


## Matthew Rosel - Submission Details for John Shawcross (object)

---

**From:** John Shawcross <johnshawcross@mail.com>  
**To:** <Matthew.Rosel@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 8/05/2013 12:42 PM  
**Subject:** Submission Details for John Shawcross (object)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Attachments:** The Inconvenient Truth 2.pdf

---

 Department of Planning

---

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: John Shawcross  
Email: johnshawcross@mail.com

Address:  
3310/2

Haymarket, NSW  
2000

Content:  
Please see my attached submission

IP Address: cpe-121-210-169-244.kqzh1.clt.bigpond.net.au - 121.210.169.244  
Submission: Online Submission from John Shawcross (object)  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view\\_diary&id=60360](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=60360)

Submission for Job: #5878 SSD 5878-2013 Sydney International Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Centre Precinct - Mixed use Development in the Southern Haymarket Precinct (Concept Proposal)  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view\\_job&id=5878](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=5878)

Site: #2784 Sydney International Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Centre Precinct; Refer to Legal Description Attached, Sydney  
[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view\\_site&id=2784](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=2784)

**John Shawcross**

E : johnshawcross@mail.com

---

Powered by [AffinityLive](#): Work. Smarter.

# The inconvenient truth

The EIS is riddled with errors, mistakes, mistruths and very biased self serving statements, which makes one wonder which pieces of evidence are factual.

## Contrary to EIS Vol 1a Page 9, Statement of Validity to the EIS

*“The information contained within this statement is neither false nor misleading”*

### For example

#### 1. EIS Vol 1a Page 17

*“ The Haymarket will create approximately 2,100 new jobs during construction ,with ongoing employment opportunities for over 2,000 people”*

2000 ongoing jobs ! That is a lot of cleaners ! Perhaps what they are trying to say is that there is office space for 2000. A big difference.

#### 2. EIS Vol 1a P 17, Key Aspects...Table 1 Error in site area

EIS Design Report Page 65 claims the Haymarket site size is 47,530 Sq.m

Illustrative concept proposal area

Site area 47 530 m<sup>2</sup>

GFA Residential Buildings 147 691 m<sup>2</sup>

Commercial 26 107 m<sup>2</sup>

Other (Retail/Community/IQ Hub) 9 850 m<sup>2</sup>

Public Car Park 13 588 m<sup>2</sup>

Total 197 236 m<sup>2</sup>

Floor space ratio (FSR) 4.3:1

However the SICEEP EIS Site Description Page 19 draws a red line around the Haymarket site which includes all of Hay St west of Quay St and the light rail corridor to the west of Darling Drive up to Pier St (including the Memorial Park) and states the area to be 43,880.



Whichever figure one uses for the site area, neither equates to the FSR of 4.3:1

The choice of the figures used is presumably to suit the argument.

The real area between Hay St, Pier St, Harbour St and Darling Drive is in fact nearer to 30,000Sq.m.

### 3. Parts that are relevant only to the Haymarket precinct are buried in the SICEEP DA.


Are these errors or just a convenient place to hide them ?

(e.g. SSD 5752, SICEEP, appendix O - visual and view impact analysis pt 61. Pdf)

*“Development application, Peak Tower, North Elevation, proposed building profile overlay*

The following figure – buried in SSD 5755 illustrates the size of the proposal in relation to The Peak.

I presume to hide the inconvenient truth.



7428A MCD AR D307 01/03/2013	DENTON CORKER MARSHALL	THE HAYMARKET LEND LEASE DEVELOPMENT	DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION PEAK TOWER - NORTH ELEVATION PROPOSED BUILDING PROFILE OVER
1:1000 @ A3 0 10 20 30			

**4. The traffic studies do not include one of the three exit/entry points to Darling Drive, that being Ultimo Rd, the key to traffic movement for the PPP and the PDA.**

**EIS ¾ Traffic Study:**

Darling Drive has three access points:

- Ultimo Road at the south end
- Harbour St (Pier St ) in the middle
- Union Street/Murray Street at the north end

Darling Drive will be reduced to one lane each way EIS 2/4 P71: “ *Darling Drive has reduced the number of lanes and tightened the road corridor to provide a more attractive setting for the student accommodation*”


One of those is at Ultimo Rd, where the study states that *30% of the traffic flow to and from Darling Drive will be via Ultimo Road* (section 7.1.1). Yet amazingly no traffic studies are done on this intersection !

