

23 August 2015

Re: Crown Hotel SEARs Attachment A

Please find below my objections to the above proposal:

1. The site in the north west corner of South Barangaroo is land dedicated (therefore to be owned) by the public for use as public foreshore recreational parkland. The proposal is to privatise the site and build a casino, high-end retail and apartments with no compensating public or social benefit. The proposed building will have severe and irreversible negative impacts on public space.
2. Due to the Unsolicited Proposals status and process the proposal has never had thorough and independent review or proper public consultation. The proposal should not be assessed as a modification.
3. In addition to privatising the site the proposal includes changing the site boundaries to increase the area for the already grossly oversized building, move the building closer to the water and site the building on the boundaries with no setbacks.
4. The public space in Barangaroo is significantly reduced by this proposal.
5. The proposal greatly increases overshadowing of public space including the water (and therefore reduces reflected light currently enjoyed across the wider bay).
6. The significantly increased overshadowing of the promenade will affect public enjoyment of the promenade and water's edge. Shadow, coupled with significant downwash winds will make the promenade hostile in many weather conditions.
7. The provision only of some sun on the promenade at lunch time for the workers is not equitable and sunlight to the promenade should be available for other morning uses + users.
8. The 34m high and 130m long podium is excessive in bulk and scale causing negative impacts on public domain. The perimeter of the podium is poorly activated. The Lime Street frontage is mostly driveways and servicing except for two short retail frontages - an unacceptable new city street outcome.
9. The design is intended by the proponent to be singularly prominent. The building blocks views to the park and harbour. The casino podium terminates the view from the street (noted as "proposed road connection to Hickson St") which is public space. The street, not just the footpath should extend to the boardwalk to maintain views from Hickson St and eliminate the strongly implied privatisation of the northern footpath. Streets are public spaces of prime importance and should function as social places.
10. The full length of the podium that fronts onto Hickson Park is not suitably activated, instead it consists of parking, ramps and driveways. The footpath is compromised by numerous crossovers. These undesirable items also take up almost half of the northern boundary facing the public open space in Central Barangaroo. The car parking, ramps and porte cochere are similar to the Crown Casino in Melbourne which has proven to be a prime example of poor urban design.
11. The casino proposal impacts adversely on the development of Central Barangaroo by proximity and bulk and severely constricts the park / public domain connections.

12. The proposal's designated park east of the casino will be compromised by overshadowing, wind downwash and lack of visual connection west to the water. The parking just below the surface privatises that portion of the park and restricts long term public uses and deepsoil planting for larger trees.
13. The western terraces flanking the promenade are overly designed and imply privatisation.
14. The high visual prominence due to the bulk and height of the building is increased/overemphasised by the proposed light / white claddings.
15. The proponents consider the building should have landmark status. A private casino should not have landmark status. Its prominence will adversely impact and compromise the broader views to and from the city and from significant public spaces in the city including the World Heritage listed Opera House.
16. The southern and western boardwalk tree planting has been modified to emphasise entry into the casino building. This is an entirely inappropriate modification of public space for the benefit of private ownership and casino operations.
17. The size and design of Globe Harbour has been changed to defer to the prominence of the casino building.

I consider that with proper and fair review of this proposal, and in the long term interest of the public this proposal should be refused.

Yours sincerely



Kerry Clare LFRAIA, Director, CLARE DESIGN, Sydney
Professor, School of Architecture + Built Environment, UoN
Visiting Professor, Abedian School of Architecture, Bond University
M +61 4131 777 81
www.claredesign.com.au