

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353993	168 Kent Street Strata Committee	Submission uploaded below - with attachment
352848	A Harding	<p>Modification 9 I strongly reject to this proposed concept plan, specifically the increase of height of previously approved buildings at Barangaroo precinct.</p> <p>My concerns are two fold: Firstly, this repeated development issue HAS TO STOP. Development companies obtain initial building approval for a relatively conservative project with the full intention of pushing a revised (more ambitious) plan through at a later date, It's a blatant and divisive means of manipulating the system, which seems to work! If the Department of Planning and Environment continues to willingly entertain such behaviours then they are complicit in this underhand behaviour.</p> <p>Secondly, if the Department of Planning and Environment continues to surround the Harbour bridge with a wall of tall buildings, then tourism and the beauty of the city will disappear. all together It should be kept as visible as possible for as many as possible, for the good of the city, for the future of all. I have already read comments from recent visitors to Sydney on a popular tourism site in the UK stating that the Sydney Harbour bridge is disappearing behind tall buildings. Is that what we want?</p>
352953	Adam Kent	I do not agree with the proposed erection of new buildings blocking the view of the heritage listed rocks area. The history of Sydney has been built, lived and loved through the hard labours of life. If money keeps talking and development of this nature keeps happening the shadows of the future will keep darkening and dampening the great history we can now enjoy. Let the world see the great history of Sydney.
353643	Adrienne Tunnicliffe	<p>I object in the strongest terms to the proposed development of Barangaroo Central. It is horrifying to me that such over development including a 75 metre high tower in close proximity to our Harbour Bridge could ever be countenanced. Instead of celebrating our historic heritage with views across to heritage terraces of Millers Point and Observatory Hill, and our Sydney Harbour Bridge, this plan will hide them and turn The Hungry Mile into a back lane. The land surrounding our harbour bridge should be excluded from high rise development. Wide views towards it should be protected from all parts of the city and surrounds.</p> <p>The high rise tower proposed at the north end of this development is far too close to our bridge. It will block views, particularly from the south and west and will pollute the wider view towards the harbour bridge. This should not even be considered. The tower would cast morning shadows over the Barangaroo waterfront and the planned Harbour Park, while the additional bulk of the development would overshadow much of Hickson Park during winter, as well as Fort Street Public School. The gross overdevelopment of this site and emphasis on commercial development will stand as reminders to the public of this Government's determination to sell off public land to developers for maximum financial gain. This is a disgraceful betrayal of the public interest.</p>
353507	Alan George	I wish to object to the proposed Barangaroo modification 9 as the proposal further alienates public land in the city, something that is in short supply. The proposal will also affect views of the harbour from Observatory Hill. Any

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		development upon the site should be 'low rise'. Surely 'Parker's Pecker' (Crown Casino) should be a wake-up call that big isn't necessarily better. Visitors and resident of Millers Point as well as ordinary citizens of NSW Will be impacted by the proposal to triple the size of the approved gross floor area on a site designed to be the 'civic heart' of Barangaroo with low rise buildings and community facilities. This proposal further steals public land for the benefit of developers.
353869	Alex Crabb	I object to this gross overdevelopment and it's impact on Sydney Harbour and the heritage of Millers Point.
354113	Alex Greenwich MP	Submission attached
352679	Alexandra Bekker	Observatory hill at sunset is packed with people enjoying a picnic and watching the sunset to the west. This view is iconic and in heritage surveys has been one of the top ten things people value about the area. Tourists and locals alike gather up there all year round - the attached photo is last week and it was a freezing and miserable day and still there were many people up there. This modification will strip Australians and visitors of this view and past time - a view that belongs to the public and is very much enjoyed by them.
353801	Alice Cawte	<p>I refer to the Modification to Barangaroo concept plan (MP 06_ 016 MOD 9). I am a resident of 21-29 Kent St Sydney, a building listed on the State Heritage List (SHR 00888). As a resident of a listed building, I am obliged to - and happy to - comply with the letter and spirit of NSW heritage legislation - to preserve Sydney's heritage for the wider community and future generations. I simply ask the NSW Government to do the same! Please respect our common heritage and disallow the overdevelopment of Central Barangaroo.</p> <p>My specific objections to the latest modified concept plans are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The increased scale and especially the height of the proposed development will degrade the heritage significance of Observatory Hill and Millers Point - contrary to existing Government commitments. Observatory Hill is a key element of the cultural heritage of NSW. Views to and from this site link the Sydney Observatory, Observatory Hill, Millers Point, Pyrmont, Balmain, and Darling Harbour. Agar Steps and Kent St (at High St) offer wide view corridors west to the opposite shoreline while the historic terraces of Millers Point can be seen from Darling Harbour, Pyrmont, and Balmain.</li> </ol> <p>The NSW Government and its agencies have recognised the heritage significance of these views in numerous policies, including through the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan, the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management plan, the Independent Planning Commission, and the original Concept Plan for Central Barangaroo. Indeed, a key condition of the Independent Planning Commission (Condition C1) was that the development of Block 5 of Central Barangaroo does not impact key views from the Millers Point and the Observatory Hill region. The original Concept Plan received approval on the basis that existing views would be maintained over and between the built form. The Concept Plan also explicitly disallowed buildings to fill the whole design envelope. Yet despite these guidelines, the Mod9 proposal increases the height of the three buildings of Central Barangaroo - from 38 to 47 metres across Blocks 5&amp;6 and a massive 73 metres for Block 7. Mod9 also increases the Gross Floor Area by 140% over previous modifications - the net effect of which will be to create a near impenetrable wall of buildings. Anyone hoping to glimpse the water from Millers Point to have a sense of the links between historic Sydney and the harbour will have to climb to isolated vantage points on</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>Observatory Hill and Agar Steps and squint to see beyond these buildings. In short, this plan contravenes existing heritage guidelines and effectively privatises priceless heritage views for the benefit of the developer.</p> <p>2. The bulk and scale of the Mod9 proposal similarly impacts the amenity of the area for residents and visitors. In addition to degrading our common heritage, the excessive bulk and height of the Mod9 proposals will greatly impoverish residents' and visitors' amenity. The reduced setbacks of the new design will create an oppressive overshadowing for pedestrians while overhanging balconies and cantilevers will further encroach on public open space. Residents and visitors will also have to live with a diminished Hickson Park.</p> <p>3. Enough is enough! Please return to the original Concept Plan for Central Barangaroo! The iterative ever-expanding claims of successive modifications of the original Central Barangaroo Concept Plan have undermined my confidence in our State's planning processes. Please return to the original Concept Plan and preserve Sydney's heritage! Alice Cawte</p>
353371	Alison Ayscough	<p>As an owner and resident of "the Bond " 38 Hickson Road , I strongly object the modification to Barangaroo Concept Plan MP06-0162 MOD 9. The modification makes an absolute mockery of the original proposal to include public land for all citizens of Sydney, NSW in the development. Local Residents, many of us who have been living here for years, will all be impacted by this over-developed site. The Harbour vistas, the views from the harbour surrounding suburbs, to the historic Millers Point and surrounds are an Historic enclave that will all be lost to this hideous over-development, an important area of our local history and heritage. Particularly following the abhorrent sale of public housing properties in the area and also the iconic Sirius building to private developers. This truly is the last stand in the local area. To reduce the proposed expanded Hickson Park, granted to the people of NSW by the Independent Planning Commission, is an absolute disgrace. The NSW Government have an opportunity to make this Precinct a world class public space to be enjoyed by citizens of the world, not developers intent on making money from public land, which should be for the amenity for the public. James Packer has now lost control of the casino he so desperately wanted to build and what a legacy he and the NSW Government leave us!</p>
352892	Amanda King	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to Infrastructure NSW's Modification to the Concept Design for Central Barangaroo. This Modification instead seeks to amplify the negative impacts of the original concept.</p> <p>The proposed concept modification would: Block public views west from Observatory Hill Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept: Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. I fully concur with Robert Hughes comments made 24 years ago, "The air is common property and that's why no one has the right to fill it with effluents....Sydney Harbour is too valuable, too sensitive to intrusion after so many years of treating the visual environment as nothing more than a raw asset." I believe the government plays an essential</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		role in fulfilling it's responsibility to the community as a whole, and to ensure "the heritage of the city should belong to everyone, not be reserved for the enjoyment of the wealthy few who can afford the inevitably scarce views from the tallest buildings." as Robert Hughes said in the National Trust Annual Heritage Lecture in 1998.
353147	Amy Perry	I am submitting my opposition to the proposed Barangaroo Development project. As a recent arrival to Sydney I felt fortunate to secure an apt in Observatory Tower. I am very impressed with the surrounding neighborhoods which while urban, manage to keep their historic vibe in the architecture, views and sense of community. The proposed development would severely impact the essence of these neighborhoods. This area is a 'breath of fresh air' in a concrete jungle. Please do not go ahead with this development - preserve what you have. It is priceless.
353717	Andreas Faeste	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I wish to register my strong objection to the Proposed Section 75W Modifications to Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). By more than doubling the above-ground gross floor area, increasing the building heights of the development and reducing the size of Hickson Park, the amendment is so significant as to warrant an entirely new proposal to be submitted, rather than having it determined as a modification. Public amenity is detrimentally impacted by overshadowing, loss of views to and from Observatory Hill and the colonisation of public space causing loss to the local community and the general public, with the area directly affected having heritage significance. The buildings themselves have excessive bulk and scale, and with inadequate articulation and setbacks, are a poor urban planning response with very negative visual impact. Adverse effects on traffic and parking will further affect the amenity of Millers Point residents and visitors. The proposed modifications are not all consistent with the approved concept for the development, nor the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views, as well as the Statement of Commitments for the Barangaroo Development. I call for the modifications be refused for what is such a significant and sensitive precinct, and for the community and public interest be preserved. Yours sincerely, A Faeste</p>
353395	Andrew Calvin	<p>I object to Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). My objections and their bases are: The proposed buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, and will create a wall between the water and Millers Point. The Sydney CBD already has far too many "walls" separating the water from the city, such as the Circular Quay Railway Station and the Cahill Expressway. The problem is notorious, and does not require a very high structure to create the problem - as we see with Circular Quay. Although the proposed development is in Barangaroo, it may as well be in Millers Point due to its location. It needs to be sympathetic to the height of buildings in Millers Point, which are all only a few stories, excepting some heritage building such as the Palisade Hotel. The sight lines between Observatory Hill and the western water and suburbs will be blocked or restricted. By my calculations, those heritage terraces on the east side of Kent Street between Argyle Street and Gas Lane will lose some precious sunlight. There is nothing nice or interesting about the proposed development. The roads in the area cannot adequately support increased development. The area is a critical piece of historical Sydney. The proposed development is completely out of character with the immediate locality of Millers Point, and this area should not be treated as if it is just an extension of the southern Barangaroo development, which is close to a greatly developed modern part of Sydney. The proponent's submissions are selective, self-serving and some of it is completely misleading. The proponent's submissions</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		cannot be accepted in their present form. The NSW Government must take responsibility for and care for this important heritage area. A failure to do so will reflect on this government for perhaps hundreds of years.
353811	Andrew Clements	I believe this Mod9 proposal to be a gross over-development of the site that is a public space. It is difficult to see what benefit this proposal to anyone except those charging rent for the additional floor space. In this case I believe this Mod9 development proposal should be completely rejected.
353539	Andrew Coroneo	My family and I have been deeply involved in environmental conservation generally, and especially in the preservation of heritage items of various kinds. Indeed, we have purchased properties for the very reason to effect their restoration and preservation for the admiration and enjoyment of posterity. The State Government has sold heritage properties in Millers Point for their preservation under strict heritage conditions and yet this utterly unacceptable, gross ambit claim, for additional stories to Central Barangaroo is contrary to all heritage principles. Our wide circle of friends agree with us that the Minister cannot approve such a proposal further limiting public heritage views, and further cluttering excessive development in such an historic and iconic location. It will highly likely lead to the defeat of his present government at the forthcoming next NSW State election. Accordingly, we agree with all the details submitted by the National Trust (NSW) in its submission, and strongly request the application be refused, as a gross over-development in such a location.
354001	Andrew Fraser	Proposed Grand Opera House for Central Barangaroo In 2008 Pope Benedict XVI's visited Sydney. Along with thousands of World Youth Day pilgrims, the Pontiff witnessed a depiction of Christ's crucifixion at Barangaroo. The site is named after a spirited Aboriginal woman who proved a colourful and powerful figure in the story of the first colonisation of Australia. The redevelopment of Barangaroo represents a rare opportunity to increase the area of green space in the CBD, create a vibrant cultural precinct and significantly increase the supply of state- of- the- art ecologically sustainable buildings. Planning is well under way to service the area with multiple sustainable transport modes such as light rail, ferries and a pedestrian tunnel to Wynyard station. This is appropriate as Barangaroo was the site of World Youth Day and the generation of Greta Thunburg has the greatest stake in ecologically sustainable development. However, at a time of difficult economic circumstances, COVID and international tensions, Barangaroo needs a unique cultural draw-card to make the redevelopment viable. Without it, the huge multi-storied Crown Casino international hotel on the site will struggle to maintain occupancy rates. Without such a `demand driver' the costly ecological improvements like the headland park, roof gardens or land- remediation may not be affordable. According to Jane Jacobs (1961), who became the doyenne of the `new urbanism' movement with the publication of her book Death and Life in Great American Cities [Jacobs J 1961 The Modern Library 1993 New York], unique public buildings can create a `buzz'. Such buildings act as `public primers' that stimulate diversity and vitality in a neighbourhood or district. To maximise this effect, Jacobs argues the public primer should be well integrated with commercial and residential uses. To find inspiration for such a unique public primer we need look no further than the superb Sydney Opera House. That project had a difficult birth but few now doubt the outstanding contribution it makes to the culture and economy of the nation. However, while the Opera House looks splendid from the outside, it does not well serve the purpose for which it was designed, namely to provide a suitable home for the high art form of opera. The largest performing space was given over to the concert hall. Opera was left with a space that was too small to stage grand opera and the lack of economies of scale means that the price of an opera ticket is beyond the reach of many Australians. A new larger building of outstanding design constructed at Barangaroo would

