

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
L1	Edith Ziegler	I object to it	See attachment
L2	Jane Knight	I object to it	See attachment
L3	Judith Tuck	I object to it	See attachment
L4	Ken Moon	I object to it	See attachment
L5	Peter Coates	I object to it	See attachment
L7	Rae Cottie	I object to it	See attachment
L8	Susan Wright	I object to it	See attachment
L10	Warren Firkin	I object to it	See attachment
L11	Highgate Owners Corporation (SP 49822)	I object to it	See attachment
L12	Noel Robinson	I object to it	See attachment
L13	Christina Ritchie	I object to it	See attachment
L14	Shane Jolly (OBO Langham Hotel)	I object to it	See attachment
L15	John McInerney	I object to it	See attachment
L16	David Burdon	I object to it	National Trust Submission – See attachment
L17	Max Deutscher (OBO SP72797)	I object to it	See attachment
385086	Siobhan Ferguson	I object to it	I object to further adding any residential or commercial structures in this space. For the sake of the Sydney community and the environment, we should continue with more parkland and allow picnic facilities or similar. Please add another harbour pool to complete this wonderful community area.
385096	Maria Danieli	I object to it	Too high.
385111	Ruth Oliver	I object to it	The building heights proposed are still far in excess of the originally suggested heights of 4-5 stories. This will have a material impact on the streetscape of this precious, heritage streetscape.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
387261	Doug McIntyre	I object to it	<p>This looks like a rerun of the development next to the Opera House. BLAND</p> <p>We have an iconic building (One Barangaroo) that wins multiple awards (including an international skyscraper award). One Barangaroo is sexy, curvy, organic and relates well to the foreshore with its curves and provides an iconic design.</p> <p>Yet next to it the Government proposes an unimaginative boxy bland proposal that does not seem to relate at all. Is all the government capable of by proposing what looks like a pile of matchboxes placed next to each other? To add insult to injury the iconic previously proposed stairs are removed thereby restricting site accessibility.</p> <p>How about something that actually shows articulation, a stepping up in heights from the headland to the tower, that actually relates to its surrounding instead of ignoring it. A proposal that allows for greater gaps between the buildings and more sun and light penetration.</p> <p>All we see so far is a proposal getting worse by the day the more government and local councils get involved in it.</p>
390696	Carol A Griffin	I object to it	<p>I understand the 73 metre tower has gone but this should never have been there in the first place.</p> <p>All three buildings are way too high and with too much mass.</p> <p>Buildings like this have no place on the foreshore. many parts of Barangaroo are dark and a wind tunnel due to high buildings.</p>
390731	Paul Haddon	I object to it	<p>My strong preference would be for the area to become parkland as per the original intention of the project.</p> <p>Additional apartments and retail will only add to the significant traffic issues that already exist, particularly at the Sussex/Erskine intersection.</p> <p>If apartments must be built then 3-4 stories should be the maximum. the top of the building should remain below the lowest level of High Street.</p>
390791	Ling Hann Kim	I object to it	<p>I strongly oppose and object to the latest proposal (amended Mod 9). It doesn't address the key issues affecting the residents in Millers Points and surrounding areas. I object to the following:</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>1. The height of all buildings in block 5, 6 and 7 is still too high especially Block 5.</p> <p>2. The size and mass of the buildings are too great.</p> <p>3. Water views from houses and all low to mid level residential towers are totally eliminated. There won't be any water view from my unit and this is totally unacceptable and defeated the purpose of my stay in my current residence. This not only affected the property values but also my well beings.</p> <p>4. View from Nawi Cove and surrounding areas to Millers Point and CBD are totally blocked.</p> <p>5. The proposed GFA of 104,000 m2 is way beyond (over 2x) the already approved GFA of 47,688 m2. This is way beyond what is acceptable for the sensitive areas such as Barangaroo and Millers Point Heritage areas. This great increase in density has great impact on the following:</p> <p>5.1 Noise. As is currently, the noise pollution is already way beyond healthy level especially in the evening with the loud music from ferry and party boats.</p> <p>5.2 Traffic. Current traffic condition and congestion is already at critical level with Barangaroo South yet incomplete. The situation will be exacerbated when One Sydney Harbour begin to populated starting early 2024. Considering the limited road infrastructure in the surrounding area, the proposed additional Mod 9 development will create traffic chaos. The proposed GFA has to be greatly reduced to at least the already approved GFA or lower.</p> <p>5.3 Wind speed. This is already extremely high and unsafe in some months of the year. All our outdoor furniture, plants etc already have to be anchored down. With the additional buildings as proposed in the Mod 9, this can becoming hazardous to the residences and visitors to the area.</p> <p>The NSW government should consider abandoning the Mod 9 development completely and extending the Barangaroo Reserve to the whole of Barangaroo Central, or convert the area into a recreation park for all public to enjoy. We want a Living City, not an over congested, polluted and unliveable place. Please place quality of life and public interest as a priority in considering approving the Mod 9 development.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			Thank you.
391001	Susan Mackey	I object to it	<p>I object that for so long individual stakeholders have been kept ill informed whilst the big developers have knowledge of the proposed plans and consideration for negative impacts.</p> <p>Historic Rocks area and Millers Point are so important for the heritage of Sydney. Please preserve the heritage of the area and do not allow further sneaky modifications. Already the impact of the proposals have a negative effect.</p>
391201	Rosemary Cave	I object to it	<p>The entire Concept Plan in 2006 has been eroded. Views proposed in that concept and therefore the amenity of surrounding dwellings in Kent and High Streets, Observatory Hill and relevant adjacent areas, will be destroyed. The amendment sought, to Modification 9, provides for dramatic increases in GFA associated with each of Blocks 5, 6 and 7. Clearly the original concept called for buildings of a much lower height but for whatever reason it is proposed to increase residential GFA from 28,000 sq.m to 75,000 sq.m. Why is there such a huge increase in GFA? One cannot help but think there is undue influence. There appears to be no disadvantage to the adjoining Casino and tower buildings. This to me demonstrates clear discrimination against private citizens and unacceptable preferential treatment for powerful corporations. It seems to me that the sharing of amenity between all residents in the adjacent area should be equitable. This is clearly not the case because water views from the Heritage houses on High Street, and all low to mid-residential towers are totally eliminated.</p> <p>I reside on level 20 in Highgate and whilst views from my apartment are not destroyed they are most clearly compromised. A further compromise of the views from level 15 and beyond is vision of what will be the ugly detritus associated with infrastructure erected on the tops of buildings. Additionally, residents below level 15 at Highgate will have little or no view at all.</p> <p>I acknowledge that a person does not own a view but having regard to the history of the Barangaroo development and the clear theft of the amenity, it is clear that residents of Highgate and all relevant houses and buildings have been dealt a very cruel blow by the Barangaroo development. Pending some knowledge as to the form of development Central Barangaroo will undertake, residents have been left with a significant degree of uncertainty and as a consequence individual property values have been impacted.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>The proposed harbour front park of 1.85 ha. is but a token, and is totally invisible from the majority of buildings and residences that would otherwise enjoy the view. I therefore call for a return to the original Concept Plan of 2006 to create a public space for the benefit of all Sydneysiders.</p>
391636	Helen Goritsas	I object to it	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>The development issues at Barangaroo are not just numerous; they are deeply troubling and resonate with a sense of injustice and disregard for the community. The towering heights of the three buildings are not just excessive; they are a blatant overreach, casting long shadows over the area's character and skyline. Their overwhelming massiveness isn't just a design flaw; it's a stark affront to the area's aesthetics, massively obstructing cherished views from various beloved spots. Imagine the disappointment of tourists and locals alike as they find their views from Darling Harbour and western viewpoints towards Observatory Hill and the Heritage Precinct, once open and inviting, now blocked by these looming structures. The situation is similar to the once-clear vistas from Nawi Cove to Millers Point and the CBD, now marred by these intrusions.</p> <p>The impact on public views from Observatory Hill is heartbreaking. It's not just a change in scenery; it's a loss of a piece of the city's soul. The law's requirement for view sharing, meant to preserve a sense of community and fairness, has been blatantly disregarded, leaving residents of Millers Point and the CBD feeling overlooked and undervalued. The erasure of water views from homes and mid-level towers isn't just about losing a view; it's about a profound loss of amenity, a diminishing of the joy and value these views once brought to people's lives. The apparent bias shown towards corporations like Crown and Lend Lease, in contrast to the cold shoulder turned to private citizens, is not just unfair; it's a bitter pill of preferential treatment and discrimination that is hard to swallow.</p> <p>The traffic situation, is already teetering on the edge due to the incomplete Barangaroo South. The introduction of One Sydney Harbour's population will not just add to the congestion; it threatens to plunge the area into complete and utter chaos. The surrounding roads, already gasping for relief, seem doomed to be choked by the inevitable influx from the proposed Mod 9 development, exacerbating the distress and dysfunction in the CBD. The colossal proposed Gross Floor Area (GFA) of this development is not just oversized; it's a clear marker of overambition and insensitivity to the area's capacity and needs.</p> <p>The concern for the northwestern corner of Hickson Park and the proposed North and South Plazas is not just</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>about technical safety standards; it's a looming threat to the wellbeing and safety of those who will visit these spaces. In the face of these overwhelming issues, the question arises: shouldn't we consider abandoning the Mod 9 development? Perhaps it's time to think about extending the Barangaroo Reserve to embrace the whole of Barangaroo Central as a more compassionate and community-focused alternative. It's a relief that the 73-meter tower, an ill-conceived addition to the area, has been removed. However, the shadow of these fundamental problems still looms large, challenging the heart and spirit of the Barangaroo community.</p> <p>With thanks,</p> <p>Helen</p>
391946	Peter Knight	I object to it	Please see attached letter
392026	Fung Yi Antonia So	I object to it	<p>Here are my concerns with Barangaroo Central Plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to Submissions Page 16 - Block 5 highest building is 42.45M. Please consider different shape and height for this building. It over hangs the view lines from Gas Lane and is taller than the current Bond Building.</li> </ol> <p>Consider using the Bond Building as the maximum height and work downwards towards the harbour from there.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to Submissions Page 16 - You have kept the views from High Street. This should have been a priority regarding Gas Lane. More people access Gas Lane and it is such a heritage site.</li> </ol> <p>There is a green dotted line that says "Approved Concept Plan". Is this the new building line? If so,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>then views from Gas Lane will be preserved. Green Line.</li> <li>Start of building is further to the north of edge of Bond Building so less bulk of building and maintains solar to Hickson Park.</li> </ol> <p>Please clarify.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to Submissions Page 33 - Maximum heights for blocks 5, 6, 7 are incorrect, using your plan above</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>the maximum height of Block 5 is 42.45 (see no. 1 above).</p> <p>4. In response to Submissions Page 43 - This plan again seems to indicate Block 5 starts back from Hickson Park boundary (that is, not level with edge of Bond Building across the road) and views from Gas Lane will be maintained.</p> <p>5. In response to Submissions Page 66 - This is not enough to maintain the view from Gas Lane. The Building needs to start at least 5M towards the North.</p> <p>Different plan to above concept. Page 67 has another plan!</p> <p>6. In response to Submissions Page 148 - Shadow shown between 11 and 12 midwinter</p> <p>Can you consider lower height at southern end of the building? Setting back from southern boundary will also help.</p> <p>Hickson Park is small and is well used by locals. It does not get any sun in the afternoon so morning and midday is important.</p> <p>7. Appendix D Part 1:5.3.2.1 - You said Stamford Marque Level 15 (RL59), Level 25 (RL90)</p> <p>8. Appendix D Part 2:6.21.1 - You said Stamford Marque Level 15 (RL70.5), Level 25 (RL97)</p> <p>But our building documents indicate Level 18 is RL70, Level 26 is RL95. Your digital views are therefore misleading.</p> <p>9. Appendix D Part 2:6.19 - There is no level 25 at the Georgia. It has only 19 floors.</p> <p>10. Appendix D P 185 - Hard to gauge exactly where southern edge of building will be in relation to edge of Bond Building.</p> <p>Could you consider the building on Hickson Road to be stepped down as well?</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Such a large mass of building, will impact on Hickson Park sun. Please note that there is no westerly sun because of Crown Building.</p> <p>11. Appendix F P 94 - Top photo is Feb 21 seems just pointy. Bottom photo is March 21 that shows massive bulk. Where is the photo for Jan 24?</p> <p>12. Appendix F Page 100 - Top photo is July 18. Bottom photo is March 21.</p> <p>Both ruin the vista from Gas Lane which is an important historical lane and a visual asset to Sydney. Tourists have been stopping here for years to take in the view.</p> <p>Where is the photo for Jan 24?</p>
392631	Carlene Smith	I object to it	<p>Please see attached file.</p> <p>Three main points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduce height of Block 5</li> <li>2. Reduce Bulk of Block 5</li> <li>3. Ensure building starts 5 m NORTH of current Barton St fence line</li> </ol>
392686	PAUL TONGS	I object to it	<p>I object to the Barangaroo Central Concept Plan Modification 9.</p> <p>The Plan Mod 9 has greatly increased the height and mass of the building Blocks 5, 6 &amp; 7 which detrimentally impact on the existing houses and low and middle height residents in the existing residential towers. The increases in height and mass of Block 5 are considerable and are even greater than the other Blocks 6 &amp; 7.</p> <p>The increased heights of the Blocks detract from the Historic Precinct of the Rocks and the Observatory Hill.</p> <p>The Modification 9 is unacceptable and plans should revert to the original lower level design.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			My full submission is attached.
392801	Geoff Wannan	I object to it	<p>The bulk of this proposal remains well above the original concept plans.</p> <p>Views to and from the Rocks and Observatory Hill remain blocked</p> <p>The proposal is all about increasing Developer returns with vast increases in floor space.</p> <p>The proposal does nothing to improve amenities for the community.</p>
392841	Jaz Stephens OAM	I object to it	<p>I recall about 8 years ago looking at plans of Barangaroo and was delighted with the green space. Then South Barangaroo was built much more height and towers than originally planned. As a Sydney resident I feel betrayed and sad as this is public land.</p> <p>Please stop this folly. Let's have open spaces - place to play ball - picnic - cricket pitch - play areas for children and not be hit with commercial and high rise residential. We have wall to wall towers in South Barangaroo and we must protect our harbour heritage for future generations. We are local Sydney custodians and we really care.</p>
393111	Angie Stricke	I object to it	<p>Way to bulky, large.</p> <p>Destroys the heritage of Observatory Hill. This will be lost forever.</p> <p>The extra residential brings even more cars to an already very congested area.</p> <p>Fails to deliver against the key principal of being the civic heart of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>If over-development is approved at this early stage I can only imagine what we will end up with. There will be continuous variations through the process. What will we end up with. This comment is proven by what we have at the rest of Barangaroo after numerous variations requested by the developer and approved by the government.</p> <p>This proposal is so wrong for the site the developer needs to start over and design something that works for the site and community for the long term. Not just developer profit.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
393126	Judith (Judy) Tertini	I object to it	<p>I wish to object AGAIN!!!! To the proposed development in Barangaroo. I also found it very difficult to lodge this submission, until I was provided with a link by a third party. I am sure that some people would have a similar situation and just give up.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new submission doubles the size of the approved concept plan. As we all know, more changes will be submitted after the initial approval, like what happened with Lend Lease. Now a number of buildings being constructed.</li> <li>2. The new submission dramatically reduces the size of Hickson Park. It is ridiculous how little green space was required to be built by Crown and Lend Lease.</li> <li>3. I have not seen the actual plans, but if the plans are like Lend Lease the buildings will not have balconies, so the residents will have to use air conditioning all the time. How will this affect the grid? Surely this will be a big drain on the electricity grid.</li> <li>4. Why are developments allowed to be so high and as a result residents loose their view? In Port Lincoln for instance, developers cannot build and obstruct someone's view.</li> <li>5. Isn't there enough development already in Barangaroo? Why can't this new submission be low rise?</li> <li>6. The proposed development will reduce the views from the historic areas of Millers Point and from the water, views of Millers Point.</li> </ol> <p>Unfortunately the developer is not going to stop until they get what they want. The original Grocon plans were much more sympathetic to the area.</p> <p>Again, I am objecting to this proposed development.</p>
393381	Judy Harwood	I object to it	<p>Barangaroo is my playground and at times my workplace. I live close by. I take my grandchildren and friends there. I object to the increased footprint in these plans. The buildings are ugly, without the architectural merit you would expect in such a public space that is used by locals and tourists. Go back to the drawing board please!</p>
393471	Linda Hemstrom	I object to it	<p>The modified proposal does not support the concept of a civic heart in Barangaroo.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Lost heritage sightlines from public spaces to the foreshore from Observatory Hill and Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point.</p> <p>Hickson Park is reduced and community space shrinks from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>Blocked historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p>
397446	Anita Puvanendran	I object to it	It is too tall, blocks heritage views!!
399116	John Richardson	I object to it	<p>My wife and I own a property at King Street Wharf. and I work at Dawes Point.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the previously proposed tower has been removed to improve the impact of Central Barangaroo on the significant views to and from Observatory Hill Park, one of the most significant heritage places in Sydney.</p> <p>We object to the new proposal impact on the significant historic views of Sydney Harbour and White Bay west along High Street from Kent Street and the Agar Steps, The buildings should be further apart and the north end of building 2A should be reduced in height.</p> <p>The view images are a very poor representation of the actual view impacts.</p> <p>Given that any development along Hickson Road will have major adverse impacts on historic views the so called 'North Plaza' should be 20m wide all the way through to Hickson Road and the High Street above.</p> <p>Any pedestrian bridge across Hickson Road should be entirely in the public domain 24/7</p> <p>John and Virginia Richardson</p>
399606	Tim Davidson	I object to it	<p>The revised concept plan offers a negligible improvement in public good. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <p>The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal. This is completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 sq m.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the “civic heart” of Barangaroo.</p> <p>The application has changed from a mixed use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the civic heart of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>The new proposal still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</p> <p>A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities, not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</p> <p>It was deeply concerning to read on 12 January (a day after the modified proposal was lodged) in the Sydney Morning Herald that Lands and Property Minister Steve Kamper was quoted endorsing the new concept plan: “The revised proposal prepared by Aqualand presents a mixed-use development that showcases residential, community, tourism and retail uses for the community.” The Aqualand website states: The design has been backed by Minister for Lands and Property Steve Kamper, who said “the refined design prepared by Aqualand</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>delivers a world class mixed-use development of residential, commercial, community and cultural uses, while balancing the views of the local community”.</p> <p>It seems the development approval process has either been ethically (&amp; possibly legally) compromised, or the NSW Government is not treating this development with the gravity that such a hugely important site, that will affect the unique character of the city, deserves.</p>
399741	Carol Henry	I object to it	<p>Submission opposing construction of buildings to Barangaroo Central.</p> <p>Barangaroo Central (blocks 5,6 and 7) should be left unchanged: this means without any additional construction of retail, residential or office buildings to this historical site that principally needs designated custodial care of the land for sustaining access to all people, provided by appointed governmental representatives. As with open parklands, such as the Botanical Gardens, Hyde Park, Centennial Park, designated authorities maintain and preserve their historical heritage. So too, Barangaroo is rightly placed for the same significance, not to be exploited for the developers’ greed or belittled by governmental nonchalance to history by changing the Precincts.</p> <p>Do not proceed with anymore building developments.</p> <p>All the following changes from the exhibited 2022 proposal NEED TO BE RESCINDED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. amendments to the size and configuration of the proposed building envelopes, including deleting the previously proposed tower form at Block 7, reducing its height from RL73.7 to RL 35 (-38.7m)</li> <li>2. reducing the total increase in GFA from 144,355sq.m to 104,000sq.m (- 40,355sq.m)</li> <li>3. increasing the maximum residential GFA from 28,000 sqm to 75,000 sqm</li> <li>4. revising the alignment of the proposed building envelopes to Hickson Park</li> <li>5. modifying the road network to retain Barangaroo Avenue as a one-way shared street and deletion of Barton Street as a permanent two-way street</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>6. providing a new north/south laneway open to the sky and amend two east/west pedestrian links</p> <p>7. amendments to the Design Guidelines to reflect the above changes</p> <p>8. amendments to the Precincts - Eastern Harbour City SEPP to support the above changes.</p>
399766	Elena Palomar	I object to it	It still blocks the Rocks
399781	Bruce Yap	I object to it	<p>Despite being the 9th modification, the plan proposed for Central Barangaroo is still NOT acceptable.</p> <p>1. It often takes 40 minutes to drive from Hickson Road on to Sussex Street to get across the intersection with King Street. This will be even worse with more residential buildings. There is already n prospect of improving access to the area.</p> <p>2. The whole of the historic Rocks area with iconic landscape around Observatory Hill will be largely obscured when viewed from the west.</p> <p>3. The potential for an area for public enjoyment for the city of Sydney and people from beyond will be lost and taken over by large housing blocks incompatible with a world class site, one of the last in this famous harbour.</p> <p>4. The concerns of thousands of residents are being ignored as are the concerns of values of aesthetics, heritage, architecture and as a public amenity.</p> <p>The current plan should not proceed.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr Bruce Yap.</p>
399816	Kate Trill	I object to it	<p>I am writing to formally express my deep concerns regarding the proposed Barangaroo Central Mod 9 plans. While I appreciate the removal of the 73-meter tower, it is imperative to acknowledge that this action fails to rectify the underlying issues plaguing the development.</p> <p>First and foremost, the continued presence of excessively tall and massive structures, namely buildings 5, 6, and 7, remains a significant concern. These edifices not only disrupt the visual integrity of the surrounding area but</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>also obstruct essential views from Darling Harbour, Observatory Hill, and Nawi Cove. Such obstruction not only detracts from the aesthetic appeal of the locale but also undermines the well-being and property values of nearby residents.</p> <p>Moreover, the lack of view sharing, as mandated by the Principles of the Concept Plan, is a matter of serious contention. The preferential treatment afforded to entities such as Crown and Lend Lease concerning view considerations represents a stark injustice. Discrimination against private citizens in favour of powerful corporations is indefensible and must be rectified to ensure equitable treatment for all stakeholders.</p> <p>In addition to these concerns, the proposed development exacerbates existing traffic congestion issues. With Barangaroo South yet to be completed and the forthcoming population influx from One Sydney Harbour, the strain on local road infrastructure is poised to intensify significantly. The resultant chaos in the CBD and surrounding areas poses grave implications for public safety and urban mobility.</p> <p>Furthermore, the potential safety hazards posed by wind speeds exceeding safety standards in the northwestern corner of Hickson Park and the proposed plazas cannot be overstated. The welfare of residents and visitors alike is paramount, and subjecting these areas to such conditions poses an unacceptable risk that demands immediate attention and mitigation measures.</p> <p>In light of the foregoing, I urge you to reconsider the proposed Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the development and prioritize measures aimed at mitigating its adverse impacts on the community. It is imperative that the development aligns with the principles of sustainable urban planning and ensures the well-being and quality of life of all stakeholders.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these pressing concerns. I trust that you will give due consideration to the objections raised and take decisive action to address them in the interest of fostering a vibrant, inclusive, and sustainable urban environment at Barangaroo Central.</p>
399826	Douglas Carlson	I object to it	<p>As a concerned resident, I am writing to express my objections to the Barangaroo Central Mod 9 plans. While the removal of the 73-meter tower is noted, it fails to address the fundamental issues at hand.</p> <p>Firstly, the excessive height and mass of buildings 5, 6, and 7 remain problematic. These structures not only</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>disrupt the skyline but also obstruct crucial views from Darling Harbour, Observatory Hill, and Nawi Cove, impacting both residents and tourists alike. This disregard for view sharing, as mandated by the Principles of the Concept Plan, is unacceptable and diminishes the amenity and property values of surrounding areas.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed development exacerbates existing traffic congestion issues. With Barangaroo South yet to be completed and the impending population influx from One Sydney Harbour, the strain on local road infrastructure will only intensify, leading to chaos in the CBD and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Moreover, the safety concerns regarding wind speeds in the northwestern corner of Hickson Park and the proposed plazas cannot be overlooked. Subjecting these areas to conditions exceeding safety standards poses a severe risk to public safety and must be addressed urgently.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I urge you to reconsider the proposed GFA of the development and prioritize the reduction of its impact on the community. It is imperative that the development aligns with the needs and well-being of residents, ensuring a sustainable and harmonious urban environment for all.</p> <p>Furthermore, the preferential treatment given to corporations like Crown and Lend Lease regarding view considerations is unjustifiable. Such discrimination against private citizens is intolerable, particularly when it results in the loss of valuable scenic vistas.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objections. I trust that you will take appropriate action to address these issues and uphold the integrity of Barangaroo Central.</p>
401026	Suzanne Audrie Steingold	I object to it	<p>I object to the latest Application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo is seeking to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public good. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are still lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from</li> </ul>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic heart’ of Barangaroo. Central Barangaroo was meant to provide civiv amenity to the people of. New South Wales. The new application provides high end accommodation for a few privileged people.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pymont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 (excessive bulk and scale, heritage impact on Sydney’s oldest residential suburb, impact on Observatory Hill vista, etc), there are a number of significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the civic heart of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</p> <p>I am concerned that the NSW Government has adopted a narrow commercial “just get it done” view of this development (jobs, economy, previous delays, bias to action and progress, less concern about heritage attitude, etc) rather than important consideration of the unique nature of this place (unlike any other Metro Station): Harbour side setting (the last remaining harbour setting able to be developed from scratch) and its adjacency to the Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area, and the unreplacable public vistas that would be seriously compromised.</p> <p>It was astonishing to read in the 12 January (a day after the modified proposal was lodged) in the Sydney Morning Herald quoting Lands and Property Minister Steve Kamper:</p> <p>“Central Barangaroo will become the cultural and civic heart of the Barangaroo precinct. Central Barangaroo will also be the major stepping off point for the new Barangaroo Metro station, transporting thousands of workers, visitors and residents in and out of the precinct every day. The revised proposal prepared by Aqualand presents a mixed-use development that showcases residential, community, tourism and retail uses for the community.”</p> <p>..and on the Aqualand website: The design has been backed by Minister for Lands and Property Steve Kamper, who said “the refined design prepared by Aqualand delivers a world class mixed-use development of residential, commercial, community and cultural uses, while balancing the views of the local community”.</p> <p>The changes in the new application are negligible and do not address all the concerns raised by the community, NSW Heritage Council etc..raised in response to the 2022 application.</p>
401116	Domenica Ribar	I object to it	Stop the overdevelopment and greed

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
401226	Judith Tertini	I object to it	<p>I have objected already, but now wanting to make further comments on the proposed development.</p> <p>The Government has recently announced that developments should be approved newer railway stations and should be up to about 6 stories high. This would be okay, except the proposed development is asking for much greater heights.</p> <p>If approved it will be a blight on the area. The over development should not be approved. There should be plans for more parkland. You already have had a competition for a park. Recently some areas have been built that are a joke - the area consists of some outdoor exercise equipment that can be used by adults, not children and then they built shelters for picnics! Who is going to use this area? It should have been set aside for park land.</p> <p>I think that it is criminal that Crown and Lend Lease were given permission to build as high as they have and taken up so much space, and they have 'rights' to views. This is totally outrageous.</p> <p>Say NO and do not any more developers lodge an DA unless it is for buildings under say 6 stories high.</p>
401291	Trevor Mudge	I object to it	Please find it on the attachment
401386	Joanne Marchese	I object to it	We OBJECT to this proposed development on all levels.
401396	Eugene Marchese	I object to it	We OBJECT to this proposal on all levels.
401406	Massimo Marchese	I object to it	We OBJECT to this proposal on all levels.
401426	Thomas Marchese	I object to it	We OBJECT to this proposal on all levels.
401451	Lucy Osborn	I object to it	<p>Our principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</p> <p>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <p>The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</p> <p>The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</p> <p>The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</p> <p>A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</p> <p>It appears one Minister (a member of the Cabinet) has adopted a narrow commercial “just get it done” view of this development (jobs, economy, previous delays, bias to action and progress, less concern about heritage attitude, etc) rather than important consideration of the unique nature of this place (unlike any other Metro Station): Harbour side setting (the last remaining harbour setting able to be developed from scratch) and its adjacency to the Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area, and the unreplaceable public vistas that would be seriously compromised.</p> <p>It was astonishing to read in the Sydney Morning Herald on 12 January (a day after the modified proposal was lodged) quoting Lands and Property Minister Steve Kamper (who is responsible for the Barangaroo precinct):</p> <p>“Central Barangaroo will become the cultural and civic heart of the Barangaroo precinct. Central Barangaroo will also be the major stepping off point for the new Barangaroo Metro station, transporting thousands of workers, visitors and residents in and out of the precinct every day. The revised proposal prepared by Aqualand presents a mixed-use development that showcases residential, community, tourism and retail uses for the community.”</p> <p>On the Aqualand website: The design has been backed by Minister for Lands and Property Steve Kamper, who said “the refined design prepared by Aqualand delivers a world class mixed-use development of residential, commercial, community and cultural uses, while balancing the views of the local community”.</p>
401526	Joseph Bitar	I object to it	<p>To whom it concern my objections as follow</p> <p>My objections is Barangaroo and the rocks going to b concrete jungle the development and the developers their greed keep going bigger and bigger it’s future slums of Sydney I bought in this area running from the eastern suburbs I thought I will enjoy the space and the green trees and the water but how wrong I was some residentials buildings going to take the over park area away from our enjoyment and our kids and great great grand kids</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>I was observing the 3 towers numb 1 Sydney harbour when they completed just let's think about the traffic and the population going to b crowded do you think we should ad more buildings that size in the new proposal</p> <p>all the developers did reduce the height of aqua land building what they did they add more concrete jungle in my opinion this development shouldn't pass</p> <p>Where is our park we promised to enjoy</p> <p>Block the rocks and ad more concrete jungles</p> <p>we going to enjoy and blocking all beautiful heritage houses and blocking our beautiful observatory and what our tourist attractions going to b concrete jungle with little of park</p> <p>Money and greed destroying the world</p> <p>Joseph Bitar</p>
401666	Nathanial Barbagallo	I object to it	Please find attached letter.
401681	John Flett	I object to it	To allow this development is to hide forever one of Australia's most historic streets of houses, to bury it behind modern architecture when it should be open for everyone to see from the Harbour, from the West and from Pymont. I strongly protest this creeping development. Put people first, put our history first, put profit last! I agree with every part of Annie's statement.
