

Att DIRECTOR for KEY DEVELOPMENT SITES

JOHN & HILDE GERATHY

34/10 Lincoln Cr Woolloomooloo 2011

Qualified Supporters -- Subject to Conditions Being Imposed on the Development

No Political Donations

SSDA 6471 - SYDNEY MODERN

Submission in Response to SM Addendum 8/8/2018

Dated 23 August 2018

SM / Adventus

Assessment Impacts

I refer to my Submissions dated 15 December 2017 and 14 May 2015 and re-iterate the comments and **Proposed Conditions** referred to therein.

Landscaping

2.5 "Native Climber Mix" ? What is proposed to "espalier" down Gallery 3 wall ?, How long will it take before Gallery 3 Wall is landscaped relieved ?

2.6 The R+S did not provide any details of the proposed landscaping on top of the bunker wall, which have been repeatedly requested.

SM has been requested to advise as to any proposals regarding the brick wall sitting on top of the Bunker Wall AND the metal capping running along the length of the Bunker Wall. Refer to Photographs 1 & 2

Both of these matters were raised in my Submission 14 May 2018 BUT NO RESPONSE !

I understand further amenable approaches have been made to the Heritage Council regarding greening some of the Bunker Wall – leaving some exposed for Heritage purposes.

Notwithstanding SM's current submission dated 8/8/18 SM did on 13 July 2018 agree that the SM still supported greening of the Bunker wall if the Heritage Council approved. Refer to proposed condition following.

The SM's submission regarding the orientation of TWT totally ignores the fact that the only entry and exit to TWT is via Lincoln Cr and we have been objecting to the canyon effect being created in Lincoln Cr – which, despite the Bunker Wall, was relieved by the RBGD green space and trees above as well as the city skyline. We are now left with what is virtually an industrial canyon as our ADDRESS.

TWT is singularly the party most affected by SM's huge overbearing development robbing TWT of the open green space immediately adjoining TWT. The Minister must protect TWT's amenity irrespective of the initial and ongoing costs involved to SM.

Proposed CONDITIONS:

- i. **SM to provide details of landscaping to Gallery 3 Wall (including establishment time frame) and on the top of the Bunker Wall**
- ii. **SM to provide details of proposals for the brick wall and metal capping on the Bunker Wall**
- iii. **SM continue to negotiate with the Heritage Council and commit to a greening of the Bunker wall.**

2.9 SM Lift on Lincoln CR

I reiterate my submissions made on 15 December 2017 and 14 May 2015 notwithstanding the lift should not unduly increase traffic , pedestrian and vehicular >

Proposed CONDITION: No bus or vehicle drop off zone be created in Lincoln Cr or Cowper Wharf Rd.

ARUP TRAFFIC

Loading Dock Operation 24/7

Arup talks in terms of "say until 12 am" but recommends 24/7 dock time . However, in comparison the Secure Parking operates from the southern end of TWT and Lincoln Cr whereas the SM loading dock operates at the northern extremity of Lincoln Cr –using the whole length of Lincoln Cr and TWT frontage including affecting our car park entry and our main foyer entry.

Proposed CONDITION:-

SM dock time should be excluded from 12.00 AM to 6.00AM daily.

ARUP ACOUSTICS CLARIFICATIONS

OUTDOOR CAFÉ AREA

I refer to the Report (response) by PKA dated 22 August 2018 attached hereto .

Arup's recommendation at the end of 2.1.2 for **"a management plan be in place to control the noise when it becomes excessive "** . It is too late when you need to rely on a management plan .SM must get the conditions correct NOW in the interest of all parties, including the SM. What is not needed is future barriers not currently assessed both in terms of effect and visual impact.

Proposed CONDITIONS

- 1 SM respond to PKA Report and provide acoustic amelioration conditions to cater for excessive noise rather than seek to rely on a doubtful management plan.**
- 2 That the Multi – Purpose Space be precluded from being used for outside activities and the doors remain shut and only used as fire escapes.**

SEA WATER EXCHANGE CHAMBER (SWEC)

I refer to the response by PKA dated 22 August 2018 attached hereto.

This is the first time SM has supplied enough details of the SWEC to permit any form of assessment , still not enough.. Arup does not deal with the ventilation shaft (exhaust) function emitting air (noise and vibration) from the pumps and fans. Arup does not address the turbine effect (noise and vibration) of the Penstock Valve exhausting water through 2 x 400mm pipes when intakes are via 2 x 1200mm pipes.

I attach a series of photographs , showing with the white bucket, the SM proposed ventilation shaft location and with the red bucket showing my proposed location of the ventilation shaft 30m to the south. Refer Photo 3

The location proposed by SM in a pristine rock corner of the RBGD with fig trees climbing up and down the rock face will destroy that HERITAGE AREA. Refer SM's SSDA submission on the heritage value of this rock wall and RBG area. Refer Photo 4

The location proposed by me , approx. 30 metres to the south is surrounded by a degraded rock face and bridge structure more consistent/compatible to the industrial SWEC chamber with ventilation shaft. Refer Photo 5.

The SM proposed ventilation turret will be less than 15 metres from my bedroom windows (opening for ventilation and cooling) not 19 metres as claimed by Arup. Do they need a tape measure?

The SWEC location as proposed by me has NO residential windows within 40 metres. Refer Photo 6

I request that the SWEC be moved 30 metres to the south. There are no cost implications to SM.

Proposed CONDITIONS

- 1 SM provide full acoustic details for amelioration of noise/vibration emanating from the Ventilation Shaft from the fans , pumps and Penstock valve.
- 2 The SWEC be moved 30 metres to the south.

John & Hilde Gerathy