

11 November 2015

Mr Matthew Rosel
Consultant Planner
Key Site Assessments
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Ms Tamzyn Bartlett

Dear Mr Rosel,

Barangaroo Concept Plan (MP06_0162 MOD 8) Response to Submissions and Preferred Project Report

The National Trust must repeat the statement in our 28 September submission on the *Response to Submissions Report* provided by Lend Lease which confirmed our low expectations. The National Trust described the Concept Plan Modification 8 outcomes as 'contemptuous' of the basic principles of social and heritage planning.

The proponent's response to the wide-ranging issues and objections about Modification 8 is to say "It has been determined that on balance there are limited environmental impacts beyond those originally assessed and determined to be acceptable in the approved Mod 7". In other words, they don't plan to change anything.

The latest response to submissions again does not address the Trust's concerns and, generally, suggests that the majority of these concerns relate to Modification 8 of the Concept Plan, rather than the CSHR tower proposal.

In the Trust's view, these are indivisible elements of the same proposal and it is disingenuous to suggest otherwise. MOD 8 is directly related to the arrangements necessary to allow this proposed building on its proposed site. This division is artificial and irrelevant from the point of view of the negative aspects of the tower.

The central thrust of the Trust's submission has been ignored - that the tower is a private development on what was designated as public land. The non-response to this concern is that the building will **'embrace and positively relate with the surrounding area'**.

Despite the often repeated claims, this building is not an "Opera House" and will never be an "iconic building"... this suggestion, that the building is justified by its "excellent architecture" is simple hubris...even if it is sincerely expressed.

Ultimately, it is just another skyscraper vying for attention in an already crowded skyline. No amount of 'good looks' ever excuses 'bad behaviour'.

The middle of the tower is its widest point, as it tapers upwards from floor 22. How floor 22 has 1508 m² and floor 23 only 961 m², is not explained.

Although the gross floor area figures appear to suggest otherwise, there are still 29 floors of residential use, 22 hotel floors, 3 for gaming and 4 of "super villa apartments".



The other elements are 5 podium levels (service, back of house and reception activities, as well as retail), 4 basement and 8 levels for plant.

The single largest use in terms of floor levels is residential – all claims about the value of the hotel and casino to the economy are peripheral to the predominantly residential use – It would appear that the tower could be at least 1/3 lower in height if the residential component was removed.

The Trust had made the point that, for such a building, there is no public benefit in its height, as there is no opportunity for public access above floor 22 (out of 71).

The response to this concern is the restatement that the public will have free access to the ground floor level and 'the surrounding public domain'. The concern is simply not addressed.

The response to submissions is shallow, misses most of the points and is patronising in its dismissal of objections.

The response should never have been handled in this manner.

At last night's meeting of the National Trust's Landscape Heritage Conservation Committee a presentation was given by the developers of a major coal mining proposal which impacted on a Trust Register listed Landscape Conservation Area and which raised concerns in respect of a National Trust Policy on the Heritage Impacts of Coal Mining.

The mine developers and their consultants addressed each of the Trust's concerns directly in an intelligent and respectful manner and the interaction was productive and positive.

The National Trust rejects the proponent's response on the Crown Sydney Hotel Resort as totally inadequate and urges that improved requirements (under the SEARS process) spell out in unequivocal terms the responsibilities of developers and their consultants, particularly in terms of meaningful public consultation and genuine responsive attention to concerns raised in the public exhibition process.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Scarsbrick AM
Chief Executive