Multiple references are made to traffic movement from Darling Drive into Quay St. **There is no such intersection.** There is a remnant of Quay St which is the entry point to the existing SEC car park, which is referred to separately in the study as the new SW carpark entry/Hay Street.

The study has not factored in the traffic exiting the Haymarket Precinct from Harbour Street that will need to cross to Darling Drive via Pier St, to get to Ultimo Rd if they want to access Broadway to go west or east without going through the City. Similarly, traffic exiting the SW blocks will need to go via Darling Drive and enter Ultimo Rd.

However, Ultimo Road westbound is very congested most of the time at Harris St with vehicles attempting to turn left onto Harris. Vehicles exiting Darling Drive to turn right on Ultimo Rd have nowhere to go and consequently select the right turn lane and then attempt to barge into the left since they have no option, otherwise they would never exit Darling Drive through the lights. So there is no problem getting 4-6 cars through each cycle even though they have to break traffic rules to do so. When Darling Drive is fully utilised under the new development, there will be LoS E (unacceptable) condition at the junction with Ultimo Rd.






Gridlock. Traffic trying to exit Darling Drive and turn right into Ultimo Road has a green light but no place to go. Ultimo Rd traffic has banked up trying to get onto Harris St. The cyclist has the solution.



Gridlock. Ultimo Rd looking west towards Harris St.. Darling Drive enters from the right at the green light and trying to merge left to turn left into Harris St. No one going anywhere.



Ultimo Rd at the junction of Harris St. Traffic from Darling Drive trying to force their way into the left turn lane to turn into Harris St

At the central access onto Pier St to go East, one assumes the study is realistic with current use.

At the Western end, in busy periods, one normally waits about 8 sets of lights to turn right (west) at the fishmarkets. The study notes this is Los E condition.

So while Darling Drive appears can just handle the traffic density at the moment, any increase will result in bottle necks exceptionally quickly, because the exits from Darling Drive are the problem.

.

And yet Hyder's report says:

*“ that the impact of The Haymarket development does not impose conditions on the intersections worse than what would have otherwise occurred through existing traffic”*

At present there is only one pedestrian bridge planned together with 2 pedestrian crossings. Pedestrians exiting the theatre will tend to cross the road to access the Goods Line, being the easiest route to Central. Similarly the 1000 students who will want to enter the Haymarket Precinct and Paddy's / Market City are going to walk across Darling Drive where there is no crossing.

DHL advise that the new light rail schedule will be increased to one every 6 minutes when the Dulwich Hill extension is open

So Darling Drive will be reduced to one lane each direction

- Have 2 pedestrian crossings
- Have students running across the traffic to get to the Haymarket Precinct, Paddy's Market and Market City
- Have a light rail train passing every 6 minutes.
- And be congested at both ends.
- People exiting the new Entertainment Centre will run across Darling Drive to use the Goods Line back to Central.

I suggest that this has not been thought through.

## 5. The consultants reports have been rushed and in cases, have had to be resubmitted twice to the applicant, possibly since they did not favour the application ( eg the Heritage report).

The Heritage Report Conclusions are shown in italics

*The proposed PPP, Haymarket Precinct and Hotel development are supportable in heritage terms for several reasons:*

*There will be no impact on heritage items located either within the development site or in its vicinity through modification to building fabric or demolition;*

We are very pleased that no demolition of heritage buildings is required.

*The settings of the Chinese Garden of Friendship, Darling Harbour Water Feature and the Carousel will be enhanced by the developments;*

It is difficult to understand how the enhancement of the Chinese Gardens is gained by the placement of a 140 metre high block (NE 3) less than 100 metres away to the south and the theatre 50 metres away to the west

*Although there will be some impact on views to heritage items in the vicinity of the Haymarket Precinct, this will not affect interpretation of these items or their heritage significance;*

Once again, it is hard to understand how the placement of a 100 metre high block (SE1) some 30 metres away and the 140 metre tower (SW3) 60 metres away can fail to affect the interpretation of the Market City façade. Similarly, the 140 m high (NE3) tower dominates the heritage pumphouse about 30 metres away.

