

# APPENDIX 10

JPW Response to Submissions

# Barangaroo Headland Park & Northern Cove Main Works

## JPW Response to Submissions



JPW  
JOHNSON PILTON WALKER

Revision 05

Date 04.02.11

App. AP

**CONTENTS**

Response to City of Sydney Submission .....3

Public Submissions

    Jane Irwin.....16

    Elizabeth Lowrie.....25

    Sydney Harbour Association.....26

## **RESPONSE TO CITY OF SYDNEY SUBMISSION**

The numbering below relates to the numbering used within the *City of Sydney (CoS) Submission to the Department of Planning 24<sup>th</sup> December 2010*. The key points addressed have been summarised or paraphrased below to assist the reader, as due to the length of the submission the comments could not be repeated here in their entirety. The CoS submission document above should be referred to review CoS comments in full.

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

#### ***Urban Design***

##### ***3.1 Introduction***

*CoS states that the Headland Park 'does not cater for nor does it meet the many pressing needs of the local and regional community for facilities such as a regional playground, skate park and recreational centre'.*

### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The design of the Headland Park has been predicated around relaxing and passive uses with major opportunities for more active recreation in the sense of walking, cycling and informal ball games on the park's upper bluff. This is in accordance with the CoS's surveys which indicate that the most popular form of recreation is walking.

It is believed that Barangaroo Central is a more appropriate setting for more formal and structured recreational opportunities. Recreation studies will be undertaken to help determine the most appropriate mix of uses. Planning and design of Barangaroo Central has only recently been commenced and will proceed through 2011.

It is noted that the city is keen to work closely with the Barangaroo Delivery Authority to ensure that Barangaroo is integrated with the Harbour Village North Public Domain. The design team welcomes their contribution to the design process.

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

#### ***3.2 Connectivity with Millers Point***

*The CoS is concerned that the park is physically separated from Millers Point by the cuttings and 'light wells'.*

## **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The cuttings and light wells are key elements of the design for two reasons. The first is the design team's primary aim to expose and celebrate the visual strength of the exposed sandstone cliffs and to use the gap to draw light and air into the internal spaces to support Barangaroo's sustainability objectives. [It is important to note – as does CoS later in their submission – that the rock face is a landscape item of heritage significance and therefore should be celebrated].

Secondly there has been a very strongly expressed desire by the local residents for fewer direct connections between the park and the local area. The submission is incorrect in suggesting that the rationale behind the limited entry points is for perimeter control during major events. Neither is there any intention to 'segregate the new park from the existing Millers Point public domain'.

In the recommendations it is suggested that the connections to Clyne and Munn Reserves should be landbridge treatments to give a seamless transition. Aside from the residents' desires for more limited access there are physical problems with this given the existing levels in the Reserves and the need to provide for accessible slopes within the park.

It should be noted that the detail of the edge condition at Merriman Street and adjacent areas (e.g., fence details and so on) has not yet been fully developed but this detail will be provided and discussed with Council in due course during design development and documentation.

It is noted that the City is currently undertaking an urban design study of Millers Point and the Barangaroo Delivery Authority and its consultant team look forward to engaging with the City in this endeavour. It is also noted that the City recommends that the brief for the park be expanded to include areas adjacent to the park in Millers Point and it should be noted that this has occurred since the submission of the Application. The Authority is currently carrying out design studies of Towns Place, Dalgety Road, Munn Reserve and Argyle Place.

It is intended that the park be open 7 days a week, 24 hours each day.

## **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

### ***3.3 Cultural Building and Car Park***

#### ***(a) Activation and vibrancy***

***Design should include active uses at edges of cultural facility shell to activate parkland***

The design of the cultural facility and carpark is still under way and it is therefore too early to address the issues raised in any detail. However it is agreed that the cultural facility needs to engage with the park at different levels and in different locations and the current design studies will address this. Nonetheless it should be noted that the intention at this stage is only to provide a 'shell' (i.e., with no internal fit out) which is as flexible as possible so that it will allow maximum design scope for the so far undefined cultural use to give the desired activation and vibrancy.

