

---

ATIVE GROUP  
49ABE35242D2EB7AE9-

---

OC

---

RE: <http://www.smh.com.au/nsw/city-or-sydney-says-modified-barangaroo-casino-plan-has-no-public-benefit-20150513-gh0p7t.html>

I've just read this article on the SMH and am disappointed to the pit of my stomach. The Baird government was reelected on the promise of an end to corrupt politics in NSW. This state is so very fatigued by bad planning decisions made in the interests of big business. It is an embarrassment to the intelligence and integrity of the people who live in NSW.

The Barangaroo project has been getting progressively worse by the year since it started. This latest modification is a hugely low blow to the integrity of your government, and to the future fortunes of this state. It's reminiscent of the 1960s Darling Point towers, which still to this day stand as odd eyesores and a constant legacy of corrupt, incompetent government.

Show some strength, push back on the corrupt casino and prove you're willing to make decisions which are in the best interest of NSW residents, not whoever happens to be greasing your palms this week.

Sincerely

Kali Reid  
Darlington resident

36

The Hon. Rob Stokes, MP  
Minister for Planning  
Parliament House  
SYDNEY 2000  
Dear Minister,

MP06-0162 MOD 8 - Modifications to Barangaroo Concept Plan

I have just walked over to Barangaroo where a part of the South area was opened to the public today. The new avenue in front of residential buildings will be a very pleasant walk, especially when the trees are in leaf in warmer weather.

The prospect of a hotel/casino of huge bulk and height, to be constructed somewhere north of this pleasant foreshore, is extremely alarming. The size and location of this building far exceed the limits originally approved, and even the wider limits subsequently approved.

What is the use of planning if it can be changed at the whim of business or other parties for commercial gain, with no consideration for amenities for the general public or, indeed, for the opportunity of building a world class cityscape of beauty and wonder on a glorious harbour?

You will have received a letter (or email) from Mr Alex Greenwich, Member for Sydney, on this same topic. He explains in detail his concerns and those of thousands of Sydney-siders about this, in far better words than I could manage. I therefore enclose a copy of his letter for your perusal again.

My husband George Soukup and I beg you to reconsider the present plans for the building of this hotel.

Yours faithfully,



Jennifer Soukup

37

**E-ma**

**From**  
**To:**

[1.nsw.gov.au](mailto:1.nsw.gov.au)  
**GROUP**  
**E35242D2EB7AE9-**

**Cc:**  
**Sent**  
**Rec**  
**Subj**

**Atta**

-----  
From: John Shawcross [mailto:john.shawcross@nsw.gov.au]  
Sent: Wednesday, 13 May 2015 10:43 PM  
To: ElectorateOffice Pittwater  
Subject: Rob Stokes: Barangaroo

This is an enquiry e-mail via <http://www.robstokes.com.au> from:  
John Shawcross

Minister,

Please be the first person who has the foresight to control development of  
Barangaroo.

The public can only assume that LLC continually outsmart our civic leaders or  
there are a lot of brown paper bags being passed around.

**E-mail**

**From:**  
**To:**

[GROUP](#)  
[35242D2E87AE9-](#)

**Cc:**  
**Sent:**  
**Receiv**  
**Subject**

s the public

**Attach**

Dear Mr Stokes

I am yet another disappointed Sydney resident shocked and dismayed at the NSW Governments inability to determine planning policy when it comes to Barangaroo. From a residences view point, the developer is getting everything they demand handed to them on a silver platter.

Why are Lend Lease allowed to trample over current rules and regulations at a whim?

Regards

Shawn Buchan

Rob Stokes MP

PO Box 91

Minister for Planning NSW

Mona Vale

NSW 2103

7.6.15

Dear Rob

I find it very difficult to express in words how saddened I am by first the extraordinary overbuilding on the Barangaroo site and second, your announcement that you have ruled out that the PAC hold a public hearing into Mod 8 for Barangaroo South.

Such a hearing must involve all stakeholders, especially the public, as the development is on the public's land.

As I understand it, you have announced that an independent design advisory panel will also scrutinise the proposal, along with the department, before the commission makes the determination.

Independent? – how can it be independent when the NSW Government Architect will be chairman? The other 2 members of the panel, as I am told, are both linked to the current proposal. Their 'opinion' will be 'considered' by the department.

And further, you won't allow the Casino Tower to be regarded as a new application.

So, the public and the stakeholders are cut out of the process and a very wealthy individual will continue his control of the Govt and the process, just as happened in the beginning when I wrote my first letter to the then Premier O'Farrell, which you may recall.

We have been to all the Open Days and a lot of it is very good, especially B North.

