

To: Infrastructure NSW, L15, 167 Macquarie St. Sydney NSW 2000

Submission regarding the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Proposed Powerhouse Parramatta at 34-54 and 30B Phillip Street and 338 Church Street, Parramatta NSW 2150

Exhibition from 10/06/2020 to 21/07/2020

I am an architect and town planner with experience in private practice, Local Government and State Government. I have reviewed the proposal as described in the EIS V3 dated 2/6/20. This EIS is now partly inapplicable given the Government's decision 3/7/20 to retain the Powerhouse at Ultimo. In view of this decision, this EIS should be withdrawn and the proposal reconsidered.

I consider the proposal as exhibited does not satisfactorily demonstrate how it will complement the Ultimo Powerhouse, is destructive of identified heritage items, is not well designed or situated to attract and service large numbers of patrons, and is inappropriately located in a flood prone area.

Objections:

1. Proposal must be reconsidered in the context of the decision to retain the Powerhouse Ultimo

This EIS is now partly inapplicable given the Government's decision 3/7/20 to retain the Powerhouse at Ultimo. This proposal should be withdrawn and revised to account for the proposed future role of Ultimo, including the disposition of major items in the collection, and the primary functions to be performed and services accommodated at Ultimo and proposed for Parramatta.

The intentions with regard to the future of Powerhouse Ultimo, and to the treatment of the major artefacts which it had been proposed to remove and disperse, need to be clarified and inform a revised proposal for Parramatta. It may be that, if Ultimo and Parramatta are to be complementary, the scope and extent of this proposal could be reduced, which may enable issues of accessibility, flooding and heritage to be better addressed.

This EIS asserts but does not substantiate the argument that the Powerhouse at Ultimo is failing to meet the objectives which the Parramatta Powerhouse is proposed to deliver. With the decision to retain the Ultimo premises, this still leaves unclear the future for both the museums at Ultimo and Parramatta and the intended treatment of major items in the collection.

Until these issues are clarified the proposal for Parramatta should not proceed in its current form. It should be withdrawn and revised.

In the meantime, I wish to make the following objections to the proposal based on the EIS as it stands.

2. Analysis of alternative sites

Section 1.4 of the EIS purports to be an analysis of alternatives to the proposal. In fact, **Option 2 – Alternative location** offers no analysis at all. It simply asserts:

Option 2 considers whether the proposed new institution could be delivered in an alternative location. The riverside site has been found to be the best and most appropriate location...

Given the issues of accessibility, flooding and heritage itemised below, this is not satisfactory.

3. Poorly situated for access for large numbers of visitors

The Els refers to another objective of the Greater Sydney Region Plan

A city supported by infrastructure

The development of Powerhouse Parramatta will support the attraction of Sydney to domestic and international visitors and the ability to hold and attract major events.

For a cultural institution which it is claimed by proponents will attract large numbers of people the site has no car parking and is not conveniently located to public transport. International, interstate and many regional visitors enter the state through central Sydney. The proposed Powerhouse Parramatta is by train some 30 minutes from the Sydney CBD, then a further bus trip or a long walk from the station (600m) or from proposed light rail (400m). The shuttle bus route which passes by the site does not connect to the rail. This poor accessibility applies also to visitors from other parts of Sydney.

There is to be no car parking provided, nor any arrangements proposed for access to adjacent private parking stations to be available to patrons; in fact, the proposal removes 500 existing car-parking spaces.

The proposal relies on a public street to accommodate limited coach parking.

An objective of the proposal (1.3) is stated to be:

Take advantage of the site's highly accessible location by prioritising active and sustainable modes of transport

There is nothing in the proposal which appears to meet this objective, apart from obliging patrons to walk 15 minutes from the railway station, and 10 minutes from a possible future metro station..

4. The site is flood prone

The proposed site adjoining the Parramatta River has potential for flooding. Emergency exit from the site will be constrained. It is not an appropriate location to house the rare and precious artefacts of the collection, nor for a facility attracting large numbers of people. This is further exacerbated by the multi-storey design which must rely on lifts and/or staircases up to 17 levels for egress. The proposed undercroft is within the flood zone and poses a potential danger to members of the public using it.

5. Loss of Heritage on the site

The proposal removes the 'Willow Grove' and 'St George's Terraces' which are heritage items of significance to Parramatta and should be retained.

Conclusion

This proposal for the Powerhouse Parramatta includes closing of the 1988 Powerhouse Museum and putting major parts of the rare collection in other places, probably not equipped to care for them, or into storage. This does not serve the people of NSW let alone western Sydney. The recent decision to retain the Ultimo site, at the time of writing, leaves Powerhouse Ultimo closed and the fate of the major items in the collection uncertain. These matters should be clarified and inform a revised proposal for the Powerhouse Parramatta, which also addresses the objections [3], [4] and [5] above. In the meantime, this proposal for the Powerhouse Parramatta should be withdrawn, or rejected.

Warwick Hatton

6/7/20

