

# APPENDIX 1

## Summary of Submissions

**Barangaroo – Modification to Headland Park & Northern Cove**  
**Summary of Submissions from Government Agencies**

Respondent	Issues Raised	Response
RTA Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee	<p>Mode split targets questionable unless identified public transport initiatives are put in place at an early stage. Concern that existing railway network, Wynyard Station and bus stops at York St may not be able to cope with additional commuters.</p> <p>Demolition and Construction Traffic Management Plan will be needed prior to issue of construction certificate.</p> <p>All road works, car parking, cycleways etc to comply with relevant standards.</p>	<p>Refer Chapter 2 of Traffic Report at Appendix 2.</p> <p>Environmental and Construction Management Plan required in accordance with Statement of Commitments.</p> <p>Noted</p>
Department of Planning (Heritage Branch)	<p><u>Harbour Control Tower</u> Provides suggested conditions of consent if demolition of tower is approved.</p> <p><u>MWS&amp;DB Sewage Pumping Station</u> Further investigation needed on potential options for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ retaining the Pumping Station in situ, albeit buried, as a future archaeological resource; or</li> <li>▪ for its relocation and adaptive reuse within Barangaroo site; or</li> <li>▪ for its relocation to a relevant location.</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<p>It is proposed that a Heritage Impact Statement be prepared prior to any decision regarding the Harbour Control Tower and MWS&amp;DB Sewage Pumping Station. .</p>
	<p><u>The 1913 Seawall</u> Heritage Branch previously advised that demolition of seawall should be avoided. If it is to be demolished there is potential for excavation of seabed and historic marine infrastructure etc to be disturbed/uncovered. Recommend that any such work is undertaken by appropriately qualified archaeologists etc.</p> <p>Relevant conditions are recommended in relation to above.</p>	<p>Statement of Commitments to be amended to incorporate recommended conditions.</p>
Brad Vale	<u>MWS&amp;DB Sewage Pumping Station</u>	Heritage Impact Statements to be prepared prior

Respondent	Issues Raised	Response
(Heritage Branch)	<p>Pumping station should be retained in situ by constructing retaining walls around building and covering top at raised ground level with a traversable steel grid.</p> <p><u>1913 Seawall</u> May be removed subject to sandstone blocks being reused within site for landscaping. There should be some interpretation on site demonstrating original use.</p> <p><u>Harbour Control Tower</u> No objection on heritage grounds to demolition.</p>	to any decisions regarding future reuse etc of heritage items.
State Transit Authority (Sydney Buses)	<p>Concerned that there will be sufficient public transport provision to cope with additional overall patronage. No principles/guidelines in document for managing public transport travel to/from site.</p> <p>STA requests to be involved in planning, design and implementation of TMAP and design of Globe St. Also concerned about traffic management and impact on bus services during construction phase. Consideration should be given to ensuring conflicts are minimised between short stay car parking and bus movements.</p> <p>Concerned about adequacy of intersection of Sussex and Napoleon Streets - need traffic control signals to manage this.</p>	Refer Chapter 2 of Traffic Report at Appendix 2.
Sydney Ports	<p><b><u>Operational Issues</u></b> Operation of Moores Wharf and Harbour Control Tower should not be compromised by park. Right of carriageway will be required to access HCT at lower level and from Merriman St – should be included in Statement of Commitments. Similarly, need to facilitate existing services to Moores Wharf and HCT (by means of easement etc).</p>	Noted. The Authority will continue to liaise closely with Sydney Ports regarding Moores Wharf and Harbour Control Tower to ensure their operations are coordinated with the delivery of the park. The Authority will also ensure that existing services and access to Moores Wharf and Harbour Control Tower will continue to be facilitated where practicable.

