

John Buckingham

PO BOX 1091 GLEBE. SYDNEY, NSW 2037. AUSTRALIA
TEL + 61 (0)2 9660 7780 MOB: +61 418 218 729

jbucking@bigpond.net.au

The Manager/Director,

Key Sites Assessments

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

10th November, 2019.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: SSD - 8924 - the new Sydney Fish Market Concept and Stage 1

SSD - 8925 - the new Sydney Fish Market Stage 2

LETTER OF OBJECTION

Perhaps I should preface my objection by indicating I was one of the many people who, perhaps fifteen years ago, worked diligently during the consultative process on an earlier iteration of a rebuild for the fish market. On that occasion I understood the application was initiated by the fishmongers, both wholesale and retail. I presume all material gathered then has been available for this process. The application died when it became clear the applicant couldn't progress the application alone, and it became clear the government of the day was not of a mind to assist. I raise this because despite problems of detail manifesting themselves then, the most odious feature of this application was not present.

It is difficult for me to organise my objections when all your promotion material is dominated by a fine looking building apparently fitting the major needs of the people directly involved in the supply and purveying of fish at the fish markets. Unfortunately you have provided the building's designers with the **WRONG SITE** on which to develop their design.

The **correct site** is to everyone's advantage: those directly involved in the fish markets through supply and auction; those involved in retailing the seafood;

those involved in ancillary retail; those involved in purchasing seafood and ancillary products; those wishing to consume their purchases on site whether informally picnic style, or by visiting a restaurant; tourists visiting the market; drivers delivering patrons to the markets; those just driving past the markets on unrelated activities; nearby residents of Glebe, Ultimo and Pyrmont who won't have their exclusively off-site parking spaces taken by visitors to the market; those paddling, rowing, boating or being ferried on Blackwattle Bay who would be able to see what is beyond the end of the bay - historic Wentworth Park and the heritage listed viaduct and arches; those in Wentworth Park who would be able to see up Blackwattle Bay to its merging with Rozelle Bay as well as Anzac Bridge and Glebe Island Bridge; pedestrians and cyclists, whether visiting the market or not, who would have far superior access to the harbourside path when negotiating the Pyrmont Bridge Road segment;,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,

All achieved without disadvantaging any stakeholders. Obviously the “**correct site**” is exactly where the Fish Market is sited now. When I put this to the representative of the applicant at the display I visited, he insisted the present site was not viable because it would mean shutting down the fish market for two years while the old market was demolished and the new one built. Sheer nonsense! [The answer the trained representatives are told to learn because there is no justifiable reason for changing the location. I don't want to sound too cynical but it's no secret the medium term aim for the present site is dense development. The fish market is, perhaps not entirely expendable, but certainly of less importance than the dense development that can be achieved on the present fish market site if the fish market can be moved.]

Businesses continue to work and trade all over while major rebuilds are undertaken. If such an approach were deemed impossible on this site, there is plenty of room on this large site to set up a temporary market while the old one is demolished and the new one constructed. Perhaps start by building a four storey carpark right up the back of the site to make much of the present the car park available for the temporary construction. I suggest the temporary covering for the Westconnex “dives” is a good guide as to what could be used for the main auction areas; something similar to school “demountables” for the retail areas.

Now my **objections** to related concerns:

LOSS of AMENITY: This relates to loss of what **should** be. For decades locals have understood that the foreshore along Bridge Road would be a link in the (intended) foreshore walk. We have the foreshore access just about completed but are about to be deprived of this vital link. I won't go into the long history of the virtual demise of the cement batching plant turned around by the coming of the 2000 Olympics; the promised restoration of the coal loading/unloading structure (now virtually demolished by neglect); the sudden decision to store the cruise/party boats; etc .

Further, despite the attractiveness of the proposed building, it deprives us of the views to and from the water that had been guaranteed during earlier discussions of use of the site. The applicant's reference to sightlines to/from bay/park are so token as to be embarrassing. Similarly, even mentioning of the coal loader which has been "demolished by neglect" belongs in the same "embarrassing" category.

The whole situation will be exacerbated when the inevitable overdevelopment of the present fish market site is assigned to developers for exploitation.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: Developing the proposed site is fraught with environmental risks. Every time a development takes place at water's edge in Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays an Environmental Impact Statement indicates the present status (dire), identifies the risks attached to the work and invariably proceeds to outline the precautions that will make the enterprise acceptable. All a bit of a giggle really as we have been told so often by those with real knowledge that it is impracticable (too expensive) to clean up the existing toxic sediments and therefore the only way to deal with them is not to disturb them.

Given that redeveloping the present fish market site would involve almost entirely on-land activity, there is no issue with stirring up the toxic sediments. Contrast this with the extreme on-water and in-water activity required to develop the new site. Perhaps making reference to the proposed below water (underwater?) parking arrangements is sufficient to make this point.

THE UNKNOWNNS: As the classics say, "these are "too numerous to mention" but I'll try a couple

- how can anyone sensibly comment on this proposal for this site without an authoritative layman's guide to the engineering requirements and solutions? The mind boggles at the potential problems created by the parking arrangements. I am well aware success is not unknown, but I have also experienced not so much outright failures, as "ongoing" (read "permanent") maintenance requirements delivered by perpetual pumps.
- how can we sensibly comment on traffic without the detailed intentions for the present fish market site? And what about the remaining private sites alongside the present fish market site? What are the likely future uses of these sites? Are we guaranteed only small scale waterfront industrial will be contemplated? Are there any resummptions intended or even possible?
- going back to the consultations I attended about fifteen years ago on redeveloping the fish market on its present site much was made of the traffic flows back there/then. Along with several measures designed to keep through-traffic away from the site, one option suggested was to sink Bridge Road (as per South Dowling Street) and provide two high-level pedestrian

bridges between Wentworth Park and the water at the high school and at the present fish market. Whereas this proposal seems to be satisfied that the present peak hour mess won't get substantially worse. Who knows?

Without doubt, your fine building proposed for the new site could be readily adapted to the present site and attention could be given to the minor tweaks needed, particularly in the area of improvements for the mobility impaired. I'm sure you'll receive much praise for the design of the proposed building. I can't imagine any objections to the proposed design (with tweaks) being transposed to the present site.

I am happy to discuss/explain any of the issues I have raised in this letter of objection.

Yours faithfully,

John Buckingham.