***(b) Safety and security***

***Lack of passive surveillance opportunities and dense planting without lighting on some paths and stairs will lead to unsafe environment***

The park will be well lit at night and the design incorporates CCTV cameras for security. A deliberate decision has been made to not light the 'bush walks' since, as the submission rightly points out, the dense naturalistic planting presents a security hazard; with no lighting it will be clear to park users that they should not enter these paths after dark.

The major stairways will be lit.

***(c) Access***

***Limited access points to car park and cultural facilities from Walsh Bay***

It is agreed that all facilities should be highly accessible. It is not agreed that there should be direct pedestrian access to the cultural facility from Walsh Bay since this, in effect, would be via the 'back door' (i.e., the northern end of the cultural facility will be taken up with back of house type facilities). Further, current design proposals are aimed at creating a major entry plaza to the park at the Hickson Road entry and this could potentially link to other major cultural facilities in Barangaroo Central.

Pedestrian entry to the car park can be gained from Towns Place. The design of this has not yet been fully developed but the City's comments are noted.

***(d) Integrated Park Amenities***

***No amenities for Headland Park other than relocated sewage pumping station (to be used as toilets). Shell provides opportunity to integrate facilities (toilets, kiosks, cafes etc) while preserving naturalised form.***

It is intended that, in addition to the amenities block near Towns Place, park amenities such as toilets and shelter will be provided within or closely adjacent

to the internal shell. Design studies for this remain under way. It is also intended that kiosks and cafes etc will be located in Barangaroo Central where there will be a greater concentration of people, making such amenities more viable. Wayfinding and accessibility studies will add to the functionality of the park.

***(e) Lightwells within the park***

***Lack of detail and inconsistent documentation re: light wells***

The design of these elements has not yet been resolved as they are closely associated with the design of the internal space which is still in progress.

***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***3.4 Park Amenity and Useability***

***Foreshore walk requires shade trees***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The City's comments are noted. Additional tree planting has been included between the foreshore walk and the shoreline in select locations during design development, and this will provide some shading from the western sun.

***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***3.7 Public Art***

***Consider submitted Draft Public Art Strategy inadequate and does not address DGR 4.***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The details of how the public art strategy will be applied to the park will be developed during the documentation process for the park. It is intended that the artworks will be closely related to the environmental themes of the design (for example, recycling of water and endemic vegetation).

It has been proposed that interpretation and public art are combined into one 'giant artwork' referred to by Peter Emmett as 'phenomenology of place' which complements the One Planet Framework and ESD strategies by placing emphasis on the poetic and the playful – the realm of public art. The One Planet Framework will be used to suggest ways that interpretation and public art can help address issues such as reconciliation, collective memory and

phenomenology. This concept requires contributions from a wide range of disciplines. This will necessarily take place over a period of time.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### **3.8 Harbour Control Tower**

***No long term strategy for HCT use or access specified and relationship to HP at Merriman Street unresolved. Need further detail.***

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The City's comments are noted. At this stage the future of the Sydney Harbour Control Tower has not yet been finalised and will remain onsite and operational in accordance with Sydney Ports Corporation's requirements. Appropriate adaptive reuse of the tower will be considered provided that the tower is to be retained and becomes redundant.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### **4.1 Heritage**

***pp21/22 states that "the proposal will dramatically change this nationally significant cultural landscape as it currently stands and the understanding of the Millers Point promontory as it evolved .....with the justification that it re-established the natural heritage of the area and provided a reconstruction of the naturalistic headland as it existed prior to 1836. A careful examination of the proposed contours provides evidence that the proposal is not a reconstruction of the naturalistic headland, but rather (distorts) the original headland profile and shoreline configuration".***

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

While the proposal significantly changes the existing landscape, it is noted that the major features of this landscape are those created in only relatively recent times. They are unsympathetic to the original landscape and are inhospitable as an area for public recreation. Further the proposed 'naturalistic' landform is derived from a careful study of the original landform by an acknowledged Sydney landscape expert. The design aim has been to interpret rather than recreate the original headland.

It is not necessary for the design to comply with the Burra Charter since the cliff face is not heritage listed.



Nonetheless the design intention is to treat the cliff face as if it were listed by physically separating the park 'structure' from the exposed sandstone cliff (which is to be retained) and any structures that 'touch' the cliff will do so lightly and in compliance with the Charter.