Respondent	Issues Raised	Response
	<p>Moore's Wharf needs to be secured either by solid fence or otherwise.</p> <p>Sydney Ports position on removal of HCT misconstrued in report. No agreement for removal of the Harbour Control Tower is given until such time as an alternate suitable site is found, and existing equipment and staff are transferred to a new site that supports operations in compliance with the Port Safety Operating License and obligations under the Ports &amp; Maritime Administration Act (1995) and the Marine Safety Act 1998.</p>	<p>Noted. This issue will be addressed in the detailed design phase</p> <p>Noted. This issue will not be undertaken until such time as Barangaroo Delivery Authority and Sydney Ports are satisfied on selection of an alternate suitable site and the transfer of existing equipment and staff along with uninterrupted operations under the Port Safety Operating License.</p>
	<p><b><u>Heritage Issues</u></b></p> <p>Heritage Impact Statement required to assess impact of removal of items currently listed on Sydney Ports s170 Register. HCT to be considered for listing on State Heritage Register.</p> <p>A number of additional statements of commitment are suggested.</p>	<p>Noted and supported. Additional statements of commitments recommended for inclusion</p>
Ministry of Transport	<p>Loss of approx 40 short stay on street car spaces may increase pressure for parking on Hickson Road and increase traffic accessing headland carpark.</p> <p>Supports proposed signalisation of proposed junction of "New" and Hickson Roads.</p> <p>Proposed new ferry hub likely to increase pedestrian traffic along the foreshore. High quality shared pedestrian/cycle path will be required.</p>	<p>Refer Chapter 2 of Traffic Report at Appendix 2.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
City of Sydney	<p>Supports proposal in principle subject to consideration of a number of issues, as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Park Design and Use</u></b></p> <p>Need for a detailed design of the Harbour Park to be considered holistically with remainder of public domain design. Public domain plan should be prepared with retail strategy which considers how</p>	<p>Urban Design and Landscape Plan (UDLP) to be prepared within overall ambit of Public Domain Plan required in Statement of Commitments.</p>

Respondent	Issues Raised	Response
	<p>space can be activated and people move through it. Master urban designer/landscape architect should be appointed to oversee this.</p> <p>Need to be careful that Harbour Parkland doesn't become dislocated and isolated from remainder of Barangaroo.</p> <p>Pinch point at southern side of northern cove is "uncomfortable" and out of character with surrounding parklands. Wider section in this area would provide for improved, more free flowing connection between north and south.</p> <p>Rationale for network of paths and tree planting is not clear. Assume further detailed design is required. Detailed design phase should consider opportunities related to landform, terracing and levels.</p> <p>Headland Park needs to include active public uses including interactive public buildings.</p>	<p>Further discussion provided in Section 2.5 of PPR Report and in Urban Design Report at Appendix 4.</p> <p>Refer detailed discussion in Section 2.2 of PPR.</p> <p>Refer detailed discussion in Section 2.2 of PPR.</p> <p>This is to be addressed in UDLP.</p> <p>Refer detailed discussion in Section 2.4 of PPR.</p>
	On site stormwater treatment and reuse should be considered in design development phase.	Noted and supported.
	<p><u>Car Park</u></p> <p>Proposal for car park within headland is not supported. This will promote use of private car and undermine future provision of public transport. Also creates security and surveillance issues.</p>	Refer discussion in Section 2.1 of PPR and in Traffic Report at Appendix 2.
	<p><u>Pedestrian Access</u></p> <p>Because of length of foreshore promenade there is a need to create a variety and diversity in the treatment of the water's edge, including urban beach concept.</p> <p>Interface between northern headland and surrounding public domain is not clear however proposal to raise landform to meet street level at Merriman St is supported.</p>	Refer discussion in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 of PPR and Urban Design Report at Appendix 4.

Respondent	Issues Raised	Response
	Need to provide opportunities for accessible travel from drop off points on Merriman St and foreshore promenade.	
	<p><u>Heritage Items</u> Potential to reuse parts of existing sandstone sea wall need to be explored further. No strategy for reuse has been detailed.</p> <p>Retention of Moores Wharf and surrounds contributes to variety and diversity of foreshore conditions. Need strong connection between Moores Wharf area and adjoining wharf area.</p> <p>Detailed consideration of the interface between new park and existing reserves and streets needs to be part of future detailed application.</p>	<p>Refer discussion in Section 2.6 of PPR.</p> <p>Noted</p>
	<p><u>Impact on Surrounding Neighbourhood</u> Need to consider widening Merriman St to improve quality and capacity of this street. Also need to consider opportunities to link Merriman St with Dalgety Road.</p> <p>Opportunity to activate Merriman St by providing park facilities, tourism or cultural uses should be explored, including partially burying structures within landform and below street level along western side of street.</p> <p>New visual analysis/view impact is required, particularly relating to new built form.</p>	<p>Refer Traffic Report at Appendix 2.</p> <p>Design has been amended to include sunken gardens adjacent to Merriman St. Other facilities may be provided subject to further investigation and detailed design.</p> <p>The Section 75W Modification is not proposing any new built form. Any visual analysis/view impact for new built form will be undertaken as part of individual Project Applications.</p>
	<p><u>Public Domain</u> Concerns about clarity and character of the Central Public domain, interface with built form etc. Need further detail about how this interface will work.</p> <p>Unclear how Globe St axis continues to the north, particularly</p>	<p>Detail design of the Central Public Domain along with the interface between built form and public domain will be further developed during the project's design phase.</p> <p>Refer detailed discussion in Section 2.7 of PPR and</p>