**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	Submission
		<p>serve a wider audience, provide the cultural heart for the site and act as a magnet for international tourists. A suitable space could be the area of land in the centre of the Barangaroo currently ear-marked for uninspiring residential and commercial development. The planned use is questionable on opportunity cost grounds. The much-needed, culturally unique and higher value use of a grand opera house could open into the proposed Harbour Park. Unlike in Europe, large public meeting spaces in Sydney CBD are at a premium, as was revealed on World Youth Day three years ago. The realisation of a new Grand Opera House at Barangaroo could provide the landmark feature that is missing on the western edge of the CBD and in elegant symmetry, twin the existing Opera House on its eastern edge. Perhaps the Canticle of the Universe (based on the Big Bang theory) incorporating the story of Barangaroo who heroically figured so prominently in the infamous terra nullius chapter of the First Nations story could be turned into a grand opera to mark the occasion. Such an event could be timed to complement the referendum on the indigenous Voice and the Treaty. I submit that the proposed development for Central Barangaroo does justice to the huge cultural significance of the site while the current plan does not. I therefore object to the current publicly exhibited Barangaroo Concept Plan</p>
353893	Andrew Jacob	<p>I would like to submit my opposition to aspects of the Barangaroo Concept Plan (06_0162) Modification 9. Although I am employed by the Museum of Applied Arts &amp; Sciences, I make this submission as a resident of NSW. The proposed 74m tall Block 7 tower will interfere with views westwards from Observatory Hill, and will block views westwards from the telescopes and grounds of Sydney Observatory. It is clear from the figures supplied in the application documents that the additional ground floor area (GFA) proposed in Mod 9 can be successfully achieved by redistributing the GFA in the tower into the envelope of the other parts of Block 5,6 &amp; 7 with no loss in total GFA. The tower is therefore not required to achieve the GFA proposed. The claim in 'Appendix G - Sky View Impact Assessment' that a 'lowest practical angle of viewing' of 10-degrees exist is false. No such angle exists and therefore the proposal will have an impact on views from Sydney Observatory. As a former Astronomy Guide at Sydney Observatory, presenting viewing tours day &amp; night, I regularly pointed the telescope below 10-degrees altitude to view planets, the Moon, Sun (safely filtered) and other objects. In addition, we viewed constellations setting, sunsets, moonsets and many other objects well below 10-degrees. The top of the Block 7 tower would be below 10-degrees, as seen from the Observatory, however as no such limiting angle exists the tower will impact on views from Sydney Observatory. Given that the Sun, Moon, planets and other celestial objects will continue to set in the west the Block 7 tower will continue to have an ongoing and eternal impact on viewing from Observatory Hill and Sydney Observatory. The proposal documents (Appendices G &amp; S in particular) fail to fully acknowledge the heritage significance of views from Sydney Observatory. Since 1858 Sydney Observatory has had a clear view to the section of the western horizon where the Sun, Moon, planets and other solar system objects set. It has had clear views of the setting Sun as it moves north &amp; south along the horizon - a marker of the progression of the calendar and the seasons. Since 1858 Sydney Observatory has had a clear view of the setting Sun - a marker for the beginning of a night of astronomical observations. The Block 7 tower blocks views of the setting Sun for up to 160 days per year from the Observatory site interfering with these historic sight lines and breaking the long-held connection between Sydney Observatory and sunset. In 2013 a Media Release from the Barangaroo Delivery Authority noted key aspects of the Central Barangaroo master plan, including the 'Preservation of views from Observatory Hill to the horizon and the harbour' (copy attached). I call on you to ensure this existing commitment is honoured.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352671	Andrew Madigan	It is just so wrong for this development to go ahead in a historic heritage area. Listen to the people!
352977	Andrew Wise	See attached
352896	Angela Hall Best	The area is already too built up.
352693	Angela Kim	<p>I strongly objected to this proposal for the following reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal without due consideration of the heritage value of the surrounding area.</li> <li>2. The proposal only benefited the privilege few, not the wider public.</li> <li>3. The proposal block the view to and from Observatory Hill and surrounding residences no matter how little it is over the existing approved proposal. We cannot make the already bad decision even worse by accepting this new proposal.</li> </ol>
353333	Angela Marynissen	<p>I object to modification 9 of the Barangaroo Concept Plan on the basis that it over develops the site.</p> <p>*It is multiples of the previously approved concept plans gross floor area.</p> <p>* modification 9 would have a height and a bulk that would inappropriately obscure views to and from Millers Point including Observatory Hill, damaging the iconic heritage vistas that should be preserved for future generations of Australians and visitors to our city.</p> <p>* The scale and bulk will detrimentally effect solar access for High St Millers Point including the KU Lance childcare centre</p> <p>* The high density construction will exacerbate the wind funnelling as experienced in South Barangaroo</p> <p>* The proposed modification will break Millers Points historic connection to the harbour that is one of its essential characteristics</p> <p>* The proposal seeks to reduce Hickson Park and overall seeks to take land that is public and put it into private hands. It is unjustified by and sensible planning principles and is jarring in its proposed abutment to Millers Point and Barangaroo Headland</p> <p>* The development proposal is driven by developer greed and government short term thinking in solving a project budget over run. The metro station cost should not be recouped by damaging the existing residents and destroying the beauty of the area that the station is purported to be providing access to. Taking public land that should be preserved for perpetuity</p> <p>* The proposal makes no allowance for parking, reducing parking in the area by around 100 places, putting that pressure on Millers Point and Walsh Bay</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353045	Angelo Korsanos	<p>I object to the revised envelopes. They are grossly oversized. They deny the reading and understanding of what is perhaps one of Sydney's greatest projects. The Urban Project of High Street Terrace, that includes cutting through Hickson Road, creation of High Street Terrace, it's unique (near unprecedented) housing types, a kindergarten at the low point in the street, and the shop top housing flanking the streets at either end as a project. It was an incredibly ambitious project incorporating all of the constituent parts of a community; home, industry, work, child care and street based retail. The project included bond stores (at the water's edge) and a connecting bridge over Hickson Road (since demolished) with a clear hierarchy of roads (Hickson) for industry and the elevated connecting streets of the city and distribution. Unlike the competition winning scheme by Hill Thalys for this site, the new envelopes fail to acknowledge the layout, geometry, and important alignments of this significant historic project from Sydney's early history. The proposed envelopes are oversized relative to the natural topography (and outlook) of Observatory Hill. It is also difficult to conceive what uses might be suitable to such deep (lightless) envelopes that would undoubtedly require unsustainable amounts of energy. Is this really the type of development we want to be promoting in such a privileged location? It is on these grounds that I object to the proposed envelopes, which demonstrate incredible disregard for Sydney's significant, rich and diverse history and heritage and it's future character. Angelo.</p>
353639	Ann Brown	<p>I would like to submit this objection to the Central Barangaroo Development. I live at 11/25A Hickson Road, Towns Place, Millers Point. NSW 2000 My objections can be summarised as: - The obliteration of views to Observatory Hill both from the harbour and the hill. - The height and size of the planned buildings along Hickson road - The vulgarity and crassness of placing a 20 story residential tower in front of Observatory Hill and adjacent to Barangaroo Headland Park. - Traffic increase along Hickson Road The development conflicts with heritage views currently enshrined in law. These protect vistas for future generations. These include the views to and from Observatory Hill and views from the harbour towards the Heritage buildings on High Street. The planned northern residential tower positioned in front of Observatory Hill and alongside Nawi Cove and the Barangaroo Headland park will totally obliterate sight lines for generations of Sydneysiders. This plan makes a joke of all the efforts made to respectfully acknowledge the cultural importance of Aboriginal connection to the area. Hickson Road , "The Hungry Mile" are part of Sydney's history. The plan aims to physically disconnect the road from Barangaroo Central. The road will now become a canyon of shadow and traffic. The height and scale of these buildings will obliterate views of the High Street Heritage cottages above the sandstone wall. Hickson Road is under pressure now. It is a funnel for the traffic to the Rocks, Circular Quay, the Overseas Passenger terminal, the Theatre district of Walsh Bay and Barangaroo Headland functions. In the past it has been a parking bay for the huge vehicles servicing the ships at the Overseas Terminal. There is no updated plan published for the increased road traffic resulting from the over development of the central Barangaroo site, Millers point, Kent Street and the Argyle Cut areas. I believe the Central Barangaroo Development plan must be refined to overcome these problems or they will degrade the visual impact of our city forever and cause complex traffic and movement issues into the future. Yours faithfully. Ann Brown</p>
352874	Ann Cairns	<p>I am a regular visitor to Sydney Observatory, a former employee of the Powerhouse Museum based at the Observatory and the current President of Sydney City Skywatchers (SCS), previously called the BAA NSW Branch. SCS is an active astronomy society, with members of all ages and has been associated with Sydney Observatory since 1895 and values the opportunity to view astronomical events from this highly significant heritage site. We encourage others to understand and</p>



**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	Submission
		<p>engage with astronomy and Sydney Observatory is very important in STEMM education of families and school groups, which the society also supports. Central Barangaroo development was approved to be below the line of the rockface/landform and was not interfere with Sydney Observatory and Sydney City Skywatchers. We and all the people of NSW and beyond gave up a lot of sky for the Southern Barangaroo development. The building seeking approval to be modified will be much higher, will add to skyglow significantly in the direct line of our telescope viewing to the west - where a large number of astronomical events occur throughout the year. There are significant errors and inaccurate assumptions regarding viewing the sky below 10 degrees above the horizon in Appendix G of the report titled "Central Barangaroo - Sydney Observatory Sky View Impact Assessment", dated 7 July 2021 * Many important astronomical events are viewed below 10 degrees above the horizon. In the location of the sky to be affected by the new Barangaroo Central tower western and setting views of the Sun, Moon, planets, comets and even the International Space Station would be blocked significantly. Also, events like eclipses, planetary transits across the Sun, as well as planetary and lunar conjunctions may well be obstructed. To lose these viewing opportunities for several months of the year is an unacceptable loss for our generation and generations to come. * Most of Sydney City Skywatchers and special event viewings use telescopes, binoculars and the naked from ground level from the north, south and western sides of Sydney Observatory. Personally, I have shown fascinated association members and the public the elusive planet Mercury setting on the western horizon in a position that would be blocked should this development go forward as planned. Our society undertakes to learn more about the First Astronomers from this site. The Gadigal People of the Eora Nation used their observations to track the seasons. The ability to track the Sun and Moon as they set throughout the year is destroyed from the highest natural point in Sydney (Sydney Observatory) by the increased height of this proposed building modification. Sydney Observatory is listed on the UNESCO portal for astronomical heritage - this development diminishes its heritage significance. This modification significantly affects the Aboriginal heritage of the night sky, astronomical and naval time-keeping heritage of Sydney Observatory and restricts STEMM opportunities for our society and the public, including school children, forever. I invite you to contact myself for further clarification on the impacts of Mod 9 relative to Sydney Observatory. You might also find accessing: <a href="https://www.barangaroo.com/news/modification-9-to-the-barangaroo-concept-plan-is-now-on-public-exhibition">https://www.barangaroo.com/news/modification-9-to-the-barangaroo-concept-plan-is-now-on-public-exhibition</a> to be useful in locating relevant documents. The National Trust has also raised their concerns about Mod 9 and have posted some excellent diagrams that illustrate our joint concerns: <a href="https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/blog/raise-your-voice-protect-sydneys-iconic-historic-views/">https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/blog/raise-your-voice-protect-sydneys-iconic-historic-views/</a> Yours sincerely, Ann Cairns President Sydney City Skywatchers</p>
353611	Ann Sharp	<p>I strongly object to the proposed Modification (Mod 9). Objections include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in the maximum Gross Floor Area (GFA) by 140% from 47,688 sqm to 144,355 sqm.</li> <li>2. Modify the approved building envelopes including</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* proposed increases in height from 38m to 47m across most buildings and</li> <li>* a proposed tower 73.7m high at the northern end of the block.</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		3. Increase in the area of Block 5 by relocating the boundary to the south and reducing the size of Hickson Park Reasons for objection include: The proposed modification would have adverse impacts on areas in and around Sydney Harbour, including iconic areas that have historical and scenic significance. The proposal would block views of Sydney Harbour and foreshores from Observatory Hill and surrounding areas in Millers Point (The Rocks). It would also block views of Observatory Hill and Millers Point from vantage points in Darling Harbour and surrounds. To the west, overshadowing would reduce morning sunlight on the harbour side resulting in cold, bleak areas of public space, particularly in winter. To the east, overshadowing would reduce afternoon sunlight within the heritage precinct of the Rocks. The increased GFA has the potential to cause overcrowding and congestion in public spaces. The proposal does not respect the heritage significance of the Observatory Hill and Millers Point. The proposal is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour REP requirements for the protection of public views. The modification does not satisfy fundamental principles in the concept plan that are required to protect public views, access to sunlight, and heritage areas. The modification proposes a substantial increase in GFA, building heights and encroachment of Hickson Park. These changes are not compatible with the context and constraints of the site. In summary the proposed changes are not acceptable and the modification should be refused.
353577	Anna Anderson	I strongly object to Modification 9 in the proposed Barangaroo planning. Please acknowledge my objection and that it will be noted by AUGUST 8. Anna Anderson
353407	Annabella Fletcher	This "modification" is dishonest. The changes proposed are so substantial they are in effect, a new proposal & should be publicly advertised to the entire public as a new proposal. The proposal cannot in any way claim to be a world-class urban renewal; it is the lowest-rate greedy grab for commercial gain. The scale fails to respect the heritage values of an irreplaceable water-front part of Sydney. Approval of this proposal would continue the catastrophic over-scaled casino tower and the other commercial developments of Barangaroo. This area should best be public open space; privatised commercial or residential buildings would destroy public amenity. The Covid pandemic has proven people need and value public open space, that centralised commercial buildings might remain empty. Australian voters want a people-friendly urban environment which has soul. Commercial developments which are over-scaled to make money for the developers reject and insult what Australian people want. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.
353681	Anne Crabb	My husband and I are the owners of 83 Kent Street, a State Listed Heritage Terrace SHR 00879, Plan 2818, a heritage item as two adjoining terraces at 83 & 85 Kent Street Miller Point. When we purchased our historic home, built in 1875, we had to sign a significantly restrictive Conservation Management Plan (CMP) relating to what could and could not be done to the house both on the outside and inside. We have followed this CMP which included not putting anything such as A/C, vents, etc. on our roof as our terrace can be viewed from the Harbour. We have lovingly restored our terrace including reinstating the flagstone from the original quarryman's cottage built in the 1830's. I was totally appalled by the GML report on the Heritage and Archaeological Impact Assessment and assessment of view impacts which dismissed any impact to the heritage significance of Millers Point. Implying the State Listed Heritage terraces views had already been lost which I dispute. The original Barangaroo Concept Plan (2007) approved three blocks within the Central Barangaroo - Blocks 5, 6 and 7. Each block was allocated a different maximum height: Block 5 - RL34; Block 6 - RL29m; and Block 7 - RL35m, and each had variable heights so most of the blocks were well below these heights - not what is being proposed

**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	Submission
		<p>now. These RL's and maximum Gross Floor Area controls allowed the retention of the significant views to and from Observatory Hill and the Harbour, which must be retained. An RL of 73.7m on block 7 is a significant increase and should be reviewed along with the heights of blocks 5/6. We - the Millers Point residents - bought these houses from the Government, which were in a disgraceful state with their maintenance being neglected by the Government for years. We as the 'custodians', as we were told we are by the Government, have spent the time and money to restore them, retaining Sydney's/Australia's oldest historic residential neighbourhood for all to enjoy. When we purchased these heritage registered houses from the Government, their real estate flyers touted 'sweeping Harbour views to the west'. This proposed development totally ignores many of the Government's heritage controls which we have to adhere to.</p> <p>Why/How? I object to the 'land' creep, with the proposal decreasing the size of Hickson Park at the south end of the proposed development and the increased overshadowing of it. The proposed development will create significant overshadowing on High Street and the oldest kindergarten in Sydney, the KU Lance. Not only are the kids who attend the KU be overshadowed they are likely to be blown away by the wind tunnel this proposed development will create (if built). I formally request that ALL the State Listed Heritage items in the vicinity of the proposed development be individually assessed for the impact on heritage and views. In <i>Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council</i> (Tenacity Consulting) the Court provided a four step assessment process to guide whether or not view sharing is reasonable. In doing so, the Court also gave some helpful guidance as to what should be considered as part of each step of an assessment. The four steps and the guidance provided by the Court in <i>Tenacity Consulting</i> is as follows: Step One - Assessment of the views to be affected. "Water views are valued more highly than land views. Iconic views (eg of the Opera House, the Harbour Bridge or North Head) are valued more highly than views without icons. Whole views are valued more highly than partial views, eg a water view in which the interface between land and water is visible is more valuable than one in which it is obscured." Step Two - Consideration from what part of the property the views are obtained. "For example the protection of views across side boundaries is more difficult than the protection of views from front and rear boundaries. In addition, whether the view is enjoyed from a standing or sitting position may also be relevant. Sitting views are more difficult to protect than standing views. The expectation to retain side views and sitting views is often unrealistic." Step Three - Assessment of the extent of the impact. "This should be done for the whole of the property, not just for the view that is affected. The impact on views from living areas is more significant than from bedrooms or service areas (though views from kitchens are highly valued because people spend so much time in them). The impact may be assessed quantitatively, but in many cases this can be meaningless. For example, it is unhelpful to say that the view loss is 20% if it includes one of the sails of the Opera House. It is usually more useful to assess the view loss qualitatively as negligible, minor, moderate, severe or devastating." Step Four - Assessment of the reasonableness of the proposal that is causing the impact. "A development that complies with all planning controls would be considered more reasonable than one that breaches them. Where an impact on views arises as a result of non-compliance with one or more planning controls, even a moderate impact may be considered unreasonable. With a complying proposal, the question should be asked whether a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact on the views of neighbours. If the answer to that question is no, then the view impact of a complying development would probably be considered acceptable and the view sharing reasonable" Given this court case, I suggest that views to and from the Harbour should be retained. I have included the various views of the Harbour we currently have. Lastly, I am outraged that this proposed development, being built on public land, is being determined by Minister Roberts without the people of</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		Sydney and Australia having their say. This proposal should be referred to the Independent Planning Commission for assessment, allowing for the public to have their say in an open forum.
353645	Anne Keating	I object to the proposal! Millers Point is arguably the most intact heritage community in the city or indeed, the country. It's view lines to and from the harbour need to be protected for current and future generations. This principle was articulated in your department's original planning documents on Barangaroo Central. This modification violates this principle. I have lived in Observatory Tower for 24 years and whilst if Mod 9 were to be approved I would lose views of the Headland Park this is not the main reason for my objection. It is the scale/height of the buildings, particularly the tower, which would be offensive. It will obliterate views of the harbour from Kent Street for motorists and pedestrians and completely ruin views from High Street. Most importantly it will interfere with view lines from Observatory Hill which have always been clear to and from the harbour. This historic precinct including the terraces of High Street, Observatory Hill, the Observatory should be able to be viewed from the water as they have always been. The beautiful Barangaroo Reserve deserves to be viewed from anywhere in the Barangaroo precinct without a 20 storey tower in the way. This audacious modification is the biggest scandal of the proposal in my view. The narrow streets of Hickson Road and Kent Street are already clogged with north/south traffic. There is very little access east/west to get traffic through the city. All of these extra residences will exacerbate the problem. It seems our community is effectively being asked by the developer to compensate it after Crown won its case against the Government for the protection of its view lines. There has to be a better way to compensate the developer (if that is deemed necessary) than to permanently ruin this precinct!
353655	Anne Keating	I act as trustee for a Super Fund which owns two investment properties each negatively affected by Mod 9 proposals. The first is on level 14 of 127 Kent St ("Highgate"). One of the mock up photographs from Highgate was taken from level 15. As this apartment is one level below this, it is clear that the tenants will not enjoy the view of the harbour they currently have. Indeed, it might be obliterated altogether. The second is on level 16 of 183 Kent St ("Stamford on Kent"). Again, the tenants' view will be impacted by the proposed height of the buildings along Hickson Road. More significantly will be the loss of the view of Barangaroo Reserve buy the proposed height of the tower in front of the headland.
353955	Anne Lytle	I am horrified by this proposed modification that completely changes a design which was approved years ago. I often visit the public spaces in this area, and the proposed increased heights of the buildings and the new massive ugly tower will ruin beautiful views enjoyed by countless visitors to the parks and city. The new changes to the proposed building does not fit in with the character of the local area, and destroys views from some of the most iconic parklands and areas in historic Sydney. I strongly oppose any modifications to the design.
353925	Anne Marie Lock	I oppose the amendment to the concept approved The new proposal would Block public views west from Observatory Hill. Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point. This would break the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water. In addition it would block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. I believe that the proposal to amend the concept:  *Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>*Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</p> <p>*Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</p> <p>*Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</p> <p>*Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill</p> <p>*Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. I request that you reject the request to amend the Central Barangaroo Concept modification</p>
353877	Anne Stevens	<p>As a long-term resident of Sydney CBD, I object to the audacity of Australand, supported by a government instrumentality, making such an ambit claim for this development. It is a gross misuse of public land, blocking some of the most endearing and historic sightlines around Sydney Harbour. Its scale and bulk is outrageous, the application obviously being made - like most - in the knowledge that the consent authority - in this case the Minister - will scale it down, but they will get what they want in due course with 'minor' amendments to the development application. Minister, this land belongs to the people of NSW, not some developer who has very dubious means to carry the development out. Think very carefully about a decision which will impact on ALL future generations. Anne Stevens</p>
353501	Anthony Bekker	<p>BarrangaRORT... BarrangaRIPOFF! BarrangaWRONG!!!! Cash grab?! Ripoff? Public Scandal? You bet. Ever wondered why the 'artists impression' of Central Barangaroo was always so blurry and translucent? Because the NSW Government didn't want you to see that the 'Concept Plan' that it had already approved wasn't quite what it had in mind for the site... NEWS just in: the (no-so-stable) NSW State Government, via Infrastructure NSW, has finally submitted its plans for the stench of buildings that will call 'Central barangaroo' home. And they're 3x bigger than previously approved. Featuring:</p> <p>**buildings so despicably tall they will block sacrosanct sight lines from observatory hill - views that have existed forever. Goodbye nice sunsets. Goodbye insta-gram moments. That's a Dom-Perrotett-20-storey-special photo-bombing your westerly wedding photos!</p> <p>**white elephant residential high-rises so monstrous they make blues point tower blush -- apparently designed just high enough so the top floor can sell for \$50M with its uninterrupted views of the Opera House. Ker-ching. That's Dom's tall middle-finger, waving goodbye to you as he gets booted out of Parliament....</p> <p>**stolen public land (for private gain) -- land that was approved for recreation and community space will be apartments and offices, even though Sydney has 15% commercial vacancy and hardly anyone goes to the office any more....</p> <p>**actively destroyed heritage -- 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.</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p><b>**140% more bulk and scale they was approved in June 2016 -- to get this much gross floor area, the government is looking to increase height above the maximum allowable, remove hickson park, ignore all block controls, have no setbacks, overhand by 3 metres, and provide no vehicle access. Doesn't that remind you of any other desolate wind-tunnel just down the street?</b></p> <p><b>**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. Imagine if you could do that when you did your own reno - skyscrapers on every block!</b></p> <p><b>**opaque partnership between the NSW Government and Mall developer Scentre Group and Chinese Apartment developer Aqualand - advised by former Labor minister Luke Foley! The next NSW election is going Nirvana - Smells like Teal Spirit.</b></p>
352751	Anthony Gilchrist	See attachment
354127	Anthony Kunz	Hello David, I attach an objection to MP06_0162 MOD 9 for the Barangaroo Concept Plan. I acknowledge that the exhibition period ended on Monday but are you able to please accept this late submission? The land owner only became aware of the proposal late in the notification period which prevented a timely response. Regards, Anthony Kunz Planning Consultant - Planning Lab, Level 24, Three International Towers, 300 Barangaroo Avenue, Sydney NSW 2000
353995	Anthony Mountstephens	<p>Submission on Modification 9 Millers Point Heritage area is of national significance .Its history goes back millennia for indigenous people and for the white settlement which strived, through largely maritime connections, to establish our nation as we know it today. Millers Point has the same significance as The Rocks which in the seventies was saved from development by the far seeing actions of the BLF and Jack Munday. This saving for posterity is universally admired. The significance of northern Hickson Rd is recorded in its name 'The Hungry Mile' where poor maritime workers had to queue for work apportioned by the bosses and only the fittest were chosen. The view from the water of these houses where many of these workers lived will now be obliterated by the increased height proposed in Mod9 - a sad loss to our appreciation of the struggles of the past and our industrial history. The Hungry Mile could be re-named The Angry Mile by those opposed to this modification. Has such history and heritage been so discredited? The public views to and from Observatory Hill will be obliterated together with the views from my apartment. The original plan envisaged "tapering" for development towards the popular park headland which is enjoyed by many throughout the year, The proposed increased building heights, and particularly the hideous residential tower at the northern end is completely at odds with the original concept. The tripling of the GFA flies in the face of history to no public benefit to local, interstate and overseas visitors. The reduced reduction of parkland for families and general leisure is appalling as are the shadows covering what remains. The State Heritage listing for Millers Point Heritage Conservation Area under Aesthetic/Technical significance sates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Aside from the south edge of the precinct it is NOT overpowered by city scale development</li> <li>2. Its vistas and glimpses of the Harbour along its streets and escarpments are fundamentally important.</li> </ol> <p>The argument put forward for the development of Barangaroo South is no justification for the proposals in Modification 9 for Barangaroo Central. The government authority proposing these changes is to be reviewed by a government Minister -</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		a complete lack of good practice and oversight from the public. Surely good sense will prevail in this important matter and a compromise achieved which, will best satisfy all parties. Failure to compromise will surely lead to mass public protest of no benefit to anyone, lease of all the proposing bodies and the State Government. Please take into account the foregoing in your deliberations. Anthony Mountstephens
353487	arabella smith	I object to the development of central Barangaroo as it is now being presented, as it completely ruins the ethos, outlook and pleasantness of observatory hill. such a wonderful spot now, why change it forever for Sydney - we don't need this development. Furthermore, Observatory Hill is such an iconic, historical landmark for Sydney, it is such a shame to ruin it.
353771	Arihant Surana	The proposed concept modification would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> </ul> The proposed modification to the Concept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.</li> </ul>
352591	Arno Mukdadilok	I object and do not support this development.
352536	Arthur Klioufis	The proposed increase in building heights and Sqm of Barangaroo is not in the spirit of the approval and a gross overdevelopment that will create shadowing , increase traffic and drastically reduce the public space. The view to central barrangaroo will also be impacted and the economic damage to millers point residences is not acceptable.
354007	Ashley McGrath	I object to the changes contained within the updated plan and feel this is completely out of proportion and not befitting the heritage of the area. Furthermore, the scale is considerably out of proportion with the position of the site.
353225	Ashley Yelds	* Most likely a duplicate submission of individual concerns rather than a submission from an organisation lodged by this person. I strongly object to the development plans for Barangaroo Concept Plan Mod 9. The Mod is a further destruction of public space and amenity, does nothing to enhance the critically important parkland, and will forever scar the landscape and historic sightlines of this historically important of Sydney precinct. In particular: Bulk and Scale The proposed development along Hickson Rd is too big - the sheer bulk, lack of setback and height all completely disproportional ot the site and lacking any empathy fo the historic surroundings. The proponent's visual impact assessment is completely inadequate It does not include visual impact images from High St or Kent St, whether as a streetscape or as individual properties. The Northern Residential Tower is totally out of context to, Nawi Cove, Millers Point heritage streetscape, Observatory Hill and the Barangaroo Headland Park. It is without merit as a standalone building. It will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Its comparison to Blues Point Tower is wholly warranted. The proposed reduction of Hickson Park is a shameful commercial "grab" of public space - for such a significant commercial development to be allowed to encroach even further on public parkland is not in the public

