

BRIAN FULLER
2/20-24 Hereford Street
GLEBE NSW 2037

12 November 2019

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

Dear Sir/Madam

RE OBJECTION

DA SSD 8924 – The new Sydney Fish Market – Concept and Stage 1

DA SSD 8925 – The new Sydney Fish Market – Stage 2

I object to these DAs for the following reasons.

LACK OF MASTER PLANNING

Planning for the Bays Precinct is being undertaken on an ad hoc basis. The Multi User Facility for Glebe Island has been approved in isolation, and now the Government seeks approval to relocate the Sydney Fish Market (SFM). At the Information Session that I attended I was told that master planning for the Bays Precinct could not commence until the relocation of the SFM was finalised. Such a statement defies all logic. After all what is “planning”?

Sydney is neither Singapore nor Hong Kong. We are not starved of land as those 2 cities are. Whilst I am not advocating urban sprawl, it is a sad day when a Government of the day has to reclaim part of a world class harbor because it cannot master plan on the land that we have.

LACK OF JUSTIFICATION FOR RELOCATION

I do not accept the DAs assertion that the cost of redeveloping the current site and the impact on the Sydney Fish Market is justification for relocation to an on water location costing at least \$750 million. To my knowledge the financials for the relocation have not been made public, but building over water is more expensive than on land. In addition to the \$750 million, there are other costs such as the loss of a potential permanent amenity between Wentworth Park and the Harbor and the loss of the opportunity for a true waterfront promenade across Blackwattle Bay.

Unless the financial business case is released, I am highly suspicious that the only way that the relocation over water is viable is with the sale of the current site for the construction of over 2700 apartments.

When told at the Information Session that in relation to transport projections, the SFM had to stand in isolation and could not include any projections that related to other developments in the area.

This smacks of selective argument. The SFM relocation, I suspect relies on the sale of the current site for high density living, but the transport infrastructure needs that result from that high density residential development are to be ignored.

TRANSPORT AND PARKING

The DAs assert that local intersection usage is forecast not to increase by more than 5%, other than the intersection of Bridge and Wentworth Park Roads. Whilst I am skeptical that these projections are

selective, it is totally unacceptable that the projections ignore the forecast increases that will result from new residential and other developments to occur in the area.

The expected population growth forecast of over 8 million for greater Sydney by 2056 will be most felt in the inner ring. Master planning must include the public transport infrastructure requirements as a result of all development activity.

Despite the intention to discourage driving to the new SFM with limitations on car spaces similar to the current site, the strategy will not work. The current statistics suggest that 75% of all visitations by vehicle stay one hour, and those drivers will now have the opportunity to park in Glebe's residential streets, many of which have a 2 hour restricted parking scheme or are free after 6 pm and over the weekend. Why would visitor drivers pay market rates when they can find free parking in nearby streets for periods under 2 hours.

There is effectively no strategy for waiting coaches other than they should find parking in surrounding streets. That is yet another example of lack of planning.

MISSED OPPORTUNITY FOR WORLD CLASS AMENITY

The DAs assert the redevelopment will offer an amenity that is a vast improvement to the current concrete works. Agreed it is an eyesore, but that is a very low benchmark upon which to claim or justify the benefits of the new amenity (and in the form of a building).

The DAs confirm that the current Glebe foreshore walk is one of the top foreshore walks in the world. Why would that be? It is totally on the water front, at ground level, amongst landscaped reserves, uninterrupted views and is accessible to all e.g. walkers, joggers, parents with prams, dog walkers, bike riders AND those who are mobility impaired.

A foreshore walk that will force all to climb stairs, or find a lift within a building, and that is discriminatory to mobility impaired people, shows a blatant disregard for all the values that are held by a modern society in an urban environment.

Many global cities would envy the opportunity to create a magnificent amenity between harbor and parklands. I understand the current occupancy arrangement for Wentworth Park (i.e. Greyhound racing) is to expire in 2027, such that Wentworth Park could be redeveloped into a highly interactive park with uninterrupted harbor views.

The proposed "slither of a view" either side of the new SFM is less than current, and far less than could occur when the concrete works are removed and the SFM is redeveloped on the current site.

Yet again, a lack of planning resulting in a missed opportunity.

NOT FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD

The DAs suggest that the relocation of the SFM will be for the public good. The documentation references that the redevelopment proposal is consistent with the aims of SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005) in that *"the public good has precedence over the private good whenever and whatever change is proposed for Sydney Harbour or its foreshores"*. The documentation further asserts consistency with the aim that *"protection of the natural assets of Sydney Harbour has precedence over all other interests"*.

These 2 aims will only be met in true context with removal of the concrete works and the return to a near as possible natural foreshore walk of world standing. To use the argument that the proposed SFM is a better amenity than the existing concrete works is in my view an abdication of responsibility of government to protect the harbor and ensure it continues to be for the benefit of the public good.

With a 93% increase in the allocation of space to retailing and dining, together with extended trading beyond 4pm every day, the facility will predominately become a restaurant and dining hall, a total contradiction to the aims of SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005).

Whilst I recognize that the current SFM needs to be upgraded, I request the withdrawal of the DAs for the redevelopment on the site proposed, whilst master planning for the entire Bays Precinct is completed so that all the requirements for residential housing, schools, public transport, road networks and industry are satisfied without detriment to an important bay on one of the finest harbors in the world.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B Fuller', with a stylized, cursive script.

B Fuller