Respondent	Issues Raised	Response
	<p>because of proposed topography.</p> <p>Concern about landscape character and use of large areas of parkland between Southern and Northern Coves. Further analysis required regarding appropriate use, connectivity and recreational demand for these areas.</p> <p>Removal of part of Block 7 will result in significant loss of residential floorspace which will reduce potential for activation of public domain.</p>	<p>Urban Design Report at Appendix 4.</p> <p>Refer detailed discussion in Section 2.5 of PPR and Urban Design Report at Appendix 4.</p> <p>The removal of part of Block 7 allows for the parkland to stretch to Hickson Road, providing greater access to the public open space. It also allows a greater area of public open space between the Northern Cove and Hickson Road allowing better access between the Central Public Domain and the Headland Park.</p>
	<p><u>Street Network</u></p> <p>Street network needs to be reconsidered holistically together with current built form and public domain principles to ensure elements of amended structure are properly integrated.</p> <p>Need to rethink conflicting role of Globe St – appears now as a major carrier of traffic but also active interface between foreshore public domain and development.</p>	<p>Refer discussion in Urban Design Report at Appendix 2.4.</p>
Sydney Water	<p>Proposed relocation of Sewage Pumping Station 14 needs careful consideration as its heritage values are associated with its age, location and function. Any relocation will lessen heritage values. Need to liaise with Sydney Water regarding future heritage assessment, including any potential for salvage.</p>	<p>Heritage Impact Statement to be prepared to address future reuse, relocation, interpretation etc.</p>
NSW Maritime	<p>No objection to proposed modifications</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Department of Environment & Climate Change	<p>Not clear whether licence will be required under Protection of the Environment Operations (POEO) Act 1997 for dredging of the Northern Cove. This will depend on amount of material to be extracted (land and water). If an Environment Protection Licence is required, DECC have recommended conditions to be included in</p>	<p>Noted. Amount of material to be extracted will be determined during detailed design phase and addressed as part of Project Application for Northern Cove.</p>

Respondent	Issues Raised	Response
	any approval.	