**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	Submission
		<p>interest. Historic views: The views of the low-rise residences of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc. The development does nothing to create a sense of "Place". The views from Observatory Hill will be severely and adversely impacted, as will the view from opposite shores and the water. These perspectives are the last remnants of how Sydney developed since the 1800's and should be retained for evermore, not compromised or destroyed for commercial gain. The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Millers Point Heritage Precinct, Sydney's Old Town. Other major cities around the world respect their Old Towns by maintaining sightlines. Once these are lost to this scale of overdevelopment, that heritage and connection to the early years of Sydney will be lost. Traffic and Parking: The proponent's assessment of traffic and parking impacts is wholly inadequate: there will be significant traffic generation spilling out across Central Barangaroo and into and through the residential communities of Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues. The proposed retail precinct provides minimal shopper parking - this will adversely impact the residential communities of Millers Point and Walsh Bay. Many of these properties do not have off-street parking. Furthermore, the proponent plans to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road. National Trust: I am in agreement with the National Trust's comments on the proposed project in that the proposed concept modification would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> <li>* Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water</li> <li>* Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. I also agree with the National Trust's position that the proposed modification to the Concept:</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill * Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.</li> </ul> <p>***Additional text from organisation submitter (353229): I object to the proposed development on a number of grounds. 1: Bulk and Scale: The proposed development along Hickson Rd is too big - the sheer bulk, lack of setback and height are all completely disproportional to the site and are lacking any empathy to the historic surroundings. The proponent's visual</p>



**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	Submission
		<p>impact assessment is completely inadequate. It does not include visual impact images from High St or Kent St, whether as a streetscape or as individual properties. The Northern Residential Tower is totally out of context to Nawi Cove, Millers Point heritage streetscape, Observatory Hill and the Barangaroo Headland Park. It is without merit as a standalone building. It will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Its comparison to Blues Point Tower is wholly warranted. The proposed reduction of Hickson Park is a shameful commercial "grab" of public space - for such a significant commercial development to be allowed to encroach even further on public parkland is not in the public interest. 2: Adverse impact on Historic views: The views of the low-rise residences of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc. The development does nothing to create a sense of "Place". The views from Observatory Hill will be severely and adversely impacted, as will the view from opposite shores and the water. These perspectives are the last remnants of how Sydney developed since the 1800's and should be retained for evermore, not compromised or destroyed for commercial gain. The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Millers Point Heritage Precinct, Sydney's Old Town. Other major cities around the world respect their Old Towns by maintaining sightlines. Once these are lost to this scale of overdevelopment, that heritage and connection to the early years of Sydney will be lost. 3: Excessive Traffic and Parking impacts: The proponent's assessment of traffic and parking impacts is wholly inadequate: there will be significant traffic generation spilling out across Central Barangaroo and into and through the residential communities of Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues. The proposed retail precinct provides minimal shopper parking - this will adversely impact the residential communities of Millers Point and Walsh Bay. Many of these properties do not have off-street parking. Furthermore, the proponent plans to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road: this is unacceptable. Furthermore, I am in agreement with the National Trust's comments in that the proposed concept modification would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> <li>* Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water</li> <li>* Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park.</li> </ul> <p>I also agree with the National Trust's position that the proposed modification to the Concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</li> </ul>

**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	Submission
		<p>* Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</p> <p>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill</p> <p>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.</p>
353839	Averill Minto	<p>My husband and I have been Millers Point residents since 2011 and enjoy the unique character of the area being at the connection of the historic Sydney Rocks area and the Sydney CBD. My property looks directly down on this development. I object to this proposal. While this development will only partly reduce my own views I am concerned about the loss of views for so many other people and that in turn will reduce the attractiveness of our location and adjacent property values. It is grossly unfair on people who have bought properties in this area since the early State Government plans were proposed for a low rise area. This includes all those people to who the State Government in effect have disadvantaged in selling Rocks properties with views and then taking those views away with this new plan conveniently timed for when the State Government has completed sales. The Court Case judgement of re Crown and the State Government in effect said exactly the same thing. People were sold the rights to views only to have a new plan proposed to reduce them. That was a sound and fair judgement. Here we go again. The State Government doing exactly the same thing and expecting to get away with it. Yes you may think you can roll over groups of individual property owners but people wont accept this. It is grossly unfair. If this level of height was proposed ten years ago for this overall area in the proposal it would have reduced buyer interest for all buildings in the area, created opposition back then and probably been rejected. People in good faith have made decisions and bought apartments and properties to have their amenity reduced. The State Government has mislead these people. Your only defence could be we should not have trusted you in the first place. People who do this in other financial settings or commercially get fined and sometimes imprisoned. You have already lost one court case trying to do it in the Crown instance. The principles are the same. People were given expectations and have been mislead. In addition views of the historic Rocks are now heavily reduced from the Western side. This is one of Sydney's unique landmark areas. All around the world people travel to see these historic areas in Sydney and other global cities. This view of the Rocks will be blocked largely from the West. Also the views to the West from the Rocks are beautiful today and they will largely disappear. This is such a beautiful area and you are trashing it. Some very poor judgement has gone into the development of this plan. The planners have valued returns over the fundamental rights of people who have been mislead by the State Government in buying their properties whether State government owned or privately. Additionally you are wrecking the beauty of the Rocks. I repeat my objection and ask that you withdraw this proposal. Averill Minto</p>
354043	Barbara Bryan	<p>Those proposed buildings are FAR TOO LARGE and bulky for that magnificent open site facing onto the harbour's waters. They will block out so many vistas for so many others beyond their bulk. Observatory Point is a place that provides sweeping views around the harbour - that's how it got its name. Until you turn south where the view is already blocked by the Crown casino. For thousands of years, this headland was used by the Gadigal people. Today it also contains the history of early colonisation."Not only does it have the Observatory but it allows us all, the public, to walk freely around and survey the harbour. You don't have to spend money. It's yours. It's public land. As was the entire Barangaroo, as was Blackwater Bay in Glebe"</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352512	Barbara Jones	Couldn,t believe what I originally read, had to re-rread it is disgusting. Our Heritage, our beautiful ObservetoryPark loved by tourists, locals and people enjoying our unique and oldest part of Australia. It sounds like money moves anything even the oldest, most beautiful area in Australia. Wake up NSW government, you are hanging by a thread, if this goes through you are all out.Who would vote for destruction? On a grand scale? This is just the START OF PEOPLE POWER. bOB cARR PROMISED the waterfront which was Patrick Wharves "to the people of NSW. He got away with what he thought was reasonable How gullible were we. NO MORE
353313	Barbara White	I object to this development submission at Barangaroo
353735	Barry Holcombe	I object to the latest proposal MP06_0162 Mod 9 for the redevelopment of Barangaroo Central in the strongest possible terms. I am the owner of unit 701, Observatory Tower, Kent Street and therefore have a personal interest in this proposal. I find it wrong and inappropriate on so many different levels that it is difficult to know where to start. Whilst redevelopment of this area is necessary and inevitable, it is essential that any proposal not detract from the beauty of our harbour foreshore and be focussed on the community as a whole, not an exclusive group of deep-pocketed individuals who will be handed water views currently held by others. The concept of lining the harbour with high-rise buildings was initiated over 50 years ago with Blues Point tower and was rejected so convincingly that no further such proposals have been attempted since - neither should they be now. This area is part of the heritage of our city and should be treated as such. At a political level the cynicism of relocating low-income tenants from public housing in the Millers Point area and selling off those properties to cashed-up private individuals then subsequently taking the views which are a significant part of the value of those properties and on-selling them to yet another group of wealthy individuals is simply breathtaking. In terms of the potential to influence the next state election such a move is nothing short of blind stupidity, as is delegating final approval for sign-off to the Planning Minister, particularly in light of the recent community backlash against being treated as fools by politicians. I could go on at length but the points that I would raise have undoubtedly been spelled out at length by many others with views similar to my own. Suffice to say that I wish to add my voice to the groundswell of opposition to such a short-sighted attempted money-grabbing exercise Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.
352969	Belinda Muller	See PDF attachment.
352551	Ben Board	I do not understand why large buildings need to be built right next the water making the surround area ugly. Imagine if bondi beach was awash with huge towering buildings. Put the people first not shareholders or Superannuation funds. Money doesn't make you happy the environment you live in does and this building proposal is going to make so so many people unhappy and push communities to despair. There's a pre school on High st that I'm pretty sure has already received enough from all the building works right outside the school and you have no idea how loud the machines are in person.I'm sad to think that the sunset from my balcony which looks beautiful now will be blocked by a large structure. Put people first.
352643	Ben Copeman-Hill	Most prominent and significant natural beauty and heritage destroyed now and for future generations Now is the time and chance to prevent that

**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	Submission
354187	Ben Guthrie	<p>Dear David Glasgow &amp; The Hon. Anthony Roberts MP Minister for Planning, It is doubtful that there has ever been a more concrete, tangible and devastating example of the politics of greed than what is represented by the entire Barangaroo precinct. The original masterplan for this site by Hill Thalys, Paul Berkemeier, Jane Irwin et al with its generous public spaces, parks, squares, rational streets &amp; promenades, city connections and appropriately scaled commercial development was lost many years ago. The development that the NSW Govt has approved and seen built on the land that it once owned on behalf of its citizens here has put commercial profit ahead of public amenity at every step. Yet the project remains incomplete and there are still opportunities for redemption on the parts of the site where development opportunities remain. Sadly, this latest modification (Barangaroo Concept Plan Modification 9) continues this contemptible attitude of private gains over and above public benefit. The modification as submitted is to the detriment of the harbour, the public open space, the heritage values at Millers Point and Observatory Hill, iconic views from across the city and to Barangaroo itself. Generally speaking, the height, bulk and scale of this amendment grossly exceeds all previous designs and approvals for this part of the city. The dramatic increase in scale of all of the buildings in Central Barangaroo, and in particular Block 7, provides an unacceptably negative impact upon the public domain in and around the site. The additional massing proposed under Modification 9 would see Hickson Park lose significant solar access in the morning and afternoon including during the winter solstice. The block 7 tower will cast unacceptably large morning shadows over Harbour Park, Wugul Walk and Nawi Cove. The waterfront and adjacent public open space are crucial public elements that must be protected and celebrated at all times of the day; it is ludicrous to claim that sun is not needed in the morning. It is already bad enough that the illegitimately approved Crown tower shadows much of the South Barangaroo promenade. Further reducing solar access along the Central Barangaroo promenade adds to significant cumulative overshadowing impacts throughout the Barangaroo precinct. This proposal also includes significant and unacceptable development encroachment into public open space with built form reducing the boundary of Hickson Park and over Hickson Road. No enclosed floorspace should be permitted within any part of the reservation of Hickson Road. Historically, this street had a 30 metre wide reservation, measured from the cliff face below High Street which should be retained, intact and unimpeded. This over-reach of the site's boundaries must be rejected, as it would diminish public open space entirely for private, commercial gain and is not in the public interest. The pair of proposed East-West oriented streets are formed with a very skinny 12m separation between tall buildings. As a consequence these streets would have limited vistas to the harbour and park, would be overshadowed and dominated by the bulk of the flanking buildings and generate excessive wind disruption at the pedestrian level. These streets are the places where a generous visual and physical connection between the existing city and the harbour should be maintained and celebrated. As with the miniaturised streets in Barangaroo South, these tall, skinny, tiny streets exist only to serve and maximise the private floor space of the buildings on the site and do nothing to address or improve the amenity of the public domain. Modification 9 fails to honour the longstanding commitment that Central Barangaroo would preserve views from Observatory Hill to the horizon and the harbour. The aptly-named Observatory Hill has provided an unrivalled panorama of Sydney Harbour for tens of thousands of years. This reciprocal relationship between hill and harbour would be severely and irreparably damaged if this proposal was approved. The long view along the axis of White Bay will be completely blocked, while the views to the Observatory from the west and from Darling Harbour would be largely lost, appropriated by a private tower dominating the foreshore. Sydney Observatory Hill Park currently has almost 270 degrees of uninterrupted views of Sydney Harbour, and can thus be seen from many distant vantage points including Balmain. These views have heritage</p>