*There will be some impact on the Darling Harbour Rail Corridor resulting from the loading dock associated with the Exhibition. The impact of the loading dock is, however, limited and will not affect interpretation of the Rail Corridor or its heritage significance. The impact will be ameliorated by the removal of monorail infrastructure by others;*

So there will be some impact

*Views to the Powerhouse Museum will be affected by the two residential blocks in the Haymarket Precinct situated next to the Rail Corridor, which will also be impacted. Principal views to the Powerhouse Museum are available from Harris Street and will not be affected by the proposed development, while views to the building are of secondary importance.*

The student blocks and tower SW 1 will obscure the sight lines to the Museum from the southwest and the CBD. Why is it deemed sufficient to retain only the western façade when the eastern façade is the most important one.

#### 5.9.1 Wind Impact

Cermak Peterka Petersen (CPP) are another consultant who appear reticent in their approval.

*The report finds that the proposed building envelopes may result in downwash from taller buildings, and that windy conditions could be expected at ground level at the windward corners of the buildings. Channelling wind flow could also be experienced at some locations without appropriate amelioration.*

A southerly wind being channelled between SE1 and SW3 will howl up the boulevard and will probably cause a cyclonic effect in the Haymarket Square.

**6.Public Art:** *“Haymarket Square is in itself considered to be an installation of public art. In addition, the Concept Proposal utilises existing public art in the northern portion of the site by retaining the Memory Lines memorial”*

Art can take many forms, but a little retail square surrounded by high rise does rarely qualify. Similarly, the domination of a tiny memorial park by a 140 m high block is stretching the boundaries of what constitutes art.

**7. The Urban guide lines suggested by Woods Bagot have been totally ignored.**

The proposal at present:

- Does not respect privacy and overlooking.




- Does not respect view sharing with existing buildings: 231 units in the Peak alone will lose an average of 60 degrees of views.
- Does not differentiate between new public views and new private views when preference should be considered for the **public** good.
- Proposes nine towers south of Pier St, where the Woods Bagot report suggests 2 and the City of Sydney recommends only 3
- Does not introduce setbacks for towers
- Does not allude to any concept of human scale


DMC acknowledge and restate those principles (Design Report p 50) and add that *“Towers are to be slender in form and should not come to the ground, but rise from urban blocks”* and then design virtually every tower originating with a sheer wall from the street !

Peak Level 42

### The views we have today



### What we are going to see




## 8. EIS 2/4 P71: “ Darling Drive has reduced the number of lanes and tightened the road corridor to provide a more attractive setting for the student accommodation”

When you are living between a rail line and, what will be, a traffic snarled road I suppose every little bit helps. But perhaps the real reason is a little different.

## 9. The consultation Process

The information given during consultation was very much smoke and mirrors. The statements given on the height of the towers was vague and variable with the number of floors being defined from the podium level in some cases. The RLs of the top of the towers were not disclosed prior to the EIS being lodged. In fact tower NE3 grew about 8 floors after consultation.

This is clear from photos of the original model.



It is claimed that ‘mildly negative sentiment after presentations was reduced by 20%.’ This is not the impression of those who attended the meeting. Many walked out in disgust when it was fairly blatantly put to them that this was the deal and you could have your say when the DA was posted.

No mention has been made of the several large meetings held with residents of the Peak who were deeply concerned about the loss of amenity (views, overshadowing, privacy, lack of transport arrangements, the reduction in value of their properties and the prospect of living in a demolition/building site for a period of 8 -12 years). I

believe a similar response was received from residents of the Goldsbrough and the Bullecourt.

The EIS consultation report actually states that the loss of views was “the subject of minimal concern” and “most felt that property prices would increase as a result of the project”, and “Some participants were very pleased to hear the work would be completed so quickly”. View loss is uppermost in the minds of owners of all 255 north and west facing units of the Peak alone.

