

Walsh Bay Wharf 4/5 and Pier 2/3

Walsh Bay Arts and Cultural Precinct

Subject: SSDA 8671

Site: 17 and 13A Hickson Road, Dawes Point NSW 2000 (Walsh Bay Wharf 4/5 and Pier 2/3)

Applicant: Create NSW/ Arts Screen and Culture Division

I write as a resident of Walsh Bay (Dawes Point/Millers Point) in objection to certain points related to subject application above. I want to make it known that I am in favour of an improved Arts Precinct however supplemental to that submission want to raise the following matters:

Need for a universal definition/vision statement of outcomes for 'Walsh Bay Arts & Cultural Precinct' (same language used by everyone at all levels/departments within government and beyond)

The Environmental Impact Statement (attached to SSDA 8671) - Under Background and Assessment of alternatives sites a 2013 Master Plan was prepared. This plan however was subject to an appeal against stage 1 consent and declared invalid and set aside. I went to a briefing session on Wednesday 15 November and asked questions around a universal Master Plan/vision. I was told *"what is written in this SSDA 8671 is what is intended"*. No where on display (photographs on easels) was there a copy of the 2013 Master Plan or shown how this new SSDA 8671 relates to the 2013 Master Plan main components or to any overall plan/vision. An example of this is in the original SSDA was a proposed waterfront square, a sliding bridge and floating walkways. At the briefing session for SSDA 8671 no where was it pictorially shown/indicated what has happened to these components – are they in scope or out of scope? The current SSDA 8671 is very misleading which in some respects feels like the intention. This definitely does not adhere to the more generally espoused government sector values of integrity, trust and accountability and especially to published objective *"Provide transparency to enable public scrutiny"*.

There are many narratives, letters and documents attached to this submission using different terminology/language (which is confusing) e.g. correspondence within the same department says that the area is going to be used for 'festivals and pop ups' – this language has different meanings and connotations and does not mesh with the current ethos and harmony of the arts and cultural area within the Precinct.

The Create NSW website doesn't even have the current information/documents generally available to the public which we had to obtain directly from Tom Kennedy (Direction GTK Consulting) – it is not easy to navigate these waters - how hard does this have to be?

In addition, under 'pre-lodgement engagement' the submission confirms it has met/consulted with various authorities about the new SSDA 8671. I however can confirm (as being party to 3 of these meetings) the outcomes were unsatisfactory and presented as a mere 'tick box exercise'. The submission even states *"given the nature of the project, and the fact that they had been consulted with during the previous SSDA multiple stakeholders confirmed they did not require additional meetings"*.

We would formally ask for documentation proving these assertions as we have direct contact with the two prime residential groups and heads of most local strata bodies.

There is no signposting (or anywhere tabled) how this current SSDA 8671 has changed/differs from the previous SSDA. Additionally the previous SSDA did not engage a wider audience that extended more than 25m from the site. I was not even included in the original SSDA distribution and I live less than 26m from the site however was in the exclusion zone (my carpark is in the inclusion zone however this was overlooked/mere oversight).

Noise

A report/document attached to this SSDA 8671 from Arup Pty Limited is deficient in a number of respects including:

