

100

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 object to this proposal because:

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

- ⬆ My home will lose winter sun hence my energy cost for heating & artificial light will increase
- ⬆ My home unit 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 extended the existing structural canyon & increase traffic noise 'echoing' off the building surfaces
- ⬆ It will create a wind tunnel, funnelling in wind born dust and allergens, especially from the West.
- ⬆ I will lose my view of water & 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
- ⬆ It will be a traffic generator and only add to the existing traffic congestion in the city.
- ⬆ 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).
- ⬆ As a traffic generator, it will exacerbate traffic noise and exhaust fumes, impacting on my health

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 are unnecessary given the abundant supply of office space to be generated in nearby Barangaroo
- ⬆ Removal of the top 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 (Syd. Harbour Catchment 2005). The cumulative impact will be detrimental to the character of the waterways, adjoining foreshores & 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
- ⬆ It makes **no** provision for on site parking for existing or the expected increase in guests and staff
- ⬆ Under Design Principles -(JBA Planning p.16) the planners aim to "Align the new tower with Darling Park Tower to frame and reveal the vistas towards Darling Harbour across the Pyrmont bridge and Market Street." Clearly they have failed because the proposal increases the frame and reduces the vista. By extrapolation, eventually there will be all frame and no vista.
- ⬆ Further, the planners seek to "reinforce the entry into Sydney's CBD by creating a gateway with the Darling Park Tower." An absurd concept given that Market Street is an exit corridor and no gateway is necessary.

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** sleep disturbance to nearby residents.
- ⬆ 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.

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 dominated 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 with many interested stakeholders
- ⤴ 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 home.
- ⤴ ~~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.~~ PL.
- ⤴ 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 other sites

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 Requirements 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 impacted apartments in The Berkeley, based on a 'desk top study' & modelling, without site visitation or any consultation with residents.
- ⤴ 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. Perceived 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~~ **have not** made reportable political donations (including donations of \$1000 or more) in the previous two years
- I request that my name be withheld **YES** / NO

Signature

Date

26.10.12

First Name

Last Name

Address