401806	Barry Fitzgibbon	I object to it	<p>1. In what is essentially a heritage area, there is no architectural model to show how the area would look following building. Usually, computer graphics are used to show the end result of developments...couldn't that be done here?</p> <p>2. The traffic in the area is already under pressure especially during peak hours at end of day and at weekends, managing tourists, residents and workers. Sometimes the Sussex/Erskine/Barangaroo Avenue is gridlocked. Can we have a Traffic Management Plan to show how the area is going to cope following the influx of new residents (from soon to be opened Barangaroo South Towers as well as the Barangaroo Central residents of which there</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			will be more than planned); as well as visitors/tourists who will be coming to the area for the Reserve, swimming and The Cutaway events.
401901	Christine Thomson	I object to it	<p>I have checked out the new plans and object to them.</p> <p>Nothing has changed - Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill, historic Millers Point views from Balmain, heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour are ALL STILL BLOCKED!! Its still too big and too high!!</p> <p>-The modified proposal reduces size of Hickson park and reduces amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800m2.</p> <p>- Proposal to build apartments, hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated as `civic and cultural heart` of Barangaroo.</p> <p>A planning principal for the precinct that heights gradually reduce as development moves north towards Headland Park has been ignored.</p> <p>Established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo were modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above.</p> <p>All above are very important issues due to the unique nature of this site - Harbour side setting able to be developed from scratch, its adjacency to Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area and the unreplaceable public vistas that would be compromised.</p> <p>Surely our government architects, politicians and developers architects can come up with a much better design and plan for the site.</p>
401951	Candice Murphy	I object to it	<p>The government has one chance to get this right. Once something is built on this significant location we, the people, have this built environment for many years to come. We deserve better. We deserve beautiful structures that will enhance our city scape. we deserve access to views and open spaces.</p> <p>The sheer bulk and size of what is now at Barangaroo South is a disgrace. I don't believe the latest Modification to</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			the Central Barangaroo design is in anyone's interest apart from the developer and the applicant. We need beautiful low rise mix use buildings alongside parks, trees and public space.
402151	Kylie Clark	I object to it	<p>Community space in Barangaroo Central must be restored to the original proposed minimum of 28,000m2.</p> <p>Any development should not interfere with the sight lines from Observatory Hill to the harbour as they currently stand.</p> <p>It is outrageous that development should *increase* in height heading north, to accommodate views *from* Crown Casino, at the expense of original residences in Millers Point.</p> <p>The general public should not be further impacted by the backdoor dealings of Alan Jones and James Packer, than they already are.</p>
402226	Dorothy Lee	I object to it	<p>The proposed buildings not only have no architectural merits (obtuse, large and squat), it is also not aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>Most of all , they still block the view from residents in the Rocks , Observatory Hills, and also residents from the other side of the harbour ie Balmain and Pyrmont.</p> <p>Please consider the democratic rights of all the residents being affected. Collectively we have accepted the changes but it has to be carefully calibrated , so all stake holders are considered, instead of just in the name of commerce and financial benefits.</p>
402296	Greg Ainsworth	I object to it	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I'd like to express my concern about the concept plan and support the position of the Millers Point Community Resident Action Group (MPCRAG).</p> <p>I support and welcome development of the Barangaroo precinct, and believe that indeed there should be increased density and intensity of land use given its position in the centre of the city with excellent transport links. However, certain aspects of the development are concerning and I note them below, as listed by the MPCRAG.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>In particular, I support the idea that more emphasis should be made on ensuring good pedestrian access be maintained and enhanced, connecting Barangaroo with the rest of the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>-The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Greg</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
402606	Mary Atkinson	I object to it	The amendments to the planned proposal are not within a reasonable scope and they are without regard to local residents and local public buildings.
407661	Tim Borough	I object to it	The development in the area has transformed Sydney. It seems that there is a lot of erosion of the original plan to satisfy developers and now ignoring the original planning principles. It appears to the general public that everything is for sale and pockets must be getting lined for these developments to be approved.
408266	Caroline Pidcock	I object to it	As my submission file sets out, there are many reasons I do not support the application in its current form.  Please redesign as described in this submission.
411996	David Silverstone	I object to it	1) The site is the last significant vacant harbourside land near Sydney city. It deserves to be a development which leaves a legacy to the future (as the Opera House was in its initial concept phase).  2) The construction of a series of apartment buildings and hotel will do nothing for the people of NSW except for the small number of people that will buy at this location.  3) Any development at such a significant site should be referred to the independent planning commission.  4) At the very least, any development at this site should adhere to the guidelines in Approved concept plan 2007 regarding building density & height.
412006	Sylvia Lestavel	I object to it	I strongly oppose this project.  1) The site in question is the last significant vacant harbourside land and it is publicly owned land. Any development on this site deserves to be one which can be used and accessed by all, a legacy to the future, and possibly a visionary architectural structure that can inspire pride (just like as the Opera House).  2) The construction of a series of apartment buildings and hotel will do nothing for the people of NSW except for the small number of people that will buy at this location. We do not need more apartment buildings.  3) Any development at such a unique and significant site should be referred to the independent planning commission.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			4) At the very least, any development at this site should adhere to the guidelines in Approved concept plan 2007 regarding building density & height.
412391	Jennifer Turner	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <p>The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</p> <p>It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the "approved concept plan" as a base line is.</li> </ul>
413061	Miranda Wallace	I object to it	Object
413336	Helene Atkinson	I object to it	<p>1) The site in question is the last significant vacant harbourside land and it is publicly owned land. Any development on this site deserves to be one which can be used and accessed by all, a legacy to the future, and possibly a visionary architectural structure that can inspire pride (as with the Opera House).</p> <p>2) The construction of a series of apartment buildings and hotel will do nothing for the people of NSW except for the small number of people that will buy at this location. We do not need more apartment buildings.</p> <p>3) Any development at such a unique and significant site should be referred to the independent planning commission.</p> <p>4) At the very least, any development at this site should adhere to the guidelines in Approved concept plan 2007 regarding building density &amp; height.</p>
413756	Thomas Kerwan	I object to it	The previous concept was significantly better. This new concept is detrimental to the Barangaroo precinct as a whole. We need the proposed large retail complex from the previous concept (was Scentre Westfield). We need more than just restaurants and bars to support nightlife in Barangaroo, there is already plenty of that in South

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			Barangaroo. We need a cinema or theatre, something that provides an activity base nightlife which will then flow onto the food, beverage, retail components too. The rigid grid layout of the blocks in this new concept is horrible, there must be a more natural, fluid design. The integration of the southern Sydney Metro access is terrible in this new concept, the previous concept has a significantly better Metro integration. Overall, this new concept is absolutely terrible. Please go back to the previous concept and just reduce the height of the disqualified tower.
414046	Robert Hansen	I object to it	This latest proposal remains a gross over-development of the site totally inconsistent with the original concept plan.
415321	Doris Huang	I object to it	<p>NOTHING HAS CHANGED!</p> <p>Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.</p> <p>Still too big. Still too high.</p> <p>I strongly OBJECT to it!!!!!!!</p>
415586	Robert Comerford	I object to it	<p>BURYING OUR HISTORY BEHIND GLASS AND STEEL.</p> <p>We believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>We believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
415596	Leonie Comerford	I object to it	<p><b>BURYING OUR HISTORY BEHIND GLASS AND STEEL.</b></p> <p>We believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>We believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
415681	Loraine Rowland	I object to it	<p>Not happy with how high the structure is planning to be! Completely destroying the ambience and feeling of such an iconic place in Sydney.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
415696	Dino Carulli	I object to it	<p>I believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. I believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. I ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>I believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
415716	Christine Johnston	I object to it	<p>I was pleased when there was a change of government as I thought it would lead to a revision and rethinking of the over-development of Barangaroo and Pyrmont: how wrong could I be? The current government has simply continued where the previous government left off. While the Central Barangaroo development has been modified it is still far from acceptable. There is little consideration of public amenity and the sight lines across to Observatory Hill will be obliterated. Building yet another hotel and luxury apartments will do little to ease the housing shortage in Sydney. Low rise affordable housing along the lines that Malcolm and Lucy Turnbull advocated last year at the Press Club would be a much more reasonable approach to take - if indeed we need any buildings on this site. This government does not listen to the community: it needs to start to do so.</p>
416026	Megan Latham	I object to it	<p>My objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</p> <p>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>Apart from previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <p>The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</p> <p>The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</p> <p>The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</p> <p>A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</p>
416356	HEATHER GATTONE	I object to it	please refer to my submission file
416376	GIANNA SWADLING	I object to it	<p>Please see the attached objection</p> <p>This iconic area is not for sale!!!!</p>
416401	Warwick Konopacki	I object to it	<p>I believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>I believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>I have read the Department's Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department's website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.</p> <p>I agree to the above statement.</p>
416786	Nicholas Jones	I object to it	<p>Millers point is a unique and magical area rich in history. Few places in the world boast an area like Millers Point. So close to a modern CBD, resting on the shore. It ties together the ancient and modern. Early buildings of such historic significance are rarely presented so authentically and in such abundance. Preserving this area requires consideration of light and outlook and a sensitive connection to the new world.</p> <p>The proposed development is akin to building a wall around Millers Point. Imagine buildings of the volume proposed sitting between the Rocks and Circular Quay - would that be permitted?</p> <p>Please consider alternative designs. The same volume could be achieved in much more sensitive ways that do not contribute to the destruction of an irreplaceable artefact.</p>
416816	VITTORIO BRESCIA	I object to it	<p>Dear Director,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development.</p> <p>Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbour and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention.</p> <p>My objections extend beyond these issues to the lack of long-term planning regarding the community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Have you attempted to drive these routes to experience how bad the gridlock already gets? It is a logistical</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>nightmare at the moment.</p> <p>It is evident that the focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our wonderful city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9.</p> <p>Thank you for you attention to this matter,</p> <p>Regards Mr Vittorio Brescia</p>
416831	DONATELLA BRESCIA	I object to it	<p>Dear Director,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development.</p> <p>Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbor and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention.</p> <p>My objections extend beyond these issues to the lack of long-term planning regarding the community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Have you attempted to drive these routes</p> <p>to experience how bad the gridlock already gets? It is a logistical nightmare at the moment. It is near impossible to get home or exist the city during certain hours of the day. Truly nightmare-ish.</p> <p>Why would you want to make this worse?</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>It is evident that the focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our wonderful city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential.</p> <p>I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9.</p> <p>Thank you for you attention to this matter, Regards</p> <p>Donatella Brescia</p>
417121	Alexandra Bekker	I object to it	<p>The buildings are as high as the Langham, are ugly square blocks that will add nothing to Sydney, block the beautiful heritage foreshore and ruin the heritage view from Observatory Hill.</p> <p>There are hundreds of people sitting on observatory hill every single night to watch the sunset. It is a favourite with locals and a massive tourist attraction as the best spot to watch the sunset in Sydney. Just go up there any night to see the scene and the vibe. The development will block this which will be a massive loss to Sydney.</p> <p>Use this last piece of city foreshore to make something as iconic as the opera house - it could transform Sydney! Yes we need more homes, but these proposed apartments are not for regular people who are going to work in the city and use the new metro - these are homes for the mega rich who probably spend little time in them. So let's use the space to make Sydney amazing to benefit all citizens and visitors.</p>
418201	Bernard Kelly	I object to it	<p>The MPCRAG objects to this project. Our submission is attached.</p>
419326	Tim Cousins	I object to it	<p>This development is too big and too high for the site. Iconic Sydney vistas will be obstructed forever for the benefit of a few.</p> <p>This is a classic case of proposing a development that was never going to be allowed so that a revised, yet still wholly inappropriate, plan can be later presented as reasonable.</p> <p>The willingness of Steve Kamper to lend his name to this inappropriate development is duly noted.</p> <p>We had hoped for more public consideration from this government.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			Tim Cousins
419521	Patricia JOHNSON	I object to it	Please find attached our submission  Friends of Ultimo
419706	Rodger Muir	I object to it	Please see details set out in the attached document.
419726	Michael Neary	I object to it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul> <p>It appears one Minister (a member of the Cabinet) has adopted a narrow commercial “just get it done” view of this development (jobs, economy, previous delays, bias to action and progress, less concern about heritage attitude, etc) rather than important consideration of the unique nature of this place (unlike any other Metro Station): Harbour side setting (the last remaining harbour setting able to be developed from scratch) and its adjacency to the Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area, and the unreplacable public vistas that would be seriously compromised.</p> <p>It was astonishing to read in the Sydney Morning Herald on 12 January (a day after the modified proposal was lodged) quoting Lands and Property Minister Steve Kamper (who is responsible for the Barangaroo precinct):</p> <p>“Central Barangaroo will become the cultural and civic heart of the Barangaroo precinct. Central Barangaroo will also be the major stepping off point for the new Barangaroo Metro station, transporting thousands of workers, visitors and residents in and out of the precinct every day. The revised proposal prepared by Aqualand presents a mixed-use development that showcases residential, community, tourism and retail uses for the community.”</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			Is this a genuine consultation process?
419836	Judith Martin	I object to it	<p>I would like to object to the MP06_0162-Mod-9 development at Central Barangaroo for the following reasons:</p> <p>The views from the Harbour to Observatory Hill will still be blocked.</p> <p>The view from Balmain to the Historic area of Millers Point will still be blocked.</p> <p>The Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney harbour will still be blocked.</p> <p>The proposed buildings are still too high and too big .</p> <p>Why would we block the views to one of our remaining historical areas from the Harbour ?</p> <p>What is the point of imposing heritage restrictions on the exterior of the buildings on High Street and Kent Street if these same buildings cannot be seen from the Harbour? It does not make sense.</p>
420016	Helen Meddings	I object to it	<p>The revised Concept Plan for Barangaroo (Mod 9) is barely an improvement on the last iteration. It still blocks historic viewpoints that should be preserved as the Rocks are of significant colonial importance. It compromises the public space previously promised and is seeking to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 sq m). In other words too dense, not to mention the extra traffic being funnelled into Sussex Street, Hickson Road and Kent Street.</p> <p>The design is boring and unimaginative giving a pancake look across the site.</p> <p>On the last site on the Sydney Harbour foreshore, it is disappointing that nothing better and more exciting could be designed. Even the cornerstone principle of heights gradually reducing as they near the headland has been abandoned.</p> <p>It looks like a desperate attempt at maximising floor space with most going to luxury residential and putting</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			pressure on government to agree the latest proposal. I greatly fear that the attitude in Cabinet is 'just get it done' and this 'public consultation' nothing more than a box-ticking exercise.
420096	Helen Psarakis	I am just providing comments	Development is inevitable in cities. Foresight is mandatory in a world that is subjected to change. The foreshore of our harbour is magnificent and with careful planning future generations will enjoy the fruits of enlightened planners. All stakeholders must be considered if we are to leave such a magnificent precinct intact for all to enjoy both now and in the future. Overdevelopment will only result in profits for the few, regret for those who did not voice a concern! I know progress is inevitable but let's manage this with astute decision making for the benefit of all not only those living at the doorstep but for all who visit. Don't block the rocks is being echoed from many directions! Take heed and reconsider the magnitude of the decisions being made for the benefit of all now and in the future!
420156	Rebecca Pearse	I object to it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds</li> </ul>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul>
420261	David Ford	I object to it	My submission is attached.
420611	Matthew Mackenzie	I object to it	Be respectful to the historic area of Millers Point. It is a jewel of Sydney. A one off. This development continues to block views from a large number of properties and adds little beauty to the waterfront. We have one opportunity to develop something of long term beauty and not just fill the space with something characterless. The area has strong arts connections and facilities, so be creative.
420816	Rod Pomroy	I object to it	As per attached file
420836	Margaret Feltham	I object to it	We need more open space than more high rise buildings

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			Keep the harbour foreshores for all to enjoy & not just the wealthy few who can afford to buy into the area. Barangaroo is very enjoyable for all to visit. Let's keep it that way
420851	Tim Gordon	I object to it	<p>I strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>The protected heritage sightlines from so many public open spaces to the harbour (particularly from Observatory Hill) will be lost forever under this proposal. Observatory Hill is a national treasure, a beautiful public space with spectacular views of great historical and contemporary significance. Just look at how many people from all over Sydney have their wedding photos there. The recently reopened Fort Street Public School is located there too. This is the oldest public school in Australia and now operates as a public school servicing a very diverse community - its natural views of the harbour will be replaced by views of expensive apartments.</p> <p>This development is a great opportunity for more usable open space with functional facilities for the increasing number of children living in Barangaroo and the city, instead this modified proposal reduces the amount of proposed community space by 90%.</p> <p>This development blocks the historical views from the harbour and Sydney ferries up towards Observatory Hill - especially the views from Balmain and Pyrmont. One of the main purposes of the entire heritage restriction regime in Millers Point is to preserve those public views from the West.</p> <p>Most fundamentally the entire premise of the modification is based on a public representation by the applicant that this is a relatively minor change from the approved concept plan. This is a misrepresentation - it deliberately disregards the original planning principles and original block development controls. The use of a misleading representation of the base-line original concept plan significantly prejudices the validity and integrity of the public consultation process. Any representations as to the variance between this modification and the original concept plan should fully and properly detail all variances from the original development controls and explain why those controls, considered essentially then, can properly be disregarded now.</p>
420861	Emily Gordon	I object to it	The amended Mod 9 plans are still too high and block historically significant sightlines to and from the Harbour - Observatory Hill. The views to and from the State Heritage listed terraces of Millers Point are deemed so significant by Heritage NSW that they must be maintained by the owners of the historic buildings for the benefit of the public, it seems completely unreasonable that large apartment buildings could then be allowed to block these sightlines. And it is a scandal that the iconic views from Observatory Hill of the Kent Street historic roofline

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>with the Harbour behind would be ruined permanently for all Sydney-siders and our tourist visitors just to build apartments that will provide benefit to only a very few.</p> <p>The way this amendment is being presented, I find misleading by stating that the RL35 height is already approved. When did that happen? In fact, it was part of the Mod 9 original submission which has already been rejected; it wasn't just the tower that needed to go, it was the change to the height of the whole development that concerned citizens objected to.</p>
420896	John Houston	I object to it	<p>This Objection is made on behalf of the 49 Residential lots and 1 commercial Lot in Strata Plan 72797 by the Chairman of the Owners Corporation SP72797.</p> <p>We strongly object to this modification</p>
420906	John Houston	I object to it	Strongly Object
420921	Frances Houston	I object to it	Strongly Object
420936	Martin Crabb	I object to it	<p>I strongly oppose and object to the Modification of 06_0162 Amended Mod 9 proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>Summary Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The “public good” test has not been met.</li> <li>- Conversion of public good to private good, without compensating benefits, cannot be supported.</li> <li>- The consent authority should insist that assessment using development block controls from the Approved Concept Plan be undertaken as was requested, regardless of whether it considers it is meaningless or not.</li> <li>- The applicant is to be required to illustrate how the approved maximum GFA can be accommodated in the maximum building envelope.</li> <li>- Insignificant view sharing is provided in the proposed development which is a breach of the requirements and cannot be supported.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Details of the pedestrian connection between High Street and Central Barangaroo must be provided.</li> <li>- Visual impact assessment must consider impacts on all impacted heritage properties in Millers Point.</li> <li>- Building heights and the articulation of building forms should be moderated to restore east-west view lines.</li> <li>- It is possible that if the advice that sightlines were “lost” in 2008 is correct and the government sold a number of properties to private interests without disclosing this, it could be culpable of providing misleading information. This must be investigated.</li> <li>- Crown and Lend Lease’s sight lines are not the only ones that are important!</li> </ul> <p>It is not good enough just to drop the tower.</p> <p>The “Public Good” Test Has Not Been Met</p> <p>Please see attached file.</p> <p>Martin Crabb</p>
421491	Thomas Cormoreche	I object to it	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>As a senior landscape architect (UNSW 2010), I remember "Barangaroo" being a new exciting prospect for landscape architecture. It's been largely compromised since, and its soul was mostly sold to developers.</p> <p>Living in Brookvale, I commonly frequent this area, for work, but primarily for leisure. I also commonly using the ferry. The different perspective on the historic heart of Sydney always gives me great pleasure.</p> <p>While not being opposed to a development at all (loving "contemporary"), in what is an artificial parcel of land; while also being passionate about architecture, I am much opposed to this proposed monstrosity. Waterways are public, this part of Sydney is already blessed with most of its iconic landmarks, let's not tarnish these landmarks with such unsightly and dominant feature.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>If there is no legal way to force the opening of a public competition to design what could be the next architectural treasure, let's oppose to the currently proposed nonsense with all our passion and tenacity. This must not happen, not in this form, not in this height, not in this colour, not smaller, simply and flatly not at all.</p> <p>This would represent an insult to all Sydneysiders, and it doesn't take much explanation, education to design or intellectualization to understand why. After a quick glance, it is obvious that it just doesn't belong here. Wrong form, wrong proportions, wrong colour, it is simply and eloquently inadequate.</p> <p>It is my designer recommendation that it should be flatly rejected and buried, not modified.</p> <p>Thanks for your time and consideration.</p>
421506	Peter Messenger	I object to it	My submission is attached
421531	Thi Pham	I object to it	We don't need more luxury apartments at the expense of public space and community. Once this is gone, it will be gone forever, with little benefit to the public at all.
421621	Richard Dale	I object to it	<p>Objection to Modification of Barangaroo Concept Plan (MP 06_016 MOD 9 Amended)</p> <p>I am a resident of Millers Point. I strongly oppose the proposed modification (Mod9) as amended of the Central Barangaroo Concept Plan in its entirety as a gross overdevelopment and a betrayal of good planning. The 2024 amendment to Mod9 proposal is referred to here as Mod9A</p> <p>1. Loss of Public Domain Views</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Views from Observatory Hill: Mod9A still obstructs heritage-significant views to the west, particularly the opposite shoreline and the harbour, diminishing the original concept plan's acknowledgment of their significance.</li> <li>- Views from Kent St at High St and The Agar Steps: Mod9A still blocks wide and significant view corridors of the harbour and the west.</li> <li>- Views to Observatory Hill and Millers Point from Darling Harbour, Pyrmont and Balmain: Mod9A still damages</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>iconic views of Kent St terraces, Sydney Observatory, Observatory Hill, and the Harbour Bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Disregard for Planning Principles: The proposal ignores the original principles of maintaining views over and between built forms, falsely claiming that views are already lost and using this to justify the increases in height, bulk, and scale.</li> <li>- Non-Compliance with Conditions: Mod9A still ignores the Independent Planning Commission’s Condition C1, impacting key views from Millers Point and Observatory Hill, going against the public interest and causing severe heritage impact.</li> </ul> <p>2. Impact on Amenity and Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compromised Amenity: The bulk and scale of Mod9A still compromises the amenity of residents and visitors. The proposed height and sparsely penetrated canyon-wall of buildings along Hickson road severs Millers Point from its founding relationship to the harbour. High St and Kent St houses face privacy issues, loss of views and will be walled in by the Mod9A proposal. Height increases overshadow Hickson park.</li> <li>- Excessive Bulk and Scale: Mod9A's building massing along Hickson Rd is too high with too few penetrations, ignoring previously approved design principles, resulting in excessive bulk and scale detrimental to the original low-rise campus and community-use vision.</li> <li>- Violation of Agreed Controls: Mod9A fundamentally violates design principles attached to the agreed block controls. Block 5 has been unacceptably increased in height above previous controls to RL42.45.</li> <li>- Adverse Impact on High Street: The height and scale of blocks 5,6 and 7 is still too high and penetrations between the blocks are too narrow.</li> <li>- Negative Development Impact: The proposed Mod9A GFA of 104,000sq.m should be rejected and should not exceed the Central Barangaroo GFA of 47,688 approved for Mod 8. The modification and current amendment still squeezes the Barangaroo vision too hard, leaving an eyesore for years and severely diminishing Millers Point's state-listed heritage.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- Adverse Heritage impact: Millers Point is a state-listed heritage area where the combined effect of our streetscape, building stock, landscape and connection to the harbour serves to preserve our state heritage. Mod9A severs heritage significant views and ignores the scale of heritage streetscapes and landscape.</p> <p>Reject Mod9 and return to the original vision in the concept plan.</p> <p>Reject Mod9 to preserve shared heritage and public amenity, safeguarding the original vision for Barangaroo and preventing a negative impact on the people of NSW, Sydney, and Millers Point.</p>
421681	Matt Robinson	I object to it	<p>It is frustrating to be re-submitting an objection for a set of plans so similar to the last set that received widespread opposition. I do not believe the prior concerns raised have been addressed by the minor amendments made to the last round of plans.</p> <p>The original approved plans for central Barangaroo envisaged a low rise, low density entertainment district in central Barangaroo designed to transition from the high rise commercial and residential towers of south Barangaroo to the Barangaroo reserve and be a leisure destination for all Sydneysiders. This is prime public realestate, shouldn't we be aiming for something with significant public amenity? How can the "civic and cultural heart of the Barangaroo precinct" (per Minister Steve Kamper in the SMH) have 75% usage as luxury residences? Wouldn't galleries/theatres/sports facilities/ restaurants / bars provide more culture?</p> <p>Between One Sydney Harbour and One Barangaroo we have added 900 apartments adjacent. One Sydney Harbour is not yet operational but traffic at Sussex st / hickson road is already challenged pre 800 apartments being occupied. The infrastructure will not be equiped for material further residential developments nor is it required given the volume of new apartments next door.</p> <p>The height of the proposed buildings will block long held views of the Rocks from myriad vantage points around the harbour. The height will also obstruct views from Observatory hill. These views are of such signficance to the city that weekend (and some weekdays) sunsets are packed with people enjoying the same views to the Western harbour that Sydneysides have enjoyed for 150 years and should be for the next 150....</p> <p>I believe the heritage deparment and City of Sydney should have approval rights over this development as this effective resubmission shows that the developer is not listening.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
421691	Leanne Wilson	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</li> </ul>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</p> <p>I support the MPRAG maintaining its position to object to the development proposal for Central Barangaroo, on the grounds of preserving the suburb of Millers Point's heritage value.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Leanne Wilson.</p>
421706	Jennifer Abraham	I object to it	<p>The present plan is considerably more imposing than the original envelope that was proposed.</p> <p>Over the years we have seen various proposals including the last one which included a 73 metre tower which was surely completely outside the original preview of the project.</p> <p>We’ve seen increases on increases on the overall scope of the impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>With present plan, all the buildings remain too high and the mass of the buildings is too great. Western views from the Heritage precinct including Observatory Hill are compromised. This area is an intrinsic and iconic part of Sydney dating back to its first settlement. This shouldn’t be allowed to happen.</p> <p>There are already many tall imposing structures on Barangaroo. What an amazing legacy could be bestowed on the people of Sydney by leaving this Central Barangaroo area open to public enjoyment on grassland.</p> <p>The names on a plaque left for history to say that the Governing Bodies of this time in 2024 had the foresight to enhance the public usage and pleasure of this wonderful part of Sydney</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			would be an honourable testament to those powerful public benefactors. The treatment of this site will stand in shame or glory for a long long time.