**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	Submission
		<p>significance dating back to when the park was used to signal incoming ships so that their arrival could be prepared for, and back even further into the millennia of indigenous occupation. Modification 9 would destroy these consistent water views, degrading the park's important heritage values, threatening the functionality of the Observatory itself, and diminishing its visible place on the headland. Proposed community &amp; public uses total just 0.025% of total floor space across Barangaroo. The provision of social and affordable housing within Sydney, and within the Millers Point and Barangaroo precinct more specifically, remains inadequate and could be addressed by increasing the supply of social and affordable housing within this development. The large quantity of social housing that has recently been removed from Millers Point and The Rocks needs to be reinstated, and within this part of the city. When we consider that, until very recently, this land was owned by the State on behalf of the people of NSW, the proposed level of provision is below any defensible standard and is a poor outcome for 22 hectares of foreshore accessible public land adjoining one of the world's major city centres. Barangaroo Concept Plan Modification 9 must thus be rejected in its entirety as it is not in any way in the public interest. Kind regards, Ben Guthrie</p>
352739	Benjamin Pope	<p>I am an ARC DECRA Fellow and Lecturer in Astrophysics at the University of Queensland, and a former member of the astronomy department at the University of Sydney. The proposed development, in my view as a professional astronomer and educator, will be harmful to the activities of Sydney Observatory, which is an extremely important institution in the history of science in NSW and an important public and educational resource today. Any development on the site at Barangaroo should therefore have a lower height and avoid blocking the view of the horizon from Sydney Observatory. The development proposal holds that Sydney Observatory only observes objects above 10 degrees from the horizon, and only with the large telescopes in the domes; this is simply not true. Much of astronomy education is about pointing to objects in the sky with the naked eye, with binoculars, or especially for outreach events, with small telescopes; these go all the way down to the horizon sometimes, and moreover a big illuminated tower on the western horizon will make it difficult to discern anything near it, not just physically occulted by it. This is likely to be an especially severe problem for events observing the Sun - for example, solar eclipses like the partial one in 2030, or the upcoming 2032 or 2039 Transit of Mercury, an event likely to draw a large crowd using small telescopes, in which the peak of the visible transit will be at sunset (<a href="https://www.timeanddate.com/eclipse/in/australia/sydney?iso=20321113">https://www.timeanddate.com/eclipse/in/australia/sydney?iso=20321113</a>). It is likely that these events will draw crowds; I was the lead organiser for the 2012 Transit of Venus viewing at the University of Sydney, at which we had several hundred attendees, and likewise for the 2019 Transit of Mercury viewing at New York University. These events are keystones of science education, and I have vivid memories of the 2004 Transit when I was at high school, really the first time I engaged not just with books but actual hands-on physics. Quite apart from these major events, it is common to look at sunspots and prominences as part of outreach and education, including at sunset. It will be important that any development not block the view of the setting Sun, but the proposed development will obscure it frequently. Speaking in more general terms beyond professional uses in astronomy, the Observatory is a historic site chosen originally for its panoramic views of the sky and harbour - and indeed for timekeeping, so that it is clearly visible from around the harbour. This is a truly beautiful place with a public park used widely for weddings and engagements, picnics, and walks, and I have watched the sun set many times from its grounds. Sydney Observatory has a function space for events outside of astronomy, and really the selling point is those views of the harbour. It is important that this historic and celebrated horizon be preserved for future generations.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353439	Bernard Kelly	Please see attached submission. (personal submission)
353687	Bettina Orellana	Shocking news to hear Philip Thalys on the Raido on the weekend explaining some of the alterations that are being made to the previous plans For the latest OVER development at Barangaroo. I refer to Concept 9 I am a member of the public, it has just taken me almost 1 hour to find how to lodge this submission, I am very concerned that these additional changes in Concept 9 will add continued over use and development of what was to be a site made for the public. I understand that the view from the beautiful rotunda in front of the Observatory will be obliterated to the west HOW TERRIBLE. Please stop this over development of a heritage area. Its already over the Top Thanks Bettina
352814	Beverley Atkinson	I thought the Barangaroo plans as built so far, were themselves a compromise to extinguish a crass blocky devastation of the topographic delight of Sydney. So what is the blocky rubbish doing, back again in addition to what we have to put up with already? As urban crime, this is quite obviously an extreme example of what never to do. There can be no legal reason to even contemplate this plan, no positive reason to waste our time and resources even looking at it, let alone "assessing" it. Way past a joke. Unless it's the bogan Australian joke; the culture-devoid uneducated island full of idiots who would wreck their most beautiful, for no reason at all. Sorry, no point giving a measured, educated reply to this. There is no language in common. I am an architect. There is, or was, only one Sydney. Just NO. Total OBJECTION.
353825	Bill Ryall	I object strongly to the over-development proposed for Central Barangaroo. The proposed development is too dense and too high (Block 7) and will exacerbate wind, impede views from Observatory Hill and Balmain, will reduce sunlight to open space, particularly of Hickson Park and the local school. South Barangaroo is massively overdeveloped and the proposed development of Central Barangaroo will again decrease the amenity of the overall Barangaroo project, as promise initially by the NSW Government.
353731	Blossom Adams	We have been in Millers Point since 2011, having renovated a circa 1869 heritage property. The latest development at Central Barangaroo is now finally declared as going higher than the community expected; with loss of views, loss of our skyline, loss of natural light, obstruction of significant landmarks, loss of sights easily identifiable from Observatory Hill, loss of parking (no additional parking allocated) and as for shopping at Barangaroo - there are very few parking stations available for any shopping; ingress of visitors to the area who are not always respectful of the area or the residents; bringing disturbance to public areas at all hours of the day/ night; our heritage precinct is now threatened by an ingress of buildings that are out of scale to the area and disrespects the area's historic significance. There are little street parking in Hickson road. The developers have constantly pushed for changes, additions, raising the height of the developments and now will also impact the landmark Barangaroo park!! Where is the exclusivity of coming in to The Rocks, the old terraces, the population of the area, its historic significance in our town Sydney. This development is not gracing our area with a contribution to the grace and age of this part of Sydney, it is simply a financial and money-making arrangement and it is not a positive addition to urban planning of the precinct.
353269	Bradley Wease	* I find it detestable that conceptional documents and plans can be provided to the public and then completely scrapped after initial general acceptance.

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>* The current approved Concept Plan guaranteed views from Observatory Hill to the water and horizon. Mod 9 will totally obstruct almost all these heritage views to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill.</p> <p>* The views to and from the High Street terraces will be significantly diminished.</p> <p>* Crown and Lend Lease's views (to the harbour, Bridge, Opera House etc) will be maintained but views from Observatory Hill, Millers Point's Office and Residential Buildings will be lost.</p> <p>* I admired how Sydney had planned to have public foreshore parkland in the city. Under Mod 9, Hickson Park will be surrounded by unacceptably high structures, diminishing the parkland and links to the harbour.</p> <p>* Millers Point and The Rocks are significant heritage assets, which will be lost if the proposed Mod 9 development proceeds.</p> <p>* The current Concept Plan Gross Floor Area is being tripled in size.</p> <p>* View sharing is an important Mod 9 consideration. Photographs used in the Mod 9 documentation are misleading. The angles and heights used hide the plan's impact on view sharing and are not true indication of the visual reality.</p> <p>* Finally, I am so disappointed that the Mod 9 plan will destroy the unique opportunity that was to be provided by Barangaroo i.e. parkland and open space with direct connections to the harbour and the historic Rocks precinct.</p>
354069	Brenan Dew	<p>It is disappointing to read about the Barangaroo Concept plan that is the next stage of building encroachment northwards towards Millers Point. While the impact assessment unconvincingly makes some attempt to nullify any obstruction to the operations of the Observatory, there is no denying this will change the historical and visual landscape of the harbour from the Observatory Hill site. The increase in height of the proposed block comes at the benefit of its few inhabitants, to the detriment of many who will see a forever changed visual landscape and a new artificial horizon that will block sunset for a significant portion of the year. There has been much public comment about the disconnect this will bring in further separating the function of Sydney Observatory and it's connection to the harbour, but the importance of this natural high ground in the Sydney Harbour area would have existed much before the construction of the Observatory that will never be viewed in the same way from the Observatory hill site. For the benefit of all future Sydney Siders, I hope and wish, the proposed plan does not proceed</p>
353947	Brendan Wallington	<p>I am a New South Wales taxpayer. Have been for the last 35 years. How dare you consider giving more public space away to commercial interests. It's not yours to give away!! It's public!!! And once it's gone, it's gone! And for what? To make some developer richer? NSW Government has seriously lost its way.</p>
353351	Brian Bestwick	<p>I object to the Barangaroo Concept Plan proposed modification 9. The increase in the height of the building has a major negative impact on all those who live around the site and those who visit the area. The increase in height blocks views for people living on the city side and Pyrmont side of the development and is not in keeping with the original intent of Barangaroo Central. The increase will negatively impact iconic views such as Sydney Harbour Bridge for many existing</p>

**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	Submission
		<p>properties. The increased height of the buildings increases the shadowing of public areas in the area having a major negative impact on the usability of the open space. The buildings in Barangaroo Central should remain within the approved heights.</p>
353117	Brian Wood	<p>This proposal is an unmitigated disaster. The scale of the overall Barangaroo development is large. It affects a large part of the city, and therefore should be viewed in the context of a very wide part of the city. Established long views to Millers Point, the Observatory, the Rocks houses, will be completely and permanently destroyed. Jack Munday and Shirley Ball "saved" the Rocks houses, and they now will be blocked into oblivion. Where is the respect for that and other hard won earlier outcomes? It is unfair and offensive for the State to sell off the High Street terraced houses and then build a wall of buildings immediately in front of them, blocking their views and sun, and blocking views to them by the public on the water and in suburbs to the west. This part of Sydney is steeped in history. It ranks amongst the most important pieces of historical land in Australia, both for the Indigenous and for the colonists. The Barangaroo Central portion deserves to be largely left unspoiled, sacrosanct, as largely open space for use by all the public and complementing the excellent hill Reserve reinstatement made so far. Compare European cities which have retained graceful open spaces, both formal and informal, displaying a respect for history and providing residents and visitors with appropriately scaled dignified relaxation space. This proposal does the opposite. It clearly displays greed and commercial profiteering at the expense of the public good. It offends long term planning principles, and focusses only on the short term. Once such developments are done they can never be un-done, and this site deserves better. The principles set out in the State Government's own architect's paper Greener Places Design Guide should be applied. The public open spaces already built on the Barangaroo site are a travesty, little left over areas squeezed in amongst buildings, not open spaces allowing strolling and quiet relaxation with sun, grass and trees, but simply standard urban thoroughfares and courtyards. Those planned for this proposal are not much better. There will be a local population of many thousands of residents, workers and visitors in and surrounding Barangaroo who deserve better than such a bare minimum. The proposed tower is the most visible and worst intrusion into the area and should be deleted entirely. It is a late addition to all previous planning proposals. It appears to be not needed functionally, it is totally out of scale, and will overpower the hill Reserve. And it is so close to the Niwa Cove that it totally destroys the concept of linking open space on Central to the hill Reserve. The Metro Station close to the proposed tower has been successfully integrated into the site and is appropriate. But I object to its cost being used as a rationale for over-building Central. It is part of an overall city-wide infrastructure which is an entirely separate development and which should stand alone. Blocks B6 -B7 are too high. Without considering the history of previous Modifications, and as stated earlier, I consider protecting the visibility to and from Observatory Hill and its Observatory, and the terraced houses on Kent St and High St, is paramount. To achieve this B6 and B7 should be reduced to three or four storeys. Alternatively the insignificant and so-called view shafts between B5, B6 and B7 should be as wide as the blocks themselves, to ensure the houses behind are clearly perceived to be there. The present viewshafts are useless in that respect. All views from the water and suburbs further south are now limited by the line between the Crown Casino and Highgate. I don't object to what is south of the line, it is the views north of that line that need to be significantly increased. As a 25 year owner in Observatory Tower I am concerned about increases in traffic, particularly along Kent St but generally also in the Miller Point area. I haven't seen data on the increase, but it is certain that what I consider to be massive over-development on Central is guaranteed to increase the traffic. The area was heavily congested before the COVID events, and it is to be expected that will return and become worse. I consider there has been insufficient public</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		consultation for the proposed development. It is easy to feel that we are being steam-rolled. Similarly I consider the presentations to the public so far are replete with vague statements, beautifully coloured artists' impressions of street views which are typical of most developments, and with carefully selected views generally aerial, all of which tell an educated viewer virtually nothing of real relevance. The reality of this proposal to me is that it will turn a truly historic, wonderful, diverse and contemplative part of our city into yet another essentially over-bulky modern ordinary city block. The current charm will be seriously diminished.
354071	Bruce Powell	Please refer the attached PDF letter and associated images and figures.
353153	Bruce Yap	Modification 9 must not proceed. Anyone who cares about public spaces and specifically Sydney Harbour will be shocked at yet more disregard for the people of Sydney. Mod 9 will change ObservatoryHill for posterity.
353247	Burford Sampson	I think nothing should be built which obstructs the views from Observatory Hill. We have no idea what the structures would look like but the latest Modification 9 should be cancelled and perhaps the original concept plan in 2007 should be adhered too.
352842	Candice Murphy	I object to the above Modification 9 The historic views from Observatory Hill belong to all those who use this beautiful spot. To block those views permanently is a disgrace. Allowing the decision making process to fall the Planning Minister alone, is to further open this flawed process to more corruption.
352786	Carlene Smith	In an area where public space is supposed to be treasured, the density of the Barangaroo Central Modification 9 is breathtaking. I note that Crown has a nice park in front but the buildings are so close together____ with such good architects all bunched in together. I object to building of block 5 on the BARTON St fence line as it will shadow the small HICKSON Park NOW REDUCED BY 30%. Please put it back and build 10m to the north of Barton St. Block 5 will also shadow HICKSON Park.... It has already lost western sun and I note that the shadows were investigated on the shortest day of the year_____ Block 5 NEEDS to be set back 10m towards the north. Soon >800 apartments adjoining the park. All buildings are too high_____ reduce by 10m. The 73.7m high residential building is too high_____reduce by 20m. It will be all that people see when they exit the Station at Barangaroo_____ Let's see the harbour.
353051	Carmel Kreamer	We object to Barangaroo (Modification 9) as per the attached letter
352941	Carol Griffin	As a long term resident of Millers Point, I object to the proposal. This area is of historic significance and up till now, except for the Crown Casino has been in my opinion well developed, particularly Walsh Bay precinct.. A 73.7 metre residential tower, allows Crown Casino and Lend Leases One Sydney Harbour Apartments will have unobscured views to the Harbour, the Opera House, the Bridge, etc. but ruins views from and Millers Point and Observatory Hill which is well loved community area and other buildings close by. This area was promised as an Arts Precinct and an over bearing building of this size is out of keeping with the historic nature of the area. I also note the gross floor area has been tripled since the draft concept plan. A majority of people,I believe find no value and abhor the Crown casino building and all it represents and now another high rise is proposed that further takes away the publics enjoyment of this area. The question I ask is

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		"Will this building enhance the liveability of the area for the public" No, this development is for the enjoyment of very few at the expense of many in a historic and relatively egalitarian part of Sydney.
353949	Carol Murray	Please Do Not approve the large buildings now proposed for the remaining Barangaroo site. They were not in the original plan and will ruin the wonderful Harbourside area beside Sydney's oldest heritage suburbs of The Rocks, Dawes Point and Millers Point. Our harbour is the envy of the world, such natural beauty must not be destroyed with ugly huge buildings on land that should be enjoyed uninterrupted by everyone to the waters edge. For the sake of future generations leave ugly gross buildings away from this special and glorious area of Sydney's harbour so all Sydneysiders and visitors from around the world can appreciate the natural beauty of our special harbour city. Please make a good decision to not allow these buildings to ruin the lovely feel of the Barangaroo Headland and the view from Observatory Hill and Sydney's beloved heritage suburbs.
352518	Casey Aladic	As a resident of Millers Point for the last 15+ years the current proposal deeply concerns me. The skyline impact from Kent St and Observatory Hill are amongst my bigger concerns, whatever this ends up becoming I just hope that a longer term vision of the area is considered. While I'm not objecting to a development of some nature it is simply too high and wide, detracting from the history of the area and detracting from the experience of local residents. Whatever the final version becomes it must consider the local community, businesses and residents as well as the history. In its current proposed state it does none of that.
353199	Cassie Fahey	How is it that we find ourselves fighting overdevelopment and greed in The Rocks/Miller's Point again? Let us not forget what this area is renowned for - standing up for the preservation and integrity of this charming space. Thanks to Jack Munday and others like him, we have this wonderful parcel of history and intrigue within the city. Why are we betraying ourselves and our children by selling off these magnificent vistas that everyone can enjoy, to a select few. If we allow this proposal to get through, we will regret it.
353021	Catherine Deakin	I object to the proposal to further develop Barangaroo in a way which will destroy the special character of Observatory Hill. Observatory Hill has been a significant place for residents of Sydney for thousands of years, and the views of the harbour in all directions are central to that significance and must not be interfered with.
353207	Catherine Papallo	I object to the building.
353819	Cathryn Hlavka	Submission Uploaded
352561	cathy xie	Dear Madam/Sir RE: Application No: MP06_0162 MOD 9 I am writing to you to strongly object to this proposal. Our community at King Street Wharf has been suffering from overdevelopment at our neighbourhood of Barangaroo in the last couple of decades. As a result we now are suffering from terribly heavy traffic jam especially during the peak hours and festive seasons. There is inadequate open space for residents. Our beautiful harbour view which we paid millions for are being taken away by ugly new buildings. This is not on. Please STOP! Regards