Local real estate agents expect the loss of view to result in the following value losses

- the 176 North facing units in the Peak to drop in value by 10 - 20 %
- the 79 west facing units to drop in the region of 10%.

The total loss in value of properties in the Peak will, in consequence, be over \$26 million. With the long building period, it will be extremely difficult to sell properties in The Peak and any sales will be seriously discounted against market value until the project is completed - which could be 10 years or more away.

The Lend Lease timeline has the last tower scheduled for 2021, but with construction delays that will be more likely 2023 and beyond. In fact it has been announced by NSW that Lend Lease have been granted “until the middle of the next decade” to complete. With demolition due to start at the end of the year, local residents will be living in a building site for some 10-12 years.

The premier was proud of the fact that the pain of demolition and construction of SICEEP would be short and simultaneous. This is certainly not the case in the Haymarket precinct, where there are substantial concrete structures to demolish, particularly the Entertainment Centre. The proposal programme allows several months for demolition.

I note there is no detailed EIS regarding the demolition of the Entertainment Centre.

Lack of consultation with Asian Residents

At least 75% of residents at The Peak do not have English as their first language. Many speak little or no English. At the two consultation meetings held at The Peak there was no attempt to engage these residents in their predominant language – Mandarin. As a result, many residents have been bewildered about the project and the submission process.

## CONCLUSION

**The whole proposal has been rushed through with little thought other than maximum density.**

**The vehicular access demand will be vastly increased, but we are restricting Darling Drive.**

**While the concept of the Boulevard and east/west laneways are to be applauded to allow pedestrians to ‘find’ the Haymarket Precinct, they will be more the most part dark, windy, sunless strips under the high rise.**

**Unfortunately, the burden for this poorly thought out scheme rests on the shoulders of local residents and businesses of the area. Not only will they have a considerable reduction in their amenities and values of their businesses and property, but will have**

to live with the dust, noise and inconvenience of living in a building site for ten years or more. INSW have given Lend Lease until the middle of next decade to complete.

While it is inevitable that population densities have to increase, the preference given to the new towers over the existing development is out of balance and a new concept should be sought where all can share in the amenities of the area.

Perhaps more thought could be given to developing over Darling Drive which would eliminate the need to reduce the width. Furthermore, seeing as it falls into the SICEEP area, why is use not made of the space over the light rail or the monorail base ?

In broad terms, the whole concept PPP is, I feel, bad planning.

- We are rebuilding the SICEEP buildings at no real net gain in area, if one ignores all the smoke and mirrors on the rubbery figures together with the double and triple counting of the multi function areas.
- The Exhibition Centre could be expanded over Darling Drive. The existing SEC has a perfectly usable shell which simply needs a refurb.
- We have a rapidly expanding population density in the CBD and through the airport corridor but then are pushing entertainment centres west.
- The current SEC size is welcomed by many promoters because of its flexibility and mid size, avoiding the embarrassment of a half full All Phones stadium. This could be paid for by the redevelopment of the carpark.
- We are selling off the Haymarket site which really should be used for genuine column free (future) expansion of those facilities.
- Meanwhile high rise towers are marching down to Darling Harbour, taking over sunny public recreation space and creating overshadowed windy canyons.

I suppose future generations could write the whole area off, then concrete over Darling Harbour to link up the Star with Packers Casino at Barangaroo with a Vegas style casino strip.

If I may quote Elizabeth Farelly's comment of last week:

*"As if that weren't private-sucking-of-public-realm enough, consider Darling Harbour, where billions of public dollars and land are deployed to repeat past errors. They say it's essential to Sydney's future, but so little changes. Three massive buildings - convention, exhibition, entertainment - will replace convention, exhibition, entertainment. There's an extra hotel at the north and some student housing at the south where, at least, streets are extended. Otherwise, same. The net gains, across a 50,000 square metre development, are a bigger banquet space and a 20 per cent increase in exhibition. Otherwise, same size, same parvenu aesthetic, same blasted public realm, same cold-shoulder to Ultimo, same disdain for public space. I'm no Darling Harbour fan but honestly, why break so many eggs just to make the same old omelette?"*

But we will have a mess of scrambled eggs in the Haymarket Precinct.