

Planning Services
Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director – Key Sites Assessments

Name of Submitter	Woolloomooloo Finger Wharf Building Management Committee 6 Cowper Wharf Road, Woolloomooloo NSW 2011 “WFW” c/- McCormacks Strata Management Suite 5.01, Level 5, 151 Castlereagh St Sydney NSW 2000 samantha@mccormacks.com.au
Application Name	Art Gallery of NSW Expansion Project – Sydney Modern
Application Number	SSD 6471
Applicant	Art Gallery of NSW Trust
Council Area	City of Sydney
Approval Authority	Minister for Planning
Donation declaration	No reportable political donations in the last 2 years

Objection Statement

We are disappointed with the timing of seeking submissions on the SMP with a due date of 15 December 2017, being one week before Christmas. This has meant that we have not been able to properly engage consultants to assist us in examining the project, as most are working to already tight deadlines to complete other projects before Christmas. This has placed us at a great disadvantage.

Therefore we can advise that we will provide our preliminary views on the SMP in this submission, but they will be subject to further research and analysis unable to be undertaken by 15 December 2017 or during the Christmas and new year period. We will undertake to provide our further comments as quickly as possible.

We also request that the Applicant provides the outstanding details requested in the comments below so WFW can provide its final submission without further delay.

Reasons for Objection

At this stage, WFW has the following comments and requests for additional information from the Applicant:

1. Reflectivity

Comment – minimal information is contained in the EIS and reflectivity has only been assessed in relation to glare to drivers (not WFW residents or users).

Request - a study needs to be carried out by the Applicant and results provided to WFW to assess the potential glare on the restaurant users and residents at WFW at different times of the day and seasons. Additionally, mitigating options to lessen the impact on WFW.

2. Visual impact

Comment - the view from WFW will be significantly altered. The design of the structures appears harsh, where some newspaper reports compare it to airport terminals. Additionally, there needs to be better use of recessive materials and colours, and judicious landscape planting. Further, consideration needs to be given to the landscaping where it is removing existing mature trees and also to soften the slabs of exposed walls. The tree report states there are 220 new plantings, but only minimal plantings to soften the 5 x 14 metre white wall.

Request - the Applicant needs to produce drawings or a montage of the landscaping to address these issues and mitigate the visual impact from WFW (diagrams to show different views from separate floor levels at WFW) - to be done in consultation with the main stakeholders including The Wharf Terraces.

3. Exterior Lighting

Comment – minimal information on exterior lighting is available, except a statement of intent to the effect that neighbouring properties are further considered in keeping lighting systems out of direct sight lines and the importance of a low warm level of lighting. The exterior lighting report does not provide any reference to façade lighting of the building.

Request – additional information regarding the impact on WFW.

4. Heritage

Comment - the SMP is a major intrusion in the heritage area of significant buildings, in particular WFW and the Art Gallery. Views to and from WFW are impeded, and whilst the materials used are to be clear or transparent, the visual impact is significant and thus reduces the heritage value of these sites.

5. Traffic, parking and access

Comment - the report states that there will effectively be a doubling of visitors once the project is finished. Currently 24% of visitors use their own vehicles. The report does not state in detail how the increased traffic and parking demands will be met, except that the Domain Parking Station will be used to accommodate this increased demand. Currently traffic at peak periods around the Domain car park is heavy.

Request – the Applicant to provide WFW with a more detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan in consultation with WFW.

Request - more detail on how heavy traffic in the area will be effectively managed. Needs to be worked through in consultation with the stakeholders including WFW and The Wharf Terraces.

6. Construction management

Comment - further details are required in relation to all aspects of construction management including noise (dust and odour mitigation), vibration, air quality including what monitoring is proposed, monitoring locations, monitoring frequency and duration of monitoring. The occupiers and visitors to WFW should not be adversely affected by undue construction fallout. The

repercussions for failure are serious relating to both the quality of life of our permanent residents and WFW's commercial operations.

Request - further details on the proposed monitoring of air, noise, vibration and odour (type, location, frequency and duration) and dust & odour mitigation measures (including AQIA recommendations). Presentation of an Air Quality Management Plan for the construction phase that confirms a commitment to the mitigation measures listed in the AQIA and outlines in detail the air quality monitoring to be performed, ideally based on AQ23 and Table 6.1 of the AQIA and including the more frequent monitoring of dust during the remediation phase.

Request - a quantitative assessment of potential downwind air pollutant and odour concentrations during the works to reliably estimate the potential emission rates of pollutants during the works and proposed mitigation measures and monitoring program be implemented and results be made available.

7. Change of use or purpose

Request - further details are required to confirm that the SMP complies with the Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust and Act, particularly when considering the cutting of mature trees, the use of the land that is currently being used as open space by the public.

8. Stormwater

Comment - the current infrastructure is not sufficient for the area at the moment and leads to sewage being pumped into the harbour (any increase in flows will add to this issue). Additionally, experience in Woolloomooloo Bay shows the problems associated with sewage after rainfall. Whilst the report states the SMP will have a neutral effect, there is insufficient detail to support this assertion.

Request – provide details to support the assertion that the SMP will have a neutral effect on stormwater.

9. Sea water plant

Comment - there appears to be no detail on how the SMP will impact on WFW. The report does not make it clear what the impact is of the temperature differential (2 degrees) on marine structures, boats and marine life.

Request – provide details on the impact of the temperature differential (2 degrees) on marine structures, boats, marine life and WFW substructure (the piles that support the wharf and marina structure). Agreement that WFW's engineering consultant review the application

10. Compliance

Request - verification of compliance with requirements which are subject to approval with time to assess the impacts on our structures.

11. Updates on the project

Request - a commitment to keep WFW updated on the project and any variations.

Note - These comments are made without the benefit of all relevant details. Therefore WFW may need to change its position if new material emerges which warrants this change.

Moving forward

WFW requests a meeting in January or February with the Applicant and any other major stakeholders, including The Wharf Terraces, to work through these and any other issues raised.

At this stage WFW reserves its rights in relation to its submission, pending the receipt of the requested information.

Regards

Woolloomooloo Finger Wharf Building Management Committee

14 December 2017