- None of the noise sensitive receptors are located within the area which is to be the subject of all construction phases
- A list of proposed construction activities was prepared and then conversely states that the construction activities and appliances are indicative and are provided for information only. What are the actual indicators then for determining the construction noise levels? What is deemed acceptable and not acceptable?
- The report states that a large proportion of the work is internal demolition and fit out work. The activities set out in Table 13 are not indicative of these works and definitely do not fall into this category of internal demolition and fit out.
- The report states that some internal works have not been modelled – then how can you project/know what the noise levels will be and whether they are acceptable or not?
- The report addresses construction traffic and is anticipated that 80 trucks per day during four months and thereafter 30 trucks per day. Residents are already feeling the pinch with an increase in noise and disruption to the area, closures of major city roads and redirecting of traffic, leading to an increase in light and heavy traffic to the area without any further planned activity e.g. we are already dealing with Barangaroo, Campbell Wharf/Warehouses, Alfred St, Light Rail, Sydney Metro and other construction activity happening because of the regeneration projects post NSW sell-off all impacting the area. Do we really need another project??? This also doesn't factor in other activity e.g. fun runs, New Year, Vivid and the increase in the number of cruise ships year upon year which dramatically effects the area.
- The report states that the noise outside Precinct wide events will largely be inaudible at nearby receivers. This can hardly be an indicator with the receivers not being within the area where the events are taking place. Conversely it ignores the fact that significant noise and disruption which will come from Precinct wide events. The SSDA confirms that the Precinct will be used for art festivals, events and popup cafes and confirms new use of wharf aprons for activities'/functions and community events. There is no information detailing the projected increase in the number of events, people, timing, operational controls of any kind – key information is completely missing. The area is predominately a residential area where currently the arts and cultural activities mesh harmoniously together – there is a schedule of activity and known noise activity. This new SSDA 8671 submission omits this information

altogether plus unlike the Botanic Gardens or Centennial Park areas (which host events) e.g. outdoor cinema there is a natural space/buffer zone between residents which we do not have. In Walsh Bay the unique characteristic we have is that most residents live immediately proximate to, cross water from or amphitheatrically to the Arts and adjacent food and beverage offerings – leaving residents highly exposed to noise, traffic and social issues.

Additionally, documents (D/2011/1258/D – relating to the modification of previous development approval) had recently been submitted to Sydney of City (as lease for Piers 2/3 had expired) and made reference to *“managing activities so that they do not generate unacceptable noise levels”, “constraining hours of operation”*. The application was ‘approved for a trial period’ (on 5 September 2017) subject to conditions. The approval included a trial period with regard to trading hours. This new application SSDA 8671 asks for differing extended hours to that of the lease agreement that has just been extended. Plus in this SSDA submission there is no mention of internal or external hours which every other business has to abide by in the Precinct. Why would this application be any different??? Plus at the briefing session I attended on Wednesday 15 November senior staff (who names are on written submission documents) did not know how many commercial businesses in the last 6-12 months within the Precinct had just been opened/renovated or given extended trading hours to help ‘activate the precinct by City of Sydney’. Do we actually need any more commercial spaces? And why?

We request that a new noise report be commissioned at the applicants expense to address the concerns raised by all stakeholders.

Traffic

We have reviewed the traffic report of GTA Consultants. Our major concern is that the traffic report deals with only 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 or within Millers Point because of the NSW government \$400-\$600m sell-off for regeneration in the area. In particular:

1. Trucks from Barangaroo construction are already using Hickson Road as a parking lot
2. The Barangaroo construction and Sydney Metro will not be completed until 2024
3. 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? Data used in the submission is completely outdated. With the current and planned high construction and event activity in the surrounding area/precinct you would deem this to be a fundamental underpinning of this SSDA 8671 for consent to be given.

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:

1. Barangaroo and Sydney Metro will not be operational until 2024
2. The Sydney Metro comes no closer than Circular Quay
3. 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.

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

Operational plan of management

The submitted operation plan merely sets out vague guidelines which do not address any of the specific issues or concerns raised by residents. The documents/appendices used as the basis of this SSDA 8671 appear to be poorly drafted, many use old/out of date data often generalised in their content, which is confusing and contain many inconsistencies. It seems appropriate to more accurately and prescriptively lock down information now. The report also does not address the applicants proposal to use the area for art festivals, events and pop-up cafes. In our opinion there are so many inconsistent descriptions of this and such issues in the SSDA 8671 (and attached documents/appendices) that it really is open to individual interpretation or skewed by the lens/bias of the people you talk to. It all seems adhoc and unacceptable.

Conclusion

This SSDA 8671 and attached documents/appendices do not give any assurances or provide confidence that the right level of attention and detail is being given to such an important State Wide Development Application for the area/precinct.