

Objection

Parramatta Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, known as Powerhouse

The following points of my objection are detailed:

1. **disregard for the History of Parramatta, that was raised in The Heritage report of the EIS documentation.**

The continued total disregard for significant Local History that the NSW Government has perpetrated on City of Parramatta. Is simply appalling. the report lists the many sites that have been sanctioned by the NSW Government recently removing History to become Photos and rubble! This is Just two in one Go!

The contradiction in the value of the 2 heritage sites in Phillip street is shown by the preference to retain the 14 story 45m metre Modernism style AGC House that was constructed in 1990. Has been sectioned out of the block of the site, it obviously has greater Value then the other heritage stock buildings on the site. These being the two Most significant historical building in the site: St Georges terrace and the amazing Italianate Willow Grove Both to be sacrificed for a Building of concrete sticks, reminiscent to a match building in Composition. The building has no merit in history of NSW colony's life. This is an Ugly Building that my Kid could have already built! So, we sacrifice real history for a place to store History. That MAAC is to be the store house of a few pictures and a pile of Bricks and rubble. Thus, Joining the recently demolished Royal Oak as political fodder for minimising Parramatta as one of the most significant settlements in Australia.

The EIS provided no justification for this act of vandalism other than some Ministers and the Premier does not want to preserve Parramatta history. In preference to scripted modern City of Sydney's with no history!

2. **The Site and the design are questionable.**

The Hydrological report reveals the site is subject to flooding and despite the proposed one metre freeboard on the Phillip street entry. The Possible flood level resulting from a combination of Over land and river Flooding would put the Ground floor potentially under 2 metres of water, Even the precautions that are envisaged are inadequate. The design conditions of the existing adjoining AGC House reveals the folly.

2.a. Folly

With the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences having substantial exhibitions and hard standing on the Ground floor, there no information as to how or if it is possible that these 5 ton + exhibition pieces would be moved out of flood reach. Seals on Glass walls, the only thing that stops flooding. MPF or maximum Flooding from all sources

These are Great seal, given its a clean look wall on a totally bespoke building. So, I question the Cost and the expertise that would be required to be effective for such a Building. Another Opera house O&M cost plus initial Cost to build is the question, given its an expensive Dyke! The building does not reveal that its flood resistant from the information in the EIS = FAIL!

Given the access to the site Loading dock being the only rescue point for exhibitions, would already be subject to waterflows capable of damaging exhibitions. The impossibility of a rescue plan in the context of having anything on the Ground level. The curator would have to have on hand a plan for

each item and the necessary transport infrastructure immediately available. A significant undertaking on any day! Let alone in a unravelling flood event = FAIL

The Loading dock Design already is a single point of failure in its Not design to move items quickly or efficiently. Specially to move Bulky and large items quick enough for a Flood event. Its designed for a slow and progressive activity an O&M cost point, given flooding is outside budget all based on flood. If you go to early and no flooding, MAAC has no Annual Flood Budget bucket! for such a move. = FAIL. Use in a Flood event is Pointless anyway If the surrounding Street and Phillip street is already subject to inundation. = FAIL

Moving Exhibition piece is never a rush job. The potential to destroy a priceless piece of History is what Curators have a responsibility to be careful and slow because it is safe! = FAIL

This calls in to question the suitability of the site

Given the adjoining AGC building has no habitable area at street level?

3. Mega Expensive to operate a ground floor Exhibition space.

3 a. Mission Impossible. The logistics and the site supervision team would need a long lead time to remove those priceless artifacts to another site. This is days before a potential flood event. This does not take into consideration the already known risks of extreme / freak storms that East coast continues to experience. The likelihood that the museum would have enough warning of a possible event that impacts on the site from either Over land or flooding from River. Either are likely an both sources cause inundation. Would mean at significant times the Museum would be closed to reset the Ground floor and the Buildings infrastructure as the potential for an event is likely. Given NSW is its own insurer the likelihood that damaged exhibitions would be off exhibition for Years if these priceless items were damaged, It's an expensive operation giving these exhibition Items are Priceless and, in most cases, heavy, bulky and once water damaged. They would be costly to get to back to a display status after flood or mega expensive if it's a failure of wall dyke. = FAIL

3.b. No other storage? The closure of the Haymarket Powerhouse site: is a dilemma given the Castle Hill site is a rotation space for off exhibition storage. So, the Impost of providing a temporary home or another annex is an expense that the Business case for the move to Parramatta and this EIS fails on! So, it is assumed what is on the Ground floor is to become junk in the event of any floor event. The EIS gives no other insights! = FAIL

3.c. Museum of foul-smelling relics: The use of the subfloor area as flood storage retention of detention. Brings another concern. Given the plant room for the amazing main floor opening walls is in the are most likely to get wet in any floor event. The design proposed means the glass wall could become fixed in position. Open or closed for lengthy periods. The subfloor area would be source of Foul smell. It would need to be cleaned after every minor flooring, same as the existing river front and existing Carpark is. An O&M Cost burden of the site, Otherwise We have a Mega expensive Museum of foul-smelling relics. The smell of rot would result in Permeating the whole building!

3.d. Achieving a significant Nabers rating. The massive glass structure with opening walls is problematic with achieving a World class STAR Rating for a Public space. It would be awfully expensive to build or would result in O&M budget that was limiting on its function as a public space. Again, the EIS is quiet on reality achieving a World class Nabers rating = FAIL

4. These are all symptoms of this being a poor Location for the purpose of a Museum of priceless history.

Powerhouse stays at Ultimo and the developer sue NSW Govt or Alternatively site the proposal is: Alternative sites within walking distance of the current proposed site. Given the Cumberland Hospital site is in the city limits is already A possible alternate site for such a museum. That would showcase NSW History in a significant heritage site!

In Summary: I Object,

This EIS is a Trojan house, as Planning approval of this proposal is to legitimise via an SSI Building in Parramatta, an alternate Object, which is NOT AT ALL about the Building,

But approval to relieve the NSW Government of theses costly piece of its built history. Destroy Local History such as Willow Grove and St George terrace and its value by purposely allowing a New museum on that site that is known to flood, Museums are to be a “Safe repository”. Again, revealing that Our History that occupies any scrap of land, has no place in NSW, it seems for the EIS documentation and the proposal presented.

This would make the reason to remove St Georges Cres and Willow Grove sacrifice have purpose. Thus, to Remove the financial burdened of having any heritage items that NSWG is responsible for. Other than which it can sell to developers.

Kim Riley

Westmead