In general it is believed that the design complies with the CoS Recommendation 7 which says that the conceptual approach should 'create a contemporary landscape setting that acknowledges, incorporates and interprets the significant cultural landscape of the Millers Point Promontory', particularly in its recommendation that the escarpment and rock faces remain visible, are interpreted and incorporated into the design in a meaningful manner. These are, and will remain, central parts of the design.

### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

#### ***4.3 Impact upon Merriman Street cottages and terraces***

***Notes infill of existing land levels to create the "Upper Bluff" will result in a contoured shape that does not interpret the original natural steep incline west of Merriman Street down to the harbour foreshores. It will restrict views to the west from the public domain of Merriman Street and the Merriman Street heritage items and alter their distinctive setting.***

***Supports 6m wide crevasse allowing rock face to be exposed and cultural facility but not at expense of Merriman Street and its heritage items***

***Increase in traffic in Merriman Street and subsequent loss of character.***

### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

It is not correct to say that the raised Upper Bluff will severely restrict views towards the west as 'the height of the raised Upper Bluff is in part a result of the proposed two levels of public parking facilities within the cultural facility'. The location and form of the carpark (or the cultural facility) has no effect whatsoever on the landform. There is no intention that anything around the control tower will restrict views to the west (indeed nothing is shown on the drawings). The recommendations are noted subject to the comments above.

### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

#### ***4.4 Impact upon Clyne Reserve and Merriman Street***

*Do not support the proposed open cut of the vehicular entrance to the car park which limits connections between Clyne Reserve and HP single bridge*

*Infilling of existing land level to create Upper Bluff will severely restrict panoramic views from Clyne Reserve to the west and south west*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The CoS comments are noted. The design team have discussed the proposal with the original designer of the Reserve and will continue to make contact with her in accordance with Moral Rights legislation as the design extends to incorporate the reserve itself. The recommendations regarding increased physical connections between the reserve and the park are noted and these will be assessed as the design progresses, bearing in mind of course the residents' desire for fewer rather than more connections between Merriman Street and the park.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

*4.5 Impact upon the Port Operations and Communications Centre and the Merriman Street rock face*

*Support retention of the HCT and associated Merriman Street rock face for its contribution to the cultural significance of Milers Point and Sydney Harbour.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The comments are noted and will be considered at an appropriate time when the future of the tower is decided. Refer also to response to Item 3.8.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

*4.6 Protection of Moore's Wharf*

*Proposed seawall and new harbour inlet of western side of former Moore's Wharf building supported as re-establishes the wharfs original dockside setting, however proposed shoreline and promenade to be resolved. Conservation Management Plan should be developed for former Moore's Wharf building. The detail design resolution of the proposed seawall and new harbour inlet on the western side of the former Moore's Wharf should be developed alongside the Interpretation*

*Strategy for the Headland Park and in consultation with the Heritage Architect Conybeare Morrison International and the City of Sydney.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The comments are noted. These matters would be addressed during the detailed design development phase.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### ***4.7 Impact upon the 1913 sandstone seawall***

*Proposed incorporation of sandstone from sandstone seawall into naturalistic shoreline will have a detrimental impact on item. Short section of seawall should be kept in its original form. Wall should be recorded to archival standard prior to disassembly.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

A portion of the 1913 seawall has been retained and incorporated into the design.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### ***4.8 Sewage Pumping Station***

*Support relocation but consider not enough information relating to the design of its new setting to ensure that its heritage significant is retained. Archival recording should be undertaken prior to any demolition works. Suitable adaptive reuse plan required. Archaeological monitoring of any ground disturbance should be undertaken.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The comments are noted and will be considered when the details of the future use are developed.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### ***4.9 Munn Street***

*Outlines significance of Munn Street and Dalgety Bond Stores. Supports but questions ability of the proposal to interpret alignment of Munn Street. Notes will restrict view from Block A of the former Dalgety Stores*

*and will significantly change the appreciation of its former dockside location. Also alters setting of the Federation Arts and Craft terrace at Munn Street. Considers design resolution critical and needs to be reconsidered to achieve state objective of interpreting the former Munn Street alignment and to conserve setting.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The design area of this area will be developed during the detailed design development phase.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### **4.10 Interpretation**