421721	Angela Kim	I object to it	<p>I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Doubling the GFA from the already approved concept plan with no benefit to the public and residences in the area is unacceptable.</li> <li>2. The heritage sightlines are still lost with this proposal. In fact, it offers no improvement to the previous proposal.</li> <li>3. The traffic situation will become much worst with this development.</li> <li>4. The current wind situation is already causing damages to residences in the area. With the proposed development, the situation will get worse and potentially becoming a hazard for the residences in the area.</li> <li>5. Noise pollution will become excessive.</li> <li>6. The development doesn't consider and preserve the heritage precinct within the Barangaroo and Millers Point.</li> <li>7. Lost of open public space.</li> </ol> <p>I strongly suggest the NSW government to do the right thing and preserve the area as a public park for the use of the NSW residences and visitors instead of for a short term benefits of selling off to the commercial interests.</p>
421856	Robert Green	I object to it	On the basis of the uploaded image that shows the proposed bulk and scale, it is a huge and unacceptable development over reach. It is not consistent with the historic nature of the precinct or existing scale of buildings
422021	RICK BAYLEY	I object to it	I strongly object to Aqualand's proposed Revision to their Mod 9 plan. My reasons for doing so are provided in the attached file.
422036	Jeannine Ashbee	I object to it	<p>I object to the current development proposal. It will totally block The Rocks and features no public spaces.</p> <p>This is the last bit of land on our beautiful foreshore and it should be set aside for public use/domain. An art</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			centre/and aboriginal cultural centre/park/community space.  I object 100% to Aqualand's proposal.
422216	Luke Miller	I object to it	IT STILL BLOCKS THE ROCKS!!
422296	Marilyn Wise	I object to it	I oppose the Barangaroo Central MOD 9 proposal on the following grounds:  The scale of the proposed development is still far too large and will have a detrimental impact, obscuring the view lines from Observatory Hill, Miller's Point and the Dawes Point Precinct, and also from Balmain and Pymont looking towards the Rocks. These are iconic views and need to be retained as part of the heritage of Sydney. The Rocks precinct was saved in earlier times but the view lines are equally important and need to be retained. These views still retain elements of the views the Cadigal people had from the highest point on the harbour. They are the views of the colonial town that was built in this area. The earlier plan for a modulated building, respecting the sandstone cutting and wall, must be adhered to. The community space of the Conditions of Consent must be protected. This area is too important to the history of Sydney to be allowed to go ahead in the latest modified form.
422401	Karen Knight	I object to it	I am objecting to the height, volume & land utilisation of the plan.
422461	Max Burt	I object to it	Strongly object.
422491	Dianne Eddington	I object to it	This is an abomination! It is vandalism of the worst kind and will destroy the beautiful and historic views from every angle. How can such wilful destruction be allowed to proceed! It is a disgrace and if it proceeds, will be a blight on our precinct forever. Barangaroo is already over developed and the increase in traffic is felt in all of our peaceful residential precinct.
422706	Mary Kelly	I object to it	I object to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9).  The iconic views and the heritage of Observatory Hill, Millers Point and surrounding areas must be protected.  Modification 9 must be rejected.
422731	John Brown	I object to it	Objection to the Modification of 06_0162 Amended Mod 9 proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo.  19h February 2024

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>I wish to object to the Modification of 06_0162 Amended Mod 9 proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo. My issues of concern are listed below.</p> <p>John Brown</p> <p>11 25A Hickson Road, Millers Point. NSW 2000</p> <p>I live in Towns Place Millers Point. I am of the opinion the development will destroy heritage aspects of the area currently enshrined in law.</p> <p>The residential buildings alongside Hickson Road are too high, will obstruct views and further impact traffic in the area.</p> <p>Observatory Hill and Views</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vistas to and from Observatory Hill are sacrosanct and must be protected. This includes views of both the water and horizon to the west and the roofscape of Millers Point (High St and Kent St) to the east and views of the hill and historical area from Central</li> </ul> <p>Barangaroo itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These views will still be obstructed by the proposed Hickson Road buildings.</li> </ul> <p>Bulk and Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, with insufficient articulation, setback, separation, etc. They are an urban planning disaster sealing off the visual link between Central Barangaroo and the historical townscape of High Street buildings and the Observatory Hill and Rocks precincts.</li> <li>- The Block 6 and 7 buildings are bulky and destroy the visual link to the low-rise residential setting. The significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc.</li> <li>- Important vistas from the above suburbs of iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge views will also be blocked.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- Adding garden areas will not reduce their impact on the area.</p> <p>Millers Point Heritage Precinct</p> <p>- The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, Sydney's Old Town.</p> <p>- Other major cities around the world respect their Old Towns by maintaining sightlines and not the NSW Government it seems.</p> <p>- The views from the west of the Millers Point streetscape have been seen ever since they were built in the 1800's to 1910's. They will be and continue to be completely obscured by the Government's new buildings.</p> <p>Visual Impact</p> <p>- The proponent's visual impact is completely inadequate. It is highly selective of the visual impact images in its Visual Impact Report. It does not include, for example, visual impact images from High St or Kent St, whether as a streetscape or as individual properties. The NSW Government sold these properties to private owners and used these views as part of their marketing material.</p> <p>Traffic from Blocks 5,6,7 theatres, the Metro and the proposed new Barangaroo Cutaway</p> <p>- No adequate assessment of how increased traffic from the residential blocks 5,6 and 7, theatre traffic and event traffic from proposed Cutaway event site has been tabled.</p> <p>- It will spill out from Central Barangaroo and the Metro station into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>- Any proposed retail precinct will only provide minimal shopper parking necessitating out-of-area shoppers to park in Millers Point and Walsh Bay.</p> <p>The public's access and enjoyment of the Central Barangaroo area The small foreshore park will now be further compromised by:</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The foot traffic to and from the Block 5, 6 and 7 buildings.</li> <li>- The events planned for the proposed redevelopment of the Cutaway.</li> <li>- Traffic to and from the Walsh Bay theatre area.</li> <li>- The existing educational and outdoor events held at Barangaroo Park.</li> <li>- The intermodal traffic flows and dwell-time at the entrance and area surrounding the Barangaroo Metro Station.</li> <li>- The Block 6 and 7 buildings are bulky and will obstruct views to Observatory Hill and historic High St. and Millers Point areas.</li> </ul>
422911	Melissa Browne	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>I also raise a number of other significant changes of concern:</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul> <p>This whole process has been problematic from start to finish with a complete lack of transparency. The sandstone cliffs represent historical significance and sightlines to them should be retained from the water for generations to come.</p>
422921	Anthony Larven	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>I also raise a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually</li> </ul>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</p> <p>This whole process has been problematic from start to finish with a complete lack of transparency. The sandstone cliffs represent historical significance and sightlines to them should be retained from the water for generations to come.</p>
423331	Andrew Coroneo	I object to it	<p>We are the owners of 63 Kent Street, Millers Point. We have experienced and value very highly, the historic and heritage values that have accrued over many centuries in that locality, now under severe further threat of utterly inappropriate overdevelopment.</p> <p>Millers Point is too valuable an area, culturally and historically, and must not be destroyed by even more high-rise buildings in Barangaroo, which block historical views to and from Millers Point. The planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct to gradually reduce the height as the development moves north toward the Headland Park are being ignored.</p> <p>We have had the knowledge, ONLY AFTER we purchased our heritage terrace house, that Central Barangaroo was to be excessively developed contrary to the initial Concept Plan. The approved concept plan was for 45,000 square metres but the developer is seeking to double the size to 104,000 square metres.</p> <p>This has resulted in a gross loss of our, AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC’s amenity, enjoyment, and heritage values (not only in material and monetary values).</p> <p>We are fully in support of the submissions made by the Millers Point Community Resident Action Group (MPCRAG)</p> <p>1. We oppose the new proposal which seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>foreshore, which was previously allocated to be the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo.</p> <p>2. We believe it would be wrong to reduce the size of Hickson Park, and the amount of community spaces from 28,000 to 2,800 square metres.</p> <p>3. The new proposals still block the historical views from Balmain and Pymont to the heritage-listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>4. The heritage sightlines from public open spaces, Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are still lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>We object and oppose the revised Mod 9 proposal for Central Barangaroo.</p>
423361	Nicoula Coroneo	I object to it	<p>My husband and I are the owners of 63 Kent Street, Millers Point. We have experienced and value very highly, the historic and heritage values that have accrued over many centuries in that locality, now under severe further threat of utterly inappropriate overdevelopment.</p> <p>Millers Point is too valuable an area, culturally and historically, and must not be destroyed by even more high-rise buildings in Barangaroo, which block historical views to and from Millers Point. The planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct to gradually reduce the height as the development moves north toward the Headland Park are being ignored.</p> <p>We have had the knowledge, ONLY AFTER we purchased our heritage terrace house, that Central Barangaroo was to be excessively developed contrary to the initial Concept Plan. The approved concept plan was for 45,000 square metres but the developer is seeking to double the size to 104,000 square metres.</p> <p>This has resulted in a gross loss of our, AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC’s amenity, enjoyment, and heritage values (not only in material and monetary values).</p> <p>We are fully in support of the submissions made by the Millers Point Community Resident Action Group (MPCRAG)</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>1. We oppose the new proposal which seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore, which was previously allocated to be the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo.</p> <p>2. We believe it would be wrong to reduce the size of Hickson Park, and the amount of community spaces from 28,000 to 2,800 square metres.</p> <p>3. The new proposals still block the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage-listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>4. The heritage sightlines from public open spaces, Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are still lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>We object and oppose the revised Mod 9 proposal for Central Barangaroo.</p>
423371	Bruce & Nicole Powell	I object to it	<p>Thank you,</p> <p>Please see attached Objection letter.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p> <p>Bruce &amp; Nicole Powell.</p>
423886	Maryann Knight	I object to it	<p>Objection to Barangaroo Central Plan</p> <p>20 Feb 2024</p> <p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I am writing to raise objection not the latest plan for Barangaroo central / North.</p> <p>The total mass of the proposed buildings are too great. They are also too high &amp; all views from street level will be blocked and particularly from the historic High St and surrounding areas.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Observatory Hill views will also be severely impacted.</p> <p>Overall this amenity of the rocks will be negatively impacted if the proposed development proceeds as planned.</p> <p>Light, views, airflow &amp; overall general amenity will be negatively impacted and both for local residents, visitors &amp; tourists.</p> <p>The planned buildings must be reduced in mass- lowered in height &amp; broken up to provide a more consistent approach which is better in keeping with the historic rocks area.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Maryann Knight</p>
423916	Simon knight	I object to it	<p>Good Morning</p> <p>I am writing to object to the plan for Barangaroo Central / North precinct.</p> <p>The proposed buildings are too massive, too high &amp; totally out of character with the historic area.</p> <p>If built amenity for residents &amp; visitors alike will be negatively impacted.</p> <p>For our historical heart Sydney deserves a better more inspiring approach to this iconic site.</p> <p>Please DO NOT ALLOW this plan as presently proposed proceed.</p>
424016	Patrick Lawnham	I object to it	<p>One has to ask, who among those who live near and/or visit or work or live in Barangaroo would like it? The latest construction proposal for Barangaroo Central is still too bulky and detracts from both the open space to the west and, let's not forget, the appearance of Barangaroo South. It would be an eyesore. The sightlines from the east and south of it are another, much discussed issue. This is land owned by the public but is not being used for the public good, under the latest proposal. This is not to suggest Central be left entirely open, but a project less obtrusive is needed. Back to the drawing board, please.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
424036	BEVERLY BAYLEY	I object to it	My strong objections to the Revised Mod 9 are attached. The Government is complicit in a major exercise to overwhelm the public with excessive reports which are not comparing apples with apples. The original Concept Plan should be the baseline against which these excessive development proposals are measured and compared. If it was the excessive development contemplated by Aqualand could not be contemplated.
424086	Paul Franks	I object to it	Attached
424141	Jane Heynes	I object to it	See attached file
424161	Stuart Murray	I object to it	<p>I am strongly opposed to the Mod 9 Barangaroo Concept Plan. My objections are based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It does not respect the indigenous and colonial worth of the Observatory Hill skyline. The buildings proposed are far too high and not in keeping with the initial vision.</li> <li>2. It reduces the public area greatly from the original specifications of the Barangaroo development.</li> <li>3. It moves from a balanced development of retail, office and apartments to a heavily loaded apartments configuration. We don't want just people living there but the public wanting to come there and work, shop and enjoy the public space and shops. And to do this use the new Metro.</li> <li>4. It appears the developer purchased the site "hoping" they would be given whatever they wanted without considering the people of Sydney, New South Wales and Australia and overseas tourists. We, the people, will have to look at this for perhaps a century or more.</li> <li>5. The developer is trying to maximise their profit with complete disregard for Sydney and Australia. They will take their profit and exit while we are left with an eyesore. Maybe they need to consider a financial haircut and admit they made a poor decision to purchase. That happens in business.</li> <li>6. The Minister for Lands and Property, Mr Steve Kamper, needs to remember he will be long gone while the world looks at a travesty he has given support to. Perhaps he should be remembered, with a generous brass plaque, as the Minister who stopped the overdevelopment of the site and gave the world another amazing view forever of Sydney.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you.</p>
424186	Stephanie Brady	I object to it	To lose that amazing view to open space and our heritage would be a crime! Stop developing our beautiful harbour!
424286	Mary Knaggs	I object to it	<p>The setting of the Nationally Heritage Listed Sydney Harbour Bridge will be extremely negatively impact on by this development. There should be a gently fine-grained approach to the bridge when viewed from the southwest.</p> <p>In addition, Barangaroo, Dawes Point, Millers Point and Observatory Hill (including their Aboriginal heritage</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>values) should rise above the harbour in a natural foreshore setting. Views from these highly significant places should also be protected.</p> <p>Together the Aboriginal Heritage values, Barangaroo, the Bridge, Walsh Bay, Dawes Point and Millers Point/The Rocks and Observatory Hill are worthy of World Heritage listing as a colonial harbour settlement with early 20th century overlay. This development will negate any chance of such a listing proceeding.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
424296	Nigel Dickson	I object to it	<p>I have attached my submission.</p> <p>I object to flaws in the preparation of the Urban Design of the Proposal,</p> <p>the Bulk and Scale of the of the Proposal,,</p> <p>the diminished size of Hickson Park,</p> <p>the effect of the Proposal on the Millers Point Conservation Area,</p> <p>the lack of rigor in Visual Assessment,</p> <p>the effect on the Observatory Sky Views,</p> <p>the Land Uses Proposed and, Traffic</p>
424306	Anne Wood	I object to it	<p>I object to the above "amended" plan on the grounds that it does not reduce the bulk of the development. Indeed the Residential GFA will increase by 47,000sqm. Not only that, the public parkland will be reduced.</p> <p>The iconic views from Observatory Hill will be obscured as will those from Balmain towards Millers Point.</p> <p>This is a very special part of Sydney and it would be a crying shame to destroy it with a totally inappropriate build. Yes, we need housing but this is not going to house the underprivileged.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
424341	Julie Elliott	I object to it	<p>I believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so an evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>I believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
424456	(Waskam) Emelda Davis	I object to it	<p>Please find my personal submission to Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) Department of Planning and Housing and Infrastructure (nsw.gov.au) Cr (Waskam) Emelda Davis (on behalf of constituents that have voiced their concerns to my office at COS.</p>
424971	John Kaunitz	I object to it	<p>The proposed development, if realized, will be a blight on the Sydney city scape second only to the Cahill Expressway.</p> <p>The block of buildings proposed for Central Barangaroo have no visual merit and rather than linking north and south Barangaroo in a way that is sympathetic to what is already there, the construction will overwhelm the visual appearance of the city from the west and will block the heritage views of High Street, and The Rocks beyond.</p> <p>The doubling of floor space has no public merit but results in extra height of the building proposed and the elimination of space between the buildings that would otherwise allow visibility of what is beyond.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			I strongly urge the Minister to ensure that he not be the one responsible for such an atrocity and insist that Central Barangaroo construction is largely kept below the level of High Street.
425036	John Cusack	I object to it	<p>Submission of Objection in Response to (RtS) for MP06_0162 MOD9</p> <p>Stamford Marque Apartment Building SP77663</p> <p>161 Kent Street, Millers Point NSW 2000</p> <p>Stamford Marque Strata Committee Submission</p> <p>We object to the revised MOD 9 proposal for Central Barangaroo that is currently on exhibition (January 2024) and wish to make the following comments in respect of the proposed plan.</p> <p>MOD 9 was resoundingly rejected, and eventually refused by the NSW government.</p> <p>Many notable organisations such as Sydney City Council, members of the NSW Parliament, the National Trust, Heritage Council as well as thousands of residents of NSW expressed major concerns about the unacceptable impacts of MOD 9. Mod 9 was a departure from the stated aims and desired outcomes for Central Barangaroo. Heritage regulations would be breached and serious negative impacts imposed on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point and its residents. There were strong valid objections to MOD 9. Unfortunately, the revised plan has failed to address many of the expressed concerns and objections to MOD 9, even though the proposed NW tower has been removed.</p> <p>1. Height and Alignment of Block 5: Particularly disturbing to our residents is the proposed street alignment and height of Block 5, is such that the proposed buildings will severely negatively impact existing residential buildings in Hickson Rd and Kent St and increase overshadowing of Hickson Park. As one of a row of residential Strata buildings, Stamford Marque at 161 Kent St, will be impacted by loss of significant harbour views and sunlight should this proposal proceed. Considerable loss of value and amenity would ensue.</p> <p>2.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Block 5 and View Lines: The view-lines diagrams for our building in the proposal don't accurately depict the loss of views. Only levels 15 and 25 have been considered and the RL's stated are at variance with those provided in the plan of our building and imply lesser impact than the actual. Most residences below level 15 will suffer considerable loss, in addition to what they have already lost from the impact of the Crown building and One Sydney Harbour. The height of Block 5 must be reduced to below the 30 Hickson Rd, Bond, building, set back from Hickson Rd, and its southern boundary moved further north, to avoid the devastating impacts on residents of our building and others in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>30 and 38 Hickson Rd will be effectively in a dark wind tunnel with the lack of setback on Hickson Rd and the height and solid mass of the Hotel building rising immediately next to the relatively narrow 2 lane road. See Attachment 1, Page 67 of the Response to Submissions (RtS) report by Mecone.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Shadow Diagrams: Shadow diagrams do not include the most affected times for buildings in Hickson Rd and Kent St after 2pm. See Attachment 2, Page 157 of the Response to Submissions by Mecone. Morning sunlight does not reach occupants of apartments and business premises</p> <p>with only west-facing windows, even in Summer. The afternoon sunlight is essential for health and well-being. Existing sunset views are treasured by residents and visitors to the area.</p> <p>These concerns were raised in submissions to MOD 9 but have not been addressed.</p> <p>External structures on the roof of the proposed Hotel building will add to the interruption of views and create opportunity for noise impacts.</p> <p>A reduction in RL of 2.05m for Block 5 provides little or no benefit. A substantial reduction in heights of buildings on Central Barangaroo is absolutely needed.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>Street Level Harbour Views Lost: This proposal reduces further the public harbour views from Gas Lane and the corner of Kent St and High St, and Observatory Hill west side. Gas Lane's harbour and sunset views are admired and treasured by locals and visitors alike. They will be reduced to a sliver should this proposal be approved in its</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>current form. The pale pink depiction of obstructing buildings, as presented in the proposal, does not truly represent the blocking impact of Block 5 on these views. Views lost at Hickson Rd with major imposing hotel building can be seen in Fig 73. See Attachment 3, Fig 47 page 65, Fig 73 Page 91 and Fig 78 Page 99 of the Visual impact Assessment Part 1 report by AECOM.</p> <p>5. Increases to the Already Crowded Density of Barangaroo: The extent of the building envelope is in addition to the imposing Barangaroo South development, which has already removed valuable public and private harbour views. There has already been a significant loss of value and amenity and increased noise and traffic impacts upon existing residential and other buildings in the vicinity of Barangaroo due to the extent of development already built and being built at Barangaroo. This proposal increases overshadowing, creates additional wind tunnels, removes remaining sunlight from residences and increases noise and traffic.</p> <p>6. Unjustified Increase in GFAs: We see no justification for increasing the GFA to 104,000sqm, particularly the heights of the proposed buildings. This is well beyond what is allowed in the approved Concept plan.</p> <p>The buildings must be reduced in height so that they do not breach Heritage regulations, and all remain wholly below the level of High St for the full length so that treasured existing public and private harbour views, and views to the Heritage Precinct from the Harbour and harbourfront walkway and Balmain East are not taken away forever. No building on this public harbourfront site should interrupt valuable harbour views from the public or existing residences. We challenge the statement in the RtS proposal 'The amended MOD 9 proposal is of a scale that ensures views to the harbour from key vantage points are respected' and Ref page 144 of the RtS report by Mecone. Much of these views will be obstructed. (see also Point 11 on Page 3 of submission)</p> <p>7. Commercialisation of Public Open Space: Large outdoor events on the public greenspace, as proposed in this plan, restrict full public access to arguably the most attractive and publicly usable harbourfront part of the site. It will create noise for residents in the vicinity and create traffic flow problems. One would reasonably expect that any commercial events proposed for Central Barangaroo would be catered for within buildings to the East of the proposed park or elsewhere. The renewed Cutaway is designed to cater for such events. Central Barangaroo was intended to provide public amenity for the large number of workers and residents of Barangaroo South, as well as</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>visitors to the CBD. This proposal by our government is a de facto sell-off of public harbourfront space for private luxury apartments and a hotel, and commercialisation of remaining public open space.</p> <p>8. Protected Views for Some: Iconic views from Crown Hotel and residences are protected. This proposal for Central Barangaroo is by our NSW Government, the caretakers of our public land. Why therefore are permanent Millers Point residents totally ignored when all they ask is that their amenity be respected in a similar vein to Crown? The visiting public to Millers Point are the other losers.</p> <p>9. Traffic Gridlock for Barangaroo and Millers Point: This plan makes no allowance for widening of Hickson Rd to meet increased traffic numbers. The occupation of numerous new residences in the almost completed One Sydney Harbour and then adding proposed hotel guests plus more proposed residential will create a traffic grid nightmare for Hickson Road. This Hickson Road gridlock will affect all the surrounding entry and exit streets in the Barangaroo and Millers Point precinct as well as the Sydney CBD. How will the provision of public transport, service vehicles, taxi drop-off and pick-up points, metro station drop-offs and pick-ups, tourist coaches, and access to public parking areas in and around Barangaroo and Millers Point be catered for with a narrow and busy Hickson Road? A shared road as a one-way northern extension of Barangaroo Avenue cannot accommodate these provisions.</p> <p>10. Apartment Overload in Precinct: There is already a significant increase in the number of apartments approved or under construction in the CBD and Barangaroo South. The new luxury residential buildings and hotel have little merit and provide no benefit to the public who owns this land. The NSW Government has been charged with the responsibility of protecting the public's interest. It is the last chance that any NSW Government will have to create a legacy of public amenity in this unique piece of harbourside land.</p> <p>11. Blocked Views of Heritage Precinct: Objections from East Balmain and Pyrmont in respect of blocking of their views of the Heritage Precinct have only been addressed in respect of the NW tower, but the other issues of blocking of views remain. See Attachment 4 Ref Fig. 94, Page 119 in the Visual assessment by AECOM Part 1. These areas will also be impacted by noise from any large events staged on the harbour park, as currently</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>proposed. Image below clearly shows the blocked-out views of iconic Millers Point.</p> <p>4 Scaled impression of the residential and hotel blocks in the revised Mod 9 submission</p> <p>12. Last Available Public Harbour Foreshore: Finally, and most importantly, enhancement of our last available public harbour foreshore area with extensive usable and attractive public spaces would provide significant value for the State of NSW. Along with the magnificent Barangaroo Headland, Barangaroo Central designed as a public amenity, would create one of the tourist destinations of the world which would boost the already attractiveness of Sydney as a tourist destination. It would ensure a legacy of open foreshore recreational space for future generations of Australians to enjoy and would complement our other iconic harbourside venues of Botanical Gardens and Barangaroo Headland.</p> <p>Submission Date: February 20, 2024</p> <p>Submitted by John Cusack (Chair), Stamford Marque Strata Committee</p> <p>On behalf of the Strata Committee and concerned residents of Stamford Marque SP77663</p>
425071	Sharon Pedersen	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.
425111	Bruce Pedersen	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul>
425171	Kate Evans	I object to it	<p>I object because the plans are still too high and it's nothing like the concept plan that was originally approved. Why does Barangaroo need another 75% residential building, when there is very limited road access to the suburb. The socio economic demographic of residents of Barangaroo love their car ownership and will prioritise driving their cars or order Ubers as opposed to using the Metro and public transport. However, if the space was used for green space similar to centennial park, it would encourage users who would utilise the fantastic public transport network of Barangaroo.</p>
425391	Bernard Kelly	I object to it	Please find my submission attached.
425426	Mark and Jean Eames	I object to it	<p>Our principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</p> <p>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>This area is the 'last piece of the puzzle' for a continuous foreshore stretch from Pyrmont to the Opera House and Botanic Gardens. Done well, it will provide lasting utility to Sydneysiders and visitors alike. But this is not done well, it will detract from the area, destroy important sightlines and, were it to be developed, would go down as a decision as bad as the Cahill Expressway or the Sirius Building.</p> <p>Mark and Jean Eames</p>
425516	Christopher Finn	I object to it	<p>As the recently retired chairman of the Owners Corporation of Broughton House (181 Clarence Street), a residential community of 60 families, what I say below mirrors what everyone at Broughton to whom I've spoken thinks about this last proposal by Aqualand</p> <p>In short, I - and my fellow owners - strongly object to it because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We lose the remainder of Hickson Park connected to the water's edge, which is replaced by</li> <li>2. A gross residential overdevelopment, canyoning Hickson Road, to be populated by absentee owners;</li> <li>3. We lose the last public land on the Harbour to a second rate development built for the profit of a few; and</li> <li>4. The site deserves an iconic structure open to all, rivalling the Opera House and surrounded by public</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>recreational space.</p> <p>I implore the Government to stop all further development at Barangaroo, compensate Aqualand for their time and effort, and leave it as open space for the enjoyment of all until a suitable and useful structure can be built, blending into the landscape and utilising the infrastructure already being built.</p> <p>Chris Finn</p>
425581	Steve White	I object to it	<p>1/ The concept plan should not be extended.</p> <p>2/ Views to and from Millers Point to the Harbour remain seriously affected.</p> <p>3/ Hickson Park should remain at 28,000 m2 and further space returned to the public.</p> <p>4/ 35m height is not appropriate. The height should not exceed 20m particularly for Block 5. Blocks 5, 6 and 7 should be the same limited height.</p>
425591	Anne Stevens	I object to it	<p>I object to the overdevelopment of Barangaroo which this plan entails.</p> <p>I have lived in the City for many years and regard Barangaroo as my back yard. I walk there most days and have looked forward to what was originally proposed.</p> <p>Mod 9 is nothing like the original plan - as is obvious to even a layman like me.</p> <p>Where has the open space gone? Where is Hickson Park? We were meant to run through the new park from Hickson Road to the water. This is all being replaced by what seems to be ugly, too tall galleries of residential blocks built for the one - time profit of the developers to the detriment of everyone else.</p> <p>I call on the government to have a vision that will well outlive them: Build a beautiful public structure for all who visit the site that will endure for eons to come. Sydney will only come of age if vision such as this is grasped by our politicians and planners without fear or favour!</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