**Barangaroo – Modification to Headland Park & Northern Cove**  
**Summary of Submissions (Non Government)**

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
1.	Darling House Aged Care Association	Support Proposal. Will provide ideal nearby destination for Darling House residents and other elderly people living in the area. Government should proceed immediately with proposal.	Noted
2.	Steve White	<p>Due to the increased traffic in Hickson Road, a turning lane should be provided so cars can access driveways.</p> <p>The development will obstruct existing residential views and affect amenity. There has been no consideration to the effect that plant equipment and other infrastructure located on the rooftops.</p>	<p>The final cross section of Hickson Road has not yet been determined. It will be required to accommodate parallel parking, cycle lanes, vehicular traffic and to retain space or the potential for a possible future light rail system.</p> <p>The design process will involve inputs from various stakeholders and will consider the needs of turning traffic.</p> <p>Proposed modified headland park will not detrimentally affect residential views. Impact on views from commercial development has been assessed in Preferred Project Report (PPR).</p>
3.	Name Withheld No. 1.	<p>Supportive of the more natural and historically sensitive form of the headland. Supports the shape of Northern Cove.</p> <p>Supports further investigation/adaptive reuse for HCT, sewage pumping station and sandstone sea walls.</p> <p>Supportive of foreshore promenade along extent of development.</p> <p>Supportive of the removal of Block 8 and Part of Block 7 to accommodate the modification of the headland and Northern Cove.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
		Provides extensive commentary on "Proposed Concept Plan"	Issues raised are not relevant to Headland Park modification
4.	Mr & Mrs Tooker	<p>Support proposal in principle but object to the car park within the headland as the locality is already congested with traffic. Concerns that the car park would generate up to 1000 vehicle movements per day. No clear justification for car park in this location. Supportive of the proposed light rail and ferry service.</p> <p>Not clear how Globe St is to be "realigned" given its current existing location</p>	<p>Detailed traffic modelling for the area has indicated that the road system can accommodate the traffic generation of the Headland Park car park. The car park is needed to provide essential access to northern parts of the Barangaroo site by persons that could not reasonably use public transport.</p> <p>Realignment relates to proposed re-routing at northern end, not anything to do with existing location.</p>
5.	Name Withheld No. 2.	Pro forma objecting to car park. Car park will generate up to 1000 vehicle movements per day, adding to congestion and adversely impacting on residential amenity. Entry/exit should be from Hickson Road near Universal Bond Building not from Millers Point Heritage Precinct.	As indicated in the Section 2.1 of PPR and in Traffic Report at Appendix 2, traffic impact of proposed car park will not be significant. Driveway access to the car park could be provided from either Hickson Road or Towns Place.
6.	Ros and Warwick Mackay	Support proposal in principle but object to the car park within the headland as the locality is already congested with traffic. Concerns that the car park would generate up to 1000 vehicle movements per day. No clear justification for car park in this location. Supportive of the proposed light rail and ferry service.	<p>As indicated in the Section 2.1 of PPR and in Traffic Report at Appendix 2, traffic impact of proposed car park will not be significant. Driveway access to the car park could be provided from either Hickson Road or Towns Place.</p> <p>Further justification for proposed car park provided in Traffic Report at Appendix 2.</p>
7.	Name Withheld No.3	In principle support for natural landform of modified headland. Would like to see recreation and other facilities provided on the headland. Objects to the location of the car park entrance. Already an area affected by noise pollution and this will compound the matter. Concerned about the security of the car park.	<p>As indicated in the Section 2.1 of PPR and in Traffic Report at Appendix 2, traffic impact of proposed car park will not be significant. Driveway access to the car park could be provided from either Hickson Road or Towns Place.</p> <p>A range of security measures, including CCTV and boom gates, would be incorporated into the car park. Detailed consideration of overall safety issues to be undertaken as part of UDLP.</p>

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
8.	Ian Curdie	Would like to see Globe Street follow the curve of the proposed cove and then merge with Hickson Street. Not in favour of a bridge or pontoon across the cove.	The raising of the headland in accordance with the Minister's Terms of Approval necessitates the re-routing of Globe Street to link with Hickson Road south of the Northern Cove. However, the alignment of Globe St will be used to locate elements within the landscape of the Headland Park to create an axis with focal points and view lines. The detail design phase will determine whether this should take the form of a bridge, pontoon or other solution.
9.	Hill Thalís	<p><u>Globe St axis</u> Under competition scheme Globe St axis provided opportunity for only continuous waterfront edge street in City of Sydney. Means of ensuring site is continuously accessible to all people. Intended to integrate Sydney's western foreshore from Lime St/King St to Walsh Bay and to match Macquarie St/College St spine that defines city's eastern edge. The proposed modification is entirely contrary to intention/spirit of competition winning proposal.</p> <p><u>Historical value of site</u> Proposal represents a fabrication and abuse of history and lacks authenticity. Loss of former seawalls and shoreline costly and ignores site's history. Headland configuration crude and a simplistic interpretation of the 1836 alignment. Not a valid or meaningful way to represent site's authentic history.</p>	<p>The raising of the headland in accordance with the Minister's Terms of Approval necessitates the re-routing of Globe Street to link with Hickson Road south of the Northern Cove. However, the alignment of Globe St will be used to locate elements within the landscape of the Headland Park to create an axis with focal points and view lines.</p> <p>The Headland Park design is an interpretation of the original landform and is not intended to match the exact shape of the original landform. Rather, the objective is for the headland park to have a 'natural' feel and a distinct presence in the visual catchment of Sydney Harbour without necessarily being cut back to the 1836 shoreline extent. However, to achieve a more naturalised shape and form as required by the Minister's Terms of Approval, an amended design is now proposed as shown in the plans at Appendix 3.</p> <p>Further response on this issue is provided in Section 2.2 of the PPR and in the Urban Design Report at Appendix 4.</p>