*Interpretation Strategy to be developed alongside design and public art strategy not as afterthought. Should interpret the original steep incline west of Merriman Street. Aboriginal use of the area followed by non indigenous cultures provides potential for public art that is interpretive. Naming of new elements provides opportunity for interpretation.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The interpretation strategy has been developed as an integral part of the design by Dr Peter Emmett.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### **5.3 Pedestrian Amenity**

*The proposed development would also increase pedestrian activity in Dalgety Road. In addition to the construction of a new footpath on the western side, the proponent should also widen the footpath on the eastern side of the street to the satisfaction of the City. The existing footpath on the eastern side is narrow, especially next to the street light poles.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The comments are noted. It is proposed to extend and widen the footpath in Dalgety Road as part of the works and design work will commence shortly.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

### **6.1 Protection of existing City street trees**

*Construction work areas have potential to impact on City's street trees – need specific measures to ensure protected (AS 4970). To be addressed prior to commencement of works.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The design of the park does not involve any works on existing city streets which would affect any trees. Should design studies for connecting streets and spaces affect street trees, CoS comments will be complied with.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

### **6.2 New Landscape**

*No technical data provided to support proposal in relation to landscape works (technical specifications required for soils, trees and the maintenance and management of the park)*

*Issues identified lower irrigation requirements of native / endemic species, sourcing of advanced stock, top soil preparation and measures to prevent compaction, details of irrigation system (including watering schedule / water management plan for new trees in a tree management plan)*

*Matters to be addressed by qualified Arborist and Soil Scientist.*

*Tree Management Plan should be provided.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

Details of the proposed planting design have been developed considerably since the Main Works Application was submitted and the design team has been assisted by a specialist arborist/horticulturalist (Stuart Pittendrigh) and a soil scientist (Dr Simon Leake). A contract will be let in 2011 to grow and supply advanced plants to be planted at the appropriate time before the completion of the park. Specifications for the plants, growing media etc will be developed as part of this strategy.

Specialist soil science advice has been sought and will be incorporated into the proposals. The specialist advice is that topsoil does not need to be 1.0m deep as suggested by the Council. Topsoil depth for trees will be sufficiently deep to provide optimal growing conditions. All of the specialist reports can be made available to Council. A Tree Management Plan will be prepared during the during the detailed design development phase.

Irrigation will be provided using water recycled from the site (i.e., no mains water will be used).

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### **7.0 Fill**

##### **Volume and Height of Proposed Fill**

*Noted volume of fill from Stage 1 may increase by 80,000m<sup>3</sup> to approximately 230,000m<sup>3</sup> putting pressure on ability to provide useful amenity space for visitors.*

*Note increase in gradients on the west and south sides of the park from 1:2 to 1:1.5 with no explanation. Raises concerns re: design being fill driven, stabilisation of slope will require engineered solution that will detract from natural landscape appearance, maintenance and provision of safe workplace.*

*Topsoil should be increased to meet Council standards of 1.5m topsoil depth for trees.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The design has been driven by the 1836 headland form. The design of the earthworks has been carried out by civil and geotechnical engineers. Further design development has resulted in gradients on the western slopes of closer to 1:1.9, with steepest sections around 1:1.7. Whilst engineered stabilisation is required for these steep slopes, the consultant team is working with landscape appearance, maintenance and safety considerations in mind.

The depth and specification of topsoil for turf and planting areas will be strictly in accordance with the recommendations of the specialist soil scientist.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### **8.0 Landform**

*Regularity of proposed contours and profiling indicates a uniform gradient not typical of headlands of Sydney Harbour.*

*Landform will impact on views from even upper floors of residences in Merriman Street contrary to DGR 4.*

*Landform profile should be amended to more closely match historic profile of Millers Point and be terraced and graded so that partial views from Merriman St are retained.*

## **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

As previously discussed the landform has been derived from studies of the historic profile of Millers Point.

The landform itself will not impact on views from any residence in Merriman Street since all levels in the park are either at the level of the adjacent street or are lower. It is acknowledged that the tree planting in the park will impact on views but there will still be framed views from parts of Merriman Street and there will be extensive views from the park itself.

