[redacted] - Four Points by Sheraton Hotel Expansion 31

From: [redacted]
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 10/24/2012 1:50 PM
Subject: Four Points by Sheraton Hotel Expansion

Attention: Director, Metropolitan and Regional Projects South
Postal Address: Major Projects Assessment
Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001
Email: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au
Fax: (02) 9228 6455

Applicant: M&L Development Co Pty Ltd
Name of Proposal: Four Points by Sheraton Hotel Expansion incl. commercial office space
Application number: 4972-2011

Subject of Submission: **Objection**

I am the owner of [redacted] and I object to this proposal because:

1. Amenity impacts – which will be felt 24/7 as a neighbouring property owner and not as a 9-5 office worker

- ☐ My apartment will lose winter sun hence my energy bill for heating & artificial light will increase
- ☐ My apartment will lose direct sun and I will suffer reduced opportunity for Vitamin D production
- ☐ It will have a significant aural and visual impact on my lifestyle.
- ☐ It will create a canyon with traffic noise 'echoing' off the building surfaces
- ☐ It will create a wind tunnel, channelling in wind born dust and allergens, especially from the West.
- ☐ I will lose my view of water and greenery and the 'boxed in' feeling will impact on my mental health.
- ☐ I will lose sight of my iconic weather vane, the Bicentennial flag pole in Darling Harbour
- ☐ As a traffic generator without offsetting infrastructure, the increased traffic congestion will increase the time for vehicular access and egress to my home (ignoring temporary road closures).
- ☐ It will be a traffic generator and only add to the existing traffic congestion in the city.
- ☐ As a traffic generator, it will exacerbate traffic noise and exhaust fumes, impacting on my health
- ☐ It will be a crime magnet offering soft targets
- ☐

2. Building impacts

- ☐ The proposed (RL 94m) tower is too high and too close to the foreshore and in any event, should be stepped away from the water.
- ☐ The proposed 25 storey tower includes 7 levels of office space that will compete with the abundant supply of office space to be generated in nearby Barangaroo
- ☐ Removal of these 7 levels above the 18 hotel levels would not impact hotel functionality
- ☐ A revised 17 storey tower (RL 66) would match the height of the existing hotel structure
- ☐ The tower conflicts with clauses 25 & 26 of the Sydney REP – its cumulative impact will be detrimental to the character of the waterways and adjoining foreshores and views
- ☐ The tower has a high visual impact – its overbearing vertical form and scale will obscure views to the harbour and landmarks and adversely impact on the amenity and visual qualities of the area
- ☐ There is **no** provision for on site parking for guests and staff

3. Construction impacts

- ☐ The stated objective of night work between 21:30 and 5:00 is to mitigate the extent of traffic disruption & road closure, **not** resident sleep disturbance
- ☐ Night works including pile driving, will generate 24/7 noise and vibration giving no relief to occupants of neighbouring residential buildings for the duration of construction.
- ☐ No consideration has been given to the impact of sleep deprivation and the potentially fatal associated health imposts on residents
- ☐

3. Heritage & public interest

- ☐ There is a net loss of soft surface and greenery
- ☐ Its 'heritage interpretation strategy' will overwhelm the 2 storey heritage street-scape in Sussex St
- ☐ The heritage listed Corn Exchange will lose its green backdrop and be dominate by the tower.
- ☐ The scale of the 25 storey tower in the proposed location is a poor fit to the topography
- ☐ "During the preparation of the EIS" the proponent failed to consult with community groups & affected landowners as stipulated in the Director General's Requirements.
- ☐ Also, the EIS has failed to describe the consultation process
- ☐ The proposed tower is not in the public interest because it takes much and gives little in return; it takes away the views of others but does not create any, it utilises existing car spaces but does not add to supply, it removes trees without regenerating more and the amenity provided to guests and staff is dwarfed by the loss of amenity of others
- ☐

4. Financial

- ☐ Loss of primary views to waterfront will significantly impact the value of my apartments.
- ☐ It's not fair – the hotel will gain financial advantage by charging guests a room rental for the view, SHFA will get a rent increase on its land but I will not receive compensation for amenity loss.
- ☐ The EIS has failed to demonstrate that a bigger/better hotel will generate a net benefit, given the enormous loss of amenity to the surrounding community
- ☐ Insufficient evidence is given to show that (1) the Sydney Tourist market needs another 330 hotel rooms, or if it does, (2) that those rooms must be on this site to the exclusion of all others

5. Report by GM Urban Design & Architecture Pty Ltd (GMU) – submitted as part of the EIS

- ☐ In respect of The Berkeley, this report is false, misleading and fails to meet the Director General's Requirments on visual impact. The author can't even get the street address right.
- ☐ This report incorrectly concludes that there is minimal loss of view , because It totally ignores the western aspect of The Berkeley, the side with the most to lose – ie immediate views of the harbour, iconic elements like the Australian National Maritime Museum and its floating exhibits
- ☐ It makes a flawed conclusion about private views from the 128 apartments in The Berkeley, based on a 'desk top study' & modelling, without site visitation or consultation with residents.
- ☐ The authors have failed to undertake mandatory consultation with stakeholders
- ☐ In respect of the Astoria Tower, on page 11, GMU makes a strange unprofessional assumption – because views from the northern elevation **may in future** be obscured **if** the adjoining low rise parking station is redeveloped vertically 42 storeys, "any impact of the proposed hotel development would be secondary and reasonable". Obviously until such eventuality, if ever, the proposed hotel tower **will make a primary and unreasonable impact** on the Astoria Tower and the appropriate mitigation measure is to not build the proposed tower.

6. Conflict of interest

- ☐ This proposed development will sit on land leased till May 2087 from the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority (SHFA), part of the NSW Government Department of Planning & Infrastructure (DoPI). The DoPI is also the Consent Authority. Ie It appears that the NSW state government (DoPI) will receive more rent if it approves this proposal.
- ☐

I/we are willing to work with the Proponent to address the above concerns.

- I *have made reportable political donations (including donations of $1000 or more) in the previous two years
- I request that my name be withheld *YES

Signature [redacted]	*Date* 24 October, 2012
First Name *Last Name*	
Address [redacted]	

[redacted] - RE: Four Points by Sheraton Hotel Expansion

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 10/25/2012 1:36 PM
Subject: RE: Four Points by Sheraton Hotel Expansion
Attachments: ATT00001

Necola,

Apoligies, I made an error on the submisson.

I have never made a donation to a political party.

Regards,

[redacted]

Date: Thu, 25 Oct 2012 13:32:26 +1100
From: [redacted]@planning.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Re: Four Points by Sheraton Hotel Expansion
To: [redacted]

[redacted]

Many thanks for you submission. The form indicates that you have made a political donation, please complete the forms and submit back to the Department/or to my email address so I can attach this to your submission.

Information can be found on the Department's website:

http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/donation-and-gift-disclouse

http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/assessingdev/pdf/form_political_donations_disclosure_minister_or_dg.pdf

Kindest regards

[redacted]
Environmental Planning Officer
Major Development Assessment
NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure | GPO Box 39 | Sydney NSW 2001
T 02 9228 6169 F 02 9228 6466 E necola.chisholm@planning.nsw.gov.au

NSW GOVERNMENT Planning & Infrastructure

Subscribe to the Department's e-news at www.planning.nsw.gov.au/enews
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

>> [redacted] > 10/24/2012 1:50 pm >>>
Attention: Director, Metropolitan and Regional Projects South
Postal Address: Major Projects Assessment
Department of Planning & Infrastructure