425616	Robert Marriott	I object to it	See attached file for details.
425756	Charley Kelly	I object to it	Please see attached
425901	Margaret Wright	I object to it	<p>I object to the amended Barangaroo Central Mod 9 on the following bases:</p> <p>The revised Mod 9 proposal does not address any of the major concerns that I objected to in my earlier proposal and has caused me to raise others.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It still blocks critical views of the water from both Observatory Hill and High Street, looking west. These are views that tourists stop to view. Indeed for the former view, they camp on Observatory Hill waiting for the sunset on the water.</li> <li>2. The proposal to build 150 luxury apartments is likely to add little effective housing for permanent residents in the area. In particular there are no plans for affordable housing and a number of residents in the vicinity have been evicted for STR. There is a high risk most of these apartments will go to the STR market as has happened in High Street (over 60%) or be sold to overseas investors.</li> <li>3. This change has reduced both the amenity of the former mixed-use plan and the key principle of being the 'central heart of Barangaroo.</li> <li>4. The community space has been reduced from 28,000m<sup>2</sup> to 2,800m<sup>2</sup> - effectively only 10% of the originally planned space.</li> </ol> <p>I and others had always been hopeful that the area would stand out and be a place for visitors and locals to spend time walking alongside and enjoying the harbour and surrounds, perhaps with one or two important buildings. With these plans, the beauty of Sydney Harbour is further diminished by commercial interests.</p>
426796	Anthony Bekker	I object to it	<p>20 Feb 2024</p> <p>Dear Minister for Planning and Public Spaces</p> <p>NSW Government</p> <p>Parliament House</p> <p>Macquarie Street</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>SYDNEY NSW 2000</p> <p>Re: BarrangaWRONG!!!! I object to the revised Mod 9 plan for Baragaroo Central.</p> <p>The revised plans represent an egregious breach of public trust by Government of NSW on its own people. Not only has Infrastructure NSW failed to grasp how out of step it is with public opinion, it appears that at least one relevant Minister, Lands and Property Minister Steve Kamper (who is responsible for the Barangaroo precinct), seemingly pre-judged the outcome, with the developer quoting the minister saying it “has been backed by Minister for Lands and Property Steve Kamper”, quoting him as saying “the refined design prepared by Aqualand delivers a world class mixed-use development of residential, commercial, community and cultural uses, while balancing the views of the local community”.</p> <p>The development is an egregious breach of public trust.</p> <p>The fact one of the Ministers responsible is an active proponent of plan which strips the state of New South Wales of some of its most unique and historic cultural heritage, is a travesty. The revised plan does nothing to balance the views of the local community. The plan has always been outrageous, and remains so.</p> <p>But the Minister’s error in backing the project is unsurprising. In 232 of Mr Kamper’s speeches in Hansard, none of them are about heritage . Zero. It isn’t an issue that even crosses the Minister’s mind. Across his four portfolios, Sport, Small Business, Multiculturalism and Lands and Property, heritage considerations do not feature at all. And it shows.</p> <p>But who is watching? Who cares about a few extra buildings?</p> <p>If you’ve never been there, ever day HUNDREDS of people watch the sunset from Observatory Hill.</p> <p>The location receives a whopping rating of 4.7 Stars from a whopping 2335 reviews on Google Maps.</p> <p>The word that those reviews mention most is the ‘sunset’.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Google Maps (Observatory Hill Park), accessed 20 Feb 2024. Available via: <a href="https://maps.app.goo.gl/iuorquFopxFQfZWv6">https://maps.app.goo.gl/iuorquFopxFQfZWv6</a></p> <p>The sunset sets to the west of observatory hill, as can be seen in the image above (23 Jan 2024, 20:13).</p> <p>The area is a free attraction of immense social and cultural impact for Sydney, on domestic and international visitors, and locals, alike. It is one of the most popular and highest rated outdoor activities in Sydney. People get married there. Take wedding photos there. Hug trees there. Watch the sunset there. Listen to music there. Get engaged there. Look at the stars there. Have picnics there. Study there. They basically take in the view there.</p> <p>Hundreds of thousands of people access Observatory Hill Park each year as a historically, touristically, socially and culturally significant site in Australia.</p> <p>And yet the Government is planning to partially block the views of the harbour, and the sunset, to build, in the words of Mr Kamper” “a mixed-use development that showcases residential, community, tourism and retail uses for the community.”</p> <p>Talk about idiotic! The fabled ‘showcase’ already exists. It has existed for time immemorial as the highest vantage point overlooking Sydney Harbour. It already draws HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS of tourists a year.</p> <p>The Minister, Infrastructure NSW, Aqualand, in their determination to build ‘something’ at Barangaroo Central, actively plan to destroy this asset. In their determination to build ‘something’ at Barangaroo Central, they ignore the fact that nothing would be better than what has been presented.</p> <p>But what is wrong with the proposed Development?</p> <p>My objections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The development actively destroyed heritage and the encircling the heritage of Millers Point in an ignomy of glass, steel and a some cheap terracotta cladding-ma-bob-crap is basically vandalism. Views from the west of the Millers Point streetscape have been seen ever since they were built from the 1800’s and will be completely obscured by the Government’s new buildings.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- a miraculous slight of hand - counting roads, locked underground 'cutaway' space and parts of the harbour as 'public space' for the purposes of their gross floor area calculations.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>There are a number of other significant changes of concern to the revised Mod 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</p> <p>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>- The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the "approved concept plan" as a base line is.</p> <p>Overall, the development represents the output of a cascading series of idiotic assumptions and decisions which spew forth a horrendous eyesore, and projects it onto the people of New South Wales, as well as domestic and international tourists. It is short-term, profit driven design, which rather than being of value, is actively value destroying, to anyone who cares about culture, tourism or heritage in New South Wales.</p> <p>Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill are still blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.</p> <p>It is still too big. It is Still too high.</p> <p>It should be rejected absolutely.</p> <p>With kind regards</p> <p>/AB/</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			Anthony Bekker Resident, Millers Point NSW 2000
426846	Tianrui Yu	I object to it	<p>Key Sites Assessment Department of Planning &amp; Environment Locked Bag 5022 Parramatta NSW 2124</p> <p>Submission of Objection to MP06_0162 MOD 9 - Central Barangaroo Development</p> <p>Dear Director,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development.</p> <p>Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbor and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention.</p> <p>My objections extend beyond these issues to include the lack of long-term planning regarding community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>It is evident that the focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Regards</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			Tianrui Yu
427666	Anne Crabb	I object to it	I strongly object to this development which still Blocks the Rocks!
427691	Kylie Robinson	I object to it	<p>Overdevelopment is everywhere. Under the current proposal, we risk losing the fabric of what makes our City of Sydney truly livable. This is a once in a multi-generational opportunity to get this right so that our beautiful City of Sydney is a place for everyone, not just a wealthy few, and for Central Barangaroo to be a place to be admired and enjoyed by everyone.</p> <p>My main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Overdevelopment of an already significantly overdeveloped part of the City.</li> <li>* The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>* The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> </ul> <p>I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
427836	Deborah Sandars	I object to it	<p>This modification has ONLY deleted the high rise tower and spread the development over three "blobs" of high end residential housing rising 35m towering over the Rocks, sandstone cutaway and heritage housing and does not modulated with the topography.</p> <p>This land is ICONIC Sydney foreshore which should be protected :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maintaining physical access to the water from and to Observatory Hill and between the buildings</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- broad open/ community space has been substantially reduced</p> <p>-retain vistas to and from the harbour</p> <p>- be architecturally unique</p> <p>- be reflected of its heritage- maritime and first nations history</p> <p>This modification is not in the public interest - it achieves none of the above goals originally set</p> <p>The cost of the Metro station should always have been budgeted for, this extraordinary piece of Sydney Harbour should not be the tool to pay for that infrastructure through an economic grab for money by poor design for the elite end of our community at the expense of our heritage and foreshore access and vistas.</p> <p>Changing planning legislation for increase residential housing at rail stations the same time as this Modification is an abuse of use of power by the NSW government and SHOULD NOT be relevant in this heritage site.</p> <p>Come on NSW Government YOU CAN DO BETTER than this plan. RETAIN and sensitively develop this ICONIC part of our history for us and our children and their children with something we can be proud of.</p> <p>Dont bow to short interest money grabs.</p> <p>Its our harbour,our foreshore and our history.</p>
427916	Anita Meshram	I object to it	<p>Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9)</p> <p>Submission</p> <p>This is my submission to the amended Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9):</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <p>In the amended proposal, not much has changed that is beneficial to the public in general and the residents of</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Millers Point in particular.</p> <p>The proposal is still too big, and still too high.</p> <p>Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill would still be blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain would still be blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour would still be blocked.</p> <p>The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a predominantly residential development. This makes it worse and incongruent with the key principle of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo.</p> <p>I understand that the cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct was that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park. The proposal does not follow that principle.</p> <p>The important pedestrian links between Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of this proposal.</p> <p>The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is not based on the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above). Instead they propose huge blocks of residential units which are placed right next to the rather narrow Hickson Road with almost no setback, no accommodation for public coaches drop off areas, bus stops etc. They form a relentless series of blocks with almost no relief. So, from High Street or Observatory Hill, all anybody will be able to see is relentless facades of residential flats. This will invoke absolutely no joy at all.</p> <p>Barangaroo Central is a very highly prized location. We should be using it for producing something which will be as highly prized as the fantastic location. Nothing that has been proposed will make this the civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>I have been living in Millers Point since 2011, after we conserved the terrace home that we bought from New South Wales Land and Housing Corporation. We engaged a heritage architect and sympathetically conserved our dwelling which was otherwise unliveable. We spent a fortune doing this because we felt that this is what this very special location deserved.</p> <p>Over the past years we have observed that the NSW Government has repeatedly intervened in the Barangaroo precinct impacting on our enjoyment of the environment that we live in, starting with the overdevelopment of the area where the Crown tower currently stands. In the name of public open spaces, there is only a small area west of the Crown. At times, the wind tunnel makes it unwalkable from Hickson road to Barangaroo Avenue and further west.</p> <p>The proposed development is the worst. It will block forever the beautiful vistas from High Street, Argyle Place, Kent Street, and even from the Barangaroo Reserve. And what happens to the views from the coveted Observatory Hill and they will be gone forever!</p> <p>The Nawi Cove is a beautiful area as is and must not be surrounded by tall structures. Any construction around the Nawi Cove will spoil the vista, no matter how beautiful the structures are developed. That area should not be built around at all.</p> <p>The proposal does not add any value to public good. It will spoil my view by obstructing the sky views from my home by being very close. It will also impact on visual privacy for me.</p> <p>And what happened to the skate-boarding facility for young children that was promised initially?</p> <p>Please give due consideration to the unique nature of this place. It is perhaps the last remaining harbour setting able to be developed from scratch. Please do not compromise the irreplaceable public vistas.</p> <p>It is a joy to walk along High Street and Observatory Hill and enjoy the water views looking west. The proposed development will deny that forever because all the proposed structures are still very large.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the NSW Government has a demonstrated history of handing over public land to private developers for private gain at public expense., The Toaster Building next to the Sydney Opera House, and South</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Barangaroo to Lendlease are just a few examples.</p> <p>We have just learnt that the Barangaroo Reserve Cutaway development proposal has been approved. Again, the cutaway was built with tax payer funds but is now being handed to private interests and the public are going to be excluded from using the lifts which they have already been using for about 10 years! So, a brand new Barangaroo metro station will open in a few months but will not have any easy access from Millers Point at all!</p> <p>The entire State Heritage listed precinct of Millers Point/ Dawes Point is now already surrounded by tall buildings. Please do not add further structures so close to this area in the name of development. Let this area and the panoramic views be available for the future generations and visitors to marvel and appreciate. Plant more trees and have greenery.</p> <p>This is public property and should remain so. Originally, only cultural, community and sporting facilities was proposed there and that's how it was 'sold' to us at that time. As elected representatives, the Ministers should not hand over this land to private developers.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose this development.</p> <p>Kind regards.</p>
428011	John Filmer	I object to it	Objection to Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9).docx (467.64 KB)
428106	Sophie Steingold	I object to it	<p>There is very little change between the Mod9 Proposal (Rejected in 2022) and the current amended proposal. The views from Observatory Hill, Millers Point Historic Precinct, High Street and the Historic Rocks are still obstructed. The nature of the development is now focused on providing a handful of privileged people residential real estate. This was not the original vision for the site. That is to provide a centre for civic activities open to the people of Sydney and New South Wales. Barangaroo is already overdeveloped with the lend lease apartment towers coming on stream in 2024. No assessment has been undertaken on the stress on the infrastructure following the occupation of these buildings. The mass of building already on the Barangaroo site is massive, There are insufficient open spaces and parks to provide for all these developments coming on stream. The proposed Hotel Tower is ten stories high, which is out of line with original heights with the original approval This will impact on the views from buildings on Kent Street. This is the last remaining harbour foreshore space to be developed and should be focused on the benefit of the people of Sydney and not developers and a handful of</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			privileged investors. The proposed development is out of line with providing the people of Sydney civic amenity. The mass of the buildings are unsightly and will detract from our beautiful harbour.
428176	Joel Mondal	I object to it	I object to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) proposal. More public space in the form of parkland is required. Less building development. A reminder that Barangaroo is public land and overall benefit for the public must be a first priority.
428201	Paul Upham	I object to it	I write to object to the exhibited plans for Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). The entire project is unnecessary overdevelopment of public land not in the overall public's best interest. The mass and density of the proposed buildings are excessive and out of context with the local area. Views from Observatory Hill by the public, for now and future generations, are negatively affected. Traffic along Sussex Street into Hickson Road and Kent Street is already over-congested. The additional traffic generated by both this new Central construction and on ongoing basis, will negatively affect the surrounding neighbourhoods and the CBD as a whole. Scaling back of the proposed buildings is requested, along with an increase in public parkland.
428236	Angelina Upham	I object to it	I object to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) proposal. The scale of the proposed development is way in excess to what the original plans for Barangaroo were, when the area was first announced by NSW Government. The building development needs to be reduced and more parkland, for use by the public, created. Historic views from Observatory Hill and surrounding areas must be preserved at all costs.
428266	Charlotte Anlezark	I object to it	Please see attached objection letter.
428291	David Pescud	I object to it	As per attached document
428341	Philip Thalys	I object to it	Refer written submission attached
428366	Louisa Zhang	I object to it	<p>Louisa Zhang</p> <p>MODIFICATION APPLICATION Central Barangaroo AMENDED SECTION 75W MODIFICATION. Number MP06_0162-Mod-9</p> <p>To NSW Government</p> <p>I am responding to the request by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure for the modification application for Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>I OBJECT to this application</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>The Development plans for Central Barangaroo have changed dramatically since the first draft in 2007. The idea that approved plans can be continued to be modified and move far from the original concept is unacceptable for Government and for sustainable development of the area.</p> <p>While I see there has been some move from the previous modification - it appears on a closer look at the detail that it is just a juggling around and indeed there is no real difference. It still is locking the Rocks.</p> <p>This land is sacred and should be treated as such with any development that is planned.</p> <p>The new proposal to increase residential by 70 percent is not respecting the land. There is no need on this land to build more high luxury residential apartments add to the 800 or so that comprise Crown and the three towers of One Sydney Harbour. With occupancy of South Barangaroo incomplete with these towers and the commercial area well below pre-covid levels, the need is to bring people into the area with the right attractions of culture.</p> <p>The majority of apartments will likely be overseas investment properties, these owners will not be contributing to the culture of the city - they will be only contributing to the State revenue in terms of taxes and rates and to the developer for the cost of the building.</p> <p>It is short-sighted for any government to embark on such a development that will largely service the rich in accommodation and give the citizens and visitors a glimpse of what it is like to be rich.</p> <p>Sydney is a world class city for its architecture, and in particular that which serves culture. The Crown Tower and the other 3 Towers are monuments to celebrity architecture and only serve those here or live abroad as high-end financial investment</p> <p>The current proposal uses public land to build yet more of the same. The current proposal steals the iconic views of the Harbour and waterways from all public viewing points especially Observatory Hill, Agar Steps, Munn Reserve. Houses in High Street and Kent Street, committed by laws to follow heritage requirements, will not be seen from the site - blocked by the heights of the new proposals which extend so high the only visibility will be of existing high rise buildings to Circular Quay. In reverse these homes will be left with a skyline not of sky but of walls and roofs off buildings.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>This is not how a city of international interest should serve its people and its visitors.</p> <p>Go back to the original concept as the starting point.</p> <p>I OBJECT</p> <p>I have not made any political donations</p>
428386	David Pescud	I object to it	<p>Sydney Harbour belongs to all Australians, its foreshores must be protected for future generations.</p> <p>This development creates visual and physical blockages to and from the harbour.</p> <p>This proposal is another demonstration of the divisiveness of the current and previous administrations.</p> <p>In this development we see housing only for the elite, denying Sydneysiders, visitors and tourists access to the harbour. Destroying what is the worlds most beautiful marine precinct.</p> <p>This type of development can be placed anywhere in Sydney.</p> <p>It is my belief that this land should remain open for the future for all Australians.</p>
428396	Cathryn Hlavka	I object to it	<p>MODIFICATION APPLICATION Central Barangaroo AMENDED SECTION 75W MODIFICATION.</p> <p>Number MP06_0162-Mod-9</p> <p>To NSW Government</p> <p>I am responding to the request by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure for the modification application for Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>I OBJECT</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>As a resident of the Millers Point Heritage precinct since 2011 when we purchased our home under the terms of a 99-year leasehold, the development and development proposals for South and Central Barangaroo areas have changed significantly. We are part of a community, bound by Heritage Laws that protect the heritage integrity of our homes, and yet again we are fighting to protect the external integrity of the surrounding environment. We are privileged to be the custodians of the rich and diverse history of the earliest settlements in Sydney and any development must consider the impact this has on the precinct in the immediate vicinity but most importantly this development should focus on the NSW public and the millions of visitors that come to this city each year. This is the opportunity to make Central an international showcase of sympathetic development surrounding an historical precinct. The current proposal only looks to maximise short term gains in providing more high-end real estate development rather than what will be remembered well in the future. I hope that my voice will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>My objection will focus on three key changes presented in this modification as outlined in the summary of key changes from exhibited 2022 proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- revising the alignment of the proposed building envelopes to Hickson Park</li> <li>- modifying the road network to retain Barangaroo Avenue as a one way shared street and deletion of Barton Street as a permanent two way street</li> <li>- providing a new north/south laneway open to the sky and amend two east/west pedestrian links.</li> </ul> <p>As a long-term owner/resident of Kent Street in a single dwelling we have over the last 12 years experienced the development of South Barangaroo and the enormous impact to our quality of life and the environment. I am not alone - this has affected all residents from both high-rise apartments at 187, 183, 168, 161, 155, 127 Kent Street, the Langham Hotel, and single heritage dwellings from 125 Kent to Windmill Street on both sides of Kent Street. During the period of development of South Barangaroo and now with the Sydney Metro development, there has been no significant study on the impact of the enormous increase in vehicular traffic in both directions of Kent Street and Hickson Road,</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>The modification uses old data, makes untested judgements of traffic flows and pedestrian movements without any data or planning and modelling of how the current traffic chaos can be addressed in this new development.</p> <p>There are serious flaws in the proposals outlined above that do not consider at all the current impact South Barangaroo has and will have completed. And that is before considering the impact of Central. In South there are 800 new residential apartments to be occupied, and the postcovid back to the office in Towers 1, 2 and 3 will bring many more back into the area. Adding to this the new proposal anticipates 200 new high end residential apartments and a hotel and making this a high-density human and vehicular zone for residents without adequate access and exit plans in place in the proposal. This must be considered an absolute priority alongside the visitors anticipated to visit the Barangaroo Precinct.</p> <p>In the documentation provided in the Modification request I make the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The impact of the development modification on Kent Street, is only considered at the intersection of Napoleon Street as a main road to access and exit.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kent Street has access to the Bridge in both directions - from Napoleon and Margaret and from 168 Kent Street. The current traffic is chaotic and this plan neglects to have undertaken any modelling of this impact.</li> <li>2. Kent Street has a major emergency service in the Fire Brigade, and this does not appear to have been considered in any impact assessment.</li> <li>3. As Kent Street is residential from 187 Kent Street, the plan neglects to consider the impact of significant traffic chaos, including access for emergency vehicles.</li> <li>4. The challenges for residents including elderly and children will increase and the number of near misses and accidents that happen now will be affected by the flows.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kent Street is already a thoroughfare for party buses, bkie parades and hotted up sports cars.</li> <li>5. Kent Street and High Street provides street parking for residents which is already at a premium given the number of visitors and Barangaroo workers to the area and includes the large number of mobility/disabilities permits that occupy the majority of car spaces between 7am and 7pm.</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>- Hickson Road traffic flow is currently so inadequate it is hard to comprehend that this proposal does not address this as a major issue in the proposal. A serious flaw in the proposal is the premise that most people will arrive and depart by Metro, ferry, train or bus and the latter being three buses that currently use Hickson Road 311, 324,325. This fails to include the many thousands that walk from all directions and from The Rocks, Observatory Hill, the CBD, Circular Quay, Across the Harbour Bridge, Darling Harbour, Barangaroo Parkland and Walsh Bay etc. to the area</p> <p>- The modification proposal does not include any real time modelling of pedestrian flows. Serious study must be undertaken to ensure the safety and accessibility for all people is considered. Accessibility plans must be thorough and integrated into the proposal. Furthermore, the proposal does not provide any real connectivity between Hickson Road Bridge/cut and High Street and Kent Street. Indeed, with buildings exceeding the height of the cut and obscuring the view of the Heritage High Street architecture from below the current proposal has neglected all considerations of the heritage impact and value of the area.</p> <p>1. It is the Heritage value and a sympathetic merge of old and new that is most valued and will put Sydney firmly on the international map as a leader in heritage planning.</p> <p>- I note in the proposal that it included wind flow and view charts etc, but these are very outdated, and any studies undertaken prior to the completion of the Crown Tower and One Sydney Harbour buildings are included. The wind flows have been seriously affected since the construction of these buildings and any further building height and laneway access points may create hazardous conditions for people in the area. As it is on a windy day it is impossible to walk along Kent Street and at Gas Lane it is highly dangerous particularly for the frail and young.</p> <p>1. As our residence is west facing and at the Southern end of Central Barangaroo I have the full impact of the wind when it hits the many new towers in South Barangaroo. There has been a noticeable change for the worse with the 4 Towers that now make up the Southern skyline. The extension of the Central building footprint to extend across Barton Street will most likely exacerbate issue.</p> <p>2. The extension of the building envelope to Hickson Park and the 4 towers will completely block my access to natural skylight by 70 percent since construction started. I am not unique in this issue with residences on Hickson Road and lower levels on Kent Street losing almost all access. The assessments of impact of light and view</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>included in the proposal are taken from mid-level floors and have not been updated to reflect the almost completion of the Towers now constructed.</p> <p>I HAVE NOT MADE ANY POLITICAL DONATIONS.</p>
428416	Ann Sharp	I object to it	<p>I object to the proposed Modification for the following reasons:</p> <p>In particular, I do not support the proposed increase in GFA for private residential use.</p> <p>The development proposal will block views of the harbour from the heritage precinct of Observatory Hill and Millers Point (The Rocks).</p> <p>It would also obscure views of Observatory Hill and Millers Point from vantage points in Darling Harbour and surrounds.</p> <p>The Observatory Hill and Millers Point Precinct makes up one of Australia’s most important heritage landscapes and the water views are significant.</p> <p>“The views from Observatory Hill have defined its role in the nation’s history since 1788...Before colonisation Observatory Hill was a significant site for the Eora.”</p> <p>The heritage precinct of Observatory Hill and Millers Point continues to be a significant vantage point for many residents and visitors to Sydney.</p> <p>The bulk and scale of the development is out of context. The maximum building height should be lower than cliff line and historic houses to protect scenic views.</p> <p>Overshadowing will reduce solar access to adjoining areas. Within the harbour foreshore the loss of morning sunlight will result in a colder environs in winter.</p> <p>The high rise buildings of South Barangaroo are visually dominant and overshadow foreshore areas resulting in public spaces that are cold and bleak on a winter morning.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>In Central Barangaroo there should be no high rise or tall development north of the line which effectively divides Central and South Barangaroo.</p> <p>The public use and amenity of the land warrants a high priority in Central Barangaroo. The site occupies foreshore land at the base of a significant historical landmark.</p> <p>The proposed increased floor space for residential use should be substantially reduced. The residential use will privatise much of the land use and access to views.</p> <p>The proposal is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour REP requirements for the protection of public views.</p> <p>The modification does not satisfy fundamental principles in the concept plan that are required to protect public views, access to sunlight, and heritage areas.</p>
428451	Julia Hlavka-Zhang	I object to it	<p>Julia Hlavka-Zhang</p> <p>MODIFICATION APPLICATION Central Barangaroo AMENDED SECTION 75W MODIFICATION. Number MP06_0162-Mod-9</p> <p>To NSW Government</p> <p>I am responding to the request by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure for the modification application for Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>I OBJECT</p> <p>I would like to raise points for consideration that I see are problems in regard to this modification.</p> <p>1. It appears the development proposal is pushing ahead without consideration of the environmental impact that high-density development located along a peninsular of land will have on the water, air and land of the surrounding area. I have lived in Millers Point since before the development of South and North Barangaroo and I have watched with increasing concern how the development of Central has morphed from what was a celebration of Australia and its cultural heritages set amongst the heritage precincts of Millers Point and The Rocks, to what is</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>now a continuation of development of high end luxury apartments encroaching at a height that steals the views and aspects of water, hills and monuments that are Sydney history.</p> <p>Sydney is a world class city for its architecture, and in particular that which serves culture. The Crown Tower and the other 3 Towers are monuments to architecture that only serve those as high-end financial investments and there are already over 800 of those apartments. Is there a need for more?</p> <p>2. The current proposal uses public land to build yet more apartments. The current proposal steals the iconic views of the Harbour and waterways from all public viewing points especially Observatory Hill, Agar Steps, Munn Reserve. Houses in High Street and Kent Street, committed by laws to follow heritage requirements, will not be seen from the site - blocked by the heights of the new proposals which extend so high the only visibility will be of existing high rise buildings to Circular Quay. In reverse these homes will be left with a skyline not of sky but of walls and roofs off buildings.</p> <p>This is not how a city of international interest should serve its people and its visitors.</p> <p>Cities around the world know that Heritage mixed with Contemporary and sympathetic development reap the biggest rewards - building more and taking green space that everyone enjoys creates an unworkable environment to live, work and enjoy.</p> <p>3. I note there has been no consideration of the impact of traffic both human and vehicular in the proposal that is close to reality. Before anything further is done this would be a key point to address. Not only for the Safety of visitors but for the dedicated residents of the 2000 post code.</p> <p>I OBJECT</p> <p>I have not made any political donations</p>
428561	James Weirick	I object to it	<p>21 February 2024</p> <p>Director - Key Sites Assessment Planning &amp; Assessment</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>NSW Department of Planning &amp; Environment</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>MP 06_0162 MOD 9 (Revised) - Blocks 5, 6 &amp; 7, Barangaroo Central</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the revised plans and supporting documents submitted by Infrastructure NSW for MP 06_0162 MOD 9 in response to issues raised by government agencies, the City of Sydney and members of the public on initial release of the MOD 9 application in July 1922.</p> <p>I object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unacceptable impacts of the proposed building envelopes on the heritage values of the State Heritage listed Millers Point &amp; Dawes Point Village Precinct (SHR 01682) and the Millers Point Conservation Area (SHR 00884, LEP C35).</li> <li>- Unacceptable impacts of the proposed building envelopes on views to and from Observatory Hill Park (LEP 935).</li> </ul> <p>For my full submission, please see attached pdf.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Emeritus Professor James Weirick</p>
428721	Howard Victor Renshaw	I object to it	Submission Re Notification of Amended Modification Application - Barangaroo Concept Plan Approval (MP 06_0162 MOD 9) - please see the attached submission.