**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	Submission
354031	Charles Mifsud	I object to the proposed changes to the development plans for Barangaroo. The Barangaroo area is already proposed to be densely populated, these changes will significantly increase the population density of the area with much larger form buildings creating more shadowing and without a proportionate increase public spaces.
353635	Charley Kelly	<p>I strongly object to the overdevelopment of Barangaroo for multiple reasons. The historical significance of Barangaroo (The Hungry Mile), Millers Point and the Rocks is unlike any other part of Australia. It is a legacy to be valued and preserved for ever. We purchased our derelict terrace from the NSW State Government in 2016. The neglect of our property and every other house in Millers Point was subjected to was criminal. No money was spent to preserve these homes. Many of these homes had damage to significant heritage aspects through the NSW Government lack of care and inappropriate works being undertaken over many years. We all had a passion to revive the suburb and homes to preserve it for many generations to come. At great cost and heart ache with no support from NSW Government but great opposition from Heritage Council we turned Millers Point from a rotting, empty suburb to one of beauty. We are proud of what we achieved in this significantly historic location and love that tourists from around the world come to see us. It is now horrifying that the NSW State government is looking to destroy our significant heritage suburbs for money. As you can see from the overdevelopment and ugliness of Crown Casino and One Sydney Harbour, we will only end up with more or less that average architecturally barren buildings. We had a chance to build something beautiful and link iconic suburbs together to create a world class area. What a shame we will be left with a Russian Communist era looking structures that will overshadow surrounding areas, all for a quick buck. I object strongly to the Barangaroo development for the following reasons: - It does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill and fills in the night sky around the Observatory - It does not respect the heritage significance of Millers Point and will sever its maritime relationship with Sydney Harbour - It is not consistent with the approved concept in bulk or scale and the impact this will have on Barangaroo as well as Millers Point - It is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan or the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan to protect icons The proposed concept modification would: - Block public views west from Observatory Hill - Block public views from White Bay, Pyrmont, Balmain and Pirrama Park to Observatory Hill - Block the public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont and Pirrama Park I urge you strongly to stop this development and replace it with one fitting for the area and historic significance of the area. Insert text from duplicate entry (353167): We purchase out heritage terrace in Millers Point to do what the NSW State Government had failed to do for years, restore a significantly heritage suburb to its former glory. With no financial support but significant hurdles we have managed to restore our princess to her former glory. It now beggars belief that the same NSW government wants to destroy the heritage significance of Millers Point and Barangaroo with overdevelopment of the worst kind. The overdevelopment impacts communities from many neighbourhoods. This development: - does not respect the heritage significance of Millers Point - does not respect the heritage significance from Observatory Hill - severs the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water - interrupts the open and significant views from Observatory Hill - interrupts significant views from Pyrmont, Pirrama Park, White Bay and Balmain of the Harbour Bridge and Observatory Hill This proposal is not consistent with the approved concept, nor is even remotely consistent with the commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development. I object strongly to the over development of Barangaroo and the considerable impact it has on so many suburbs, residents and visitors alike.</p>

**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	Submission
353073	Chris Hemstrom	<p>As a resident, rate payer and voter in the area I totally object to this outrageous proposal by the property developer, which is to the detriment of the NSW, Sydney and local community. The obliteration of views from Observatory Hill and the streets of historic Millers Point caused by this proposal causes great harm to the community; especially through destruction of the now well documented health benefits of views of nature, which have been enjoyed by generations of NSW and Sydney residents who have visited the area for picnics, meditation, and relaxation. Relevantly, the proposal is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views nor is it consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan for the protection of iconic views. The high density and intrusion of built structures on parklands proposed in the developer's submission further destroys the community benefits of developing this part of Sydney. The proposal is not consistent with the approved Concept nor with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development. There are already too many developments that have destroyed the natural beauty and heritage of many parts of Sydney. This proposal fails to respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill and Millers Point through its obstruction of views and its overall build density. Please do not contribute to this destruction by approving this outrageous proposal.</p>
352655	Chris Russell	<p>We live at 119 Kent Street . We have 2 Cars for our family and rely on onstreet parking to get our children to and from school and general day to day activities. I am extremely concerned that the lack of parking proposed will significantly impact our ability to park close to our home. High street and Kent Street are already congested. Our 4th floor office also has sweeping views of the harbour and the current proposal will 100% block our views, significantly reducing the value of the property and the right to view under which the property was purchased.</p>
353003	Christina Ritchie	<p>Please see the following points made in objection to the Mod 9 proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed increase in GFA from 47,000sqm to 144sqm in Central Barangaroo to accommodate 6 office blocks and 1 high residential tower with extensive retail space, significantly alters the intended predominant use of Central Barangaroo and destroys significant heritage view-lines. Such bulk and scale were never the stated intention for this public harbourfront land next to the highly developed Barangaroo South. Central Barangaroo was designated to be a public cultural and recreation precinct to balance and support the extensive high-rise office, residential and commercial built environment at Barangaroo South, with provision of much-needed public amenity for the well-being of residents and workers within Barangaroo South and the inner-city.</li> <li>2. As a largely public cultural and recreation space Central Barangaroo would be a valuable drawcard for Sydney. Enhancing our last undeveloped public harbour foreshore area with extensive usable attractive public spaces would provide significant value for the State of NSW. This can occur if the GFA is not increased as per the Mod 9 proposal. The 47,000sqm GFA approved prior to this Modification proposal would have limited the private ownership and building bulk so that optimum value could be gained from this extremely valuable public foreshore area. The State cannot afford to lose the opportunity to provide the citizens of NSW, visitors and tourists with a major new attraction that optimises the value of our famous harbourfront. An increase in GFA to provide largely private commercial and residential buildings would devalue this unique site. Such buildings belong on privately owned sites of less significance and less value to Sydney. The cost of lost opportunity has not been considered.</li> </ol>

**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	Submission
		<p>3. Was a needs analysis provided to support the addition of 6 office blocks and a residential tower on our public foreshore? Surveys and trends would indicate that empty office space in our existing city buildings will increase with the embedding of the hybrid work-from-home/office model. There is already a significant increase in the number of apartments approved or under construction in the CBD and Barangaroo South. The new residential tower has no merit and provides no benefit to the public who owns this land. The NSW Government has been charged with the responsibility of representing the public's interest in public land.</p> <p>4. The increase in GFA as proposed in Mod 9 enables the height of buildings to increase along the full length of the site to levels that block longstanding public heritage views as well as the views, outlook and sunlight from homes. There is insufficient articulation and separation of buildings. The narrow enclosed public view-lines through the site as per the Mod 9 plan are demeaning. The significant Heritage views have been seen since before white settlement of Australia. The current State Government must not obscure them forever by approving this land grab by developers that is largely for the benefit of private interests. Iconic views of the Heritage precinct at Millers Pt and the Harbour Bridge from Pymont, Darling Island and Balmain will be lost under the Mod 9 proposal. Advertising by Government of Heritage homes for private purchase attached significant value to the water and distant vistas.</p> <p>5. At the limit of 47000sqm the building envelope, as per the block diagram in the proposal, cannot be filled, as the proponents would have us believe. Their assertions in Mod 9 that the increase in heights and blocking of views along the length of the site is small, is misleading. A limit of 47000sqm would prevent buildings being built along the length of the envelope to the maximum height of the envelope. A GFA of 144,000sqm allows this, and more. Existing homes along Kent St and the Bond building at 30 Hickson Rd will suffer from extensive overshadowing and loss of valuable sunlight and water and distant views.</p> <p>6. The proposed residential tower does not contribute positively to the urban planning of the precinct. It sets a new unwarranted height allowance for the site and is a blight on the landscape, blocking views to and from our unique historic Observatory Hill site. Observatory Hill is an historic site of immense value to our State that cannot be replaced. It is a site for observation and perusal of our harbour through 270 degrees. Has the proponent considered any effect on the observation of the night sky from the Observatory telescope and any likely light spillage from residences in the proposed tower? Any such effect is unacceptable.</p> <p>7. The minimum public space GFA is miniscule compared with the extent of private commercial and residential building that is proposed for this public harbourfront land. This is unacceptable and not in keeping with the intended outcomes of plans for Central Barangaroo. There needs to be a significant reduction in private commercial and residential GFA for the site. The cultural and recreational amenity included at Central Barangaroo must not be in the form of more built structure on the remaining open space but be the designated use for the majority of any building on the rest of the site. Extensive public green space and tree canopy are needed to enable a people-friendly climate within the precinct.</p> <p>8. Hickson Park, a small pocket park that provides some respite from the multiple high towers of offices and residences in Barangaroo South and surrounding areas, was increased, and the increase approved under Mod 11 last October as the heights of the residential buildings adjacent to it were increased. Buildings on the northern side of Barton St were set</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>back and limited in height to prevent overshadowing of this small greenspace. Mod 9 seeks to overturn this recent approval and ignore the valid reasons provided and accepted. Hickson Park must be extended as per Mod 11, or more, to support green environmental credentials and meet the needs of the area. This small respite area is not comparable in size with Bryant Park in New York. The setbacks of buildings along the northern side of Barton St as per Mod 11 must be retained and the heights of the buildings along this line be reduced to avoid overshadowing and a sense of being enclosed and blocked from the harbourfront.</p> <p>9. Gas lane view-lines will be destroyed under Mod 11. Beautiful public sunset views are frequently captured on phone cameras by passers-by, local residents and visitors looking towards the water, west from the corner of Kent St. Similarly, lovely admired public views from the corner of Kent St and High St will be lost, as well as along the length of High St and the Heritage terraces. The public have been assured many times over the years that views to and from these Heritage terraces would never be blocked.</p> <p>10. Traffic congestion around Barton St and Millers point will be a major problem, with the additional traffic following completion and occupation of the residences in Barangaroo South, if Central Barangaroo Mod 9 is approved. Parking provisions are insufficient to meet the needs of workers, residents, shoppers and visitors to the area. While the Metro can provide additional public transport access, service vehicles, delivery vehicles and maintenance vehicles have not been considered. There is likely a need in the near future for additional traffic flow provision and access. Widening of Barton St might be required to avoid serious congestion. This would not be possible unless building setbacks are retained along Barton St as per Mod 11, or increased. Additional road access through the development site might also be needed. Mod 9 does not provide necessary building setbacks along Hickson Rd or Barton St for drop off and pickup areas. There is no provision for feed-in traffic lanes for access into Central Barangaroo. I ask that the determining authority for the Central Barangaroo Concept Plan Mod 9 refuse this defective plan. Optimum benefit to the citizens of NSW must be achieved, with attractive public harbourfront cultural and recreational areas being the predominant provision in any approved plan for this site. Opportunity to optimise the value to NSW of this harbourfront space must not be lost. Historic iconic view-lines that define and celebrate our cultural Heritage must be preserved. Proper consideration needs to be given to future traffic, cycle and pedestrian access routes and parking. Any negative impacts upon the existing, and soon to be completed, residences in the vicinity must be minimal, and appropriate amenity provided.</p>
353807	Christine Newton	I totally object to this development. This site should be all open space. There is nowhere in this area to throw a ball with a child or just enjoy the waterfront except on the busy walkway. The walkway is not open space. The point park is so overcrowded it proves that more open area is vital.
353307	Christine Salkild	I object to this proposal.
353575	Christine Thomson	The Northern Residential tower is totally not correct for the Millers Point heritage streetscape, Observatory Hill, Barangaroo Headland Park, Nawi Cove - it will be permanent eyesore on Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land - not another blues point tower!!!!!! Good Urban planning is NIL. Other cities around the world respect their heritage by maintaining sightlines not NSW STATE GVT! Completely obscured by NSW new GVT buildings!! Bulk and scale is too much. The low rise residential setting of significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		blocked as seen from western harbour and neighbouring suburbs! I strongly object due to proposed concept modification as it would - -Block public views west from Observatory Hill -Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill -Block public views of water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point -Server maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water -Block public views of Harbour Bridge from Pyrmount and Pirrama Park The proposed modifications to Concept is NOT consistent with approved Concept NOT consistent with Statement of Commitments issued for Barangaroo Development NOT consistent with Sydney harbour Regional Enviro Plan requirements for protection of public views NOT consistent with policies in Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan for protection of public iconic views DOES NOT respect heritage significance of Millers Point or Observatory Hill Regards Christine Thomson -
353859	Christopher Finn	DEATH BY A THOUSAND CUTS! We knew the writing was on the wall when, for totally spurious reasons, the second half of Hickson Park wasn't going to be built! What demographic is Australand using to persuade the Minister to accept this gross over-usage of PUBLIC LAND? Similar to the one used for Darling Harbour in 1988, which left ALL the stakeholders out-of-pocket or bankrupt? What legacy does the Minister - PERSONALLY and his government - want to leave us with? What's left of our open space after the predations of Packer's Palace and One Sydney Harbour or just another concrete jungle bereft of any human interaction. In a word, Minister, stop this project now. The government will find the money for the Metro cost over-runs somewhere else, as you know they will. Chris Finn
352713	Christopher Yip	I am concerned by the new plan for Barangaroo Central, which I believe will have an overwhelmingly negative impact to the Millers Point neighbourhood. The designs will adversely affect the feel and community that comprise Millers Point, rendering the historic enclave yet another commercial centre. The historic Millers Point is worth protecting and cherishing, and I plead that the State Government would have the foresight of rejecting these new plans. .
352649	Ciara Copeman-Hill	This development is not in the public interest blocking historical views to & from Observatory Hill. Barangaroo should be a public space and these plans do not reflect this. Personally we will also have lost privacy behind our house and we are extremely concerned about the lack of parking within the development which will negatively impact the heritage area of Millers Point & The Rocks. There are very few areas of the Harbour not in private ownership so we really need to protect Barangaroo for future generations.
352852	Cindy Duffield	This Historic site should be preserved for the country and further generations. It is criminal to put a high rise buildings, spoiling our famous views of opera house and harbour bridge. It will forever damaged our city skyline which is what Sydney is famous for. After building the beautiful Bangaroo headland park and Nawi Cove , now they are going to ruin the whole thing by building this monstrosity right adjacent to it. I hope that common sense will prevail.
353837	Claire Versace	Please find attached the Submission from AILA (Australian Institute of Landscape Architects) re: Submission: OBJECTION TO CENTRAL BARANGAROO MODIFICATION 9 APPLICATION, (Miller's Point and Observatory Hill) - Aqualand - SSD-Infrastructure NSW - Section 75W Modification Request; Application No MP 006 0162 MOD 9, made on behalf of the Heritage Committee. Kind Regards Claire Versace - Communications and Events AILA NSW Chapter nsw@aila.org.au mb:

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		0400 375 003 Insert duplicate text submisson (354109): Dear David, Please find attached the Submission from our AILA NSW Heritage Committee, re the Central Barangaroo Modification Kind Regards Claire Versace
352663	Colin Chiu	Would rather nice parklands instead of those disgusting apartment buildings like the Crown development
353101	Colin Gibb	I OBJECT I am deeply concerned that the height of the buildings will negatively impact the views of Millers Point residents from other buildings. I also believe the buildings will be detrimental to views of the foreshore from the harbour. I am concerned that Hickson Park has been reduced in size from the initial plan and if the proposal goes ahead the park will be in the shade of the new buildings and heights except between 12 and 2pm. This will be very sad for people who love the park. I am concerned about all the extra residential units planned and the impact of all these extra residents in the area on transport and traffic which is already a nightmare. I feel that the government has betrayed our trust in allowing this private development to go ahead and then be altered and revised with little consideration of the people of Millers Point.
353545	COLIN WARING	I regularly traverse that area both on the road as a cyclist and on the foreshore as a pedestrian. Putting a lower height structural development broken up in its pattern is more in fitting in with the adjacent Crown tower to the lower height of Barrangaroo as a tapering design. Something in the shape of a sail arc would be more fitting. Eyesores are all too readily built but rarely enjoyed for either the occupying tenant or the passing public.
353843	Cormac Champion	Too tall all along high street / Hickson Rd. Nothing should be built in central Barangaroo that is higher than the road level of High street so that all of the historic houses can be seen from the harbor.
352947	Craig Bingham	I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed increase in the height of the development, which will have disastrous effects upon the historical character of the Observatory Hill and Miller's Point areas. Views to and from Observatory Hill and Miller's Point would be obliterated if this proposal proceeded. There will also be negative impacts on views of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The proposed changes also have negative impacts on the Barangaroo precinct and parkland. I do not think the proposed modifications to the concept plan are consonant with its original purpose, and they directly contradict the requirements of various important planning instruments, such as the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan or the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development.
352689	Danny Sankey	See attachment
353557	Darling Island Apartment's Strata Committee	We object to the modification on the grounds of bulk and scale and obliteration of our views - refer attached letter
353485	David Barry	The site the subject to the modification is adjacent to sites of world, national and state significance. It is wholly unsupportable on heritage grounds and the bulk of the buildings will obscure a view integral to understanding the pattern of development by settlers in Australia. The application is submitted with a heritage impact statement that is out of date and not tailored to the proposal in it's current form. Further, the density referable to the metro in the relevant precinct is



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		to the south of the subject site and the development cannot be supported on the basis of government initiatives to have development near infrastructure.
354273	David Burdon	Dear Mr Glasgow, Thank you for the extension that was provided to the National Trust in relation to the Barangaroo Concept Plan - Modification 9. I sent this to you yesterday but have received an email bounce-back due to an error in the email address. I apologise for that error and hope this email is successfully delivered. Please find our submission attached. Kind Regards, David
352854	David Duffield	Having visited the exhibition at the Town Hall, I wish to strongly object to the modifications as described above. The size of the proposed buildings is totally out of scale to the surrounding areas of High Street, Hickson Road, & Kent Street. Also, the close proximity of the proposal to the natural & recreational areas of Nawi Cove & The Barangaroo Headland Park will ruin the area. The many sight lines of the Harbour, Observatory Hill & The Opera House will also be severely affected. I think this is pure vandalism foisted on the people of Sydney as this development is occurring on PUBLIC LAND. I am enclosing a photo of our sight line which will be affected for reference to my objection.
354037	David Ford	See downloaded submission.
353599	David Hargreaves	<p>I wish to make a submission outlining my objections to the Central Barangaroo proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Negative Impact on Millers Point &amp; Walsh Bay heritage area- the oldest part of the city.</li> <li>* Traffic coming from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point &amp; Walsh Bay causing congestion and parking issues.</li> <li>* Shoppers taking rare parking spaces around millers point &amp; Walsh Bay.</li> <li>* Visual impact from low rise residential dwellings in Kent Street and High Street with loss of views. * Views from the harbour and Balmain to Observatory Hill would be lost.</li> <li>* Views from Observatory Hill to the harbour blocked.</li> <li>* We personally would have our views to Nawi Cove and Headland Park obscured.</li> </ul> <p>I deeply believe that the proposed development would be disastrous for old part of town and have a truly negative impact for the residents of Millers Point and Walsh Bay. It must be prevented from being approved. Sincerely, David Hargreaves.</p>
352747	David McGilchrist	I object to the proposal: MP06_0162 MOD 9. This becomes a basic question of why do we put protections in place for the heritage, communities and culture of our city, if they can be overridden by someone with a fat wallet and a few political contacts. The building heights proposed are purely designed to maximise the profit for a few, at the expense of homeowners, visitors and anyone who appreciates commonsense, by destroying sunlight for many homeowners/tenants, destroying views for anyone walking through Millers Point or Observatory Park, and creating a certain chaos with increased foot and vehicle traffic in what has been an oasis in the city. There was a reason the original plan created a cap

