



Our Ref: NI:17-017

21 November 2017

The General Manager  
Department of Planning

Dear Sir,

**SUBMISSION RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR 421-249 WHEAT ROAD,  
COCKLE BAY, AS PROPOSED AT 1/11/2017**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This constitutes a further objection to the development proposed for 241-249 Wheat Road, Cockle Bay. It is again made on behalf of the residents of One Darling Harbour, Pyrmont, who directly face this site.

**GROUND'S OF OBJECTION**

2. While some changes have been made to the earlier proposal for this site, in particular, shaving off the highest part of the tower building to provide improved solar access to the public open space to the south, this is a marginal benefit which does not overcome the major objections to this proposal. A copy of our previous submission, which is still relevant, is attached.
3. The application claims to contain all available information relevant to the environmental assessment of the development. But it does not. SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 has as its first aim the following:

"(1) This plan has the following aims with respect to the Sydney Harbour Catchment:

- (a) To ensure that the catchment, foreshores, waterways and islands of Sydney Harbour area recognized, protected, enhanced and maintained:
  - (i) As an outstanding natural asset, and
  - (ii) As a public asset of national and heritage significance,"

Urban and Regional Planning, Environmental Planning and Statutory Planning  
Registered Office: Lyndhurst, Suite 19, 303 Pacific Highway, Lindfield N.S.W 2070  
Telephone: (02) 9416 9111 Facsimile: (02) 9416 9799  
email: [admin@inghamplanning.com.au](mailto:admin@inghamplanning.com.au)  
A.C.N. 106 713 768

[www.inghamplanning.com.au](http://www.inghamplanning.com.au)



For existing and future generations.

We pointed out that the earlier proposal did not address Sydney Harbour as a “public asset of national and heritage significance”. The amended proposal still does not address this matter anywhere. The application is therefore flawed and does not address a very significant heritage issue.

#### Other Matters Previously Raised In The Objection

4. All of the matters previously raised in our earlier submission area still relevant to this objection, including the matter raised in 3. Above.

#### **CONCLUSION**

5. Without considering the detail of this development proposal, it is clear that this is an ambit claim made with a complete disregard to the long held and established principles for Darling Harbour.
6. The proposal does not satisfy the principles established for the site and is totally inappropriate in the context of Darling Harbour and Pyrmont Bridge. It does not produce a valley floor extending buildings in height up to the ridges of the City or Pyrmont.
7. For the reasons set out in this submission, and outlined in our earlier objection, the development proposal should be refused with advice that it will need to be dramatically modified and be consistent with the SHFA principles before further consideration can be given to redevelopment of the site.

**Neil Ingham**  
**Consultant**