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
		<p><u>Pedestrian/disabled access</u>  Question adequacy of pedestrian access at northern and southern ends. No detail of disabled access to and within the site. Levels not properly resolved. Southern-eastern corner has 15% gradient therefore pedestrians from the south can only access headland park around foreshore edge. Proposal effectively severs the foreshore park into two.</p>	<p>The design has been amended regarding accessible path locations and circulations. All paths will comply with mobility requirements. In addition, further design has been undertaken with consideration to levels within the park, path and tree locations. The amended landscape plans are provided at Appendix 3.</p> <p>The enlargement of the cove is in response to the Minister's Terms of Approval and allows for greater interaction with the foreshore's edge. It also provides for greater definition of the headland. The Headland Park is designed to perform a different function to the remainder of the Barangaroo development and physically separating the park by the Northern Cove helps to distinguish it as recreational parklands. However, there is still a width of some 40m between the cove and Hickson Road which will readily allow for pedestrian flow.</p> <p>Detailed landscape design and pedestrian access will be the subject of further consideration and refinement as part of the Project Application and Public Domain Plan for the park.</p>
		<p><u>Park configuration and design</u>  Report is misleading in that area of parkland has decreased not increased. Northern Cove should be not counted as useable open space.</p> <p>Northern Cove is illogical and bears no resemblance to previous water bodies.</p>	<p>Area of public open space (land component) in the amended design is approximately equal to that in the approved plan.</p> <p>The Northern Cove helps to recreate the natural shoreline of the headland and provides a transition from the naturalistic shaped headland to the regularly shaped Central Public Domain. Enlarged cove a requirement of Minister's Terms of Approval. Design has been amended to provide for a more naturalistic shape for both the headland and</p>

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
		<p>Proposal ignores dramatic scale and material quality of the cut sandstone cliff which is a fundamental characteristic of the area. Landscape design risks being homogenised scattering of trees and grass.</p> <p>Significant reduction in parkland at southern end will mean that events and other civic uses will not be catered for.</p>	<p>northern cove (refer Appendix 3).</p> <p>The amended design addresses the historic sandstone cut by allowing visibility of the cut at its southern end and integrating the full height of the cut into the design of the car park. This will allow the cut to be used as a design feature and be viewed from certain spaces within the Park.</p> <p>This view is not supported. The expansion of the northern cove is in direct response to the Minister's Terms of Approval. There is no significant reduction in overall parkland and the design of the Headland Park and Northern Cove does not in any way diminish the opportunity to cater for events and other civic uses. Further discussion is provided in Sections 2.2-2.5 of the PPR and in the Urban Design Report at Appendix 4.</p>
		<p><u>Car park</u> Proposal to construct headland over car park is a major concern because of difficulty in providing for deep soil planting over the top. 5 storey car park higher than 13m indicated. Footprint of car park misleading as it doesn't shown entry tunnels, lifts etc.</p>	<p>The detailed design of the car park is yet to be undertaken however it is envisaged that a deep tree planting zone will be provided to allow for significant tree species e.g. Figs</p>
		<p><u>Impact on surrounding neighbourhood</u> Character and scale of Merriman St likely to be significantly impacted by additional traffic, including buses, wedding cars etc.</p>	<p>This view is not supported. Traffic assessment by Halcrow MWT indicates that traffic impact on surrounding neighbourhood will not be significant. (Refer Appendix 2)</p>
		<p><u>Changes to Blocks 7 and 8</u> New High St project proposed in original scheme was intended to relate to urban form and scale of original High St housing to the east. Proposal to reduce Block 7 ignores design intent and loses historical connection.</p>	<p>Refer discussion in Section 2.8 of report.</p>