428796	Cormac Champion	I object to it	<p>To whom it may concern, and this should concern ever Australian.</p> <p>This modification proposal is worse than the last one. Not only does it still block the public from seeing the historic residential part of The Rocks at Millers Point from from the Harbour, but it does that by sticking three huge blocks of apartments in front of all that history.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>This location could house something iconic that all of Australia could be proud of and love to visit. Instead this proposal requests that the location house a hundred or so multimillionaires.</p> <p>When the lord mayor of Melbourne famously said that Sydney had a wallet where its heart should be this is exactly the sort of thing he was referring to.</p> <p>This current proposal is terrible, looks bad, will hide from view the history that looks good, and benefits the least amount of people as possible. It is the opposite of "public interest" and, the very definition of planning that tries to "never miss an opportunity, to miss an opportunity"</p> <p>Was this meant as a joke? Can we see the real proposal please?</p> <p>I object to the proposal, and so will everyone who see's central Barangaroo (if this stupid idea goes ahead) for generations to come.</p>
428876	John Sidoti	I object to it	<p>My major concern with the proposal remains the obstruction of views to the Western Harbour from Observatory Park and views to Observatory Park from the Western Harbour and the Balmain peninsula.</p> <p>These are very significant views in relation to the heritage not only of Millers Point but of Sydney generally. The preservation of these views is important in respect to heritage and townscape. It is a vital part of what makes Sydney and of Sydneysider' awareness of their city.</p> <p>It is difficult from the information supplied to determine what the appropriate maximum RL should be, however it is clear from the Mecone Response to Submissions Report Nov. 2023, Fig.7 page 20, that views of the Western Harbour will be all but totally lost as a consequence of the proposal.</p> <p>Building heights as set out in Mod 8 and in any planning instrument are maximum not minimum heights. Regardless of the maximum heights previously adopted the overlaying principle should be the retention and preservation of these intrinsic and characteristic Sydney views.</p>
428916	Patrick Hay	I object to it	I support the position put forward by the City of Sydney.
428936	Stephen White	I object to it	I object to the revised proposal.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>While it is an improvement on the currently approved plan with a higher tower at one end, the new proposal is generally too flat with RL35.0 roofline.</p> <p>There needs to be more variation in height to give some vitality to the skyline from a lower level.</p> <p>However the overall density is still too much and seriously impacts the views of residents along Kent and High Streets, as well as the views from Observatory Hill.</p> <p>Key views along High Street are lost.</p> <p>Please reduce the volume !</p>
429031	Michael Jermyn	I object to it	The area is becoming to full. There needs to be some more balance to the proposal. More parkland. It's a once in a generation opportunity to green the harbour further
429236	Simon Lesch	I object to it	As per attached document. Thank you
429261	Matthew Donnison	I object to it	As per attached document.
429301	Mani Houston	I object to it	<p>Enclosed herein is a detailed objection to the proposed development of Barangaroo Central by Aqualand, with particular regard to the adverse impacts on The Bond Apartments, 38 Hickson Road, where I, Mani Houston, am a resident.</p> <p>This objection letter outlines significant concerns and is formulated based on established legal precedents and planning principles that mandate consideration of view sharing and the assessment of view impact in development proposals. The absence of such considerations in the current proposal for Building 5 is alarming and warrants immediate attention and action.</p> <p>It is imperative that the perspectives and the daily living experience of the residents of The Bond Apartments are given due weight in the assessment of this development proposal. The enclosed letter details the specific areas where the current proposal fails to meet the reasonable expectations and rights of the residents.</p> <p>I trust that the Department of Planning and Environment will address these concerns with the seriousness they deserve.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Mani Houston</p> <p>Resident, The Bond Apartments</p>
429436	Jarvis Hinton	I object to it	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the current development proposal for Central Barangaroo, echoing the concerns raised by the City of Sydney Council. After thorough consideration, I firmly believe that these concerns warrant serious attention and consideration. Below are the key points of objection, which closely align with the Council's stance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Excessive Heights and Floor Space:</b> The proposed heights and floor space surpass acceptable limits, posing significant threats to public views and diminishing solar access to Hickson Park. Preserving these aspects is crucial for maintaining the area's aesthetic and environmental integrity.</li> <li><b>Preservation of Hickson Park:</b> Any reduction in the size of Hickson Park is deemed unacceptable. This green space plays an integral role in the community and must be safeguarded for present and future generations to enjoy.</li> <li><b>Residential Considerations:</b> While acknowledging the need for increased housing, it is imperative that such development offers tangible public benefits, including Affordable Housing and genuine open spaces. Furthermore, a diverse mix of apartment sizes is essential to cater to the diverse needs of our community.</li> <li><b>Community and Cultural Enhancement:</b> While supporting the inclusion of increased cultural floor space, there must be flexibility in its usage to ensure the activation of the precinct and accommodate various community needs.</li> <li><b>Public Open Space:</b> The proposed streets and laneways inadequately compensate for the loss of public open space. Prioritizing public places, such as parks, is essential for enhancing community well-being and recreational opportunities.</li> <li><b>Protection of Public Views:</b> Safeguarding significant public views, especially those between Observatory</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Hill/Millers Point and across the harbor, is imperative for preserving the area's unique character and identity.</p> <p>7. Sustainable Transportation: The development's sustainability objectives necessitate a reduction in basement areas and car parking rates to accommodate more greenery. Encouraging alternative transportation methods aligns with the proximity to a new Metro station and promotes a more sustainable urban environment.</p> <p>Given that Central Barangaroo represents the final opportunity for public land redevelopment at Barangaroo, it is crucial to ensure that the proposed development aligns with the community's values and aspirations. Therefore, I urge you to take these objections seriously and advocate for a revised proposal that addresses these concerns comprehensively.</p>
429661	Cameron Jackson	I object to it	<p>The footprint and scale is too great, and not consistent with the original objective, which was to provide good public access and amenity to the waterfront.</p> <p>If it is approved, it is the triumph of private greed over public good.</p>
429871	Graham Wilson	I object to it	<p>I strongly object to this proposal on both behalf of myself and my partner, Mary Moloney, joint owners of 56 Argyle Place Millers Point for multiple reasons as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal is aesthetically ugly and not in keeping with the heritage character of this part of Sydney, including the other buildings of southern Barrangaroo which has attractive architectural features</li> <li>2. The proposal is a major departure from the original concept plan for this area. This previous concept plan was for an attractive mix of public space, retail and residential building which was broadly acceptable to th4 local community with a balance of different uses and construction types and as such provided benefit to wider Sydney from these use options in one of its most significant areas of public lands</li> <li>3. The proposal substantially blocks sight lines to Millers Point and Observatory Park, such that the views from the harbour and Balmain to this locality are substantially impeded and even more significantly the views from Observatory Park and Kent St are greatly reduced. This view is characteristically viewed by many thousands of people per week, being a mix or all parts of Australia and particularly international visitors in the late afternoon, with typically several hundred per day visiting to enjoy this view. With this proposal the view from the western side of the park will be almost entirely lost, greatly reducing the visual amenity of the site and being likely to lead</li> </ol>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>to a substantial drop in visitor to this part of Sydney</p> <p>4. The style of this proposal is incompatible with the heritage values of this part of Sydney.</p> <p>I strongly encourage Infrastructure NSW and the Minister to reject this proposal as totally unsuitable for the site and rather to return to something closely in keeping with the original concept plan</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Graham Wilson</p>
429921	Jason Banton	I object to it	<p>I, Jason Banton, a resident of The Bond Apartments and a concerned member of our community, am writing to register my formal objection to the proposed Modification 9 to the Barangaroo Development Application. This proposed modification poses significant and detrimental impacts to the cultural, environmental, and visual aspects of our precinct, which I firmly believe are not in alignment with the community's best interests nor with the principles of sustainable and considerate urban development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Jason Banton</p>
430036	HY William Chan	I object to it	<p>21 February 2024</p> <p>The Director General NSW Department of Planning and Environment 4 Parramatta Square 12 Darcy Street Parramatta NSW 2150</p> <p>By email david.glasgow@planning.nsw.gov.au Dear Director General</p> <p>Letter of Opposition to Barangaroo Central and MP06_0162 /</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Modification 9 to Concept Plan</p> <p>I am writing to express my considered objection to the Modification 9 amendments to the Concept Plan for Central Barangaroo (Blocks 5, 6, and 7).</p> <p>First and foremost, the portrayal of Modification 9 on the Planning Portal in relation to the previously rejected and withdrawn 2022 application is deeply misleading. The purported numerical reductions are inaccurately framed as adjustments to a plan that never received planning approval. This lack of clarity in the project description misleads the public regarding the true implications of the proposed modification.</p> <p>Modification 9 perpetuates a troubling trend of distorting the planning process for this pivotal site. Since its inception with the original Concept Plan in 2007, the use of the discredited Part 3A planning pathway has resulted in a series of modifications that significantly deviate from the urban form and objectives outlined in the approved plan. This latest modification represents a significant departure from the site's original vision and demands a fresh application subjected to a comprehensive assessment process.</p> <p>As a concerned elected representative deeply invested in the liveability and heritage of our community, urban design excellence and public benefit outcomes, I urge you to consider the following points of objection.</p> <p>The proposed heights and floor space in Modification 9 remain excessively high, significantly impacting public views and solar access to Hickson Park. Such excessive development compromises the integrity of the surrounding area and diminishes the quality of life for residents and visitors alike. The proposal to increase the height of Blocks 5, 6, and 7 would sever the historic and culturally significant relationship between Sydney Harbour and Observatory Hill, obstructing crucial visual connections and setting a detrimental precedent for future development. These views contribute to the unique character and identity of our city and must be safeguarded for future generations of Sydneysiders to enjoy.</p> <p>While I recognise the importance of increased housing, particularly during a time of a housing crisis, it must be accompanied by tangible public benefits and amenity, including affordable housing provisions and genuine open spaces accessible to all. I advocate for a diverse mix of apartment sizes to contribute meaningfully to housing supply and accommodate a range of socioeconomic backgrounds within the community.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Modification 9 glaringly omits any allocation of public space designated for the City of Sydney, which is indispensable for fostering a coherent and interconnected public network. This stark absence contradicts the public interest and should serve as sufficient grounds for rejection. The proposal's disproportionate emphasis on private development, devoid of any substantiated public benefit, is particularly egregious, especially considering the prime location on Sydney Harbour, our city's most valuable public space. Hickson Park has been subject to a steady erosion of its integrity through previous modifications, resulting in diminished amenity and overshadowing. This green space is a vital asset to the community and must be preserved and enhanced rather than minimised. Modification 9 further exacerbates these issues, perpetuating the erosion of its public value, amenity, and functionality.</p> <p>The proposed streets and laneways in Modification 9 fail to adequately compensate for lost public open space. It is imperative that public places, such as parks and green areas, be prioritised and adequately provided for to maintain the quality of life and wellbeing of the community. The proposed treatment of Barangaroo Avenue as a mere private driveway severely undermines its critical function as an essential urban axis, pivotal for integrating the site with the broader cityscape. The proposed anti-urban configuration is wholly inappropriate and fails to fulfill the site's crucial public role in shaping Sydney's waterfront interface.</p> <p>The proposed 'plazas' suffer from a lack of separation from surrounding structures, severely restricting their visual prominence and subjecting them to overshadowing. Structured primarily as commercial ventures, these spaces neglect their broader obligation as integral components of the cityscape and public realm, falling significantly short of acceptable standards for urban design.</p> <p>I note the expansion of cultural production floor space within the precinct. However, I believe there should be flexibility in the designated use of these spaces to ensure the activation and vibrancy of the precinct. Allowing for various cultural and community uses will enrich the area and better serve the needs of residents and visitors alike. While the proposed community floorspace is disproportionately minimal and lacks meaningful public access, highlighting the project's disregard for community needs and public benefit.</p> <p>Basement areas and car parking rates must be significantly reduced to accommodate more greenery and promote sustainability objectives. Given the proximity to Sydney Metro City &amp; Southwest's new Barangaroo Station, private car usage should be actively discouraged in line with the development's sustainability goals and</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>to promote alternative modes of transportation. Furthermore, the proposed integration with Barangaroo Station lacks coherence and presence, suggesting a standalone structure on the Hickson Road frontage would be more appropriate, independent of the proposed development.</p> <p>The overarching planning approach for Barangaroo Central, including Modification 9, prioritises commercial interests at the expense of the public good, contravening established planning and urban design principles.</p> <p>I firmly believe that Modification 9 should be rejected outright due to its significant departure from the original vision, its adverse impacts on public spaces, and its failure to prioritise the public interest.</p> <p>I urge you to carefully consider the concerns raised and act in the best interest of our community, including the preservation of the cultural and heritage significance of Millers Point and Observatory Hill.</p> <p>Should you require further information, please contact my office on 02 9288 5922 or at <a href="mailto:WChan@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au">WChan@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au</a></p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Councillor HY William Chan RAIA City of Sydney</p> <p>BDesArch(DigitalArch)(Hons) MSc(ArchSustDes) DottMagArch CertASA DipASP RAIA PIA(Assoc) NSW Registered Architect 11229</p>
430156	Alex Mattea	I object to it	<p>It is frankly difficult to tell if the Minns government wants to match the previous Liberal governments in corruption, or is proposing Barangaroo Central now on the basis of its undeniable incompetence and stupidity.</p> <p>There is no need to object on any more basis than the theft once again of public land - as if the history of Barangaroo in relation to Crown wasn't already one of banana republic kleptocracy.</p> <p>The suggestion that multimillion dollar Barangaroo apartments will somehow relieve housing "shortages", when they will certainly be largely bought by offshoring foreigners (as much trophy RE is all over Sydney) and then</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>even kept vacant, is laughable and insulting to Sydneysiders. You need to cease taking dictation - and political donations - from developers and their lobby groups ("Urban Taskforce" etc).</p> <p>I should add that the Barangaroo Central proposal, like the fraudulent Sydney densification plan just dictated to councils, is the reason I will in 2027 for the first time ensure that no preference flows in my ballot paper to Labor. I have had enough of political corruption and incompetence, and the complete blurring of corrupt Right and copycat pseudo Left.</p>
430166	Maria Mattea	I object to it	<p>It is frankly difficult to tell if the Minns government wants to match the previous Liberal governments in corruption, or is proposing Barangaroo Central now on the basis of its undeniable incompetence and stupidity.</p> <p>There is no need to object on any more basis than the theft once again of public land - as if the history of Barangaroo in relation to Crown wasn't already one of banana republic kleptocracy.</p> <p>The suggestion that multimillion dollar Barangaroo apartments will somehow relieve housing "shortages", when they will certainly be largely bought by offshoring foreigners (as much trophy RE is all over Sydney) and then even kept vacant, is laughable and insulting to Sydneysiders. You need to cease taking dictation - and political donations - from developers and their lobby groups ("Urban Taskforce" etc).</p> <p>I should add that the Barangaroo Central proposal, like the fraudulent Sydney densification plan just dictated to councils, is the reason I will in 2027 for the first time ensure that no preference flows in my ballot paper to Labour. I have had enough of political corruption and incompetence, and the complete blurring of corrupt Right and copycat pseudo Left.</p>
430271	Josh Tirado	I support it	<p>I saw the 3D view of the area on maps and side by side buildings depicted on the mod 9 project barely block any view from the Observatory tower, plus tourists are barely looking in that direction, all they wanna see is the Harbour Bridge and Opera House, I support this project and I protested against the obscene allegations this project is getting.</p>
Late 1	Adrienne and Keith Tunnicliffe	I object to it	<p>Director, Key Sites Assessment Department of Planning &amp; Environment Locked Bag 5022 PARRAMATTA NSW 2124 MP06 0162 MOD 9 – Central Barangaroo Development</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>The government's revised plans in response to submissions opposing the proposed Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9), (as in its response to the huge public objection to the poorly planned development of Blackwattle Bay), shows the NSW government's appalling disrespect and disregard to any individual, community or professional group that objects to its plans to allow developers to maximise profit at the expense of public amenity. The only meaningful change to the original plan was the removal of the appalling tower. The tower was an indication as to how poor the whole concept plan is.</p> <p>This last segment of Barangaroo was claimed to be its civic heart! Where is the heart in the acknowledgement of Millers Point's working-class history through the replacement of public and affordable housing, which characterised Millers Point? Where is the heart in architecture that honours the heritage terraces and The Hungry Mile? Where is the protection of long sightlines to and from our Sydney Harbour Bridge, Observatory Hill, Millers Point and Dawes Point?</p> <p>Where is the beating First Nations heart with the provision of a Centre for Indigenous Culture and Art?</p> <p>The revised plan does not address these things.</p> <p>We object to the revised proposal on the following grounds: –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apart from removing the totally inappropriate tower, it has largely ignored any other requests for meaningful change to the plans.</li>   <li>• The heritage sightlines to and from the shoreline, public open spaces and from further afield, to Observatory Hill and the State Heritage-listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precincts would still be lost behind a wall of buildings up to 10 storeys high.</li>   <li>• It proposes to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on the Sydney Harbour foreshore. It doubles the floor space of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m<sup>2</sup>). This plan will not assist people trying to find an affordable home, or the housing crisis. The area is already packed with expensive hotels, luxury apartments and empty office towers.</li>   <li>• Instead of increasing the size of Hickson Park, it reduces it! It reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m<sup>2</sup> (i.e. divided by a factor of 10!). There is a great need for additional open space/parkland, including public sporting facilities, play space and community infrastructure to assist neighbourly and social interaction. Without this you cannot foster active communities.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Name	Position	Submission
			<p>This is publicly owned land. Public amenity, heritage and access should lead the planning process, not become an afterthought. Barangaroo Central, on the shores of our harbour, should become a place that all Australians can enjoy. It should be a place where we can proudly share our heritage and history with visitors and tourists.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the gross real estate overdevelopment of this public harbour foreshore and request that The Hon. Minister, Mr Paul Scully, reject it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

### Anonymous Public Submissions

Submission ID	Position	Submission
L6	I object to it	See attachment
L9	I object to it	See attachment
L18	I object to it	See attachment
Late 2	I object to it	As a resident of the Sydney CBD who frequently visits Barangaroo, I object to the proposed further development which is not in the public interest and has only adverse effects on the existing public areas and surrounding residential buildings through overshadowing, view blocking, sunlight reduction and additional vehicular traffic.
384726	I support it	So happy to see the tower removed and heights lowered. Well done. Looking forward to having more retail close to the Metro.
385326	I object to it	I strongly object to this MOD 9 - please read my attached submission
385606	I support it	<p>It's time we get on with this project! We can debate all of our lives about height, scale, traffic, parks, etc.</p> <p>The approval authority needs to quickly approve these plans so work can commence that promotes jobs, provides housing and keeps the NSW economy going.</p> <p>The revised proposal reflects a big compromise and should be supported on the following basis -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It generally fits within the allowable building envelopes</li> <li>2. The scale provides an appropriate level of development given the already built state of the area</li> <li>3. Plans connect well with the newly built public transport nodes</li> </ol> <p>One condition that should be placed on the developer is to ensure ONLY Australian registered architects are involved in the final design, documentation and execution of the project.</p> <p>The previous plan involved international architects who don't understand the Australian context or the desire of the Australian</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>community. As we can see from the new plans, led by an Australian registered Architect (SJB) there is great consideration placed on the height, scale and overall plans for the site.</p> <p>As a state government, we must promote local jobs, local design and the development of our local talent working on a once in a life time a critical city making project.</p>
386066	I object to it	The new plan is an improvement by removal of the tall tower, however, the proposed development is excessive in bulk and scale, and the impacts views to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill.
387421	I object to it	<p>This development execution is highly disappointing for such a prime site, reflecting a wasted opportunity. Those involved should be held accountable for the poor decisions that will affect future generations. Sydney deserves better. I recommend a complete overhaul, emphasizing real density and restoring the planned underground connection to the station with retail. The significance of the southern entrance/exit to the Barangaroo Metro Station cannot be understated, connecting seamlessly through Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>The initial proposal, emphasizing commercial with retail and an underground connection to South Barangaroo, was superior. Disregarding the explanation citing COVID-19's impact on work and shopping habits, the station corridor linking major office complexes demands a robust retail presence. Quality city center retail has proven resilient, and I believe the planners have underestimated the potential business from commuters.</p> <p>Reverting to the 2022 scheme, with the proposed underground retail connection and multiple entrances/exits to Hickson Park and Barton Plaza, would be a wise decision. The current direction has led to a loss of interest in the project, and the city deserves better planning.</p> <p>This project appears to cater to NIMBYs, resulting in a poor outcome for the city. It exemplifies the consequences of allowing various interests to shape planning without a strategic vision. Sydney deserves a better-planned development. Lastly, what happened to the Sydney Steps?</p>
389991	I object to it	<p>I write to register my objection to the Barangaroo Concept Plant (Mod 9). I acknowledge the reduction of Block 7 from 20 stories to 10 stories but object to the height being proposed for rest of the buildings.</p> <p>Millers Point is a heritage-listed historic precinct. It's importance in the story of Australian history is highly significant. The neighbourhood's historic worth is crucially linked to it's maritime past. The houses that are protected by our heritage laws were built by traders, ship's captains and stevedores. The cottages were lived in by wharf workers and their families and the pubs were</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>frequented by sailors. These buildings are very important and a vital aspect of protecting them is maintaining their connection to the harbour. The connection to Sydney Harbour is the essence of this historic maritime neighbourhood. The fact that Millers Point is still intact, with it's original buildings and unobstructed link to the harbour is a precious gift. As a fully preserved historic maritime neighbourhood of it's time, Millers Point is globally unique. It's value as a vital piece of Australia's heritage, which was very much maritime in nature, is priceless.</p> <p>We should maintain Millers Point's connection to the harbour for future generations - not destroy it permanently.</p> <p>I object to the height of the buildings proposed in this plan because they will act as a wall blocking off Millers Point from Sydney Harbour along its Western side. This block the view of the harbour, and feeling of connection with it, from the streets of Millers Point (High St, High Lane, Kent St at High Lane and Kent St at High St). The proposed height of the buildings will also obstruct the historically and culturally significant views west to the harbour from Observatory Hill, permanently damaging it's worth to Sydney and Australia.</p> <p>The height of the buildings at Central Barangaroo should be reduced to 4 stories to retain Millers Point's connection to the harbour. Wide gaps should be planned between the buildings west of High St and High Lane so that the view of the harbour from Kent st is not obstructed.</p> <p>I am a long term resident of Millers Point, with a long family association with the neighbourhood. My grandmother went to school at St Brigid's primary school, which is across the street from my home. My great grandparents lived in Merriman St, Millers Point and my great grandfather, Con Wallace, was a local organiser of the Seaman's Union of Australia and the local Federal member for West Sydney, the seat for Millers Point. It is from this understanding of Millers Point and it's history as well as a local resident and community member that I strongly object to the height of the proposed buildings which will cause this historically significant neighbourhood permanent and irreparable damage.</p> <p>May it be noted that I do not have any views of the harbour from my home. It is the loss of Miller's Point's overall connection to the harbour that I am concerned about.</p>
390566	I object to it	<p>The Mod 9 development appears to have ignored the concerns raised by the residential property owners of Millers Point and CBD via earlier submissions. All three buildings under the proposal remain too high with an excessive footprint. Views from Observatory Hill and heritage listed Millers Point are seriously impacted. Views earlier shared by the Millers Point and CBD residential property owners in reviewing Concept Plan stage has been ignored.</p> <p>I urge you to merge Barangaroo Central with Barangaroo Reserve to make a more visually attractive harbour front.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
391041	I support it	<p>As a local resident, I want to thank you to the Government for listening to the concerns of the public and sending the proposal back for a rework. The revised proposal with lower scale and more residential makes better sense.</p> <p>The traffic issue is still a real one that may need to be addressed because getting through the precinct and surrounds is currently a nightmare most times of day and this will make matters worse. That said, the reopening of Sussex St (hopefully with more than 2 lanes and the flow through of the streets in the new precinct will help).</p> <p>I think it has been in the works for too long so the developer should be encouraged to get on with it and complete the final precinct.</p>
391131	I object to it	<p>1) Improvements to the design, such as the removal of the 73m tower and the re-siting of the bridge from High Street to the lowest point of the High Street cutting, the new proposal for MOD 9 does NOT mitigate the problems raised in previous submissions.</p> <p>Commercial precedence is taking precedence over the benefit of the wider community of Barangaroo, Millers Point and Sydney.</p> <p>2) MOD 9 continues to misrepresent the building envelopes for Central Barangaroo that conform to the 8 Principles of the Concept Plan. It continues to present full height and massed depictions that do not account for the actual Concept Plan requirements e. g. for Block 7 that is made up of tall slender buildings with wide separation.</p> <p>3) All three buildings remain too high and overly massed; they do not conform to the Principles of the Concept Plan or the Conditions of Consent for MOD 8.</p> <p>4) Photographs and depictions of the impact of the proposed MOD 9 development are distorted by use of a wide angled lens and long focal length to minimise the impact of the development on heritage views and vistas.</p> <p>5) Block 6 has no resemblance to the Concept Plan creating a wind tunnel at unsafe wind speeds in the South Plaza.</p> <p>6) The proposed increase in the Block 5 footprint has already been rejected by the Planning Assessment Commission (PAC), and the connectivity of Hickson Park to the water is inadequate. The PAC rejected a 28m link and recommended 48m; only 32m is proposed.</p> <p>7) View sharing with Millers Point and CBD residents, as required by law under the Principles of the Concept Plan, is ignored. Water views from houses and all low to mid-level residential towers are totally eliminated. This brings loss of amenity and loss of property values. Yet consideration has been shown to Crown and Lend Lease regarding to loss of views. This demonstrates</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		indefensible discrimination against private citizens and unpardonable preferential treatment for powerful corporations.
391141	I object to it	See attached document with all objections.
391461	I object to it	Please refer to the attachment.
392166	I object to it	<p>This plan is too dense , too close to the bridge , too high and totally unnecessary as the area should not be a land grab by a developer.</p> <p>This development will end up being bought by wealthy and offshore people which does not assist out housing crisis .</p> <p>Further the density - read the number of parking spaces and apts is unnecessary for this location.</p> <p>The area should remain a very low &lt; 5 storeys to protect our harbour , the rocks and all surrounding harbour locations.</p> <p>As one of the last areas on Sydney harbour these box like structures are ugly and the plan should be withdrawn .</p>
392766	I object to it	<p>This development is offensive to the Rocks and Millers Point precinct. It is unnecessary adds o value to the community, the area or the city. It is not in line with the important heritage of the area. The infrastructure of the area already struggles with all the recent changes to road and traffic flows in and around the rocks. Pushing commercial traffic through residential area will result in further congestion.</p> <p>The government should rethink the best value use of this land for the broader Sydney community. Allowing more retail and hotel accommodation that is in o way sympathetic to the area is just poor short sighted leadership.</p>
396921	I object to it	<p>My objection is particularly directed at the proposed reduction in the size of Hickson Park to 1/10th of the original planned size.</p> <p>The reduction and obvious inference and obstruction of heritage sightlines from public open spaces to and from the foreshore</p> <p>That a cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct is being IGNORED.that building heights be gradually reduced as the development moves northwards towards Headland Park</p> <p>Doubling the size of the originally approved concept plan ( from 45,000 to 104,000) seems to offer negligible improvements for 'public good '</p> <p>Increasing the use of the area to more residential ( an increase of 75%) will fail to deliver on MANY grounds ( all of which the</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>developer will be aware of) ..while there is the new metro station in proximity you will have noticed the ROAD has remained unaltered in size, the congestion of road traffic .. all the changes in the city have only but increased congestion in The Rocks area.</p> <p>If you have to develop anything more in this precinct, then, for goodness sake develop a plan for access to it : road, water, rail. And don't seek to exacerbate the congestion.</p> <p>Surely, for the area to be of use, ease access ( in and out) needs to be front of mind.</p>
397431	I object to it	<p>The latest proposal for Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9)Central is not in keeping with the hopes and expectations of surrounding residents. The scale of the buildings is much too immense for the area they sit upon. Barangaroo is meant to be for the ordinary people, not the developers, and the Minns government has lost sight of what a beautiful site this could become. A site that offers opportunity to the public, not just those with enough money to buy up property there. The new towers currently being built behind the Crown Tower will bring in thousands of new residents which will cause much congestion of the Hickson Road area. Why add even further to the number of residents living in the same area. Why compound the mistake that has already been made with these ugly towers!</p> <p>The plans obliterate any desire to maintain the views and integrity of this historic area of Sydney. And what of the right of the long-term residents of Millers Point whose views will be severely compromised. What constitutes a loss of property values for residents is replaced with money in the pockets of the government and developers who have little concern for the welfare of residents currently living in this area and its cultural heritage. The developer has sought to double the size of the previously approved plan! When are they going to be told that this does nothing for the people of Sydney. Government approval cannot be given to such a blatant ruse from the developer.</p> <p>Hickson Park should be for all the people and would be welcome open space to residents living in this area, particularly those with young children, and for the many visitors to Barangaroo. Barangaroo Reserve is a wonderful area and the concepts for that should flow further into Central Barangaroo to make it an area that Sydney can be proud of. The foreshore is so beautiful and an amazing park here would rival the best in the world. Any further buildings should be minimal and serve the public, e.g. a low level supermarket. The metro station is the one good thing there however it looks terrible on the outside. Surely more thought regarding its aesthetics could have been incorporated.</p> <p>I urgently request that the minister of lands and Property, Steve Kamper, listen to the outcry from the people of Sydney and review this proposal with more care and concern.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		I certainly cannot abide a government that would destroy the opportunity to develop this land in such a way as shown in the current Mod 9 concept plan.
