result in little public benefit while creating significant public impacts.

As the representative of communities adjacent to the proposed development and future Barangaroo residents, I oppose this application.

Widespread concern has been raised about proposed modification 8 to the Barangaroo South concept plan with regard to relocating the Crown hotel along the waterfront. Placing the detailed design for the tower on public exhibition before this modification is approved reflects an appalling planning approach that relegates public input to a box ticking exercise with approval a done deal.

The community is already cynical about Barangaroo's planning process and the current process which assumes relocation will be approved despite serious concerns raised, only reinforces this. Throughout the SSD 6957 environmental impact statement, impacts are justified in terms of being within the scope of modification 8, making public submissions difficult because there is still no response to concerns raised about modification 8.

#### **Traffic and Transport**

I strongly oppose the proposal for 610 off-street car parking spaces.

Five hundred spaces are proposed to cater for the casino section of the hotel, based on an assessment of Crown Casino in Melbourne parking demands, which are 800 cars at the maximum and 100 cars at the minimum. This is an absolute over-estimation and must be rejected.

Melbourne's Crown Casino is open to the public whereas the Barangaroo casino is claimed to be restricted to 'high rollers' with limits on gaming including no poker machines and minimum bets. Even the environment impact statement states that only five per cent of Crown Melbourne's local gaming customers would be able to play in the proposed casino due to membership restrictions. Parking space demands for the approved casino should not be close to that of Melbourne Crown's demand.

With the casino operating 24 hours a day, traffic impacts could occur at all times, with little respite from noise and congestion for adjacent residents.



(2)

Provision of an additional 110 parking spaces for the 66 residential apartments in this development equates to almost two car parking spaces per apartment. This is well above what is needed in an area with multiple public transport options and easy walking distance to jobs and services. Most new inner city apartments provide only one or no parking spaces and remain in high demand.

The site is difficult to drive to and the Barangaroo integrated transport plan estimates that 96 per cent of visitors to the site will travel by public transport, or bike or walk. The environmental impact statement identifies that multiple public transport options that will be available when the building operates including train, light rail, ferry, bus and metro – there is no reason to provide so many parking spaces.

Provision of 610 parking spaces will encourage casino patrons and visitors and residents to drive, adding to inner central business district and local traffic congestion. The number of parking spaces must be significantly reduced.

I am concerned that the porte-cochere would be located adjacent to open space in the north. This could put pedestrians at risk with frequent car movements at all times; its location must be closely assessed in terms of pedestrian safety.

### **Underground Car Park**

Car parking spaces are proposed to be built underground adjacent to the site below Barangaroo Central, but no assessment has been provided on impacts for landscaping and vegetation at Barangaroo Central. The underground car park for the hotel resort must not prevent deep soil planting in the public domain at Barangaroo Central and this must be addressed.

### **Signage**

The hotel resort is proposed to be built on public land and its design should not detract from public amenity. The proposal includes 12 Crown logo signs, some with the word 'Crown' printed, on the building from various sides and aspects. The signs are large and illuminated and will be reflected in the harbour increasing the building's domination of the site.

The number of signs must be reduced significantly so that the private aspect does not dominate the entire Barangaroo site and the harbour.

### **Site Location**

The hotel resort should not be located on the waterfront, which remains as Barangaroo South's only approved waterfront public recreation space and is vital to be retained so that Barangaroo will be a desirable place to live, work and visit. Barangaroo South needs more than a pocket park to become a globally competitive commercial and residential redevelopment; it needs public open space along the harbour.

The location of the approved waterfront park helps link South Barangaroo with Central Barangaroo and the Headland Park through continuous open space. Building a tower on this site will create a physical barrier that would reduce integration across Barangaroo and with the rest of the city.

The small part of foreshore land for public use around the perimeter of the hotel would be dominated by the hotel and casino and would fail to provide a harbour experience or a place where the general public will wish to socialise and enjoy the harbour. Continuous ground floor public accessibility is supported however it provides no benefit to the public experience of Barangaroo – harbour views at a private restaurant cannot compare to the potential draw of an expansive and accessible open public harbour.