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
		With increase in commercial floorspace and removal of Block 8 and part of Block 7 there will be significant adverse impact from resulting bulk of scale of buildings (loss of tapering effect).	
		<p><u>Change to precinct character</u> Proposal to raise foreshore park to front Merriman St risks turning this area into exclusive enclave.</p> <p>Providing for small wharf in the northern cove for use by water taxis and other watercraft will service "well-heeled" but does not facilitate access by kayakers, small rowboats etc. Original scheme made provision for breakwater and sheltered cove to facilitate access.</p> <p>The series of public squares and laneways do not appear on revised drawings – project is becoming increasingly privatised and exclusive.</p>	<p>Proposal to raise foreshore park to physically link with Clyne Reserve and allow direct pedestrian access from Argyle Place a requirement of Minister's Terms of Approval.</p> <p>Proposal has been amended to allow for steps leading to water in Northern Cove. These steps have potential to be used for small watercraft. Proposed treatment of northern cove edges subject to detailed design phase. Design direction for northern cove provided in Conybeare Morrison report at Appendix 4.</p> <p>Proposed public squares and laneways not part of this modification. Proposed approach to public squares and laneways as per approved Concept Plan.</p>
		<p><u>Sustainability</u> Proposal involves unspecified amounts of fill to reconstruct headland. No reference to "water sensitive urban design". No sensitivity to history/indigenous landscape characteristics of site. Proposal also socially unsustainable.</p>	<p>Sustainability principles and commitments in Concept Plan will apply to proposed modification.</p> <p>Conybeare Morrison report at Appendix 4 provides objectives, principles and strategies for ensuring future design of park has regard to historic and indigenous landscape characteristics of the site.</p> <p>Reconfigured headland park meets social sustainability objectives as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it will allow for better integration with surrounding communities;</li> <li>- it will provide a variety of spaces to cater for</li> </ul>

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
			<p>events and civic uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it will cater for passive and informal recreation, such as walking, jogging, picnics and the like;</li> <li>- the historic elements of the site and its role in the development of Sydney will have expression in the final design.</li> </ul>
10.	Catherine Lewis	<p>Proposal will generate additional traffic and have an adverse impact on congestion and noise pollution in the area.</p> <p>There will be adverse impacts on views and property values. Public transport won't be able to cope with the additional commercial floorspace. There is potential for commercial floorspace to become a white elephant given the current economic climate.</p>	<p>As indicated in the Section 2.1 of PPR and in Traffic Report at Appendix 2, traffic impact of proposed car park will not be significant. Driveway access to the car park could be provided from either Hickson Road or Towns Place.</p> <p>No impact from proposed modification on views.</p> <p>Issues raised in relation to commercial floorspace relate to southern end of site and are not relevant to proposed headland park modification.</p>
11.	Australian Institute of Landscape Architects	<p><u>Park design</u> Raising ground levels is artificially contrived and will cover the site's dramatic west facing sandstone which is a significant cultural symbol of city-building and working harbour. Doesn't correspond with headland geology elsewhere in Sydney Harbour.</p>	Refer detailed discussion in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 of PPR.
		<p>Culturally artificial. Does not correspond with history of site. Provides little amenity or opportunity for engaging with water's edge.</p> <p>Landscape planting – monocultural, lacking in variety. Park should provide more diverse range of park experiences.</p>	Refer detailed discussion in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of PPR.
		<p><u>Pedestrian/Disabled Access</u> Steep gradients limit mobility impaired people from accessing much of the park.</p>	Refer detailed discussion in Section 2.3 of PPR.
		<p><u>Street connections</u> Lack of substantive street connections will result in loss of</p>	Refer detailed discussion in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of PPR.

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
		activation. Proposal disconnects park from rest of Barangaroo.	
		<u>Safety</u> Serious public safety concerns - lack of surveillance. Park may require gates at night. Park design and loss of Globe St through park substantially diminishes potential for equitable and safe public use.	Measures to address safety and security are discussed in Section 6.4.3 of the Modification Report and will be addressed in detail in the proposed UDLP.  Car park will be designed to meet all current security standards. This will be addressed in the detailed design phase.
		<u>Sustainability</u> No reference to how proposal will achieve sustainability/biodiversity objectives. Needs to be world's best exemplar. No assessment of impact of climate change or implications of "mid term" international oil supply decline.	Sustainability principles and commitments in Concept Plan will apply to proposed modification. Refer also to urban design objectives in Urban Design Report at Appendix 4.
		<u>Process</u> Question transparency of process. Amendments have emerged with little consultation or communication	Proposed modification has been publicly exhibited. Change to Headland Park and Northern Cove have arisen directly in response to requirements in Minister's Terms of Approval.
12.	Scott Hawkin	Proposal will prevent headland being integrated with the city. Destroys axis to Globe Street and doesn't replace it with anything. The elimination of the road axis compromises security and there is now the potential for the headland to become a forgotten, parochial neighbourhood park. "Naturalistic design" is parochial and neo-traditionalist.	Refer discussion in Section 2 of PPR.
13.	National Trust	<u>Heritage Impact</u> Concerned about impact on Millers Point/Dawes Point Village Precinct which is listed on State Heritage Register. Concerned that access via Towns Place to car park could generate large daily traffic volumes through this area. Suggest consideration be given to alternative entrance to car park from Hickson Rd beneath Munn St Reserve.	Direct access between park and Millers Point/Dawes Point provided in response to Minister's Terms of Approval. Consideration to be given to alternative access to car park from Hickson Road however traffic assessment indicates that traffic impact will not be significant.