**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	Submission
		on heights to preserve sight lines, its about time you respected a concept that the community agreed to, rather than continue the horrendous history of the state government and building contracts.
352884	david morris	Dear Minister, I would like you to consider this DA from one simple and honest aspect: Does it improve or disadvantage the inherent beauty of Sydney harbour? Sydney harbour is Sydney's most critical asset. It is natural, it is open to all. It is Australia's most beautiful public space. Its foreshore is public space. Yet this proposal would erect a "wall" between the harbour and the people who value it for its natural and historical value. My criticism centres on mass, scale and particularly the height of this development proposal. I am not a Barangaroo local - I live in Cremorne Point, but the shock of seeing these "Before and After" pictures <a href="https://www.millerspoint.org.au/general-7">https://www.millerspoint.org.au/general-7</a> is impetus enough to appeal to you to reject this DA. Unsurprisingly when I look for pictures on the developer's site, their "flythrough" video shows not one scene of the proposal's mass from the foreshore - at eye level. The human level. The public level. They have tricked us into aspects that only show the mass and scale and height of the buildings from a seagull's pov. I am not a seagull. I am a Sydneysider who is sick and tired of the government and developers with hands inside each others pockets. Leaving Sydneysiders the poorer. Once again. Crown Casino next door to this proposal is a stark legacy of the government trading public space for private benefit. For trading parkland for poker machines.(Yes there will now be poker machines.) For trading foreshore land for the developer's nod. For trading sunlight for overshadowing. And the public loses. Once again. What is the point in having a beautiful public space if no one can appreciate its beauty, if it is blocked by poor development? By a wall and a tower instead of a proportionately scaled development? Sure, the developer wins. Does the public? Do residents? Do visitors? Rob, you have been involved in these pressures for several years as Minister for Planning, for Heritage, for Public Spaces. You have never, nor are you now Minister for DOING BAD THINGS. But this plan is One Bad Thing. As you face a critical election, here's a chance for you as Minister and public servant to leave Sydney with a better option that this proposed development. Regards, David Morris
353863	David Russell	I am very concerned with the proposed Buildings on this land and the enormous increase in maximum GFA from approximately 47,600 m2 to 144,300m3. Whilst the principles of the development are sound it does not take away from the fact the increase in heights of the buildings will have on the visual impact not only the harbour and heritage views (with afternoon shading) from multiple vistas and suburbs (eg Balmain views). Therefore I strongly object to the increase in height of ALL the proposed buildings. I understand that all these buildings have increased in height and are higher than the current houses on High Street and Kent Street in Millers Point. The blockage of the view and the reduced light and increased shadows to these houses is not acceptable. The visual impact from Observatory Hill will also be adversely impacted and the schematics provided have been carefully constructed from certain angles and do not represent the true views for visitors to Observatory Hill. It is not enough to say the telescope facility will not be impacted. There are no concept designs available for viewing even though the architectural firms have been chosen to build these structures. The visual impact of Building 7 is of particular note with a height increase to 73.7m!! Not a height that is conducive to the area and would start to look like a "West Wall" along Barangaroo. I object.
353671	David Wilson	1 Vistas to Observatory Hill Modification 9 that includes a proposed 20 storey building on the northern part of the site will block views to and from Observatory Hill and destroy the views to this cradle of the start of Heritage buildings in Millers Point. This proposal by Aqualand is betrayal of the residents and building owners in this area and undermines the great

**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	Submission
		<p>iconic views from the harbour of this historic landscape. The 20 storey building is a dreadful example of poor design by a second rate team inserting anywhere architecture without merit. 2 Bulk and scale The bulk and scale of Mod 9 is completely out of proportion to the adjacent Millers Point area that will overshadow the historic heritage listed precinct with its distinctive low rise residential development. What were the designers thinking introducing these architectural giraffes that are so out of scale bringing overshadowing have they heard of stepped development that is practiced world wide on waterfront sites 3 Northern Residential Tower This building siting next to Nawi Cove, Millers Point Heritage areas, Observatory Hill, and Barangaroo Headland Park and walkway like a sore thumb is yet another gratuitous money making tower that will not contribute to this scenic location waterfront site instead it be a blot on the landscape overshadowing and destroying the waterfront that has been carefully designed and landscaped. 4 Millers Point Heritage Precinct The Mod 9 Proposal completely ignores the adjacent Heritage area that any other world city would be respected preserving sightlines and the unique character of the area instead it seeks to overshadow it. Instead the buildings on the west side of Miller Point will be overwhelmed by the gigantic scale of the new government buildings. 5 Visual Impact The State government sold the buildings in Millers Point promoting the views from the properties in there marketing. Do the state government know what their right and left hands are doing. The NSW State departments appear to be blatantly ignoring. 6 Traffic The documented traffic assessment appears to have under estimated the impact of generated traffic generation in the area that even now spills into Millers Point searching for unobtainable parking spaces. It is imperative that an area wide traffic plan is prepared otherwise the whole proposed new Central Barangaroo precinct will suffer grid lock 24 hours a day. 7 Mod 9 Assessment The delegation of the decision making to the Government Minister Anthony Roberts or some other delegate instead of the Independent Planning Commission smacks of more government secrecy and more mis-managed decision making given the continuing saga of daily NSW Government Ministers resignations mis-management and government blunders.</p>
352763	David Wood	<p>I wish to object to this proposal on the following grounds: No structures of this scale or bulk were ever included in the agreed concept plan for Central Barangaroo. This latest 'modification' seeks to increase building size and encroach on public land and will block views to and from the historical Rocks and Observatory Hill. Infrastructure NSW ignores height, heritage and other building restrictions imposed by the Government itself. This is greedy over development which, if it goes ahead, will be regretted for years to come. Please do not allow this 'modification'.</p>
354075	DE and JL Hunt	<p>Mailed submission attached</p>
352923	Deborah Sandars	<p>This mod 9 application is not consistent with the concept plans for central barangaroo it is not - A public space for all or - A unique Public domain and open transition from the commercial/ residential end of south Barangaroo to the harbour it is through a maze of " campus" buildings creating wind tunnels and a huge imposing residential tower on nawi cove. This is a gross over development in bulk and scale for the elite not a place for tourists and all citizens to gather walk around the headland park to enjoy the vistas to and from the harbour foreshores. Cultural and art is more than a convention style "town hall" shown in the application The Roof top indigenous garden for an expensive restaurant in site is a token acknowledgement to the first Australians on this site This land is significant public land and should remain so with No impact on heritage sites and views to and from observatory hill We owe it to generations to come not to lose this space would we build a residential tower on kirribilli house or the botanical gardens ? NO so why at central Barangaroo The</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		Barangaroo concept so articulately formulated by Mr Keating and others was what citizens wanted why change it because a metro station is built? who knows when Wynyard is just up the road ? This must be one of the worst developer grab for profit It's time to listen to the peoples voice - the National Trust, Millers point residents and Friends of Sydney harbour to name a few I have seen IT IS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST This mod 9 MUST be reviewed by the independent planning panel for transparency it is OUR HARBOUR for everyone to enjoy.
353039	Deirdre Duchesne	My objection is attached in PDF format
353907	Delon Price	I object in the strongest possible way to this proposed modification to the Barangaroo Concept Plan. Aside from being yet another betrayal by the State Government of the trust of the people of Sydney and NSW, the proposed modifications are egregious on several specific grounds. Most notably are the detrimental effect on significant views from Observatory Hill and Millers Point and the disruption of historical elements and relationships in the built environment that connect the city and the edge of the harbour. These proposed modifications are inconsistent with the original concept for Barangaroo, with the Statement of Commitments for the Barangaroo Development and with multiple regional conservation and environmental plans. This is another shameful chapter in a process that has seen commitment made to the people of Sydney and NSW abandoned in the face of developer pressure and economic expediency. As a design professional and Sydney resident I lodge a strong objection. D.Price (B.Arch) Insert duplicate text submission (353903): I object in the strongest possible way to this proposed modification to the Barangaroo Concept Plan. Aside from being yet another betrayal by the State Government of the trust of the people of Sydney and NSW, the proposed modifications are egregious on several specific grounds. Most notably are the detrimental effect on significant views from Observatory Hill and Millers Point and the disruption of historical elements and relationships in the built environment that connect the city and the edge of the harbour. These proposed modifications are inconsistent with the original concept for Barangaroo, with the Statement of Commitments for the Barangaroo Development and with multiple regional conservation and environmental plans. This is another shameful chapter in a process that has seen commitment made to the people of Sydney and NSW abandoned in the face of developer pressure and economic expediency. As a design professional and Sydney resident I lodge a strong objection. D.Price (B.Arch)
353413	Denise Steele	Sydney Harbour is the people's Harbour, not the Harbour of wealthy developers. The people 'own' the Harbour, and I seek to have it retained for the people to enjoy. Stay off our land!
353627	Des Barrett	The Barangaroo Central Precinct Development (MOD 9) Dear Department of Planning and Environment, Please find below my submission on the Barangaroo Concept Plan (MOD 9) and some concerns I have with unfavourable impacts the proposed development potentially will have on Sydney Observatory. I believe further investigation is required on the matters raised in my submission. I was a tutor at Sydney Observatory from 1984 to 2017. I taught a variety of courses in the history of astronomy and cosmology. In regard to the proposed development, especially in terms of its height (73 m), I raise the following matters that, I suggest, require further investigation: (1) As a public Museum of Astronomy, Sydney Observatory provides a range of observational programs for the general public, and students from primary to university levels. (2) The objects observed include: the planets; sunsets; the phases of the Moon; bright stars; constellations; and the Balmain Post Office Clock Tower, to name a sample of the range of observing work undertaken at the Observatory. The

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		Balmain Post Office is especially of interest to children who can observe the Clock Tower through the telescopes in the Observatory's domes. And, observing westward from the Observatory can often entail looking at objects that are close to the horizon. Hence, the lowest practical angle of viewing is not, strictly speaking, 10 degrees altitude, as is suggested in the AECOM/UNSW Unisearch analysis. (3) I believe it's reasonable to consider future astronomical events and the direct impact of the height of the development on the observing work at the Observatory. There will be a total lunar eclipse in 2025, a partial solar eclipse in 2030, and Transits of Mercury in 2032 and 2039. (4) In general, the proposed development most likely will add to the already substantial light pollution of the area, thus making favourable viewing of the night sky more difficult. Thank you for considering these matters.
352503	Des Monaghan	BCP(Mod9) represents a tawdry attempt to satisfy the Barangaroo demands of Lend Lease and Crown while greatly enhancing the potential profitability of the AquaLand original application. The "fattening up" of development projects has been developed into an art form in NSW but the scale of the Mod 9 proposed land grab is a shocker and the hubris of AquaLand reflects a contempt for the citizens of Sydney. If there is to be any possibility of restoring public confidence in the planning process in NSW Mod 9 must be REJECTED
353963	Dexus Office Trust and Hickson Road Subtrust	This submission has been prepared by Dexus Property Services on behalf of the Dexus Office Trust and Hickson Road Subtrust, the owners of the commercial buildings 30 The Bond (30-34 Hickson Road) and 36 Hickson Road which are located directly east of the current Modification (MP06_0162 MOD 9) under assessment by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE). Dexus objects to the proposed MOD 9.
353727	Diana Ryall	I believe that the proposed modification 9 should be rejected on the following grounds: - This a major increase in development and should be treated as a new application not a modification or a better solution would be a rejection. - It reduces public open space which is extremely limited and of long term value. This area is a public asset which should not be utilised for developer profits. - The northern building is way to high. Do you really want to approve a new 'Blues Point Tower' eyesore? The bulk and scale would be overpowering. - The bulk and scale of the buildings would shade nearby areas especially in the mornings. Already much of the Barangaroo area is over developed as every stage has allowed more development than original planned in 2007. - The proposed development has little architectural merit. It is yet another series of boxes that is too wide and too high. - The views from the observatory and from the water would be impeded to the detriment of long term Sydney ambiance - It will block views of the harbour bridge from Pyrmont and Pirrama Park. - Approval of this overdevelopment to a chinese developer would simple approve more expensive apartments that would likely be vacant for the majority of the time. - The profits from this development would likely flow to China. - Community space has been relocated to the cutaway at the Headland Park and only 800 sq.m of the 144,355 total sq.m. increase in gross floor area will be for community purposes
353057	Diane Erickson	The use of public land to build flats that will take away public views and enjoyment is a disgrace
352798	Dianne Eddington	We have loved iiving in this beautiful historical precinct of Millers Point for more than 20 years. When we initially saw the headland of Barangaroo North we thought it to be magnificent. We are now total&#371; horrified by the overdevelopment and and destruction of public land and the Barangaroo Concept Plan Modification 9 is the worst vandalism we have seen. Historic vistas, preserved and enjoyed for hundreds of years are about to be destroyed. This is in the name of greed. We

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		walk the streets of Millers Point, The Rocks, the Harbour foreshores daily and we can see, bit by bit, the creep of ugly development destroying our amenity.
352850	Dino Carulli	Obscuring the bridge is not acceptable
353527	Doreen Borg	I strongly oppose this development. It appears we have forgotten the importance of heritage when developers come through with their proposals. The tabled proposal will mean the loss of water views for the majority of both residents and visitors to our beautiful harbour and surrounding parklands. How many current residents will lose their existing outlooks to another building? We fought to save our heritage buildings in NSW and this proposal does not respect the significance of heritage of Observatory Hill and Millers Point. Once an obstruction such as this is built the scenic views of our magnificent harbour are lost forever. I and my family oppose the proposal - let's start respecting our heritage - it's a long time gone if we don't.
353489	Edward Hearsom	The part 3a component of development presents a threat to public enjoyment of the harbour. Such high building that close to the headland has a major impact on such a highly significant cultural area. Barangaroo has become an attraction only available to Sydney, we should be maximising the access and view of the harbour, not reducing it. This is a ridiculous land grab for private gain, which must be halted.
352541	Elaine Clisby	I object to any reduction of the public space between Darling Harbour, Barangaroo, the Harbour foreshore and the Rocks area. The location of historical artefacts at Barangaroo and The Rocks demonstrates the historical importance of this area. Our parklands are what makes our city one of the most beautiful in the world and I don't think that developers should be allowed to build anything that is not complementary to our historical Rocks precinct. My understanding was that the new metro stations would allow more people to access these areas not to lead to a high rise housing density boom and with so many office blocks empty as a result of Covid, is it necessary to construct more than what is already at Barangaroo? The Barangaroo site is one of the best public areas in our city and more harbour front areas should be developed for public use for families and other Sydneysiders to gather and enjoy our beautiful city. Our inner city parks provide the lungs to our city helping to keep our air quality better than most cities in the world. Covid demonstrated what were the important things necessary to a city's amenity and health safety and that is, plenty of outdoor greenspace and limiting high density apartments. Recent building failures and the experiences we have had with the Crown Group investigation, the Balmain Leagues Club site and questionable awarding of development applications suggests we need to take more care in the future decisions regarding the development of our city. Benefits to the community should outweigh the profits to be earned by large corporations. We rely on our governments and the departments that oversee the future development of our City to make sound decisions that benefit all not just a privileged few. Our prime harbourside locations should be accessible to all and height restrictions of building construction kept low to allow sunlight into our city.
352830	ELaine Gao	The proposed modifications planned will significantly destroy our views of the historic Millers Point/Rocks precinct and Harbour Bridge. The project below the water level will damage to the Harbour.