Given residential apartments represent a significant use within the tower, particularly in the upper levels, the proposal reflects the worst case scenario for the public benefit, with harbour views monopolised for private benefit and public impacts created.

The proposed casino location provides little public benefit and represents a private grab for prime public land. It should be rejected and the building moved to areas of Barangaroo South dedicated and approved for development.

### **Building Scale Impacts**

The proposed height of the hotel resort of 271 metres is too high and over a hundred metres above what is currently approved, with gross floor area significantly greater than approved controls.

The proposed tower sited on the harbour will be one of the tallest buildings in the CBD and is inconsistent with accepted planning principle and practice, which would have building heights reducing as buildings get closer to the waterfront in order to maximise public benefit and integration of the harbour with adjacent areas. This principle was adopted by the 2007 winning design.

### **View Corridors**

The proposed building maximises private views while blocking view corridors across the city.

The design of the building is stated to maximise views in all aspects of the building; putting private gain at the forefront of design. The proposed tower will significantly erode views from adjacent areas including from homes, parks, reserves and public open space in Pyrmont and the CBD, impacting on historic local character and amenity.

Impacts on Sydney Observatory's operations are unacceptable, with the hotel resort to block views of the Centauri constellation during August, September and early October. This is in addition to lost views of four key target objectives from other towers on Barangaroo South which create significant cumulative impacts on the observatory's functions. I am also very concerned about light spill, particularly given bright signage and glazing will be used on the building, noting that the Sydney Observatory Sky View Loss Assessment fails to assess potential light spill impacts.

Claims that Sydney Observatory is in an "inappropriate" location to function as an observatory because of the existing light spill from the CBD and Sydney Harbour Bridge and smog and pollution should be rejected. Sydney Observatory provides residents and visitors to Sydney opportunities to learn about astronomy and see stars and has served this purpose since the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. It must continue to do so for future generations.

Building bulk and scale must be reduced. This can be done by reducing the number of residential apartments provided. The project was meant originally to be a hotel; however the government approved a casino within the building in order to "subsidise" the hotel. There is no need to provide apartments in this building, they were never part of original plans and add over 27 floors to the building. Waterfront apartments represent an unacceptable privatisation of the harbour that goes beyond hotel rooms.

The hotel resort will overshadow public open space including Globe Harbour in Barangaroo South during morning to early afternoon between Autumn and Spring. Lunch time is when the foreshore would be in highest demand but during the colder months there will be no sun and strong winds, making this open space unpleasant and unattractive for lunch breaks and passive recreation.

The tower will create wind tunnels across the Barangaroo South site, making it inaccessible for some people and challenging and unpleasant for all. The north west of the building will not meet wind criterion. This is unacceptable for a planned redevelopment of prime public land.

### **Construction Hours**

Construction is proposed to commence at 7am six days a week and cease at 6pm Monday to Friday and 5pm on Saturdays. Given the project will likely take years and is in a major redevelopment site where construction is already occurring over a number of years, more needs to be done to protect adjacent residents from noise impacts. Work commencing at 7am, particularly on Saturdays will significantly interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of adjacent homes.

(4)

I receive regular complaints from residents in apartments adjoining the Barangaroo site who say that construction hours often get extended and that noise impacts for residents in apartments at high levels are not properly predicted or prevented. They say that noisy works not deemed 'construction', such as truck bump in and bump out, regularly occur outside permissible hours including on Sundays, with noise impacts often starting at 6am. The cumulative impacts are significant and unfair.

Conditions must include times for respite and limit the times of *all* noisy works.

***The proposed Crown Sydney Hotel Resort would see a privately owned tower constructed on public waterfront land, privatising prime land, views and vistas, creating impacts on adjacent homes, public space and parks, and reducing integration across the Barangaroo site and CBD. It would support significant private gain from access to scarce public land.***

***This proposal should be rejected, with the hotel relocated to areas already-approved for development, the building height significantly scaled down and private parking spaces significantly reduced.***

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AG', written in a cursive style.

Alex Greenwich  
**Member for Sydney**