398391	I object to it	<p>Submission with respect to MP06 0162MOD9</p> <p>I own unit 1906 in Stamford on Kent, 183 Kent Street, Sydney (“SOK”).</p> <p>It is disappointing that the Barangaroo public GFA is being reduced by 40,000 sqm in order to increase the residential GFA by a similar amount. This will result in an overbuilding of the area with more wind tunnel effect, a loss of amenity, a loss of views for some existing residents, a negative impact on the views from Observatory Hill (and towards the Hill from the west). In short we will end up with a nasty looking urban mess which will add bugger all to Sydney’s standing as a truly great global city.</p> <p>Keep the developer to what has been approved. They are purely motivated by maximising their profit. Barangaroo already has plenty of residential space.</p> <p>I also think that turning Barangaroo Avenue into a one way street will cause major delays, especially when cars are lining up to enter the Crown Casino and the queue goes beyond the exit to Watermans Quay. This is currently already happening, which traps motorists while they wait for the queue to dissipate. Then, by removing Barton Street, this means that cars can only enter the Crown Casino from one direction, only making the situation worse. And peak hour travel will also become worse, with workers trying to exit the precinct, especially from International Tower 1. Then, when the three One Sydney Harbour towers open, will they too only be able to access their buildings from Watermans Quay?</p> <p>I believe this will become a major area of gridlock with potentially 1000’s of people needing to use it on a daily basis.</p> <p>I urge you to keep Barton Street in place, and to keep Barangaroo Avenue as a two-way street. Pedestrians already have more than adequate space at Barangaroo and don’t need more, especially if it makes the traffic worse than it already is. In short and stand your ground and don’t concede anything material to the developer.</p> <p>David Vaux AM</p>
399581	I object to it	This area should be left open for everyone to use. It's not necessary to build more apartments or retail. More cultural, public space is important and required. Don't build up the one last remaining historically significant areas of Sydney.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
399801	I object to it	<p>I wish to object to the proposed Amendment to Modification 9 of the Central Barangaroo Concept Plan.</p> <p>The amended plan still Blocks The Rocks</p> <p>Historical Heritage sight lines are lost</p> <p>The plan reduces the size of Hickson Park, which should in any case be 50% larger.</p> <p>The scale of the development is far too heavy a footprint for the site. The changes from Mod 9 are cosmetic and do no credit to Aqualand. They were far too extreme in the first place.</p> <p>Central Barangaroo is not the place for 150 luxury apartments and a hotel. It was originally conceived as the "civic heart" of Barangaroo</p> <p>Aqualand have presented a boring pancake of architectural style, not the modulated building heights envisioned in the original concept, with heights reducing towards the North</p> <p>Central Barangaroo is uniquely the last part of Sydney Harbour available for development. Is this the best we can do with such an iconic site?</p> <p>It simply pales in comparison to the aesthetic of the Headland.</p> <p>It would be like having just a hotel on the site of the Opera House.</p> <p>The Development is still Too Big and Too High and Too far from original concept.</p> <p>It lacks Vision and a sense of the Grand Asthetic demanded by a site of such significance to all Australians.</p> <p>The banal ugliness of this design failure should be rejected - and not foisted on future generations who will come to lament it.</p>
400086	I object to it	<p>I strongly oppose to the modified Barangaroo Concept Plans provided by NSW Infrastructure with the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This plan is against the concept in preservation of Barangaroo reserve.</li> <li>2. There seem to be no benefits for Dawes Point residents/local communities from increasing un-affordable luxury hotel/residential buildings in Barangaroo reserve.</li> <li>3. Bringing the benefits only for investors from overseas or corporation or developer or Aqualand who make profits from this development is unwelcome and is derailed from the concept to plan towns and cities for the people in NSW.</li> <li>4. The department of Planning and the Government Architect have their obligations to disclose the approved concept plan to the public to clarify uncertainty for local residents.</li> </ol> <p>Kind regards</p>
400781	I object to it	<p>This is still too high. Once we take away these views we can never get them back. I love looking over at the Rocks from Pymont for a piece of history. I'm not against growth or new buildings, but history still counts.</p> <p>Likewise, Barangaroo is only nice for people who can afford to eat or drink there. The parks and Observatory Hill are a piece of</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		Sydney where everyone can enjoy water views for free. They will be far less scenic when you've restricted that water view to those who can afford to visit the new building.
401236	I object to it	<p>I do not know if you got this submission last week as I did not get an acknowledgement so I am sending this again.</p> <p>!!! wish to object AGAIN!!!! To the proposed development in Barangaroo.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new submission doubles the size of the approved concept plan. As we all know, more changes will be submitted after the initial approval, like what happened with Lend Lease. Now a number of buildings being constructed.</li> <li>2. The new submission dramatically reduces the size of Hickson Park. It is ridiculous how little green space was required to be built by Crown and Lend Lease.</li> <li>3. I have not seen the actual plans, but if the plans are like Lend Lease the buildings will not have balconies, so the residents will have to use air conditioning all the time. How will this affect the grid? Surely this will be a big drain on the electricity grid.</li> <li>4. Why are developments allowed to be so high and as a result residents lose their view? In Port Lincoln for instance, developers cannot build and obstruct someone's view.</li> <li>5. Isn't there enough development already in Barangaroo? Why can't this new submission be low rise?</li> <li>6. The proposed development will reduce the views from the historic areas of Millers Point and from the water, views of Millers Point.</li> </ol> <p>Unfortunately the developer is not going to stop until they get what they want. The original Grocon plans were much more sympathetic to the area.</p> <p>Again, I am objecting to this proposed development.</p>
401361	I object to it	It still blocks such a beautiful heritage area from view. Also changes the gorgeous harbour landscape from observatory hill which is such an iconic view point for tourists and locals.
401376	I object to it	This proposal is not suitable for the beautiful site at Barangaroo. Not only does it block views to and from Observatory Hill, it is ugly and far from the original concept. Why can't the state government scrap ideas of building any towers on the site even if lower than the current modification 9? Think ahead 50 or 100 years and imagine a park on the site with easy access via metro and ferry for citizens to enjoy and benefit from physically, mentally and spiritually. Our apartment is in The Bond, 38 Hickson Rd, and whilst we will be hemmed in by the proposal we accept developers need to make a profit, but people should come first, not just our generation but the millions who follow us in the future. Anne Spencer
401501	I object to it	I object to the current proposal as am concerned about traffic congestion and the fact that heritage areas and the observatory are going to be obscured which is detrimental to Sydney's profile as a city with a historical past.
401541	I object to it	The Barangaroo plan is an insult to the people of Australia. How dare any group be allowed and what's more supported by politicians to build this monstrosity is a disgrace. We the people of Millers Point and Dawes Point have had to endure every

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>possible restriction to rebuild and preserve old historic buildings. Not only to endure noise, filth, traffic from other builds around us with no heritage respect. Not to mention our private money has been invested to turn this area into a living museum. In return everyone makes money from us who gave us no support. How can this development be considered without a plan for a decent supermarket? Then to encourage more traffic down Hickson Rd, Sussex St and Kent St. Who thinks up this stuff? What about consideration for new age technology to build a whole green clean build. Why arent the builds providing their own power, water and reducing urban heat sink effect. Everything is contrary against new build for the environment. No vision, dumb ass, lazy planning. Why is the government handing over this beautiful part of our city to more wealthy people who probably wont be living here full time. It's unbelievable that the government thinks this ok.</p> <p>Saving the best till last the loss of historic views, its sickening to think certain people support this and allow views to be destroyed forever for future generations. May Jack Mundy rest in peace his legacy appears to be of no value. More disrespect.</p>
401551	I object to it	I submit my objection to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) and ask that it be rejected as per the objections outlined within the Submission file I have attached.
401691	I object to it	<p>I object to the Concept Plan (Mod 9) as it still will look like an eye sore instead of the Jewel in the Crown of Sydney's foreshore for locals, Interstate visitors and Overseas Visitors.</p> <p>The Road is already a nightmare at times, trying to get North or South and more apartments with carpark space which was not on the first plan will make this much worse.</p> <p>It is an outrage that the public/community space has been so dramatically reduced, this was always supposed to be a new area for the public and visitors to enjoy.</p>
401711	I object to it	<p>I wish to object to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). I do so on the basis that this concept far exceeds the approved plan. I can see no public benefit to the modification to that plan, while I suspect there will be a financial gain for developers.</p> <p>A second reason for my objection is the deliberate obfuscation by both the developer and the State Government. This submission has not been accurately summarized, but the details are hidden in many documents. Instead, the summary showed the decrease from the previous plan, but did not detail any increases from the approved plan. This is duplicitous, and I could be construed to have been done with the intention of waste the time and energy of concerned citizens. I would urge the State Government and the Minister to consider if its planning process is conducted in the interest of voters or developers.</p> <p>The approved plan was a balance between the public interest and the developers' profits. I urge the State Government to hold the developers to the approved plan and disallow this modification.</p>
401736	I object to it	<p>The latest version does not deliver against the vision of providing "the civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo."</p> <p>The amendment to construct 150 additional apartments does not recognise the impact of traffic - already a major issue.</p> <p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>offering a negligible improvement in public benefit.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p>
401841	I object to it	<p>I oppose the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) primarily due to the excessive height and mass of the proposed buildings. These structures would significantly obstruct important views, such as those from Nawi Cove to Millers Point and the Sydney CBD, as well as views from tourist vessels on Darling Harbour to Observatory Hill and the Heritage Precinct.</p> <p>Furthermore, the plan neglects the legal requirement for view sharing with residents of Millers Point and the Sydney CBD, favouring the interests of corporations like Crown and Lend Lease over those of private citizens. This unequal treatment not only disregards the principles of fairness but also undermines the well-being and property values of affected residents.</p> <p>Additionally, the already existing traffic congestion in Barangaroo South, coupled with the anticipated population increase from developments like One Sydney Harbour, will only worsen with the implementation of Mod 9. The inadequate local traffic infrastructure cannot support such a significant increase in activity, further burdening the Sydney CBD.</p> <p>Given these concerns, I advocate for the abandonment of the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) and instead propose extending the Barangaroo Reserve to cover the entire Barangaroo Central area. This alternative approach would mitigate the disruptive effects of the concept's excessive scale on current residents and promote a more sustainable and harmonious urban environment.</p>
402476	I object to it	<p>The modified proposal is reducing the size of Hickson Park and reducing the amount of community space for 28,000 to 2800m2. The proposal is now seeking to build another 150 new apartments and a hotel which was previously allocated to be the civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo.</p> <p>It appears the applicant has ignored the requests to represent the original concept plan and the application has changed from a mixed use retail office and residential proposal to primarily residential up to 75% which of course will fail to deliver the key principle of being the civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo.</p> <p>We have one chance to develop this important site on our harbour and not to over develop this important site. Therefore I strongly object to the revised Mod 9 plan.</p>
402546	I object to it	<p>As far as I am concerned, there is far too much development in Barangaroo already. I think the whole area should be a park!! But that won't keep the greedy people happy!!</p> <p>The original proposal of three levels was acceptable to the community so why can't it just be that!! A huge number of people use the existing space already, so with hundreds moving into Barangaroo &amp; once the station opens, there will be more people. I strongly opposed the new development.</p>
402926	I object to it	<p>Bob Carr committed to keeping a working harbour. Since his broken promise every step from a global competition winner being junked to change in scope beyond each approval this a saga of developers greed and public administration ineptitude. ENOUGH</p>
405141	I object to it	<p>As a resident to this local Millers Point area, I am against the proposed 3 buildings being built in Central Barangaroo. It still blocks Observatory Hill and Millers Point, and will block the Langham Hotel's view where I run retreats for my small business.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>The harbour views of The Langham Hotel are a prime reason that I choose to hold my retreats at this venue because of the light and views out over the water.</p> <p>I also do not wish to see the school and historical terrace houses in High Street having their views and light blocked, and the vista from the foreshore back up to Millers Point and Observatory Hill being blocked. The gaps between the buildings does not remediate these issues.</p> <p>My recommendation would be to put forward a development proposal that keeps in line with the approved concept principles, especially following the existing dipping heights of the asphalt road of High Street as the maximum height for any new development/s in this space (or ideally, even lower than the pavement of High Street). And ideally keep it as a community space as was originally intended. The development should not be required to "cover the cost" of the Barangaroo Metro Station - that is what my taxpayer dollars are for.</p> <p>The Crown Barangaroo Tower sticks out like a sore thumb and the entire area is becoming a major wind tunnel due to all the new high rises being developed along this Barangaroo space.</p> <p>I do not believe the proposed residential buildings will improve housing affordability in the current crisis - they will be exclusive and premium-priced. New residences will also worsen traffic congestion in the area.</p> <p>This is the last great piece of harbour foreshore in the area and we should be using it for public benefit.</p>
406036	I object to it	I object to more high rise buildings going up in Barangaroo, when the original plans were for green belt
406251	I object to it	The height of rl 35 is the equivalent height of the observatory hotel which is way too high. Apart from destroying heritage view the overshadowing caused by the excessive height will impact many existing rocks residences and will impact on the public park facilities in Burangaroo. I do not understand why we deviated from the original density in mod8/9 plan. Building 7 needs to be removed and other buildings reduced by 3 levels. Too high and too large.
407806	I object to it	The whole complex will continue to stain the government with corruption. Barangaroo was supposed to be parks not buildings. Shame on the NSW Government.
407836	I object to it	Stop this greed and return the park to the people
407851	I object to it	Why do you continue to get involved in corruption - build trust back into Government and stop the complex and any other buildings on Barangaroo
408176	I object to it	It's a beautiful place, embodies and captures the old and the new harmoniously. I'd be such a shame to see it go. Stop!!
408936	I object to it	<p>Blocking heritage sightlines from public spaces and Millers Point and Dawes Point.</p> <p>Reducing community space. No graduation of heights to the water and northern end.</p> <p>The Rocks area belongs to the people of NSW not the developers.</p> <p>Central Baranagroo was to be the cultural and civic heart of Barangaroo.</p> <p>With all the road closures where is the traffic going with more cars in these apartments .</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>Where is the pedestrian link from Millers point to Central Barangaroo ? No respect for the High Street Sandstone wall .</p> <p>This is an important piece of Sydney foreshore land that deserves a beautiful low rise building of merit such as the opera house , not another apartment BLOCK that BLOCKS .</p>
409211	I object to it	<p>I object to the revised MOD 9 proposal and wish to make the following comments:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Why is there an increase of the GFA to 104,000 sqm, especially an increase in the heights of the buildings that well exceed the approved Concept plan.</li> <li>2) This height of Block 5 will affect public and private views on the western side. This has not been considered as in the proposal, the only mention are residences on Level 15 and above. Why is there no mention of loss of views (public &amp; private)?</li> <li>3) Public view from Gas lane is significantly narrowed. I see many local and tourists stop right at the top of Gas lane to admire the western views of Crown Towers and the western sea views.</li> </ol>
409251	I object to it	<p>I strongly object to this proposal as it is going to block our heritage not only for myself but for all the people who pass on a ferry that can see the rocks area. It will hide our history. it seems to be a very greedy area for developers and Sydney is not going to benefit from it.</p>
409286	I object to it	<p>I wish to strongly object to the revised MOD9 proposal.</p> <p>While some improvements (like removal of the Tower) on the northern end is good, there is still much work to be done to get back to the approved CONCEPT PLAN.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction in the height of the blocks (in particular 5) to be at or below the BOND.</li> <li>- Reduction in the GFA to be in line with the approved CONCEPT PLAN</li> </ul>
409451	I object to it	<p>I highly object to the revised Mod9</p> <p>1, It STILL BLOCKS THE ROCKS AND HERITAGE LISTED BUILDINGS IN MILLERS POINT AND DAWES POINT</p> <p>The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</p> <p>The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</p> <p>The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</p> <p>A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the "approved concept plan" as a base line is. Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.</p> <p>Still too big. Still too high.</p>
410226	I object to it	<p>I have noticed recently that Observatory Hill has become, or maybe always was, a popular spot to view the sunset for overseas tourists. I know this because I am asked countless times each week for directions to Observatory Hill as maps do not cope with the area. The majority of these tourists are young adults.</p> <p>It would therefore be a grave mistake to destroy yet another popular landmark of our beautiful city just for the sake of development.</p> <p>The view west from Observatory Hill is therefore not just for the locals, it's for everyone Australia wide and overseas.</p> <p>Redacted</p>
411121	I object to it	<p>I am writing to object to the increased density in the area from the pre approved zoning in the area. Currently there is already an existing traffic problem on barangaroo Avenue with cars constantly dropping off guests at the crown and the queue can extend the congestion right up to harbour street in Haymarket. With another 800 something units settling in One Sydney harbour the traffic jam between barangaroo Avenue and also Hickson road will be increased tenfold. Ambulances won't be able to get into the area with the one lane roads on both directions on each street. The complete lack of planning is deplorable. Every Friday, traffic is at a standstill with cars queuing up from Hickson street onto Napoleon street to Kent street to the harbour bridge. Nothing moves. Please reconsider having so many more residential units in the area. The retail and commercial are fine. There is more needed in the city to bring life back after CV. But no more traffic please.</p>
411401	I object to it	<p>Objection to Barangaroo Development Plan - Mod 9</p> <p>As I did not receive an acknowledgement that the .pdf file setting out my Objection to Barangaroo Development Plan - Mod 9 had</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		been successfully submitted via this portal either to the email I provided or from this web page, I was advised on 9 February to resubmit.
411471	I object to it	See attached. There remains too much shadow in Hickson park and into Hickson Rd/Sussex street. Barangaroo Ave should be southbound traffic only, greater drop off/pickup points are needed on Barangaroo Ave and Hickson road. as well as retaining/providing a covered walkway to the Metro station from South Barangaroo. greater set down and pickup points on Hickson Rd and Barangaroo Ave are required, as well as provision for future light rail.
412201	I object to it	The community has waited 10+ years for Barangaroo Central. The wait deserves huge community amenity. Please reconsider more community use notably a theatre and community space. Please bring a substantial take on your 'Sydney steps' concept. The steps were a good place setter and an anchor to bring people for meeting etc. Please also reconsider the connection to the metro - this needs to provide ample connection undercover to Barangaroo south. This is the middle of the city in a huge urban renewal area that we've been waiting a decade for - the plans need to reflect this. Let's go big! Thankyou
412286	I support it	I think it's a mistake that the Sydney Steps have been removed from the masterplan. They need to be included in order to create a sense of place and a defining quality that separates it from other parts of Sydney. The current plan is quite generic looking and basically looks like another version of King Street Wharf which is disappointing. Sydney deserves better and after 12 years of nothing happening on this site I'm hoping the NSW Govt actually delivers something spectacular for the community and doesn't build something bland just to save costs. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to rejuvenate this part of town. Now hurry up and construct something worthy of this great city!
412321	I am just providing comments	The exit for the Barangaroo metro station needs to be refined. The proposed design is too close to the other (soon-to-be open) exit and is not oriented to attract more users from the south-end of Barangaroo. A perfect outcome would be one similar to the proposal with Scentre's involvement where the exit is much closer to the office towers and have underground retail.
412381	I object to it	Barangaroo Concept Plan (Modification 9) Objections to the Revised Modification 9 There are many reasons why I object to the Revised Modification 9. Many are the same as my objections to the initial Modification 9 which I have appended to these objections. This is because little has changed! Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill are still blocked. Historic Millers Point views from Balmain, Pyrmont and Darling Island are still blocked. Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour are still blocked. The proposal is still too big and still too high.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>This is well demonstrated by Figure 83 from Appendix D View and Visual Impact Assessment (Part 1) to the Response to Submissions Report. The picture shows the impact of the new proposal from Ballarat Park on Darling Island. And this is without the proposed landscaping on top of the buildings! The views from Balmain, Pyrmont and Darling Island to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are blocked, and to the Harbour Bridge are mostly obscured.</p> <p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m<sup>2</sup>), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little. Of course, the developer misleadingly says that it has reduced the total increase in GFA from 144,355 m<sup>2</sup> to 104,000 m<sup>2</sup> because it defines approved concept plan, not as the original approved concept plan from 2006 but as the so-called approved concept plan after MOD 11 (October 2020). The developer has ignored requests to represent the original approved concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</p> <p>The “approved concept plan” promulgated by the developer is based on legal technicalities rather than the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High Street sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal. The Millers Point Precinct is part of Sydney and Australian history and must be protected for its unique heritage. Central Barangaroo must not be allowed to become an eyesore like South Barangaroo.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 2,800 m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</p> <p>I express my opposition to the Revised Modification 9 in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>12 February 2024            Barangaroo Concept Plan (Modification 9)            Objections to Modification 9            There are many reasons why I object to Modification 9. I list some of them here.            Heritage            The Millers Point Precinct is part of Sydney and Australian history and must be protected for its unique heritage.            Governments and developers have tried over the years to destroy this heritage. In the 1970s, the National Trust, trade unionists</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>and community groups successfully worked together to stop government-driven high-rise development in The Rocks and Millers Point. Now, 50 years later, the NSW Government and developers are trying again. Their greed has no bounds. This overdevelopment must be stopped once again.</p> <p>Modification 9 completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point and must be rejected for this reason alone.</p> <p>Use of Public Land</p> <p>The site the subject of this application is owned by the State of New South Wales and operated on its behalf by the Barangaroo Delivery Authority. It is public land!</p> <p>The NSW Government’s own State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021 has aims for the Sydney Harbour Catchment which include ensuring that the catchment and foreshores of the Harbour are recognised, protected, enhanced and maintained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) as an outstanding natural asset, and</li> <li>(ii) as a public asset of national and heritage significance,</li> </ul> <p>for existing and future generations.</p> <p>To achieve these aims, the Policy adopts the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Sydney Harbour is to be recognised as a public resource, owned by the public, to be protected for the public good,</li> <li>(b) the public good has precedence over the private good whenever and whatever change is proposed for Sydney Harbour or its foreshores,</li> <li>(c) protection of the natural assets of Sydney Harbour has precedence over all other interests.</li> </ul> <p>I do not need to go through these line by line for it to be seen that Modification 9 is clearly in breach of every one of these principles.</p> <p>The Original Concept Plan of 2007 respected these principles.</p> <p>Views from and to Observatory Hill</p> <p>The View and Visual Impact Assessment (December 2021) accompanying the Modification 9 application is inadequate and misleading. It cannot be relied upon. As its authors from AECOM admit, it “has been prepared based on the Client’s description of its requirements”. AECOM may also have relied upon information provided by the Client and other third parties to prepare this document, some of which may not have been verified.”</p> <p>Misleadingly and deceptively, the View and Visual Impact Assessment compares the proposal with what it calls the “Approved Concept Plan” which it says is the most recently approved plan: MOD 11. It is deceptive because the proposal ought to be compared with the Original Concept Plan approved in 2007. The latter made it clear that any future development had to retain the views of Observatory Hill from public spaces on opposite foreshores, including the Pyrmont foreshore where I live.</p> <p>Modification 9 obliterates the views from Pyrmont, Darling Island and Balmain. The low-rise residential setting of the significant</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>heritage Millers Point streetscape will cease to be visible from these areas.</p> <p>Modification 9 also blocks the views of the western Harbour from Observatory Hill and Millers Point. These views have been seen for thousands of years. The NSW Government has no right to obscure them and forever. This photo shows my current view. Should Modification 9 proceed, I will not be able to see Observatory Hill, the Millers Point historic housing or the Harbour Bridge. People on Observatory Hill or at Millers Point will not be able to see Pyrmont and surrounds.</p> <p><b>Bulk/Scale</b> The buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, with insufficient articulation, setback, and separation. They are an urban planning disaster.</p> <p><b>Traffic and Parking</b> The assessment of how traffic will leave Central Barangaroo and travel into Millers Point and Walsh Bay is inadequate. These residential areas will be adversely affected by excess traffic and out-of-area shoppers parking in their narrow streets. Modification 9 offers no additional car parking. Rather, it seeks to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road despite planning a 28,000 sqm retail development.</p> <p><b>Hickson Park</b> The NSW Independent Planning Commission increased the size of Hickson Park to improve its amenity. Modification 9 seeks to reverse this while at the same time creating a park which will be overshadowed in winter.</p> <p><b>Northern Residential Tower</b> The proposed tower at the northern end of Central Barangaroo will be an eyesore comparable to Blues Point Tower. It is totally out of keeping with its surrounds: Nawi Cove, the Millers Point heritage streetscape, Observatory Hill, and the Barangaroo Headland Park. It has no merit as a standalone building. It will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land.</p> <p><b>Finally</b> In opposing Modification 9, I echo the words of my local Member of Parliament. Alex Greenwich, MP, Member for Sydney: Central Barangaroo could be a world-class unique attraction enjoyed and celebrated by locals and visitors near and far. But if this proposal is approved, it will leave a second-rate legacy for future generations. I express my opposition to Modification 9 in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>Redacted February 11th 2024</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
412401	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <p>The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</p> <p>It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Â· The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>Â· The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>Â· The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>Â· The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>Â· A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>Â· The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>Â· The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul>
412411	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <p>The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</p> <p>It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Â· The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>Â· The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>Â· The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>Â· The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>Â· A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>Â· The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>Â· The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul>
412501	I object to it	<p>1) The site in question is the last significant vacant harbour side land and it is publicly owned land. Any development on this site deserves to be one which can be used and accessed by all, a legacy to the future, and possibly a visionary architectural structure that can inspire pride (as with the Opera House).</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>2) The construction of a series of apartment buildings and hotel will do nothing for the people of NSW except for the small number of people that will buy at this location. We do not need more apartment buildings.</p> <p>3) Any development at such a unique and significant site should be referred to the independent planning commission.</p> <p>4) At the very least, any development at this site should adhere to the guidelines in Approved concept plan 2007 regarding building density &amp; height.</p> <p>If the Minns Government does not stop this disgraceful land grab by this developer they do not deserve to serve the NSW people and this will be demonstrated to them at the next election. This greed cannot be allowed to happen.</p>
412511	I object to it	<p>1) The site in question is the last significant vacant harbourside land and it is publicly owned land. Any development on this site deserves to be one which can be used and accessed by all, a legacy to the future, and possibly a visionary architectural structure that can inspire pride (as with the Opera House).</p> <p>2) The construction of a series of apartment buildings and hotel will do nothing for the people of NSW except for the small number of people that will buy at this location. We do not need more apartment buildings.</p> <p>3) Any development at such a unique and significant site should be referred to the independent planning commission.</p> <p>4) At the very least, any development at this site should adhere to the guidelines in Approved concept plan 2007 regarding building density &amp; height.</p>
412621	I object to it	<p>WE ARE NOT THERE YET and NEED CREATIVE THOUGHTFUL MINDS THAT SHAPE CHARACTER INTO OUR BARANGAROO.</p> <p>“Knowing what is right and not doing it, Is as bad as- knowing what is wrong and doing it.”</p> <p>ANOTHER HOTEL NEXT to THE CROWN!!!!.. on the edge of our Harbour is just deliberate immaturity. With no RL at all on plan!! Like a sore thumb and completely out of balance (Just because what!!)</p> <p>NSW Government (2012) BARANGAROO VISION..(Brochure) “Barangaroo will instill pride and inspire innovation. It will be a global reference point of design excellence and sustainability.” “The CENTRAL portion of BARANGAROO will be a vibrant, active and publicly accessible Harbourside precinct.”</p> <p>Paul J Keating quotes: ‘In the cities that are dense, it is the public spaces that need to be fought for.’ “This beautiful site will never be held hostage to commercial interests”-</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>“Barangaroo and the headland park are going to be there for future generations of Australians”.</p> <p>WE MUST STAND SENTINELâ€¦as we all represent understanding - resident, worker or visitor approval to the highest creative, discrete standards of design excellence, for our finishing touches dignifying Barangaroo through view sharing and clustering of activity.</p> <p>NSW Government - Barangaroo Delivery Authority:  “CENTRAL Barangaroo will be a place for all Sydneysiders to enjoy with a mix of public parkland and open space, shopping, cafes, restaurants, commercial and residential space.”  “Great place-making is about creating a place where the spirit moves you.”  “CENTRAL Barangaroo will be an exemplar of urban life.  “CENTRAL Barangaroo will be the public and cultural heart of the development -</p> <p>The CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL ..in April 2020 wrote key changes proposed for central Sydney.  “The City of Sydney has updated its planning framework to ensure future growth ONLY occurs where it RESPECTS our SPECIAL places, spaces and parkland.  Key changes include changes to ensure that any new development achieves design excellence through a revised design policy.”</p> <p>“Remove the extra incentive for residential floor space.  Introduce a new provision to PRESERVE SIGNIFICANT VIEWS from public places by restricting encroachment of tall buildings.”  DO NOT make “The Hungry Mile” into The Greedy Mile”.  You have the CENTERPIECE of BARANGAROO in your hands. Huge responsibility and there is no hurry.  ‘THE GREATER THE DIFFICULTY- THE GREATER THE JOY’</p>
413381	I object to it	<p>I object to the development proposed. The adopt as my reasons for doing so the reasons set out in the submission of X that I have uploaded as part of this submission. I add that given the present public debate which is presently happened about increased density in Sydney and the decrease in open space it beggars belief that the subject proposal should reduce open space in a prime area of Sydney to the extent that has happened with the proposed modification compared to the original intent. The details are set out in the attached submission.</p> <p>The wanton destruction of such an historical part of Sydney by excessively large developments should not be permitted and this proposed development is excessively large in scale and built. From the montages provided by the developer it is clear that the proposed buildings form an impenetrable wall with no variation in height set backs or scale.</p> <p>This blight on the beauty of our harbour and the reduction in public open space to benefit a developer should not be allowed. The</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		reduction if not substantial elimination of views from the historic Rocks, Pyrmont and Balmain amongst other places and their replace with a wall of buildings with no architectural significance or value if permitted will be a decision that ranks with the construction of the Cahill Expressway and Blues point tower as a blight on the harbour and harbour visitors of a permanent nature.
