

This submission relates to the Development Application by Infrastructure NSW concerning the Walsh Bay Arts & Cultural Precinct.

Martin Simich Owner of Studio 10, Pier 2/3 Hickson Road, Walsh Bay NSW 2000

My tenant in Studio 10, is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia.

I am aware that the Walsh Bay Precinct Association is lodging a formal submission dealing with matters which impact the Association and its members. I am a member of Walsh Bay Precinct Association and support and adopt the submission lodged by the Precinct Association.

Supplemental to that submission I raise the following matters:

1. Noise

I express extreme concern as to excessive noise during the construction and post-construction phases.

The noise and vibration impact assessment of Arup Pty Limited is deficient in a number of respects including:

- (a) None of the noise sensitive receptors are located within the area which is to be the subject of the construction and post-construction use.
- (b) Paragraph 3.5.1 asserts that a list of proposed construction activities was prepared in consultation with Cadence Australia. The paragraph then says that the construction activities and appliances are indicative and provided for information only. If the activities and appliances are for information only then there can be no reliance placed on them for the purposes of determining the construction noise.
- (c) Paragraph 3.5.1 also asserts that a large proportion of the work is internal demolition and fitout work attenuated by the existing building envelope. The activities set out in Table 13 call into question this assertion. Included in this table is roof sheeting, insulation and sarking, external lifts, raising of roof of Pier 2/3, raising of roof of workshop and raising of roof of Wharf 1. Structural works include concrete slabs, new steel portal frames and new gantries. None of these activities can be regarded as being internal demolition and fitout.
- (d) Also of concern is the statement at the top of page 19 of the report which provides that some internal works have not been modelled.
- (e) Page 22 sets out noise levels projected for the construction phase. As indicated above none of these receptors are within the immediate area of the construction.
- (f) Clause 3.7 addresses construction traffic and it is anticipated that 80 trucks per day during four months and thereafter 30 trucks per day. The report blithely calls this "insignificant additional contribution to the ambient noise environment". Eighty trucks per day can hardly be classified as insignificant.

In relation to post-construction noise we raise the following:

- (i) Paragraph 27 states that the noise outside Precinct wide events will largely be inaudible at nearby receivers. This is little wonder given that the receivers are not within the area in which events will be taking place. **Studio 10 is in the direct firing line of all noise from any event that will be held.**
- (ii) This paragraph ignores significant noise which will come from Precinct wide events. The Development Application provides that the Precinct will be used for art festivals, events and pop-up cafes. There is no detail in the Application or any report concerning the number of these events, number of people, timing or any controls surrounding them. This is a substantial defect in the Application. **Having owned a large security business across 10 countries, which has been responsible for managing hundreds if not thousands events over the 20 years, I have great concerns on this matter.**
- (iii) **My Company at one point provided the security patrols for the Walsh Bay precinct so I am well aware of the related issues of noise and disruption to the residents and businesses in the immediate proximity.**
- (iv) The modelling patron number set out in Appendix E1 shows outdoor patron numbers which, in our submission, would clearly be exceeded and as a result the noise modelling is flawed.

I request that a new noise report be commissioned at the Applicant's expense to address the concerns raised in this submission and other submissions.

2. Traffic

I have reviewed the traffic report of GTA Consultants.

My major concern is that the traffic report deals only with traffic during the construction and post-construction phases directly impacted by use in Walsh Bay. There is no account taken for the significant Barangaroo construction which will continue until 2024 and construction in the Circular Quay/Alfred Street area. In particular:

- (a) trucks from Barangaroo construction are already using Hickson Road as a parking lot;
- (b) the Barangaroo construction and the light rail will not be completed until 2024;
- (c) there is only one lane of traffic which flows from Hickson Road under the Harbour Bridge.

The report does not address the construction impact on traffic. In particular, how will the 80 trucks per day be managed in addition to the existing traffic volumes?

Clause 5.1 of the report addresses public transport and asserts the site is broadly accessible by public transport. This is despite the facts that:

- (i) Barangaroo Sydney Metro will not be operational until 2024;
- (ii) the light rail comes no closer than Circular Quay;

(iii) the Barangaroo Ferry is a significant distance from Walsh Bay.

The report asserts that Hickson Road is a dual carriageway of three lanes in each direction. There is in fact a single lane of traffic in each direction. **Again this is a major flaw.**

It is our submission that a whole of area traffic report should be commissioned at the expense of the Applicant.

3. Building attenuation

Despite assurances from the Applicant, the Development Application does not cover attenuating the owners and occupiers of Shore 2/3 during construction and post-construction. **This is of extreme concern! My tenant, the Commonwealth Bank of Australia has a significantly long lease and my very real concern is that this development will give them grounds to terminate the exiting lease. The real costs to me will be in the millions over the life of the lease.**

4. Operational plan of management

This operational plan merely sets out vague guidelines which do not address any of the specific issues of concerns to the objectors. There are no specifics in any of the document which only contains vague statements on issues which may or may not be addressed. The report also does not address the Applicant's proposal to use the area for art festivals, events and pop-up cafes.

The objector welcomes an opportunity to discuss these matters in detail with the Consent Authority and the Applicant.