## **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

### **9.0 Public Domain**

#### **Materials and Park Furniture**

*Suggested finishes and furnishings reference City of Sydney standards as specified.*

#### **Lighting**

*Lighting plan generally acceptable subject to lighting levels being met. Suggest landings on stair receive increased lighting especially to increase safety upon the western stairway where it crosses through areas of understorey planting.*

#### **Signage and Interpretation**

*Signage Strategy plan to be submitted for Council comment with signage at key locations, including site interpretation and surrounding points of interest.*

## **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The City's comments are noted. A set of Public Domain Design Guidelines is in preparation and the City's standards will be considered as part of the process. A Wayfinding and Signage Strategy will form part of this guideline.

The document will pull together all of the project work on the public domain. It will outline the **what, where and why** of the public domain and will need to be updated from time to time. The Guidelines will:

- Incorporate and build on the information presented in the Public Domain Plan and the Public Domain Sub-Plans;
- Guide the implementation of the Barangaroo Public Domain Vision;
- Inform the Detailed Design and Documentation for Headland Park, Central and South Precincts;
- Set the future direction for the public domain design; and
- Be utilised by other teams to develop the public domain design (including the Barangaroo South Team).



## **PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS**

### **PUBLIC SUBMISSION - Jane Irwin Landscape Architect**

#### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***1. b. The Northern cove forces a disconnection between the Headland Park and South Barangaroo. This connection should be fostered to draw the headland back into the city, increase its vibrancy and enable it to sit more comfortably in its context.***

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The comment is noted but it is considered that the foreshore promenade provides a strong physical connection throughout the site and that there are powerful visual connections.

#### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***1. c. Creation of a 'beach' on the South Western site of the Headland Park is a questionable decision. It has no interaction with the water, and has the potential to be a significant safety concern, as dangerous material could end up in the sand, especially as one of the intended uses of the park is for special events.***

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

There is no beach in the proposed design.

#### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***1. e. Ignores 200 years of industrial heritage by removal of all sea walls and remnants of previous uses.***

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The vast majority of the seawalls are fairly recent caisson constructions from around 1970 and they have no heritage value. The sandstone seawall is mostly left in position but some of the top layers are being dismantled and re-used in the landscape immediately adjacent to their current location. The sandstone rock faces are being kept as features within the Cultural Building.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

*Use of water-blasted sandstone to achieve a 'natural effect' is conceptually problematic. To dig up sandstone from the site and blast it to pretend it is 'natural', is not only a waste of energy, but also entirely disingenuous to the authentic heritage of the site. In addition, although there are sediment mitigation measures to be put in place, and although the material is local, the short-term impact of large amounts of sediment flowing into the harbour should not be underestimated in terms of its impact on marine flora and fauna.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

It is not intended for the sandstone to 'pretend' it is natural. It will clearly be an artificial construct. The sandstone is being excavated for re-use in the park rather than having to purchase sandstone from elsewhere.

Strict safeguards will be put in place to ensure that no sediment enters the harbour. Thus there will be no damage to marine flora and fauna.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

*2. Demolition or modification (yet to be determined) of the Sydney Harbour Control Tower*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The treatment of the harbour control tower is outside of the current scope of works. However it is agreed that the tower offers potential opportunities for some other use when it is eventually de-commissioned and these will be explored in due course.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

*3. Detailed design of the Headland Park including the final landform; landscape design, stormwater strategy, services and infrastructure, pedestrian pathways, Globe Street extension, car park within headland, park amenities and heritage interpretation.*

*a. Landscape design:*

*ii. 'large shade trees in irrigated grassland' (Headland Park And Northern Cove Main Works Environmental Assessment, P. 50) Again, if the proposal is for a naturalistic headland park representative of the landscape before 1836, what is naturalistic about 'large shade trees in irrigated grassland'?*

## **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The aim is to create a park with usable areas (i.e., with grass and shade), similar to the area around Lady Macquarie's Chair.

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***3. a. iii. Use of palm trees throughout the park is questionable. Again, how does this fit with the idea of a naturalistic park? Are we in the North African desert, or Sydney?***

## **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

Comment noted. The palm trees to be used in the park are *Livistona australis*, a native species which was a common species around the harbour on sites like this before they were largely removed. [It is noted that the graphical representations available in CAD packages are somewhat limited and that this may have contributed to the misunderstanding.]

