

1 Lombard Street  
Glebe 2037

Planning and assessment,  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
GPO Box 39,  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director – Key Sites Assessment

Regarding      SSD-8924 – the new Sydney Fish Market Concept Stage 1  
                     SSD – 8925 – The New Sydney Fish Market Stage 2

## Letter of objection

Dear Sir/ Madam

This letter objects to this development on the grounds of:

Loss of amenity to the existing community,  
Erosion of the harbour by non-essential development,  
Traffic.

In Particular:

### **What is it?**

First let us be clear what this development is. It suggests this is a much needed wholesale fish market. It is not. There is a perfectly adequate wholesale market in a purpose built building on the existing site. There is no proposal to expand the wholesale component.

It is suggested that the wholesale market is a major tourist attraction. It is not. The wholesale market starts very early and is finished long before the tourists get out of bed. To see the market in action you need to be up very early and book a tour.

What this development is about is the retail component. The existing retail has been demolished-by-neglect; Potholed and chaotic parking, mouldy umbrellas, rusty metal work, pallets of rubbish stored in public areas and bird excrement everywhere. A bit of grunge might suit the fisher folk but it does not look good for Australia's international image and certainly not in food service areas.

The proposed site

There is no site. The current cement works is built on piles. At the end of their lease they are obliged to remove their structures including the piles. When James packer wanted to build his casino over the water, Sydney rightly said no. The people do not want the harbour fritted away for a shopping mall.

In summary, this development should be assessed as what it is:

A shopping mall that will consume pristine harbour.

### **Loss of amenity**

Planning is about making the city better. Each development should contribute something to improving the lifestyle of the population. For the first time in a hundred years we have an opportunity to decide how this site can make the lived experience of our community better.

The pictures with this proposal show lots of glamorous retail. What it does not show is the 28 meter wall that will cut the community off from the water. Yes there will be promenades etc. I don't mean the occasional special experience; I mean the everyday life of citizens as they move around the city.

Simply doing nothing with this site will open unimpeded views to the water. Each day tens of thousands of people will walk, cycle, drive or ride the light rail with views to the water to gladden their daily commute. Think of the Grand Parade at Brighton-le-Sands or the Corso at Manly.

The proposal suggests tall walls more reminiscing of Broadway Shopping centre: bland concrete with advertising and tour coaches. Commercially focussed, not a better city.

### **Erosion of the harbour**

Urban Growth admits this development will be built entirely over what is currently harbour. RMS has always insisted that over-water developments should be essential and minimal. This is neither.

There is no ESSENTIAL reason to build even the wholesale market over the water. Most of the produce arrives by truck and all leaves by truck. It could just as easily be at Flemington. If proximity to source is important it should be by the airport. If we must have a shopping mall by the water, there is land to the north of the existing site that would provide a firm base to build on and be nearer the light rail station. Or they might build on the existing car park using, say, Wentworth Park as a temporary car park. There are alternatives. The presumption that it has to be here has to be rejected as unsubstantiated.

The proposal is not minimal, it proposes considerably expanding the retail component. If a new wholesale market is needed it could be built without a retail sector on a much smaller footprint. The retail component is scaled for profit – not to be minimal.

Urban Growth tells me it has to be here because they “don't own other land”. They seem to think they can get the harbour for free. Selling off the harbour is bad enough, giving it away is not a reason to support this proposal.

### **Traffic**

The development proposes what it calls ‘improvements’ to Bridge Road. None of these benefit the community. None of the ‘improvements’ would improve traffic flow on Bridge Road if the development was not constructed. They exist merely to get customers in and out of the development. Every time a vehicle enters or leaves the site it will impede through traffic on a road that already suffers major tailbacks from the lights at Glebe Point Road. These tail backs will be

reproduced at the 'improved' intersections into the development. The development does not propose any compensatory road works. Once they are out the door, they are someone else's problem.

Where is the benefit to the community?

The claim that they are "between two stations" should be read "as far as possible from both stations". The bus parking will be for coaches, not public transport. Will the car park be free? Or will fee-dodges clog surrounding streets?

### **Planning**

Urban Growth says they have no plans for the existing site. This is either dishonest or the poorest of planning. They have been looking at The Bays for years – but no plans for this site? Can we trust them at all?

We have a state government that has sold off essential infrastructure, yet it is now in the business of shopping malls? Selling off the old site is the real game here. They are alienating the harbour permanently to raise give a temporary blip to their spending.

People of the inner city pay a high price for doing so, not just in house prices but in small lots, dense living and congestion. Why do I have pay to park in front of my own house? Big developments push ever more people into the city, but where are the big proposals for sports fields, open spaces and community buildings?

We also pay a price for being "in the way" of broader Sydney. West Connex is not called Inner-City Connex, because it does not. It does not serve us, but we bear the burden of off-ramps, traffic and stink pipes. We pay for freeways to the west through asset sales and our electricity bills. The Gateway project will compensate Sydney Airport for providing a highway to their door! The inner city has to give up its harbour front to pay for it.

If the state can spend billions 'serving the west' it can forgo selling the harbour.

In assessing this proposal consider this;

Should the harbour front be the property of a few shop keepers?

Or

Should it serve the tens of thousands who pass each day?

Make our city better, reject this development.

My thanks for your patience

Tim Vye