No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
		<p><u>Park Design</u>  Park design very steep and grassed – this design is alien and not in keeping with other headlands. Suggest Mrs Macquarie's Chair good example.</p> <p>National Trust can assist in refining landscape design.</p>	<p>Refer detailed discussion regarding park design in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 of PPR.</p> <p>Noted</p>
14.	Deanne Holz on behalf of Executive Committee of No. 1 Towns Place.	In principle support for headland modification. Would like to see more park facilities included. Trucks should not enter from residential streets of Dalgety/Towns Place. Objects to the car park as there is already a commercial car park situated at the Town Place Apartments. It will increase traffic in already congested roads. Heavy construction traffic will cause adverse impacts on residents. Security concerns in relation to the proposed car park and parkland.	<p>Construction truck routes and management will be covered in a construction traffic management plan that will have regard to resident amenity consideration.</p> <p>Measures to address safety and security are discussed in Section 6.4.3 of the Modification Report and will be addressed in detail in the proposed UDLP.</p> <p>Car park will be designed to meet all current security standards. This will be addressed in the detailed design phase.</p>
15.	David and Lorraine Sketch	The proposal will isolate the headland from the commercial component of the development. Reiterates previous objection to approved increases in floorspace.	<p>Design has been amended to allow a greater area of public open space between the Northern Cove and Hickson Road. This will allow for better access to the Headland Park from the south. The proposed redesign is shown in Appendix 3. However, important to note that the Headland Park is designed to perform a different function to the remainder of the Barangaroo development. Physically separating the park by the Northern Cove helps to distinguish it as recreational parklands.</p> <p>Issues raised in relation to commercial floorspace are not relevant to Headland Park modification</p>
16.	Letter from	Support proposal in principle but object to the car park within the	As indicated in the Section 2.1 of PPR and in Traffic

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
	Residents of Merriman, Bettington, Munn and Kent Street, Millers Point (18 signatures')	headland as the locality is already congested with traffic. Concerns that the car park would generate up to 1000 vehicle movements per day. No clear justification for car park in this location. Supportive of the proposed light rail and ferry service.	Report at Appendix 2, traffic impact of proposed car park will not be significant. Driveway access to the car park could be provided from either Hickson Road or Towns Place.  Transport Management and Accessibility Plan being prepared in consultation with key transport agencies will give detailed consideration to public transport access to site.
17.	Rosalind Mary Lehane	Support proposal in principle but object to the car park within the headland as the locality is already congested with traffic. Concerns that the car park would generate up to 1000 vehicle movements per day. No clear justification for car park in this location. Supportive of the proposed light rail and ferry service.	Refer above.
18.	Richard and Margaret Hall	Letter of support urging the government to proceed with the development of the headland park and not to wait for the construction of the commercial precinct. The headland construction will create jobs and lift the spirits of the community in difficult times.	Noted
19.	Mara Barnes	Objection to the inclusion of a car park and the proposed location of the car park entrance. The car park will congest nearby streets. Suggests alternative entrance from Hickson Road beneath Munn St Reserve. Concerns over the impact traffic will have on the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point Village. General residential amenity will be affected.	As indicated in the Section 2.1 of PPR and in Traffic Report at Appendix 2, traffic impact of proposed car park will not be significant. Driveway access to the car park could be provided from either Hickson Road or Towns Place.
20.	Name Withheld No. 4.	Would like to see trucks entering the site from the southern end of Barangaroo rather than coming through Towns Place triangle.	An Environmental and Construction Management Plan is to be provided which will address truck movements during construction.
6.	Sydney Harbour and Foreshores Committee (Michael Rolfe)	Proposed reconstruction does not reflect original landform. Suggests series of modifications to headland design, shown graphically.	Refer discussion in Section 2.2 of PPR.

No.	Respondent	Issues Raised	Suggested Response
		Suggests opportunity for car park to be used instead as dry boat storage.	Building up of Headland Park provides the opportunity to consider a range of facilities to be contained within the landform. This will be explored during the detailed design of the park.