

Unit 1703, Highgate
127 Kent St
Miller's Point
NSW. 2000
9th August, 2015

Planning Services, Department of Planning and Environment,
GPO, Box 39,
Sydney NSW, 2001

Attention: Director of Planning and Environment,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application No SSD 6956 - Remediation and earthworks - Barangaroo South
Application No SSD 6957 - Crown Sydney Hotel Resort - Barangaroo South

I have several concerns in relation to the the above Development Applications

1. General Concern - Traffic

The original award winning concept plan for Barangaroo recognised that traffic could become a serious problem and the area would not be able to handle a significant increase in vehicle movements. The solution to the problem was straightforward and involved a project concept which minimised vehicle access and movements and maximised public transport. To this end, the concept plan was developed with minimal parking availability in the hotel and offices and maximising access to public transport.

The initial Barangaroo concept plan, approved in February 2007, had a GFA of 388,300 square metres. It is my understanding that the latest proposal will take the GFA to 661,686 square metres. This increase will make the final GFA approximately 70% increase on what was originally approved in the concept plan. In fact, the the maximum approved GFA for Barangaroo South is already more than the initial concept plan for the whole of Barangaroo .

There is no doubt that the major increase in the GFA compared with the original award winning concept and the provision of an extra 500 car parks will result in a subsequent increase in vehicle activity. The vehicle congestion associated with this proposal for increased parking will be exacerbated by the fact that the Casino is proposing 24 hour by 7 day gambling and restaurants.

The proposed excessive bulk at Barangaroo South will reduce integration with the CBD, the rest of the Barangaroo site and Darling Harbour. I do not believe that the traffic issue has been effectively addressed and I have seen no evidence of proper road and traffic planning designed to cater for the modified concept plan.

Given the significant increase in car parking, traffic impacts from the proposal should be thoroughly tested and mitigation strategies agreed before any determination of the Concept Plan modification.

This issue must be urgently addressed.

2. Specific Concern - DA for 610 new car spaces

My specific concern is in relation to the traffic impact of the above proposals. The DA for the hotel proposes 500 new car spaces to cater for the casino section of the hotel. This proposal is based on an assessment of the parking demands of the Crown Casino in Melbourne.

It should be noted that Melbourne's Crown Casino is open to the public whereas the planned second Sydney casino is claimed to be restricted to 'high rollers' with limits on gaming including no poker machines and minimum bets. Consequently, parking space demands would not be close to that of Melbourne Crown's if, in fact, it is really the intention of Crown to restrict the Casino to "High Rollers". - "High Rollers" do not drive their own cars - they will arrive and depart by Hire Car.

in addition to the request for the 500 extra car spaces for the Casino/Hotel, the DA also requests a further 110 car parking spaces for the 66 residential apartments – that's almost two each!

The site is difficult to access by car and the Barangaroo integrated transport plan estimates that 96 per cent of visitors to the site will travel by public transport or bike, or walk. Providing 610 extra parking spaces would encourage casino patrons, residents and visitors to drive and add to congestion. There is no justification for this increase in private parking spaces unless the long term plan is to open this Casino to the general public in line with Melbourne's Crown Casino which would be totally inconsistent with the current proposition.

3. Other

The Development Application No SSD 6957 for the Crown Sydney Hotel Resort has been prepared in accordance with Mod 8 of the concept plan. It is my understanding that Mod 8 has not yet been approved and I find it difficult to understand a process which might approve a DA for an unapproved concept plan.

If the DA is approved prior to approval of Mod 8, it would suggest that the process for approval of the concept plan is irrelevant.

Yours Sincerely.

Peter Coates AO