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***3. a. iv. What will the treatment of the Light wells in the middle of the parkland be. Before this submission is approved, more information is needed on how these will be treated and how they will relate with the rest of the park?***

## **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

These elements have not yet been designed as they are connected with the Cultural Facility which is still under design development.

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***3. a. v. What is a 'spray fountain'? And what is its function in the landscape of Barangaroo. It currently seems like an object in space, rather than a well-considered landscape proposition***

## **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

There is no spray fountain proposed in the Headland Park. There may be water features in Barangaroo Central.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***3. a. vi. The proposed amphitheatre has no relation to any other element in the park. Again it seems like nothing but an ill-conceived object in space that divides the parkland space and the experience of the amphitheatre from the main feature of this landscape, the harbour.***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The amphitheatre (if it proceeds) will be in Barangaroo Central.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***3. a. vii. What is the circular element in the cultural facility forecourt plaza?***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

This is a notional design element. The design of the forecourt will be developed with the design of the cultural facility.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***b. Stormwater strategy:***

***3. b. i. Nowhere is the stormwater strategy represented on the landscape drawings.***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The stormwater system is described in the Hydraulic Engineer's drawings and reports and has been under continuous development in parallel with the landscape design. It will be closely integrated with the landscape and this needs a lot of detailed design work and coordination between the engineers and landscape architects which was not appropriate at the Main Works Application stage.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

**3. b. ii. A total tank capacity of 1250kL will be installed to capture stormwater from the Headland Park site'(Barangaroo Headland Park Headland Park Main Works Package ESD Report, p. 8). Where?**

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The location of the storage tank for stormwater re-use is subject to detailed design but in general terms it will be located underground along the line of the foreshore promenade.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***Pedestrian Pathways, accessibility and movement***

##### ***i. Accessibility***

##### ***1. Towns Place***

***a. Very undeveloped entry. The existing condition has chain link fence with no relation to Moores Wharf. How will this change?***

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

It is acknowledged that the detail of this entrance was not fully developed in the project application. The design of the entry is being progressed with the landscape architects.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***c. i. 2. c. The Southern entry 'grand stairways', pages 3 and 4 (landscape) display something different to page 21 (engineering) (APPENDIX 1 Headland Park and Northern Cove Works Drawings,)***

***c. i. 2. d. The 'grand stairways' force the construction The 'grand stairways' force the construction of a retaining wall that will be a minimum of 14m at its highest point. This has the potential to be an unfriendly and unattractive space.***

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

Any inconsistencies will be resolved as design progresses. The southern entrance to the cultural facility is being designed by very experienced architects with design excellence a key criteria. It will be vetted by the Design Excellence Review Panel and other expert advisors to the Barangaroo Delivery Authority.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***c. iv. Special Event***

***1. Large volume of people wanting to use the elevators.***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The public elevators are neither intended nor required for moving large crowds during special events. They are intended only for vertical access to and from the car park, the cultural space and the top level of the park, particularly for the mobility impaired during normal use of the park. The main entrances of the park are connected by the 5m wide foreshore pedestrian path which is connected to the upper levels of the park by a 4m wide accessible (<1:20 gradient) path as well as by bridges from Clyne Reserve, Merriman Street and Munn Street Reserve.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***d. Car park within headland***

***d. ii. The 'slot' entrance to the car park is very ungenerous.***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The 'slot' is intended to expose the sandstone 'cliff' along its length and to allow light and ventilation. It is wide enough only to allow trucks and cars to access the carpark and the future 'back of house' for the cultural space. It is considered more important to maximise the park area than to widen the 'slot'.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***d. iv. 'The most likely users (of the car park) would be visitors to the area for leisure activities in the park, or to cycle or walk along the foreshore' (Headland Park And Northern Cove Main Works Environmental Assessment, P. 88). We find it difficult to imagine all of these users being served by a single lift entrance.***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The provision of two lifts (in one shaft) will be sufficient for public access from the car park to all levels of the park, including the foreshore walk, the upper bluffs and the cultural space. However the majority of park users will arrive by other means.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***d. vi. Western air plenum (Headland Park And Northern Cove Main Works Environmental Assessment, P. 61) How does the air get out? Releasing car park fumes into parkland? No reference to emission rates in the 'Air Quality and Health Assessment'. Where are the vents for a 5 story building?***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The car park will exhaust at a low level to the north via the car park driveway ventilation slot away from publically accessible areas and adjacent residential areas. There will be no car park exhaust stacks within the park.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***d. vii. The entrances from the south and the north to the cultural facility and the car park almost meet. Why not just put the originally proposed street through?***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