413566	I object to it	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed development at Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>The expansion of the approved concept plan to double its size without a proportionate increase in public benefit is concerning, and the ramifications of this development are deeply troubling for the surrounding community. Below are several key points outlining the detrimental impacts of the proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic Congestion and Infrastructure Strain: The addition of more apartments and commercial spaces exacerbates existing traffic congestion issues, particularly in areas like Hickson Road and the casino precinct. The current infrastructure is ill-equipped to handle the influx of residents and visitors, leading to further gridlock and safety concerns.</li> <li>2. Reduction in Public Space: The modification to the proposal significantly reduces the size of Hickson Park and diminishes the amount of community space available, undermining the quality of life for residents and visitors alike.</li> <li>3. Excessive Height and Density: The proposed Block 5 hotel, standing at 42.45 meters, is unacceptably high and contributes to the excessive density of the plan. This height not only disrupts the visual landscape but also encroaches upon the sunlight and water views enjoyed by the lower floors of surrounding buildings, notably affecting the iconic views of Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> <li>4. Loss of Heritage Sightlines: The proposed development jeopardises the heritage sightlines from public spaces such as Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct. These sightlines, which are integral to the historical and cultural significance of the area, will be irreparably lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>5. Misalignment with Civic and Cultural Vision: The shift towards a primarily residential development contradicts the original vision of Central Barangaroo as the "civic and cultural heart" of the area. The proposed luxury apartments and hotel encroach upon valuable foreshore space that was intended for public use and cultural enrichment.</li> <li>6. Lack of Pedestrian Connectivity: The absence of important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo neglects the need for cohesive urban planning and community integration. These connections, crucial for fostering a sense of belonging and accessibility, must be prioritised in any development plan.</li> </ol> <p>In light of these concerns, I urge you to reconsider the proposed development and prioritise the preservation of heritage, public space, and community well-being.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objections to this development proposal</p>
413586	I object to it	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed development at Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>The expansion of the approved concept plan to double its size without a proportionate increase in public benefit is concerning, and the ramifications of this development are deeply troubling for the surrounding community. Below are several key points outlining the detrimental impacts of the proposed development:</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>1. Excessive Height and Density: The proposed Block 5 hotel, standing at 42.45 meters, is unacceptably high and contributes to the excessive density of the plan. This height not only disrupts the visual landscape but also encroaches upon the sunlight and water views enjoyed by the lower floors of surrounding buildings, notably affecting the iconic views of Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>2. Loss of Heritage Sightlines: The proposed development jeopardises the heritage sightlines from public spaces such as Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct. These sightlines, which are integral to the historical and cultural significance of the area, will be irreparably lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>3. Reduction in Public Space: The modification to the proposal significantly reduces the size of Hickson Park and diminishes the amount of community space available, undermining the quality of life for residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>4. Misalignment with Civic and Cultural Vision: The shift towards a primarily residential development contradicts the original vision of Central Barangaroo as the "civic and cultural heart" of the area. The proposed luxury apartments and hotel encroach upon valuable foreshore space that was intended for public use and cultural enrichment.</p> <p>5. Traffic Congestion and Infrastructure Strain: The addition of more apartments and commercial spaces exacerbates existing traffic congestion issues, particularly in areas like Hickson Road and the casino precinct. The current infrastructure is ill-equipped to handle the influx of residents and visitors, leading to further gridlock and safety concerns.</p> <p>6. Lack of Pedestrian Connectivity: The absence of important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo neglects the need for cohesive urban planning and community integration. These connections, crucial for fostering a sense of belonging and accessibility, must be prioritised in any development plan.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I urge you to reconsider the proposed development and prioritise the preservation of heritage, public space, and community well-being. Any future plans for Central Barangaroo must align with the principles of sustainable urban development and inclusive design, ensuring that the interests of residents and stakeholders are adequately represented and protected.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objections to this development proposal. I trust that you will make a decision that serves the best interests of the community and preserves the integrity of this cherished area.</p>
413601	I object to it	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed development at Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>The expansion of the approved concept plan to double its size without a proportionate increase in public benefit is concerning. Below are several key points outlining the detrimental impacts of the proposed development:</p> <p>1. Traffic Congestion and Infrastructure Strain: The addition of more apartments and commercial spaces exacerbates existing traffic congestion issues, particularly in areas like Hickson Road and the casino precinct. The current infrastructure is ill-equipped to handle the influx of residents and visitors, leading to further gridlock and safety concerns.</p> <p>2. Reduction in Public Space: The modification to the proposal significantly reduces the size of Hickson Park and diminishes the amount of community space available, undermining the quality of life for residents and visitors alike.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>3. Excessive Height and Density: The proposed Block 5 hotel, standing at 42.45 meters, is unacceptably high and contributes to the excessive density of the plan. This height not only disrupts the visual landscape but also encroaches upon the sunlight and water views enjoyed by the lower floors of surrounding buildings, notably affecting the iconic views of Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>4. Loss of Heritage Sightlines: The proposed development jeopardises the heritage sightlines from public spaces such as Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct. These sightlines, which are integral to the historical and cultural significance of the area, will be irreparably lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>5. Lack of Pedestrian Connectivity: The absence of important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo neglects the need for cohesive urban planning and community integration. These connections, crucial for fostering a sense of belonging and accessibility, must be prioritised in any development plan.</p> <p>6. Misalignment with Civic and Cultural Vision: The shift towards a primarily residential development contradicts the original vision of Central Barangaroo as the "civic and cultural heart" of the area. The proposed luxury apartments and hotel encroach upon valuable foreshore space that was intended for public use and cultural enrichment.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider the proposed development and prioritise the preservation of heritage, public space, and community well-being.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objections to this development proposal.</p> <p>thanks</p>
413716	I object to it	I object to the submission. The overloaded and overwhelming structures already clog the neighbourhood with traffic each day and you cannot get out in peak time in a timely manner. This project does not cater for the multitude of people that would live here. It cannot be healthy nor conducive to true urban planning of a free and open space what feels like a stressed, cramped jungle.
413731	I object to it	The overcrowding alone is a grave concern to all that live in the area. The traffic alone is an absolute debacle each and every day, and that is now before any additional development, which should not progress.
413826	I object to it	<p>SUBMISSION FROM THE STRATA COMMITTEE OF THE DARLING ISLAND APARTMENTS, PYRMONT.</p> <p>BURYING OUR HISTORY BEHIND GLASS AND STEEL.</p> <p>We believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The "civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo" is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia's most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development.</p> <p>We believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
414136	I object to it	<p>The current proposal is too big and bulky, blocking historic connections between heritage Millers Point and the water, potentially impacting views from the observatory, and encroaching on Hickson Park.</p> <p>Please scale down and back, thank you.</p>
414181	I object to it	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site in question is the last significant vacant harbourside land and it is publicly owned land. Any development on this site deserves to be one which can be used and accessed by all, a legacy to the future, and possibly a visionary architectural structure that can inspire pride (as with the Opera House).</li> <li>2. The construction of a series of apartment buildings and hotel will do nothing for the people of NSW except for the small number of people that will buy at this location. We do not need more apartment buildings.</li> <li>3. Any development at such a unique and significant site should be referred to the independent planning commission.</li> <li>4. At the very least, any development at this site should adhere to the guidelines in Approved concept plan 2007 regarding building density &amp; height.</li> </ol>
414476	I object to it	<p>This is blatant over development in a historical area that should be protected. The rocks and Barangaroo is quickly becoming unrecognisable as a Sydney attraction and the natural beauty that it once was.</p>
414521	I object to it	<p>What a sorry low-grade developer. Please make a bold statement and give this city something to be proud off not this watered-down shameful development. Better to let it lie empty that waste everyone's time with what is planned. Where are the towers? Where is underground connections? Where is retail space or anything of interest. No want wants this boring waste of space. Go back to drawing board and inspire us. Such a prime location wasted forever.</p>
415066	I object to it	<p>Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.</p> <p>Still too big. Still too high.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
415331	I object to it	<p><b>BURYING OUR HISTORY BEHIND GLASS AND STEEL.</b></p> <p>We believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>We believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
415941	I object to it	<p><b>BURYING OUR HISTORY BEHIND GLASS AND STEEL.</b></p> <p>We believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>We believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
416146	I object to it	<p>Dear Director,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbor and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention.</p> <p>My objections extend beyond these issues to include the lack of long-term planning regarding community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>It is evident that the focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9. Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>
416631	I object to it	<p>I object to this development in its current form as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The developer continues want to over develop with the doubling of the size from the current concept plan</li> <li>2.The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory hill and the State listed Millers point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal</li> <li>3.The modified plan reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount and reduces the amount of community space from 28000sqm to 2800sqm.</li> </ol> <p>The objection list can go on and on but this is fundamentally a decision that will last generations and adds zero value to the lives of all including tourists. If poor planning principles had been achieved on The Rocks and QVB they would not exist today. as we know. This is another one that has absolutely no merit. The Department has to stop considering this in isolation to the broader impact to the area.</p> <p>An incredibly poor concept. Stop it now! Dont Block the Rocks.</p>
417046	I object to it	Far too much development in Barangaroo as it is!! Something cultural & more park land is acceptable
417061	I object to it	there is too much development in Barangaroo as it is. It's becoming smothered and loosing its pretty state as it was!
417361	I object to it	Key Sites Assessment Department of Planning & Environment Locked Bag 5022

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>Parramatta NSW 2124 Submission of Objection to MP06_0162 MOD 9 - Central Barangaroo Development</p> <p>Dear Director, I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development. Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbor and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention.</p> <p>My objections extend beyond these issues to include the lack of long-term planning regarding community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic. It is evident that the focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9. Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Regards Redacted</p>
417771	I object to it	<p>I would like to object to the barangaroo Concept Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The site in question is the last significant vacant harbourside land and it is publicly owned land. Any development on this site deserves to be one which can be used and accessed by all, a legacy to the future, and possibly a visionary architectural structure that can inspire pride (as with the Opera House).</li> <li>2) The construction of a series of apartment buildings and hotel will do nothing for the people of NSW except for the small number of people that will buy at this location. We do not need more apartment buildings.</li> <li>3) Any development at such a unique and significant site should be referred to the independent planning commission.</li> <li>4) At the very least, any development at this site should adhere to the guidelines in Approved concept plan 2007 regarding building density &amp; height.</li> </ol>
417976	I object to it	<p>Again, a plan submitted which vastly overreaches on the floor space provided for in the original proposal. It is so disappointing that this is even considered - this is the last of the public harbour foreshore essentially being developed for private interest/profit. The</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		plan lacks vision and foresight and would turn central barangaroo into another cold wasteland like Darling Harbour. I think there should be parkland, and lower and more spread out buildings to avoid stealing the light from and views of High street (especially NSW's oldest childcare centre - KU Lance). As it stands the only public land provided in the whole development is a sad, dark park behind the casinos, some roads, and a narrow walkway along the harbour. Barangaroo reserve is already swamped with people and often unavailable to the public due to private events.
418426	I object to it	Please see attached a letter outlining my objection to the planning proposal. Thank you
418656	I object to it	Dear Director, I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development. Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbor and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention. My objections extend beyond these issues to include the lack of long-term planning regarding community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic. It is evident that the focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential. In conclusion, I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Regards
418921	I object to it	My objections to the revised Mod 9 include: - The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little. The promise of the Barangaroo development at every step has been a focus on increased public access and public block amenity. This must be maintained as a central outcome of this project. The mod 9 does not serve these central commitments. - The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precincts of The Rocks are lost under the new proposal. These are crucial aesthetic features of our city that have value for social and community health and retaining the intrinsic touristic attractiveness of our city. - The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>This cannot be allowed to stand. Public spaces are essential for community health. The commitments made to public space creation in the original proposal must be maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on the Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain, Pyrmont, and the harbour, to the heritage-listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct of The Rocks.</li> </ul> <p>This is the last part of Sydney city that the public can see from the harbour and surrounding suburbs that looks the same as it has it did:                      Pre-colonial and early 1800s (Observatory Hill),                      Late 1800s (Terrace houses on Kent St)                      and the early 1900s (terrace houses on High St).</p> <p>Not to mention that the landscape of this whole part of Sydney was cut into giant steps from Observatory Hill down to the Hungry Mile at water level, by convict labor to quarry the sandstone out of The Rocks area which was used to build the great historic buildings of Macquarie St and George St; and currently the public can see all this from the water.</p> <p>Please reject this proposal and ensure that public amenity and equity of access outcomes remain at the heart of this phase of development at Barangaroo and there are no further reductions of public access space and no height variations that cut our heritage sightlines.</p>
418961	I object to it	This proposal directly try impacts the view from our home, detracting and potentially blocking the iconic Harbour Bridge with an unimaginative development of bland buildings
419066	I object to it	<p>I strongly object to the latest development Barangaroo Concept Plan Mod 9.</p> <p>it is very sad as a resident to see what is being proposed -a development with only self interest for the developer and a total disregard for the civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo and it's beautiful history. The modified proposal only allows 2800m2 instead of 28000m2 for community space -this is a mere 10% of the original plan.</p> <p>Mod9 shows a total disregard for the previous site plans -views from Observatory Hill of Sydney Harbour are still blocked and the Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour are still blocked as well.</p> <p>Please let common sense prevail and reject this over commercialised proposal</p>
419376	I object to it	<p>I wish to register my objection on the grounds that it is not in the best interest of the local community or preservation of Sydney's heritage. The development serves nothing more than to financially benefit the developers of the site, City of Sydney council and future occupants of the building.</p> <p>The proposed modification to this development will have a permanent negative impact on the community, local infrastructure,</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>Sydney's cultural heritage and the environment.</p> <p>I am somewhat appalled that the application to amend the existing proposal is even under consideration and allowed to be submitted for public comment when there are so many against the original application being approved.</p> <p>Please consider this objection in the best interest of the local community and Sydney's cultural heritage, rather than in the interest of those seeking personal gain.</p>
419411	I object to it	See attached
419491	I object to it	attached
419581	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> </ul> <p>The traffic generation will be totally unacceptable in an already congested Hickson Road. The junction of Hickson Road with Erskine Street / Sussex Street will be intolerable - there are no traffic management proposals attached to this development proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the "approved concept plan" as a base line is. It appears one Minister (a member of the Cabinet) has adopted a narrow commercial "just get it done" view of this development (jobs, economy, previous delays, bias to action and progress, less concern about heritage attitude, etc) rather than important consideration of the unique nature of this place (unlike any other Metro Station): Harbour side setting (the last remaining harbour setting able to be developed from scratch) and its adjacency to the Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area, and the unreplaceable public vistas that would be seriously compromised.</li> </ul> <p>NOTHING HAS CHANGED!            Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.            Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked.            Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.            Still too big. Still too high.</p>
419656	I object to it	<p>NOTHING HAS CHANGED.            IT STILL BLOCKS THE ROCKS.</p> <p>Principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo. Losing this cultural significance is a broken promise to the people of NSW. As the previous Minister pointed out 'NSW doesn't need more luxury apartment that Sydneysiders cannot afford.' This does nothing for affordable housing, social housing or our growing homeless problem.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is. It appears one Minister (a member of the Cabinet) has adopted a narrow commercial “just get it done” view of this development (jobs, economy, previous delays, bias to action and progress, less concern about heritage attitude, etc), rather than the important consideration of the unique nature of this place (unlike any other Metro Station): Harbour side setting (the last remaining harbour setting able to be developed from scratch) and its adjacency to the Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area, and the unreplaceable public vistas that would be seriously compromised.</li> </ul> <p>It was astonishing to read in the Sydney Morning Herald on 12 January (a day after the modified proposal was lodged) quoting Lands and Property Minister Steve Kamper (who is responsible for the Barangaroo precinct): “Central Barangaroo will become the cultural and civic heart of the Barangaroo precinct. Central Barangaroo will also be the major stepping off point for the new Barangaroo Metro station, transporting thousands of workers, visitors and residents in and out of the precinct every day. The revised proposal prepared by Aqualand presents a mixed-use development that showcases residential, community, tourism and retail uses for the community.”</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
420081	I object to it	<p>My principal objections to the revised Modification 9 (Mod 9) are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The developer of Central Barangaroo aims to double the size of the approved concept plan, increasing it from 45,000 to 104,000 m<sup>2</sup>. However, this expansion offers minimal improvement in public benefit, thus providing disproportionate gains.</li> <li>2. The revised proposal undermines heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore, impacting Observatory Hill, and the State Heritage-listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precincts. Hickson Park's size is reduced, and the amount of community space is decreased from 28,000 to 2,800 m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>3. The new proposal includes plans for 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on the Sydney Harbour foreshore, previously designated as the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>4. The proposal continues to obstruct historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage-listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precincts.</li> </ol> <p>In addition to the aforementioned objections, there are other significant changes of concern:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Developers argue that views below a 35-meter height west of the site were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls in 2008, contradicting the Conditions of Consent requiring the retention of these views.</li> <li>6. Despite requests from the Government Architect, the applicant has refused to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments, dismissing such analysis as "meaningless."</li> <li>7. The application has shifted from a mixed-use retail, office, and residential proposal to primarily residential development (up to 75%), failing to fulfill the key role of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and underutilizing the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>8. The proposal lacks important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo, such as the Sydney Steps in previous proposals.</li> <li>9. There is a disregard for a cornerstone planning principle of Barangaroo, where heights are supposed to gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>10. The "approved concept plan" promoted by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities rather than the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> </ol> <p>The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not clarified what the "approved concept plan" serves as a baseline.</p>
420176	I object to it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m<sup>2</sup>), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct. Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</li> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the "approved concept plan" as a base line is.</li> </ul>
420201	I object to it	<p>I object to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (mod9) Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure. NSW - basically I object to the size of the development - 45,000 to 104,000 M</p> <p>the loss of heritage sightlines, the reduction of community space but mostly the blocking of views for those of us living in the precinct.</p>
420331	I object to it	<p>THE WHOLE OF THE REMAINING AREA OF CENTRAL BARANGAROO MUST BE RETAINED AS COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL PARKLANDS</p> <p>The northern Barangaroo Recreational Area serves the people of Sydney allowing for picnics, walks, relaxing time, while presenting a very picturesque view showcasing Sydney to all residents, visitors, local and overseas</p> <p>The new growing population density of the Barangaroo area MUST be stopped and NOT allow further growth</p> <p>Sydneys beauty must be retained, and a full size Botanic Park established in this area up to the Barton Street Line bordering</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		Hickson road would benefit the environment, while allowing for auditorium style community entertainment
420371	I object to it	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed development. Despite promises to the residents and visitors to our beautiful city, Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill will still be blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain will still be blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour will still be blocked.</p> <p>The proposal is far too big and too high.</p> <p>The area and views needs to be available to everyone. This proposed ruins our heritage and wonderful city.</p> <p>Any council who passes such agreement should be ashamed and prosecuted. The previous state government agreed not to develop - - this has broken all trust.</p>
420486	I object to it	<p>Dear Sir/Madam. I live in REDACTED and have done so since 1996, sadly watching the development in The Rocks change the lovely environment and quality of life as the developers are allowed to use every square inch of space to build high rise and concrete jungles. This proposed development of Barangaroo is totally out of kilter with the environment and the area...its footprint is far too large for the space and it will result in an ugly development, which blocks the natural beauty and views from Observatory Hill of the Harbour and surrounding vistas. Having seen images of the proposed development (including the latest, which the developers seem to change at will to circumvent the planning regulations) it is appalling that NSW Planning are even considering this proposal. Surely lessons have been learn from what they have already done in the Barangaroo space, the wind tunnels they have created and the eyesores of buildings that have built seemingly with little regard for the community and the environment. I strongly object to the latest iteration of the development.... the footprint proposed in the land available(which is significantly bigger than the original proposal) is by far too much and the height should be reduced not to impede the vistas and visual; access by the community to the wonderful Sydney Harbour.....why are we allowing the developer to pollute the foreshores of Sydney ?</p>
420626	I object to it	<p>I object to Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod9) on the following grounds.</p> <p>The Plan has doubled in size from original approved Concept Plan. This would seem to have very little public benefit.</p> <p>Heritage sight lines to opposing foreshore are lost in this plan. The size of Hickson Park &amp; community space is drastically reduced.</p> <p>There are now 150 luxury apartments &amp; a new hotel proposed to be built on Sydney Harbour foreshore which was previously designated to be a civic &amp; cultural heartbeat of Barangaroo. Again there is no wider public benefit here.</p> <p>The original proposal of building heights gradually reducing as the development moves north towards Headland Park has been totally changed which would result in historic &amp; significant views being blocked &amp; eliminated from a number of perspectives.</p> <p>I would hope &amp; anticipate that Sydney City Council &amp; State Government would examine the many Objections from the local &amp; wider community to ensure that the most appropriate development possible is delivered to this unique area of Sydney.</p>
420681	I object to it	See attached pdf

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
420691	I object to it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved oncept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m 2 ), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2 .</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pymont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).Â</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul>
420761	I object to it	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. reduction of size of Hickson Park</li> <li>2.reduction of public open spaces</li> <li>3.reduction of public views to &amp; from Observatory Hill and state heritage listed Millers Point</li> <li>4.increasing development from49,000 sq m to 104,000 sq m detrimental to the liveability of Barangaroo by overcrowding</li> <li>5.the cultural heart of Barangaroo will be swallowed by the proposed hotel and huge increase in the number of proposed apartments. The foreshore will be seen from the water and opposite shore as an unappealing wall of buildings with no human</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>element visible.</p> <p>6. there is no detailed concept plan available</p> <p>7. the development is too big. Financial gains for NSW Govt and Aqualand have taken precedence over the public enjoyment of Central Barangaroo</p>
420991	I object to it	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As a resident of Millers Point, I strongly oppose, and formally object to, the amended MOD 9 proposal for the Central Barangaroo development, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no 'public interest' aspect to this proposal, the lack of which was the reason for the previous Planning Minister to send it back to the drawing board. It is all high-rise residential, with no care for any civic/cultural interest, as originally intended. It is insulting to the community that this has been once more overlooked.</li> <li>- It is completely on-the-nose to have so many luxury apartments in such a space, when we should be promoting affordable housing and/or community space.</li> <li>- The buildings are too high (with huge increases in Gross Floor Area), and negatively impact protected heritage views.</li> <li>- Hickson Park is negatively impacted and reduced. As a local parent of two teenagers, this would be a greatly missed opportunity. We desperately need some harbour foreshore parkland in this area for meaningful recreation space (Observatory Hill and Stargazers Lawn being hilly and not conducive to many activities).</li> <li>- Traffic gridlock will be another problem with this plan.</li> <li>- The crucial pedestrian link between Millers Point and Barangaroo has been left out.</li> <li>- And, it is simply not the visionary nor aesthetically pleasing development that a great city like Sydney deserves.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you,</p>
421006	I object to it	<p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <p>The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2. The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo. This fails the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct. A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>established Barangaroo and Sydney Harbour planning principles or the original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>NOTHING HAS CHANGED!                      Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.                      Historic Millers Point views from Balmain and Pyrmont still blocked.                      Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.                      Still too big. Still too high.</p>
421036	I object to it	<p>I the revised proposal                      NOTHING HAS CHANGED!                      Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.                      Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked.                      Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.                      Still too big. Still too high.</p>
421196	I object to it	<p>Here is my objection.</p>
421256	I object to it	<p>Dear Madam/Sir                      I am a resident in Millers Point for 10 years.                      I object this development plan.                      Reasons:                      The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal;                      A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park;                      Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked;                      Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked;                      Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked;                      Overall, this proposed plan is still too big and too high. If the power that be wish to deliberately destroy the appearance of sydney headland, and by all means, approve this proposal.                      Your sincerely                      Redacted</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
421406	I object to it	<p><b>BURYING OUR HISTORY BEHIND GLASS AND STEEL.</b></p> <p>We believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p> <p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>We believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p>
421791	I object to it	I object to this concept plan. Word document attached to support my objection
421946	I object to it	<p>I find it frustrating that the revised modifications make the matters worse and the whole development more objectionable. There is little regard to the previous feedback / objections provided. It appears that the commercial considerations have taken far more weight over the heritage and local community sentiment.</p> <p>My principal objections to the revised Mod 9 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>Apart from my previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> </ul>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be “meaningless”.</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principle of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don’t form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul>
422276	I object to it	<p>As a resident of Dawes Point for more than 20 years who gets a lot of enjoyment from the local amenities i am appalled to note that the Revised Mod 9 does little to address the concerns expressed by locals to the original version.</p> <p>My main objections are:</p> <p>The developer seeks to increase the size of the approved concept plan from 45,000 to 104,000 square metres with negligible improvement in public benefit.</p> <p>Thye heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point Precinct are lost under the new proposal,</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 square metres.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel Sydney Harbour foreshore previously designated as the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo.</p> <p>The new proposal still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>I am not against development of the area - I just want to see development that is sensible and takes account of the wishes and concerns of affected residents.</p>
422366	I object to it	<p>Typical lend lease dogs coming in and changing everything. I've been working construction for the last 30 years and I've seen this constantly every project they work on. It's just greedy and the government always behind it. Greedy, greedy, greedy. What this is going to do to the local traffic will be unheard of. Got four residential towers going up, which they have one way in and out which is already massively congested.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
422386	I object to it	<p>I object to the proposed modification 9 to the concept plan on the basis that it still too tall and too massive. It blocks visual access to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill. We are frequent visitors to the area and were happy to see this proposal rejected a year ago.</p> <p>Walking around Millers Point we enjoy the connection of the harbour, heritage, nature and some modern buildings. To stand beside some of the oldest buildings in the country and enjoy all of this in one vista is incredibly special and rare. It is unbelievable that the developers could again submit a proposal that will wipe all this out after being told so clearly their proposal was totally unacceptable. Their new application shows contempt for the public.</p> <p>I believe they will be building 150 apartments and a hotel ! Hotels and apartments are not in short supply, within close proximity to this area and how could we allow such a rare and precious public site be butchered by a development so selfish as this and ruin such a fine historic area?</p> <p>The Barangaroo central concept was supposed to complement the overall environment of the locale, the proposed development envelope will dominate and obscure all the good things about the area.</p> <p>As they say in the Millers Point 'Still too big, Still too high' and we agree. We urge you to reject it once and for all</p>
422426	I object to it	<p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <p>The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</p> <p>It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained. The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</p> <p>The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</p> <p>A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</p>
422561	I object to it	<p>When the Barangaroo concept was firstly proposed the final actual buildings and idea was to create an environment where people could enjoy space for the community at large. This proposal goes against what was originally intended and overlooks the basis of the original approvals. Observatory hill was meant to be easily seen and enjoyed.</p> <p>The free air idea and ability to view the historic architecture and buildings are lost from the western aspect creatino a boxed of the original approvals. Observatory hill was meant to be easily seen and enjoyed.</p> <p>The free air idea and ability to view the historic architecture and buildings are lost from the western aspect creating a boxed in Enviroment. If this is not what was approved the state and the council can't be trusted. We overwhelmingly object to this grab for cash which is ruining our city scape And should be REJECTED.</p> <p>Redacted</p>
422691	I object to it	<p>The proposal goes against everything that was promised on the land.</p> <p>Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain and Pymont still blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.</p> <p>Still too big. Still too high.</p> <p>The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</p> <p>The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the ‘civic and cultural heart’ of Barangaroo.</p> <p>This fails the key principal of being the “civic and cultural heart” of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <p>It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pymont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</p> <p>A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established Barangaroo and Sydney Harbour planning principles or the original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
422751	I object to it	<p>My goodness! Tooooo much overdevelopment!!</p> <p>Would love more parkland!</p> <p>As I live in the inner city more space is paramount.</p> <p>Please reject this overdevelopment</p>
422761	I object to it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The present government should never have allowed this proposal to survive. It should have been rejected as soon as it was put forward.</li> <li>- This proposal is worse than any of the previous proposals, all rejected as catastrophic. It is an injury and an insult to the people of Barangaroo and Millers Point, and to all the people of Sydney and Australia.</li> <li>- A few extra people would be crammed into this small area so that millions of people could and would suffer an enormous, irrevocable loss now and forever.</li> <li>- This area is of local, national and international significance because of its rare, surviving natural and urban landscapes - not because of new buildings and infrastructure.</li> <li>- Tourists, visitors and residents - real-life human beings - would be denied access to places and experiences that make Sydney unique in the world.</li> <li>- What other major 1st-world city has retained so much of its direct physical links to its origins, to its European and aboriginal history and pre-history?</li> <li>- Walking, looking, admiring and learning would disappear. Playing, relaxing or quietly thinking, in a natural or historical environment would be impossible.</li> <li>- This proposal would condemn people to the same old experience found in other dull cities: a few forgettable hours of spending on pointless gambling, eating and drinking, after which they abandon the area.</li> <li>- For every single person - visitors, tourists and residents - the proposal would destroy forever the practical, accessible fascination and delight of the natural (historical) and urban (built) landscape of Barangaroo and Millers Point.</li> <li>- The government that approves this terrible project will be condemned forever as destroying the last remnant of Sydney's unique, beautiful, priceless history.</li> </ul>
422956	I object to it	<p>I am objecting to the proposed modification 9 to the Barangaroo concept plan. My husband and I visit the Millers Point area regularly with our 2 children aged 3 and 5. We love the heritage of the area, its views across the Harbour to Balmain and Cockatoo Island. It is an iconic part of Sydney and I am outraged that Aqualand are once again pushing for a ridiculously imposing development that will block the connection between Millers Point and Sydney Harbour. We have enjoyed the views from Millers Point and Observatory Hill and also looking back toward Millers Point and the Harbour Bridge from ferries in the Balmain and Piermont area, clearly the proposed development would annihilate these views of Millers Point and Walsh Bay that would be a travesty they are one of Australia's oldest heritage areas.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>I understood that these views were heritage protected and that is why Millers Point development has been so controlled, how can a development be allowed to block this out?</p> <p>The original concept for Central Barangaroo's was to be low rise development with substantial amenity for public enjoyment, the proposed development takes more away from the public than it gives. 150 new apartments and a 10 storey high hotel may enjoy the proposal but that seems like a very bad tradeoff.</p> <p>I think about how a visionary development, that is sympathetic to its surroundings, could stand the test of time and my children's children could still appreciate the foresight that was shown in treating this area with care and consideration. Looking up from the waterside at Barangaroo central and seeing all the elements that have made Sydney what it is today, all the way up to Observatory Hill. If modification 9 is allowed to proceed all my kids would see from the waters edges is a massive block of buildings and maybe sight a squillionaire or 2 on their balconies!</p> <p>As the locals so aptly summarise their objection;            Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked            Historic Millers Point views from Balmain still blocked            Heritage Link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked            STILL TOO BIG. STILL TOO HIGH            I totally agree and urge you to reject the application with prejudice</p>
423076	I object to it	<p>This part of Sydney is special. The proposed development will not help the shortage of accommodation in the city as it is available to the very few with enough money and means. Most will likely only be available on air band B. This is therefore just a ploy to take more of Sydney away from everyone</p> <p>Small apartments at this price and in these numbers will only available to the ultra rich. Leave parts of the city as they are and available to families and communities.</p> <p>Enough of the High rise foreign owned, light blocking, community killing developments that drown out everyone's lives</p>
423086	I object to it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo. This fails the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <p>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established Barangaroo and Sydney Harbour planning principles or the original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</p> <p>NOTHING HAS CHANGED!</p> <p>Sydney Harbour views from Observatory Hill still blocked.</p> <p>Historic Millers Point views from Balmain and Pymont still blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour still blocked.</p> <p>Still too big. Still too high.</p>
423316	I object to it	The area is too crowded already
423466	I object to it	<p>I am making a protest regarding the proposed changes as listed in Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9)</p> <p>I moved into my apartment in 2002 and have watched the entire development of Barangaroo. Initially from when the Cruise Ships docked there to now housing the amazing Crown Casino. The beautiful walk way around the entire development. To watching the seedlings planted now grown into the most beautiful gardens.</p> <p>As I’m a daily walker, I could go on and on about watching the various stages of the development of Barangaroo. Sometimes very nervous about what was developing in front of my eyes but generally very pleased with the outcome. However I’m very disappointed about the upcoming proposals, to mention a few.</p> <p>Views from Observatory Hill to Sydney Harbour will be blocked.</p> <p>Views from Balmain to Historic Millers Point will be blocked.</p> <p>Heritage link with Millers Point and Sydney Harbour will be blocked.</p> <p>I’m hoping common sense will prevail and when completed Central Barangaroo will be just amazing and certainly not too high or too big as proposed.</p>