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
354203	Eliza Zampieri-Fox	I have an investment property at 38 Hicksons road. Central Barangaroo Development is not what we want. It's too big It will impact already big parking issues It will block views. It's an eyesore It's out of touch with the other buildings It will increase traffic Do not allow this to go ahead.
352794	Elizabeth A. Evatt	I strongly object to the proposed modification plans for Central Barangaroo, which extend far beyond the earlier approved height limits. They would block public views west from Observatory Hil, and of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill They would bock public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point, and sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water. They would block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modifications are NOT consistent with the approved Concept, or with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development They are NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views, or with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views They do NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill, or the heritage significance of Millers Point.
353537	Elizabeth O'Brien	Dear Mr Glasgow, Please see attached submission. Regards Elizabeth O'Brien
353617	Elizabeth Wang	Please refer to attached objection letter on behalf of the Owners Corporation - Strata Plan 72797, 37 Hickson Road, Millers Point
352759	Emily Gordon	I absolutely object to the proposed design modifications at Central Barangaroo. They are an offence to public interest. There are significant issues with the scale and complete disregard for planning and heritage guidelines. The scale of the proposed development is wholly inappropriate for the site. The proposed buildings are ballooning to an enormous envelope under modification 9 and it is completely contrary to the initial low-height proposal that was sold to all Sydneysiders at the inception of the Central Barangaroo project - a bait and switch of monstrous proportions. My biggest issue with the scale is the blocking of public Harbour views and light - including the iconic views of the Harbour from Observatory Hill, one of the most historically significant sites in Australia. The world-class attraction of Observatory Hill houses both a public school and the landmark working astronomical Observatory, which brings in school children from across the vast expanse of Sydney who might not have cause to otherwise spend time near Sydney Harbour, as well as tourists from both across Australia and abroad. I attach photos of the stunning western Harbour views publicly visible from the public park on Observatory Hill above the Kent St skyline - these will all be lost (such is the scale proposed here), which is shocking and devastating for the future of this incredibly beautiful and historically significant site, one of the most spectacular public spaces in the entire country. The View and Visual Assessment document articulates that even the 'lower' buildings cover these stunning public Harbour views: "The lower block obscures a portion of the view to the water of the Harbour, and a portion of the Pymont ridgeline development." This same View and Visual Assessment document does not even pretend the tall tower on the north of the site is appropriate in its scale and impact on the public outlooks, dubbing it "an anomaly in the view creating a disruption to the horizon line. It is seen in high contrast against the skyline, partially removing the view towards of Rozelle and White Bay Power Station." Further, combined with the towering heights proposed here, the buildings have swollen into thick blocks with very little visual lines maintained from the public spaces across Millers Point to the Harbour below. The View and Visual Assessment includes an image looking west from

**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	Submission
		<p>Kent St down the south end of High St - the "gap" provided for the grand "Barangaroo steps" is narrower than the already quite small street - so not only do the buildings loom above the skyline of Kent St - they also nearly entirely wall off the public views from streets across the historically State Significant Millers Point precinct. And finally, this enormous wall of buildings will hem in the local daycare centre on High St, which has served the local area for over 100 years - a devastating negative social impact for the children of this neighbourhood. See attached photo of Lance daycare centre from above vantage which shows its intensely close visual proximity to the Central Barangaroo site. No visual/light gap has been considered for this centrally important not-for-profit social amenity for local children. I implore the commission to protect Sydney's visual and historical legacy and precious public spaces from the irreversible negative impact of this proposal.</p>
354005	Eric Hamilton	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I would like to object to Barangaroo Concept Plan (MOD 9). The bases for my objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Impact on the Heritage value of Millers Point,</li> <li>* Impact on the views and sightlines from many parts of Millers Point, especially towards the west, and</li> <li>* The logic behind seeking an increase in Gross Floor Area (GFA). Heritage Value Impact Millers Point is one of the oldest European settlement sites in Australia. The locality has been a part of Australian fabric since the time of the first European settlers to the continent. While there has been renewal in the area - streets have been removed and there has been renewal of sites - the overall historic character remains. One of the most important connections for Millers Point is to Sydney Harbour.</li> </ul> <p>There are homes in Kent St, for example, that have special walkways on their rooftops, dubbed "widows walks", that were used by residents of these homes to view the shipping traffic in and out of the Sydney Harbour. In fact, when the houses in Kent St and High St were sold, the new owners were placed under onerous Heritage conditions to ensure that the "look and feel" of their houses, when viewed from the harbour and the west, would not be changed.</p> <p>Heritage conditions included being required to use certain (expensive) roofing materials, and prohibitions on adding skylights to rooves. With the introduction of Blocks 5, 6 and 7 in Central Barangaroo, virtually all of the homes in Kent St and High St will not be visible from the harbour. This makes a mockery of the effort that home owners have made to adhere to Heritage restrictions.</p> <p>Millers Point will be hemmed in from the west by a steel and glass barrier that is completely out of keeping with any Heritage considerations. The whole character of Milers Point will be lost. It seems that there is one rule for large developers and a completely different rule for everybody else, when it comes to Heritage. Views and Sightlines I read with interest Appendix F to the Modification Application. The Appendix goes into great detail comparing the views and visual impacts of the proposed buildings on a number of locations. My view is that the Appendix fails to consider a number of things in its analysis and as a result the conclusions that are reached are faulty and misleading. Things that I believe have not been properly considered are:</p>



**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	Submission
		<p>* Considering the impact of the proposed buildings on the view from Observatory Hill from locations to the south of the Observatory. The only two locations considered in Appendix F are away from the area most impacted by the proposed buildings - the view to the west from the area to the south of the Observatory will be obliterated. I observe many people that go to that location, especially in the evenings in summer, to have a picnic and take in the view. The buildings in Central Barangaroo will take away the view and the appeal of the location.</p> <p>* Views and visual impact assessments have been made for apartments at Levels 15 and 25 for the apartment buildings on the western side of Kent St. The Appendix does not consider that fully half of the residents in these apartments live below Level 15, and hence would be impacted more by the proposed buildings. If the analysis was performed properly, the assessment would show a significant impact on views for a large proportion of apartment dwellers in these buildings.</p> <p>* The assumption that there is an "approved building envelope" associated with MOD 11. As far as I understand it, there has been no approval for MOD 11, and its associated building envelope.</p> <p>I understand that all that has been approved is a GFA, which does not have a building envelope associated with it. The methodology of the Appendix is to compare the building envelope from MOD 9 with the "approved building envelope" and to then discuss whether the views and visual impacts are worsened by the introduction of MOD 9. In my view, this is an invalid comparison. The approach taken in Appendix F essentially means that homes in Kent St and High St, and the Langham Hotel, would be deemed to be minimally impacted by the change from the "approved building envelope" to the building envelope proposed for MOD 9.</p> <p>This approach is flawed and needs to be called out. Overall, I believe that Appendix F needs to be revisited in the light of the issues that are raised above. I strongly question the conclusions reached in Appendix F. Increase in GFA The history of Barangaroo has been one of developers seeking to increase GFA with each part of the development. MOD 9 is no different. From the outside, it appears that developers have a modus operandi where they seek modification after modification to increase GFA, and hence profit for themselves. The tripling of the GFA sought for Central Barangaroo would appear to be an attempt to create greater revenues and profits. It raises the obvious question which is, "If the previously approved GFA is not sufficient for the developer to make a profit, why was the project even considered?".</p> <p>I note that the developer is intending to create "premium office space" in Blocks 5 and 6. Given that the whole world continues to be in the grips of a pandemic, it is very unclear to me how there could be demand for even more premium office space in the Central Business District of Sydney. Times have changed. It is by no means clear that the only way to make a project profitable is to scale. The other alternative, which is "do nothing" is now a real option. A much lower cost and lower impact solution would be to turn Blocks 5, 6 and 7 into parks and gardens - creating more greenery in the face of climate change. Conclusion My objections to the proposal are based on:</p> <p>* Impact on the Heritage value of Millers Point,</p> <p>* Impact on the views and sightlines from many parts of Millers Point, especially towards the west, and</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>* The logic behind seeking an increase in Gross Floor Area (GFA).</p> <p>As a resident of Millers Point, I believe that enough is enough. Barangaroo is already a major Business District and does not need to be any larger. Especially if it means tearing the Heritage heart out of Millers Point. This Developers Dream need not be our Neighbourhood Nightmare. Eric Hamilton 8 August 2022</p>
353297	Eugene Marchese	<p>We purchased our home in Kent Street Millers Point in 2015 when the NSW Department of Housing sold the public housing. During this process we enquired with McGraths regarding potential future build out of views. We were told 79 Kent Street would NEVER be built out as a precedence for a Heritage line of site view from the Sydney Observatory to the water line from its westerly view. They quoted the court case of the Observatory Hotel wanting to add floors which was rejected based upon this heritage requirement. We therefore purchased our property based on information that we would NEVER lose our views. All of the brochures and marketing showed and quoted Harbour Views and Water Views. We then proceed to spend \$2.2 million dollars on a top to toe renovation, respecting the Heritage guidelines for Millers Point. Brining one of the original homes of Sydney back to its original glory. This includes the widows walk which has 360 degree views of Sydney including to the waterline in the west. So we invested \$5.5 million dollars on our property with the belief based on information for the representatives of NSW Department Of Housing that those views would NEVER be under question. If these views are removed and blocked we will be taking our case to the Land &amp; Environment Court and seeking damages and compensation for the lies we were told upon the sale of our property. The submission by Aqualand is a gross abuse of the previously approved scheme for Barangaroo Central. The increase in floor space and height and bulk and scale is not only illegal as this is not what has been approved, it smells of an underhand deal that has been done between Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW. Aside from our own personal loss, this proposal will have serious negative effects on the Millers Point suburb. No longer will visitors and Sydney siders see the views of the beautiful Heritage suburb of Millers Point from Sydney Harbour. These will be hidden behind a large wall of modern office buildings. The houses on High Street will have a complete removal of privacy and sunlight at various times of the day. The oldest Kindergarten in Sydney will have virtually no sunlight from overshadowing in the afternoons. Traffic which is already choking in Millers Point due to the number of residents vs car spaces will be untenable. The proposal includes very few car spaces for office worker, supermarket shoppers and residents. City residents and workers who flock to Observatory Hill to watch the sunset will no longer be able to experience this vista. they will be met with a residential tower block of apartments as the view. When the Barangaroo precinct was presented to the citizens of NSW. This was never the vision. It was low rise at the northern end with public outdoor event spaces and parks that tied in with the headland. Creating a beautiful connection with nature for all to enjoy. This vision has been decimated with this proposal. Sydney has an oversupply of offices including at Barangaroo South. Do we need this scale of offices and housing at Barangaroo Central? Low lying buildings that maintain the vistas from Observatory Hill , the site of the beautiful Heritage houses from Sydney Harbour and privacy to the existing residents is paramount. This scheme takes away all of these. The great wall of Aqualand should not be approved. It is not in ANY WAY consistent with the approved concept.</p>
352631	Eva Frey	<p>Objection to the project in its current form. The project proposed will completely block the historic view of the cottages of High Street in Millers Point. The famous sunset spot for locals and tourists will be lost as well as the visibility of all historic building that in recent years were restored with great efforts and at high costs. In addition Sydney's oldest</p>

**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	Submission
		daycare KU Lance will no longer have any sunshine areas for the children. The buildings that are planned to be built right next to Hickson Road will completely block any light and view and most likely create a wind tunnel as well. I strongly object to rid Sydney of one of its historic views both from High Street down to the harbour as well as the view of the cottages that can be seen from the harbour and Barrangaroo.
353855	Fiona Gracie	i am strongly opposed to the amended Barangaroo Concept Modification which proposes to significantly increase the building height. Should this modification be approved, it will result in irreparable loss of public views from Observatory Hill to White Bay Power Station and many other key places of interest from historic Millers Point. The proposed modification therefore does not respect the heritage of its surrounding area of Observatory Hill and Millers Point, and furthermore is NOT consistent with the stated requirements of the Barangaroo Development, nor the protection of public views as stated in the Sydney Harbour regional Environment Plan of Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan. This area of Sydney is an world-recognised site that draws local Australians and overseas tourists to it because of its iconic views. The approval of these structures will fundamentally alter this to the permanent detriment of current and future generations.
352981	Francois Crespel	I find it is a disgrace to attempt to erect a building of this size in the heart of what is left of Barangaroo. Taking the views from Observatory Hill, closing the views from Balmain and taking the beautiful views of Sydney from the Harbour. Stop the damage.
353945	Fred Heida	To whom this concerns, We should protect the green lands around the harbor for public use, help the environment with green house emission though more green spaces with plant's and tree's. Show the current generation of children, that we are doing something about global warming by creating beautiful public parks rather than another apartment building. Regard, Fred, - parent of a child that hopes the government stands by their promise to do something global warming!
353625	Fred Watson	The proposed Block 7 tower will contribute significantly to the ongoing erosion of Sydney Observatory's view of the night sky and the surrounding heritage landscape, as well as adding more interference by direct light trespass to the Observatory site. In particular, the assertion that the observing facilities are not used below an altitude of 10 degrees is erroneous, with significant astronomical events occurring right down to the horizon. Moreover, the limited azimuth range quoted as being blocked is only one-third of the range that will actually be affected for instruments used over the whole of the Observatory site. This proposal is detrimental to the ongoing work of one of Sydney's principal science education centres, and should be rejected.
353901	Frederick Sarkis	Gross overdeveloped killing Sydney's heritage
353555	Friends of Sydney Harbour	See below.
353107	Friends of Ultimo	Please find attached the Friends of Ultimo submission
353465	Gary Aitchison	I strongly object to the modification of Barangaroo Central concept. Fundamentally this is not at all consistent with the approved Concept - why such a major change and in whose interests? It does not appear to be in the interests of the

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		citizens of Sydney. This modification also directly contravenes the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views and with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views. The cold, dark obstructed views of the southern end will be repeated. Have we learnt nothing about what constitutes a vibrant space in sunny Sydney? The modification seems oblivious to the fact that the site is contiguous to the heritage areas of Millers Point. Has no thought been placed on the importance of harbour views and transitions so these places remain integrated into a holistic city?
353347	Geoff Dang	The current plans only favour the developers and not the local residents. It's a disgrace
352530	Geoff Wannan	I strongly oppose this latest modification. It is yet another modification to the original Concept Plan. Each modification allows more building development and eats away at the public amenity of the site. After the gross over-development of the southern end of Barangaroo this modification continues to reduce public amenity, both on the site and for the surrounding area. It seeks only to vastly increase the development of more multi storey buildings. Hickson Park is already compromised by being pushed away from the water to allow Crown Casino to occupy that space instead of the public, and now it is to be further reduced in size to the detriment of public use. The Rocks is the oldest part of Sydney The heritage importance of the Rocks is ignored by obliterating views to and from the west side of The Rocks, particularly the iconic dwellings of High St, and blocking views to and from Observatory Hill. Building heights should be restricted to below the level of High St. The proposal makes a mockery of the historical significance of the 'Hungry Mile' by cutting off connection to the site of the original wharves, and turning the road into a cavern. The extent and increased size of building development will further extend the time that Hickson Rd is primarily a construction site road - again to the detriment of residents of The Rocks. The Central section of Barangaroo was planned to be completed by 2021. This will extend that time for at least 5 years and probably much longer.
352625	Geoffrey Carroll	Why not leave the area as a parkland that all Sydney Sixers can use. Maybe a water park or leave as a picnic area that people can use on nye to watch fireworks, etc. we don't need more apartments, crown and king st wharf area have enough appartments for this area. Give the space back to all Sydneysiders Thank you for allowing my day. Geoff
353201	Geoffrey Hanmer	The envelopes proposed are too large and bear no relationship to the scale of the heritage fabric in The Rocks. The proposal blocks important views from The Rocks to the West. The proposal is unimaginative and does not respond to the character of Sydney, or the opportunities the climate and the proximity of the Harbour offer.
352522	Georgia Vrondas	I have not been able to find any reports on the impact of the proposed increase in density and height on the historic precinct of the Rocks. In particular, I am keen to see why the sheer bulk and contrast north of the line that was set at the edge of the Crown towers will not have an adverse effect on the character of the Millers point and Rocks localities. The statement that block 7 will become a landmark and frame the landing point from the station is inconsistent with the historic character of the Rocks and thus provide a stark contrast. How is this justified? I note that the public also wants to recoup some of its investment in the transport infrastructure. I think it is safe to say that the people who will occupy the luxury high rise apartments wont use the Metro (if they are even likely to occupy permanently at all). The experience around the world has been that multi level retail does not work well and the office market is likely to be decimated by the work from home migration. The Government seems to be pining its hopes of some short term revenue on mass GFA and

**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	Submission
		<p>revenue from the development without considering the consequences of creating a white elephant that will be thinly occupied. If the carbon emissions released in the creation of the buildings and the adverse environmental impacts are to be taken into account along with more realistic occupancy and economic impact (including the potential adverse effect on the existing property in the locale) will the Net Present Value make economic sense? Additional text from submitter (352520): Since I last wrote to you I have had the opportunity to look at the PwC report on the economic impact analysis. I note that the impact on the existing areas and the adverse effects on the historic character being swamped by the proposed monstrosities is not hi-lighted. May I ask why an assessment of the economic impact of loss of tourism to the historic Rocks precinct has not been assessed? That may be due to the loss of attractiveness or the dilution of activity over a wide area? IN addition, the loss of values and rents in the local area due to view impacts has not been taken into account in the impact assessment of the public purse. Has this been fully considered? Additional text from submitter (352499): The views from Observatory Hill seem to have been ignored. Whilst the new buildings being developed by Lend Lease and the Crown towers are having views protected, a significant impact will be experienced by occupants residents and office buildings in the area (among others High Street terraces, the Observatory, Highgate, Georgia, Stamford Marque and Stamford on Kent residential buildings as well as the Maritime Trade Towers office buildings). The impact on the character of Millers Point is likely to be substantial as it denigrates the "old Sydney" aesthetics. This could have a more than proportionate impact on land value (and thus land tax), property values (and therefore stamp duty), rents (and therefore income taxes) and diminish the attraction to tourists (and therefore income taxes and GST). This may have a more than proportionate adverse effect on public revenues in the long term relative to the prospective short term gain to the public purse associated with any agreements with Acqualand and Scentre that relate to FSR or revenue share formulae. It seems that the developers will get the benefit from the desperation of the public sector to gain near term revenues. The lack of transparency on this matter indicates a lack of economic impact analysis or a flawed assessment. The people deserve to know. I intend to make my voice heard!</p>
352743	Georgina Gordon	<p>As a Balmain resident, one of my favourite things is to go down to the Balmain East ferry wharf and look out over the beautiful Sydney Harbour and its surrounds, including the beautiful Observatory Hill. There's no better view in the world. However, should this development go ahead, that will change. The proposed scale of of this development is significantly different to what was initially approved, and is utterly inappropriate for its position. It blocks views that are central to Sydney's identity, and diminishes the historical significance of Observatory Hill. This development is not in the interest of Sydney locals or tourists. It just doesn't make sense.</p>
352769	Georgina Long	<p>To whom it may concern, I am writing to you in regard to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). I have reviewed the plans and documents provided and have put together the following summary of our concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The proposed concept plan will irreversibly negatively impact the experience of visitors to the Millers Point area by altering many historically significant outlooks currently available.</li> <li>* The proposed concept plan does not fit within the established character of the area and is considered out of context for the locality.</li> </ul>