There is no advantage in connecting and mixing pedestrian with vehicular traffic and there is no intention of driving through the ground floor of the future cultural space

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

***e. Cultural Facility***

***e. ii. It is inappropriate and disrespectful that this cultural facility has NO physical public presence that allows its significance to be expressed in a strong, inclusive and accessible manor.***

**RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

It is agreed that the cultural facility should have an appropriate physical presence. Whilst the use of the space has yet to be determined its design will allow for its entry to be expressed with appropriate significance - the immediate entry 'forecourt' is approximately 35m x 35m.

**SUBMISSION COMMENT**

*e. iv. The proposed cultural facility will be entirely dependent upon artificial light for its operation, except the top level indicated by the problematic and unresolved 'light wells', for its operation. This raises significant ESD issues.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

Environmentally sustainable design is an important element in the design. Light will not only be brought into the facility through the lightwells but also via the 'slot' along Merriman Street.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

*e. v. The proposed cultural facility should be located above ground where it can develop a strong, generous, expressive and accessible public identity.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

The comment that the facility should be located above ground is noted but the Authority believes that it can have an equally 'strong, generous, expressive and accessible public identity' in its proposed location.

#### **SUBMISSION COMMENT**

##### *g. Heritage interpretation*

*The basic intent of the cultural space is to express the morphology of the sandstone headland by leaving the sandstone cliff exposed similar in manner to the existing wall in The Bond building on Hickson Road. This will create a space with the potential to provide a venue as evocative as the Tate Modern's Turbine Hall or (locally) the Cockatoo Island halls.' (Headland Park And Northern Cove Main Works Environmental Assessment, P. 51). The morphology of a sandstone headland does not involve the creation of a cavernous entry to an underground building, or for that matter, an underground building at all. Perhaps a more effective solution would be to leave the sandstone wall exposed in the public domain, much the same as Pirrama park. This is potentially far more evocative and entirely more representative of a headland park.*

#### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

See previous comments regarding seawall, control tower and industrial heritage.



With regard to the treatment of the sandstone wall it is agreed that this should be fully open to public view and the design caters for this. Whilst Pirrama Park is a highly successful piece of design the circumstances are quite different. For example, the sandstone 'cliff' at Pirrama Point is not actually a physical part of the site (although it is an important visual element in the design), as it is separated from the park by a public road. Further, Pirrama Park does not attempt to evoke a headland.

## **PUBLIC SUBMISSION - Elizabeth Lowrie**

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

***Ms Lowrie's submission comments primarily on traffic and pedestrian issues relating to the car park and proposed car park entry location***

### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

It should be noted that the entry to the car park must also include the entry to the cultural facility loading dock/back of house. There are only two possible locations for this (as the submission implicitly acknowledges) – Towns Place or Hickson Road. Careful studies have been carried out on both options and these concluded that the proposed arrangement (with the vehicular entry at Towns Place) was the optimal (indeed the only logical) solution since the main pedestrian entry to the cultural facility will be from the south i.e., from Hickson Road which will be served by the proposed light rail system, bus drop off and from Wynyard. It would not be a sensible design decision to have both vehicle and pedestrian entry from a single point.

## **PUBLIC SUBMISSION - Sydney Harbour Association**

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

*Tree planting on the western slope should be re-arranged to enable direct views to Me-mel (Goat Island) from the Headland Park.*

### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

There will be direct views of Mel Mel from the majority of the foreshore and from the northern parts of the site (including the northern slopes). However from the upper bluffs and the bush walk the views will be filtered through the trees, as they are on other similar sites such as Balls Head. Providing a variety of views is considered to be a desirable design aim.

### ***SUBMISSION COMMENT***

*A section of the revised upper bluff is attached as Sketch C. It suggests that community and tourist activities should be linked by lifts to the cultural facility below.*

### **RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION COMMENT**

It is agreed that the upper bluff should be connected to the facilities below. The proposal includes provision of access by lift and by pathways into the cultural facility and the car park. The detail of these connections is still being determined.