423841	I object to it	I oppose the proposed development, please see my attached submission.
424121	I object to it	Attached
424641	I object to it	I am submitting my submission on the uploaded PDF. this document clearly explains the reasoning behind my objection to the newly submitted development so called modifications.
424761	I object to it	<p>I object to the proposed modification 9 to the concept plan on the basis that it still too tall and too massive. It blocks visual access to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill. We are frequent visitors to the area and were happy to see this proposal rejected a year ago.</p> <p>Walking around Millers Point we enjoy the connection of the harbour, heritage, nature and some modern buildings. To stand beside</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>some of the oldest buildings in the country and enjoy all of this in one vista is incredibly special and rare. It is unbelievable that the developers could again submit a proposal that will wipe all this out after being told so clearly their proposal was totally unacceptable. Their new application shows contempt for the public and should be rejected.</p> <p>I believe they will be building 150 apartments and a hotel ! Hotels and apartments are not in short supply and I foresee that most of these spaces will remain vacant. How could we allow such a rare and precious public site be butchered by a development so selfish as this and ruin such a fine historic area while not adding any public good?</p> <p>The Barangaroo central concept was supposed to complement the overall environment of the locale, the proposed development envelope will dominate and obscure all the good things about the area.</p> <p>As they say in the Millers Point 'Still too big, Still too high' and we agree. We urge you to reject it once and for all. This is outrageous.</p>
424801	I object to it	Please see submission file.
424866	I object to it	My main concern is with the traffic and that the buses won't run to schedule. The road is already very congested and more cars will add to the delay in public transport. I object to this development.
424891	I object to it	<p>I object to the Barangaroo Central "Response to submissions"</p> <p>Block 5 is still too high and very bulky. The parks we love and use will be shadowed by your buildings and will receive much less sun.</p> <p>I am unhappy that the historical view from Gas Lane will be further obstructed by the development. This view from Kent st should be preserved as much as possible. It a much treasured view by pedestrians walking past.</p> <p>I hope that your proposals will reflect the public's wish to save and expand Barangaroo reserve further. With no impediment to sunlight. This can only be done by reducing the bulk and height of your proposed buildings.</p>
425226	I object to it	I object to the Hickson Rd development in its current plan as the proposed building structures will block the view of the historic cottages of High Street and change the overall feel of the area. The building structures should end at least one or two stories below High Street level to ensure that the views are maintained and the historic part of Sydney protected and valued.
425371	I object to it	<p>My objection to this development is detailed in the attached document.</p> <p>My objection can be summarised as concern over the complete loss of views and further erosion of the amenity enjoyed by residents of 38 Hickson Rd.</p>
426496	I object to it	<p>Dear Director,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development.</p> <p>Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbor and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention.</p> <p>My objections extend beyond these issues to include the lack of long-term planning regarding community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>It is evident that the focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Regards Redacted</p>
426766	I object to it	<p>I object to the revised Barangaroo Central MOD 9 proposal for the following main reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to more than double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct will be lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore which was previously allocated to be the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo. This is completely contrary to the original vision for this precinct.</li> <li>- The proposal still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to my previous substantive grounds for objection to the last MOD 9 proposal in 2022 as detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes over which I am concerned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35-metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and which is completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to re-present the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principle of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and fails to</li> </ul>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities rather than the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the "approved concept plan" is as a base line. It appears one Minister (a member of Cabinet) has adopted a narrow commercial "just get it done" view of this development (jobs, economy, previous delays, bias to action and progress, less concern about heritage attitude, etc) rather than what should be the most important consideration of the unique nature of this area (unlike any other Metro Station): harbour-side setting (the last remaining harbour setting able to be developed from scratch) and its adjacency to the Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area, and the irreplaceable public vistas that would be seriously compromised by the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p>I object to the revised Barangaroo Central MOD 9 proposal and request that it be rejected and the development returned to the original concept of the precinct genuinely being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo.</p>
426826	I object to it	<p>Dear Director,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed amendment and development, specifically MOD 9, concerning the Central Barangaroo Development.</p> <p>Previous objections articulated in your documents have consistently highlighted valid concerns regarding the impact of height and location on the foreshore, as well as the preservation of heritage and history, particularly concerning the harbor and iconic landmarks such as the Harbour Bridge. The visual impacts from various vantage points have also been a significant point of contention.</p> <p>My objections extend beyond these issues to include the lack of long-term planning regarding community needs. This shift towards development raises concerns about the strain on already limited road infrastructure, particularly considering the anticipated increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>The focus of this proposal is on land and commercial gains rather than the improvement of our city and the preservation of Central Barangaroo's unique character and potential.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly oppose all aspects and locations outlined in MOD 9.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Regards</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
427581	I object to it	<p>The proposed development at Barrangaroo is unacceptable as a.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It removes what should be open space for public use by a large number of people to be replaced by use for a relatively few privileged people.</li> <li>It reduces the amenity for the large number of people who work or live around the area. views will be blocked in every direction, even those from north of the harbour.</li> <li>It will cause the microclimate in surrounding areas to become more extreme, creating shade and funnelling wind in winter and increasing heat by absorption and reflection on the hard surfaces in summer.</li> <li>The hard surfaces will also increase runoff into the harbour and carry more contaminants into the water body without the filtering and capture effects of a permeable surface such as parkland.</li> <li>Habitat and biodiversity will be further reduced rather than increased as would be the case if the area was developed as parkland.</li> </ol> <p>This is a very important area for the citizens of Australia and International tourists and visitors which should be retained and developed as parkland which has a much higher economic, environmental, social and health value than a multi-storey residential development offering short term profits and privilege for a few people.</p>
427951	I object to it	<p>Principal objections to the revised Mod 9 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</li> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the development moves north towards the Headland Park.</li> <li>- The "approved concept plan" promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the "approved concept plan" as a base line is.</li> </ul>
427971	I object to it	<p>Primary Objections:</p> <p>The developer of Central Barangaroo seeks to double the size of the approved concept plan (from 45,000 to 104,000 m2), despite offering a negligible improvement in public benefit. It takes much and delivers little.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The heritage sightlines from public open spaces to the opposing foreshore from Observatory Hill and the State Heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct are lost under the new proposal.</li> <li>- The modified proposal reduces the size of Hickson Park and reduces the amount of community space from 28,000 to 2,800 m2.</li> <li>- The new proposal seeks to build 150 luxury apartments and a new hotel on Sydney Harbour foreshore previously allocated to be the 'civic and cultural heart' of Barangaroo.</li> <li>- It still blocks the historical views from Balmain and Pyrmont to the heritage listed Millers Point and Dawes Point precinct.</li> </ul> <p>Apart from our previous substantive grounds for objection to the last Mod 9 proposal in 2022 detailed above, there are a number of other significant changes of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The developers have doubled-down on the argument that the views below a 35 metre height (higher than the roof line of the Langham Hotel) west of the site (all of High Street, Kent Street, parts of Observatory Hill) were lost when Modification 2 did not approve the development block controls back in 2008 and completely at odds with the Conditions of Consent that these views must be retained.</li> <li>- The applicant has ignored requests to represent the original concept plan in visual assessments despite requests from the Government Architect, suggesting such analysis would be "meaningless".</li> <li>- The application has changed from a mixed-use retail, office and residential proposal to a primarily (up to 75%) residential development which fails to deliver against the key principal of being the "civic and cultural heart" of Barangaroo and failing to capitalise on the amenity of the metro station.</li> <li>- The important pedestrian links between neighbouring Millers Point and Central Barangaroo (characterised by the Sydney Steps in previous proposals) don't form part of the proposal.</li> <li>- A cornerstone planning principle for the Barangaroo precinct has been ignored and that heights gradually reduce as the</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>development moves north towards the Headland Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The “approved concept plan” promulgated by Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW is based on legal technicalities not the established planning principles and original block development controls for Barangaroo (modulated building heights respecting the High St sandstone wall cutting and terraces above).</li> <li>- The Department of Planning and the Government Architect have not declared what the “approved concept plan” as a base line is.</li> </ul>
428161	I object to it	Please see the attached file
428281	I object to it	Submission to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod9)
428331	I object to it	<p>I strongly oppose the 2024-amended Barangaroo concept plan (MOD 9).</p> <p>While I support responsible development, the sheer scale and bulk of the proposed 2024-amended Barangaroo concept plan (MOD 9) are insensitive and unnecessary.</p> <p>The plan prioritises short-term economic gains over preserving our heritage. This prioritisation will undermine our city's longer-term economic potential and weaken our sense of community identity and pride. I ask that the applicant review and remedy the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of views to and from Observatory Hill, Agar Steps, High St, and Kent St.</li> </ol> <p>Observatory Hill is an iconic Sydney landmark, offering captivating westward views, encompassing the opposite shoreline and harbour. It is a significant attraction for visitors to our city, as are Balmain and Pyrmont which offer views back to Observatory Hill. On the Millers Point side, Agar Steps and Kent Street, including at the intersection with High Street, offer charming corridor views of the harbour and contribute significantly to the experiences of resident and visitor alike. The loss of the views back to the Hill from Pyrmont and Balmain will also impact the experiences of residents and visitors there. The original concept plan for Central Barangaroo development acknowledged the importance of these views and received approval on the condition that they would be preserved. However, the 2022 modified proposal misrepresents the situation, claiming these elements are already lost and the new building envelope will only marginally worsen the issue. This assertion is demonstrably false. The panoramic views from and towards Observatory Hill remain iconic and warrant preservation. At a minimum the heights</p> <p>of the proposed blocks must be lowered to allow direct line of sight from the Hill to the harbour, to maintain the view corridor down High Street facing west, and the views along the north-south footpath direction of High Street. The developer’s commercially driven prioritisation of maximising views from the proposed buildings cannot override the NSW Government’s responsibility to safeguard these iconic external views. Upholding the previously agreed-upon concept design parameters remains</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>crucial to ensure their preservation for future generations of Sydneysiders and visitors. Please don't block our wonderful harbour!</p> <p>2. Excessive bulk of the proposed development and impacting heritage and amenity.</p> <p>Millers Point, with its captivating streetscape, diverse building stock (including 18 State Heritage-listed structures), and charming landscaping, stands as a significant contributor to Sydney's heritage and a major draw for visitors. But the revised Barangaroo Central development, even with its most recent amendment, exceeds the original concept plan's gross floor area (GFA) by more than double, and will severely compromise the very essence of Millers Point: its unique look, feel, and character.</p> <p>Residents along High Street face the prospect of being virtually walled in by the excessively tall blocks 5, 6, and 7, with minimal separation between them. Such an oppressive environment is also unlikely to attract visitors, and it will spoil any sense of Millers Point's maritime heritage.</p> <p>In addition to reducing the height of the proposed blocks to ensure they don't impact views, the applicant needs to increase the distance between the buildings. I appreciate that the latest plans remove earlier overhanging elements, but setbacks from the street need to be increased to avoid creating an oppressive and visually overwhelming presence for pedestrians and residents.</p> <p>While the applicant has emphasised community spaces, they have in fact been reduced to around 10 percent of the originally approved allotment, significantly impacting the community's amenity. Public community space needs to be preserved.</p> <p>Please preserve Sydney's heritage and amenity for everyone! 3. Reduce size to avoid aggravating traffic congestion Millers Point, particularly along Kent Street, Argyle Street, and Hickson Road, already struggles to accommodate parking and traffic flow. The proposed addition of more residences, each likely to include multiple car spaces, along with service vehicles for the development, can only exacerbate this traffic congestion. Traffic flow will inevitably slow, forcing more vehicles from Hickson Road onto Kent Street, overburdening that corridor.</p> <p>A more modest development and as originally envisaged and would avoid traffic havoc.</p>
428466	I object to it	Barangaroo needs more open space for the community, visitors, workers and tourists. More development is not needed around city foreshores.
428481	I object to it	Please accept the attached submission on behalf of the Hunters Hill Trust.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
428511	I object to it	Allowing this development would be an appalling mistake. It is out of character, would despoil one of the few remaining historical vantage points near the harbour, and would only advantage a small, privileged minority, at the cost of a permanent and significant public detriment.
428551	I object to it	Australian Institute of Landscape Architects objection submission attached.
428596	I am just providing comments	<p>I'd like to see a more Civic development for a site connected to so much of the city with ease of access of metro, ferries and train station and have it be different to what we already have in the city, something that stands out and revives Sydney's Nightlife and not become a quiet nimby village.</p> <p>*Public interconnected access of the rooftops with bars and restaurants with views over the harbour and harbour bridge.</p> <p>*Sydney is a UNESCO City of Film how about a museum that celebrates that.</p> <p>*Better underground access from metro to Barangaroo south with cheaper food court options.</p> <p>*Bring back the Sydney Steps and why was it removed?</p>
428621	I support it	Please see attached file. We lodged a submission in response to Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) and hence are following up that submission with the attached document regarding Amended Mod 9.
428671	I support it	<p>It is important to progress the final build out of Barangaroo as the new city and southwest Metro approaches completion - this is a modestly-scaled development which can contribute to creating a vibrant, liveable area of our city. Where possible, the proposal should be refined to ensure well-shaded pedestrian amenity and third places as a form of social infrastructure.</p> <p>However, with the additional capacity for residential development, feasibility testing must be undertaken to understand the potential for an affordable housing contribution.</p>
428781	I object to it	Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. I object to this proposal that still offers a building that will block harbour views from a public park (giving a very privileged few the views that the public -locals and tourists alike - had access to). This type of scene stealing development should not be encouraged. Additionally the design for the proposed dwellings are mediocre looking at best (especially the tallest building). For such a prime site we should expect better designs. A lack of respect for the people of Sydney.
428841	I object to it	<p>Hi,</p> <p>My objection to the proposal are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lose of uniqueness in a historical preserved area, if this Mod 9 plan is approved, the entire Barangaroo area will lose its distinctiveness and there will be no traces of a 'heritage' site.</li> <li>- The proposed buildings will severely block the view of the current residential buildings which is unfair to the homeowners who had paid a premium price to purchase a home with a comfortable view. This is particularly so when the initial plan had much lower height and mass than the current proposal.</li> <li>- Loss of sunlight and increased strong winds caused by the high-rise buildings will make visiting the Barangaroo area a less</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>enjoyable experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The current proposal did not consider the well-being of the residents living in lower floors. The Crown Casino building and the 3 Sydney Harbour One towers have already caused the residents to lose their view including inability to look at the sky and enjoy the sunlight from their homes. With the proposed new buildings to be erected, the current residents who are left with the view from the Hickson Park side will lose the remaining little open view from their homes, not to mention there will be more residents living in the lower floors of other buildings will suffer the same fate. This is not only unfair to the residents, it will potentially cause negative impact on their mental health.</li> <li>- There is a total ignorance of the people living in the area in terms of the environmental impact, increased traffic congestion, loss of quality of life and property values.</li> <li>- The 73 metre tower should never have proposed as it did not meet the share view principles, even if it is now reduced in height, it still does not solve the underlying issues.</li> <li>- All 3 blocks of buildings are still too tall with too much mass. It is too dense for the area and does not seem to create much attraction to visitors.</li> <li>- Loss of attraction to tourists and visitors. For examples, the views from ships on Darling Harbour and most western viewpoints to Observatory Hill and the Heritage Precinct are obstructed. Also, the view from Nawi Cove to Millers Point and the CBD is blocked as well.</li> <li>- Public views from Observatory Hill are seriously impacted. There is no view sharing with Millers Point and CBD residents, as required by law under the Principles of the Concept Plan. This is unacceptable and unfair to the residents and visitors to the area.</li> <li>- The elimination of water views from houses and all the low to mid-level residential towers will resulted in a loss of amenity and property values.</li> <li>- Worsening existing traffic congestion. The traffic condition is already at a critical level, when One Sydney Harbour is populated, it will add more congestion to the area. Considering the limited surrounding road infrastructure, adding the proposed Mod 9 development will create local traffic chaos.</li> <li>- The development will create wind tunnels and shadows. The northwestern corner of Hickson Park and the proposed North and South Plazas will be subject to wind speeds higher than safety standards, which is a severe safety hazard, especially when extreme weather conditions are happening quite frequent these days.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, the development proposal will cause negative impact to the residents and visitors due to loss of distinctiveness to a heritage area, the loss of views from Observatory Hill (which attracts many visitors) and the surrounding residential area, public open space are reduced for more buildings, the height and mass of the proposed development are too great and the safety concerns caused by the wind tunnels. It is therefore highly recommended that consideration be given to abandoning the Mod 9 development .</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
428901	I object to it	There is not enough public space- too much overdevelopment
428926	I object to it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Height and floor space: Proposed heights and floor space remain excessive, impacting public views and solar access to Hickson Park.</li> <li>- Residential: While we support increased housing, it must come with public benefits (including Affordable Housing and genuine open spaces). We want a mix of apartment sizes to contribute to housing supply.</li> <li>- Hickson Park: We oppose any reduction in size.</li> <li>- Community/cultural: We support increased cultural floor space but think there needs to be flexibility for various uses so the precinct can be activated.</li> <li>- Public open space: Proposed streets and laneways do not compensate for lost public open space. Public places (like parks) must be prioritised.</li> <li>- Public views: Protecting important public views between Observatory Hill/Millers Point and across the harbour is essential.</li> <li>- Car parking: Basement areas and car parking rates must be reduced to accommodate more greenery. Private car usage must be discouraged given the proximity to a new Metro station and in line with the development's sustainability objectives.</li> </ul>
428996	I object to it	See attached file
429096	I am just providing comments	<p>I support plans to increase house stock but the following should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no loss of green space should be considered to expand the development. Laneways are not a replacement for greenspace.</li> <li>-Social and affordable housing should be offered in the development. At least 20% of the apartments. a mix of people able to live in this beautiful location.</li> <li>- reduction in car parking requirements. Parking for able bodied people is not necessary in such an accessible area. Car share, metro, trains and buses is more than enough.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you</p>
429106	I object to it	Poorly thought through project - creation of more shaded , wind tunnels blocking any views and not enough focus on parks & leisure areas for the community - another plan developed to cater for the needs of a Westfield shopping centre only - a waste of prime waterfront land and an opportunity to make a world class destination
429191	I object to it	<p><b>BURYING OUR HISTORY BEHIND GLASS AND STEEL.</b></p> <p>We believe the latest proposal for the development of Central Barangaroo ignores objections previously received and offers little or no public benefit while doubling the size of the concept plan.</p> <p>The modified proposal decimates community space, reducing it to around 10% of the original 28000 square metres. Hickson Park is reduced. The “civic and cultural heart of Barangaroo” is replaced by 150 luxury apartments. And a new hotel.</p> <p>Critically, the historic views from Balmain and Pyrmont will be blocked with some of Australia’s most iconic historic streets buried behind glass and steel. This, the birthplace of modern Australia, must be preserved for all to enjoy and reflect upon.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		<p>Despite the Government Architect requesting that the applicants represent the original concept design in visual assessments, this has not been done. We believe such representations will show the development accurately, to the detriment of the application. We ask that this is done so evidence-based decisions can be made on the inappropriateness of the development</p> <p>We believe the revised plan is being rushed through for financial benefit, to the total detriment of residents and all those who cherish the preservation of historic streets and the stunning views they provide to all to the West and southwest of the precinct.</p> <p>MILLERS POINT COMMUNITY RESIDENTS ACTION GROUP SUBMISSION. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. IT STILL BLOCKS THE ROCKS.</p>
429426	I object to it	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I object the Modification to Barangaroo Concept Plan (MP06_0162 MOD 9). The density and heights of those building blocks do not improving real issues on the grounds of environment, ecology, social, and local community. It does not respect the traditional land/site in relation to the surroundings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Redacted</p>
429556	I object to it	<p>I object to the current proposal. I believe it's crucial to refer it to the Independent Planning Commission. Here are some of the reasons why:</p> <p>Height and floor space: Proposed heights and floor space remain excessive, impacting public views and solar access to Hickson Park.</p> <p>Residential: While I support increased housing, it must come with public benefits (including Affordable Housing and genuine open spaces). I want a mix of apartment sizes to contribute to housing supply.</p> <p>Hickson Park: I oppose any reduction in size.</p> <p>Community/cultural: I support increased cultural floor space but think there needs to be flexibility for various uses so the precinct can be activated.</p> <p>Public open space: Proposed streets and laneways do not compensate for lost public open space. Public places (like parks) must be prioritised.</p> <p>Public views: Protecting important public views between Observatory Hill/Millers Point and across the harbour is essential.</p> <p>Car parking: Basement areas and car parking rates must be reduced to accommodate more greenery. Private car usage must be discouraged given the proximity to a new Metro station and in line with the development's sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Central Barangaroo is the final piece of public land to be redeveloped at Barangaroo and the last opportunity to get it right.</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
429636	I object to it	All new developments must include a lot of open green spaces and social and affordable/community housing Supports and safe places for children and older people Places for community markets for all items including fresh fruit and veg
429836	I object to it	Preserve hickson Park, and preserve the view from Millers Point over the harbour.
430146	I am just providing comments	It should be bigger. This is rare and valuable land with a new Metro station, it should have significantly more floorspace and be taller. This will provide jobs and housing for our city. The Baranagroo Steps should be kept, to better link the waterfront to the city. It should also provide lifts from High St to the station. Finally the underground arcade should be kept to provide better access to the station.
430506	I object to it	The original design of Barangaroo focused upon public amenity. Everything that has happened since has encroached upon that in order to facilitate private profit. They are still at it.
420186	I object to it	I am astounded at the hubris exhibited by NSW government and its public planning departments. This proposal not only insults the intelligence by overarching denial of the original government set height limits and planning concepts on its own (public) property but also retains the same bull-headed desire to maximise return to the owner [self same NSW government who set original limits] . This alone is a conflict of interest. Further, without any hint of recognition of the widespread consternation this government plan has caused, it continues to ignore impact of: * sight lines to and from observatory hill * inconsistency of agreed heritage locale planning with height rise limited north of the "highgate line". * an overt, expanding reliance on fine print legalese from bureaucrats attempting to paste over what will be seen to be an enormous government planning bungle, overturning past self imposed design criteria and ignoring concerted professional public criticism. One wonders what impels the ministers responsible to allow their department(s) to act in such a high handed manner. This may sound emotional but I perceive an increasing tendency in government that the public service has forgotten it was established to serve the public not itself nor its masters in government. That it has got to a "mod 9" submission surely is an indication that something is wrong!! Looking forward to a reduced height mod 10 plan!!!!!!
424431	I object to it	I live in apartment REDACTED which is REDACTED the proposed development. I and many others objected to the initial proposal and as a consequence, adjustments were made. Now we get this new proposal which is appalling and totally money driven. The traffic will be a real problem. Our view will be badly affected. The person who proposed closing Barton St has no idea of the

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions received during the 2024 exhibition

**Department note:** Where a submission refers to an attachment, this file has been made available on the Planning Portal as a separate file with the submission ID.

Submission ID	Position	Submission
		impact for all residents in this area. Also the extended area for apartments is totally thoughtless and they want to reduce Hickson Park dramatically. If this is approved, we will have lost total faith in our council we have endured over 6 years of noise, smells, dust and blocked views. Please don't approve this. Thank you.