

## BARANGAROO SOUTH

### CROWN SYDNEY HOTEL RESORT (SSD 6957)

I wish to object to the above development for the following reasons:

**1. Proposition.**

The development is based on the provision of a new hotel and casino development. Why then does this use allow nearly 30 floors of residential accommodation and 6 floors of villas (easily convertible to apartments) and yet is lodged as a hotel development not a residential development. What is the need for luxury apartments over removed public amenity through overshadowing and loss of views?

**2. Process.**

The application for Modification 8 that proposed a change to the controls has exactly the same drawings in terms of ground floor plan and elevations as this application. So much so that the proposed controls seem to shrink-wrap this proposal. That suggests that the controls are responding to the design rather than the other way round, which would be the normal approval process.

The fact that this proposal was lodged before those controls are approved also suggests that there is scant regard to process and the belief that what is lodged will be approved regardless. In terms of faith in the planning process and the independence of the assessment this is worrying at least.

**3. Location.**

By placing the casino on what was dedicated as a public park the proposal needs to demonstrate what public benefit the change of use addresses. What assessment has been done of other sites and other models?

**4. Public Park.**

The building is located on what the previously approved concept plan had dedicated as a public park. This gave a contiguous public park along the western edge of the site, from the northern bay to Southern Cove. The relocated park will now be overshadowed in the afternoon by the Casino building and also from the north if, as recent reports suggest, there is an increase in density in the Barangaroo Central. It is worth noting in this regard that every change in Barangaroo has resulted in an increase in height and floorspace.

The park is further compromised by the placement of car parking one metre below the park thus limiting the ability for deep soil planting over nearly 40% of the park. This also means that for the term of this approval (99 years?) the park can't be remodelled or excavated for uses such as amphitheatre, skate park, services, etc.

It relocation has also caused the park to be strangely configured so that some parts are unusable and it is no longer separated from development by roads which used to clearly define the distinction between the public and private realm. Now the proposal is to have massive residential towers within the same block as the park with out clear delineation. This will create the usual conflicts between residential uses and park uses – light spill, noise, etc and therefore create the potential for the park to seem to be (and may actually become) semi private.

**5. Southern Cove.**

The Southern cove was introduced as a requirement by the competition Jury after the international competition for the site, and has been part of every change in the concept plans or master plans since then. The location of this massive development not only diminishes the quality of the public park, but also effectively removes the Southern Cove and the introduction of water deep into the development.

**6. The Streets.**

The proposal to build the basement below streets surrounding the casino as well as the park equally compromises their flexibility into the future and will potentially limit the growth of street trees and access to services. It is normal to expect a development to restrict its basement levels to within its property boundaries, why not here? There is a clear negative effect on the public places with no discernable benefit beyond cost savings to the proponent - and this is on publicly owned land.

**7. Traffic.**

By placing the building at the western edge of the site it will cause all the traffic to traverse the site from Hickson Rd to the Casino and past the public park. This not only compromises the park (which formally faced its long axis west to the open harbour and pedestrian access), but also increases traffic load to the streets. This would be avoided if the building were placed on Hickson Rd for example.

**8. Height.**

The clearly articulated vision for the southern precinct prepared by Rogers Sirk Harbour and Partners was based on the urban design principle of a hard edge of buildings finishing as a wall at the northern end, with comparisons to Circular Quay. The proposal to alter that strategy and have a higher building north flies in the face of earlier approvals for that concept plan. It now escalates the height to the north where the original (competition winning) design and subsequent masterplans had the height getting greater to the south. With this massive element placed so far north the approved strategy. Is clearly compromised.

**9. Scale.**

The height of the building is excessive and changes the paradigm for built form on Barangaroo, but the podium too is a massive building. The equivalent of one and a half football fields in plan and up to 36m high. That height is nearly twelve stories of normal residential development. Barangaroo south already has buildings with large floor plates. By continuing these massive block developments the potential for a variety of urban grain is lost along with the potential for more intimate spaces. There is an internalising of laneways and walkways that could have otherwise have added character to the development. This proposition is similar to a major internalised shopping precinct yet is placed adjacent to parks and the harbour whose very characteristics offer the potential for a different model.

**10. Active edges.**

The proposed development controls for Modification 8 had a requirement for 80% active edges to all sides of the podium building at ground floor. This proposal has less than 20% active frontage to the eastern side facing the park. So the park is now not only lacking visual access to the harbour but it is faced with service areas including the car park entry and massive port-cochere for vehicle movements. This may be of benefit to the hotel and apartments but is detrimental to the public park. Vehicle movements could be handled below ground rather than occupying nearly 30% of the footprint of the ground floor.

**11. Icon.**

The building is described as a new icon for Sydney and compares itself with the other Sydney icons, the Harbour Bridge and Opera House. Neither of these were designed as icons, they developed iconic status over time. This proposed icon however is an icon not for public infrastructure, or culture, but to commerce - it is surmounted by a logo for the Casino group and so advertises itself as an icon to gambling. In fact there many locations proposed for the Crown Casino brand some as large as 8m. Is this not further reinforcing the commercial status over public benefit on what is publically owned land?

**Conclusion.**

In summary this submission is concerned about due process and the perception of fairness in assessment through the planning approval process, the loss of amenity to the public park, the need to balance public benefit with commercial gain and the question of the scale and placement of the building, both of which are impacted by the inclusion of massive residential development as part of the hotel/casino proposal.