My Official Submission (if anybody worries about reading it) is as follows:-

#### **Height and Bulk of the Buildings**

What started as a comparatively modest building program on public land - one of the best sites in the world, designed by very good architects, has enlarged hugely – not 'bracket creep' but 'bracket gallop':

# 330,000 sq m to well over 600,000 sq m

# 170 m to 275 m for one building

# resultant narrowing of corridors between buildings leading to significantly increased wind impact on pedestrians

# a huge footprint for the Casino Tower – it looks as though it has a most unfriendly connection with the ground and the people.

No wonder the wonderful Jan Gehl gave up – no doubt in disgust.

### **The People**

Some clever dishonest person/s have stated that the public space is still 50%, when in fact, as I read, the streets and other similar areas are now being counted as Public Space. Is this correct?

And of course, as we know, good urban architecture does **not** have large buildings slap-bang up against public park space. It diminishes the latter and will cast some dramatic shadows across the public space, including over to Darling Harbour I believe.

### **The Casino Tower**

I know design is a personal thing – but there are certain basic rules to good design. I have not met anyone who thinks the Casino Tower is good design – almost always is the comment – Dubai! (although I did see a program on Qatar and their buildings are up there on a par with Dubai – quite extraordinary).

Rob, why can't we insist on good architecture that has a Sydney character – and there are some excellent ones in Sydney.

The Rogers Harbour hotel design was good in that it fitted into the Sydney environment – the Sydney character.

Here's a question for you – does this building meet the very high sustainability standards set by Lend Lease for Barangaroo?

I'll bet it doesn't! I'd really appreciate an answer on this.

Height – started at an approved height of 170 m, with Mr Packer saying 'he would like to do something for Sydney' – now he wants 275 m – for him.

And everyone rolls over.

Here's another point – you know when a big cruise liner docks in Circular Quay, it dwarfs the whole of the Quay area.

The same will happen with the Casino Tower – it will dwarf the Harbour Bridge and the Opera House. And please, it is not an iconic building. That word is for buildings like the Opera House and the Bridge.

This building is totally out of character with Sydney. I wouldn't mind betting that it was a design destined for Dubai, but for some reason didn't get used. And hey presto, the architects pulled it out of one of the lower plan drawers!

Further it says – 'Sydney, the Gambling City' – what a label to be placed on this great city of ours!

These points alone are enough to go back to square 1 .

### **Heritage**

I am sure that the Mod 8 application would have a very serious impact on the heritage areas, not the least of which would be the Sydney Observatory.

### **Parking**

Apparently inadequate. The Casino already, apparently, wants to use a lot or all of the surrounding parking.

And street parking is being cut back. There probably shouldn't be any anyway.

### **Pedestrians**

Squeezed into narrowed pedestrian corridors. Apparently the scale of the buildings will create very unpleasant wind conditions.

### **Cycling**

Planning apparently lacking. Probably inadequate – contrary to original concept.

### **Transport**

Seems like some work to do here, with buses, light rail, walking, cycling etc

### **Waterfront**

It seems as though the buildings are moving to minimise the public walkway area along the waterfront. Public space is being squeezed.

### **Urban Design**

Referred to above.

Fundamentally, big buildings should be at the back - up the hill. The buildings that front Public Space should be of smaller scale.

This development, as is requested (M8) , will be quite the reverse.

Why doesn't this critically important development follow good urban design? – like not putting huge buildings up against Public Space.

I hope that Mr Poulet and his panel are very strong on this.

Incidentally Rob, I understand that the hotel, resident apartments, gaming facility complex is now planned to be sited on land where building is prohibited !?

Rob, this is all a bit rushed. I could go on, but tomorrow we're off for a few weeks and I desperately wanted to get some of my feelings about this potentially brilliant project to you.

**My constructive summary is:-**

# Open it up to very good and thorough research. You will end up with something that not only meets the wishes of all the stakeholders (except for 1 or 2) but is excellent.

I know it's very small fry, but that's what we did with Pittwater - the Vision and all the Strategies coming from conducting a lot of research with the Pittwater community and the Council. Has been working very well for years.

# Once the research is completed , sorted, communicated back to the stakeholders etc, then do some good urban design, as touched on above

# Then it'll be ready for construction

Rob, right now, the whole project is potentially destined to be (with Mod 8) an area filled with massive buildings, with some public park space nudging up against it.

Pressing on with this will give Sydney, now and a long way into the future, a very second rate result.

This is a vastly changed development and should be treated as such - a new one.

I, and many others, will be bitterly disappointed if this development goes ahead, even with a few changes.

To me it will illustrate the power of one man and an organisation over the Government to the detriment of Sydney.

I'll make contact when we return

With very best wishes

Greg