**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	Submission
		<p>* The proposed concept plan results in substantial overshadowing of the adjoining public open space with the shadow diagrams showing that the concept plan doesn't comply with the development controls.</p> <p>* The proposed concept plan results in substantial view impacts as a result of the design choice for the development. It is considered that the view impacts are detrimental.</p>
353035	Gerald Erickson	<p>The height of the proposed unit blocks on Hickson Road are disgraceful. To use public land to block out views to and from Observatory Hill is criminal behaviour. This is madness from all levels of government planning by all the past State Governments this century. If this is not changed then beware the independent teals" at the March election.</p>
353049	Geraldine Bloustien	<p>I have been a resident of Millers Point for the past 8 years. I am disgusted by the proposed plan to allow the obscuring and blocking of key parts of our national heritage by private interest and greed. When we originally purchased our home in Millers Point we were shown the plan of the development of Barangaroo and even went to the planning department to see the constructed models and diagrams. We were assured by the officials there that the original plan agreed to would respect the open public views and iconic sightlines, the Heritage Precinct and the vistas of the water and the roofscapes originally seen from our building. None of these aspects has been adhered to in the current and proposed modification of the original development plan.</p> <p>* The state government has no right to obscure the views of water and landscape that have been available to the public for generations</p> <p>* The blocking of these views and the significant heritage of the low-rise heritage buildings are being effaced by the developments that have already been allowed to proceed such as the Northern Residential Tower (which is completely without architectural aesthetic value and is an affront to the landscape).</p> <p>* The proposed buildings along Hickson road are also a disgrace. They are too big and do not allow for the necessary set back. As such they will block the views of the western harbour for the existing heritage building and for the adjoining suburbs and for the general public visitor. Our own view of the harbour will be impacted.</p> <p>* The land and water views that the development is encroaching on and in fact stealing, is public and was intended and indeed promised as open areas for the people of Sydney and visitors to enjoy.</p> <p>* Finally, the impact of the developments goes beyond aesthetics. The impact on life style from the excessive traffic and lack of adequate parking will cause congestion and increase pollution.</p> <p>* In sum, you are creating an unsightly ghetto through the deliberate changing of the original development concept and commitments for the Sydney Harbour Regional development and conservation plans. Your total lack of respect for the residents of Millers point and local areas and indeed the people of Sydney is appalling</p> <p>* It is essential that this further development is rescinded and the heritage and harbour vistas and open land be maintained.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353009	Geraldine O'Toole	I'm in total opposition to this proposed development. Too many buildings already.
353277	Gerard McGarry	I write to object to the planning modification for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change in height creates an unacceptable impact on public views from observatory hill (namely block 7). Sort term commercial gain should not be allowed to damage an invaluable public amenity.</li> <li>2. Current agreed heights align well with High St. Changing will go against the original vision for the development.</li> <li>3. There should be no encroachment on Barangaroo av. The foreshore surrounding the harbour should be protected.</li> </ol>
352711	Gerard Reynolds	I strongly object the latest development application for Barangaroo Central on the following grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The developers seek to gain additional private use of Sydney foreshore which is a public asset and should be retained for public use.</li> <li>2. The proposed development removes views to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill and has a negative visual and heritage impact on the area.</li> <li>3. The bulk and scale of the development is greater than previously allowed for no public benefit</li> <li>4. The reduction in size of Hickson Park has a negative impact on public use</li> </ol>
353815	Gilbert Grace	Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposed changes to the development of the Barangaroo area. ARTcycle Inc is a not for profit artist run initiative. We advocate for sustainable development and transport including the Sydney Green Ring ( <a href="http://www.sydneygreenring.org">www.sydneygreenring.org</a> ) as part of increased quality of life for all Australians. The proposed changes to the development is egregious having already gifted so much of what should have been open space and recreational facilities to private developers this is beyond abuse of the system. The current plan impinges upon the sightlines from the last remaining area of green space in The Rocks with a view of the harbour. On behalf of ARTcycle Inc we disagree with the changes and want a return to quality open space with publicly accessibl harbour views adding to the amenity for all. Yours sincerely, Gilbert Grace President ARTcycle Inc
353827	Gillian Delbridge	I strongly object to the proposal to modify Central Barangaroo on the following grounds: The heritage significance of Observatory Hill and Millers Point is not respected. Public views of the water from strategic places in Millers Point will be blocked. It is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views. It is not consistent with the approved Concept, or with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development. It will encroach on public parkland and detract from the heritage values of the Rocks and Millers Point.
352514	Glen McPherson	I'm extremely disappointed that this development is moving forward, and would like the plans to be amended to reduce the impact it will have on the local community and surrounding areas. This is possibly the last piece of prime harbourfront in our city, and it's being destroyed by this development. The plans have now expanded into Hickson parkland, the views

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		from Observatory Hill and all the surrounding buildings will be destroyed, it brings nothing in terms of tourism that isn't already accomplished by the current developments at Barangaroo, and the residential real estate further erodes the divide between upper and middle class residents in the surrounding areas.
352615	Glyn Williams	The plans were already an outrageous overdevelopment of the space and now this application is making the situation worse. They effectively close in on Millers Point, blocking visibility of the heritage listed buildings , the views from observatory hill to the west and destroy the unique characteristics of this area. This development has to be reduced to ensure that the height remains at 5 stories or less. High st road needs to be the height measure. This is as a big a deal as when the Green bans were brought in to protect The Rocks. Please learn lessons from the past!
353419	Gordon Sutcliffe	Introduction My submission relates to the proposed development described in the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Modification 9). I specifically object to the proposal to modify the approved building envelopes of Blocks 5, 6 and 7, in particular, the additional building heights. The primary reason for my objection relates to the impact of the proposed Blocks 5, 6 and 7 on the visibility of Sydney Observatory's Time Ball from the waters of Sydney Harbour to the southwest of Millers Point. Background Sydney Observatory was built in the 1850s to provide a means of making accurate observations of the sun and the stars from a location close to Sydney's port facilities. The Observatory was located at Millers Point because of the excellent visibility of the hilltop location from ships anchored in Sydney Cove and Cockle Bay, and other ships' anchorages and berths around Sydney Harbour. The daily descent of the Time Ball on the roof of the Observatory provided visual confirmation of the time of day to all ships on the water. This allowed a ship's master to accurately set their ship's chronometer in preparation for a voyage. This was fundamentally important to the navigation of all ships travelling between Sydney and the UK. Conclusions As described above, the visibility of the Time Ball from Sydney Harbour was crucial to the development of the colony of NSW. The lines of sight to the Time Ball from the water have been essentially preserved to the present day (in particular, note the building height of the Langham Hotel on Kent Street). These sight lines remain of huge cultural significance to the city in 2022. The proposed heights of Blocks 5, 6 and 7 would totally block the view of the Time Ball from significant areas of Sydney Harbour southwest of Millers Point. On this basis, the impacts of the proposed Blocks 5, 6 and 7 on the visibility of the Time Ball from the water of Sydney Harbour is judged unacceptable. PostScript It is telling that the impact of the height of Blocks 5, 6 and 7 on the sight lines to the Time Ball from the waters of Sydney Harbour are not specifically discussed in any way in the developer's visual impact assessment <sup>1</sup> . Reference Barangaroo Concept Plan: Modification 9, View and Visual Assessment Report, December 2021, by AECOM
353301	Graeme Milton	I oppose Modification 9 as it seeks to increase the approved maximum GFA of Central Barangaroo from 47,688sqm to 144,355sqm. This is more than a tripling of the size of the development. The proposed change to the built form and building heights within Central Barangaroo is totally unnecessary, is disproportionate to the perceived benefit and will completely dominate the heart of Barangaroo. Crown Casino should stand alone as the tallest building in the precinct. The currently approved building form and heights should remain.
354073	Graham Malcolm	This building should never be built.



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The block of land was originally assigned as Public Space</li> <li>2. The amount of public space in this precinct of Barangaroo has been steadily declining as a result of the greed of both business and State Government interests.</li> <li>3. The current NSW State government did Not adequately advertise that they were selling the land originally ear-marked as public space to private interests for a one-off profit. This has resulted in Barangaroo becoming a boring repetition of ugly box-like and cigar-shaped buildings that succeed only in blocking light and once- beautiful views from both land and water!</li> <li>4. The scale of the proposed building will dominate the block of land on which it's built and cause excessive shading and over-development of the very limited public access to the Barangaroo foreshore.</li> </ol>
352876	Graham Matthews	<p>I am very concerned by several aspects of Barangaroo Central's Mod 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* there is excessive density and bulk that is inconsistent with the area and will damage public amenity</li> <li>* the northern tower is out of all proportion to the rest of the proposed development and should be reduced in height</li> <li>* the additional bulk compared to the previously-approved plans will obstruct unique views and vistas</li> <li>* the additional density will exacerbate traffic flows in the narrow, historic streets; and</li> <li>* there is insufficient green and open space. The development of Central Barangaroo is a unique opportunity to create a beautiful and world-class legacy for future generations. Please don't waste this opportunity by approving the proposed modifications</li> </ul>
352677	Graham McGilchrist	<p>I am writing in regard to barangaroo concept plan (mod 9) Having reviewed the plans and documents I am concerned that such a gross development is being suggested for an iconic area of public land which is a key part of Sydney's history . From an overall point of view the proposal for a large shopping centre with no allowance for parking will lead to more congestion and increased traffic in an are which is already overloaded. The general Rocks feeling will be lost as views down the laneways that run from Kent St will be blocked by the increased height of the proposed buildings. From a personal rather than neighbourhood point of view our own view to Nawi Cove will be blocked by the increased height of all the buildings plus the new builing that does not meet development controls. I am also concerned about the impact on the views from Observatory Hill which will be blocked by the new development . As a daily user of the Hill to walk our dog I am very aware of the number of locals and visitors who visit the Hill for the views and to spend time enjoying this unique piece of Sydney. I believe that any proposal that relies for its justification that it is only a moderate increase in height from a previously flawed proposal cannot be allowed to succeed if we are to retain the character of a key part of our history.</p>
352957	Graham Tribe	<p>I am objecting to the proposal as outlined in Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) since some aspects of the proposed development ignore the importance of the Millers Point area as a unique precinct with heritage values. It compromises the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, Sydney's Old Town and the important sightlines from this area. The views from the</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		west of the Millers Point streetscape have been seen ever since they were built in the 1800's to 1910's. They will be completely obscured by the new buildings. Approval of this development would be a breach of trust between the NSW Government and the Millers Point community, and the people of Sydney who value the old town environment. Prior development plans and approvals had reasonably maintained the importance of Millers Point and the various sightlines, the Mod 9 proposal ignores many of these. The Mod 9 Proposal is not in line with the prior approved Concept, the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development, the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views, and does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill or Millers Point. Many residents have purchased apartments and houses in Millers Point trusting that the NSW Government would reasonably maintain any development in Central Barangaroo in line with prior approvals. The Mod 9 proposal breaches some of these, particularly the Residential Tower of 73.7m height and the park to the north of Barton St. With the 808 apartments in the adjacent One Sydney Harbour towers, the existing residential apartments along Kent St, and the houses in the Millers Point area, there is little point in additional residences in Central Barangaroo. The only point is improved return on the development for Aqualand. Decades ago following Building Union protests, it was agreed the precinct in Millers Point north of buildings such as Highgate and Observatory Tower, would be preserved as a traditional area with heritage protection and building height limitations. The proposed Residential Tower in the Mod 9 proposal ignores this tradition. The 73.7m high Residential Tower to the north of the Mod 9 proposal is out of context with Nawi Cove, Millers Point heritage streetscape, Observatory Hill, and Barangaroo Headland Park. It does not have merit as a standalone building. It does not contribute to the whole development. It will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Deleting the park area to the north of Barton St reduces space in front of the One Sydney Harbour apartment blocks and removes the prior parkland connection between Hickson Park and Harbour Park. Aside from views, this connection made the park area feel continuous from Hickson Rd around to Nawi Cove. This open feeling will now be lost.
353981	Graham Wilson	As a local resident I regularly visit Observatory Hill both to walk my dogs and enjoy the view. Most afternoons when I visit in the late afternoons there are between 100 and 200 people enjoying this view - a mix of people from around this part of Sydney and visitors both from other parts of Sydney and across the rest of Australia and well as many international visitors. Currently this is the best natural view of the harbour from any vantage point in Sydney with un-obstructed views to the Harbour Bridge and extending around to Darling Harbour, Balmain and many other parts. The proposed developments will extensively block these views reducing both the amenity values of this place and also greatly diminishing its heritage as the oldest vantage point of the colony, which must be protected for the future of all Australians as well as the enjoyment of visitors from many other places. It will also block views of this part of historic Sydney from many other vantage points and lead to extensive shading of existing structures There are also many other reasons why this development is totally inappropriate (as described by others) and should be rejected whereas the previous proposal for this site was broadly satisfactory
353935	Grant Ure	Submission is attached.
352699	Greg Ainsworth	CONNECT HIGH STREET TO BARANGAROO WITH PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AT ROAD C One of the goals stated in the Urban Design Report is to "Better connect the city to the neighbourhoods of the north-west city peninsula" This would be much

**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	Submission
		enhanced if there was an additional staircase/bridge over Hickson road from Road C up to High Street. High Street dips down to a low point approximately at Road C. Pedestrian access here would add great connectivity between the Barangaroo area and The Rocks. The Barangaroo steps are far too high to be practical and the steps north of Nawi Cove are a very long way away from the rest of Barangaroo. I don't believe many people will walk that way, leaving Barangaroo still isolated form the rest of The Rocks.
352767	Greg ODea	<p>To whom it may concern, We are writing to you in regard to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). We have reviewed the plans and documents provided and have put together the following summary of our concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The proposed concept plan does not fit within the established character of the area and is considered out of context for the locality.</li> <li>* The proposed concept plan results in substantial overshadowing of the adjoining public open space with the shadow diagrams showing that the concept plan doesn't comply with the development controls.</li> <li>* The proposed concept plan results in substantial view impacts as a result of the design choice for the development. It is considered that the view impacts are detrimental.</li> </ul>
353711	Gregory White	I object to this project proceeding in the proposed for the following reasons; It is NOT consistent with the approved Concept It is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development It is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views It is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views It does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill It does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. IT MAKES THE CONCEPT OF APPROVAL PROCESS IN NSW A JOKE.
353709	Gretchen Miller	I am writing to strongly object to the concrete behemoth proposed for Central Barangaroo. This proposal is an insult to the people of NSW, for reasons of blocking public views west from Observatory Hill, of the White Bay Power Station, and of the water from Millers Point, and various other blockages including the Harbour Bridge from Pymont. Nothing about this proposal is sympathetic with our precious Harbour foreshore. It breaches various statements of commitments, the REP for Sydney Harbour, and fundamentally disrespects the heritage of the Harbour and foreshores. Basically, it sucks. Get rid of it. Gretchen Miller.
352975	Guy Harding	There is a routine development strategy that sees a reasonable proposal approved and then modifications added later that never would have been approved at the outset - this is one such scenario If we box in the Bridge from public view in favour of the rich minority, then we are effectively creating a Sydney I don't want to be part of. This is the biggest tourist site in Australia and Mod 9 seeks to remove it from the view of visitors whilst at the same time over-developing Barangaroo which we fought so hard to protect as a public asset. Time to tell the developers "no" and to protect that which the council, the local public and indeed the wider population of Sydney and Australia value so highly This process of soliciting feedback is exceptionally poor and may be designed to avoid hearing people's voices. Finding this page has been difficult and laborious - perhaps that is intended....

**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	Submission
352687	gwendolyn klaassen	<p>I am one of a few people who are in the unique position of living on 9 Agar Steps Millers Point which consists of a set of three heritage listed terraces staggered up the steps. It is on a 99 lease from the NSW government. There is no road access - to reach my front door I must climb Agar Steps. To leave, I descend the steps and look directly on to Barangaroo (photos available but unable to be uploaded). Presently, myself and the thousands of others who traverse the steps to access Observatory Hill, the Observatory, Fort St Public School and the National Trust every day, enjoy the amenity of looking across the Harbour. Under the proposal, that will all be lost. All that will be seen are more buildings. The Agar Steps and surrounds are iconic and not a day passes when the cameras are out to capture the beauty and history of the area. The Crown Casino building already casts a significant shadow and diminution of amenity. The proposed modification, which significantly increases the height and overall footprint, adds the lessening of heritage, views, and general amenity whilst simultaneously reducing the accessible public space and access to the foreshore. Traffic on Kent St (the nearest access road) will no doubt increase as will the pressure on parking as the numbers of residents, workers, shoppers and day trippers swells. As my property has no off street parking, I already rely on increasingly limited resident parking (Area 16), sometimes being forced to drive around the block several times before a spot becomes available. All this will ultimately adversely impact the physical environment while creating a stressful environment overall. I am concerned not only for myself, but for all who visits this beautiful area. Once it's gone, it's gone.</p>
353559	Harley Nash	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the proposed the road network modifications, including the removal of vehicular traffic from Barangaroo Avenue north of Barton Street adjacent to Blocks 5 and 6 with controlled service vehicle access only, and converting Barton Street to a permanent street connecting Barangaroo Avenue with Hickson Road, servicing the wider Barangaroo precinct will have far reaching adverse impacts across the residential communities of Millers Point.</li> <li>* The proposed modifications of building envelopes of Blocks 5, 6 and 7 including additional height, block alignments, additional GFA and flexible allocation of GFA across the blocks are unnecessary, commercially driven, do nothing for the sense of Place, and significantly and adversely impact the historic sightlines of Millers Point and Observatory Hill to and from the water and other shorelines.</li> <li>* The proposed development along Hickson Rd is too big - the sheer bulk, lack of setback and height all completely disproportional to the site and lacking any empathy for the historic surroundings</li> <li>* The proposed reduction of Hickson Park is a shameful commercial "grab" of public space - for such a significant commercial development to be allowed to encroach even further on public parkland is not in the public interest.</li> <li>* The views from Observatory Hill will be severely and adversely impacted, as will the view from opposite shores and the water. These perspectives are the last remnants of how Sydney developed since the 1800's and should be retained for evermore, not compromised or destroyed for commercial gain. I am strongly opposed to the proposed Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) and I am in agreement with the National Trust's comments in that the proposed concept modification would:</li> <li>* Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> <li>* Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water</li> <li>* Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park</li> </ul>
352621	Harold Kerr	<p>I strongly oppose Mod 9. The imposition of a virtually solid wall of buildings between historic Millers Point, and particularly Observatory Hill, and the west bespoils the heritage precinct and one of Sydney's greatest assets. Ideally Barangaroo Central should be parkland, an extension of Barangaroo Reserve, a western counterpart to Hyde Park and the Domain. A green breathing space for the CBD, Barangaroo South and Millers Point. Additionally, existing residential and commercial populations and extremely limited road infrastructure support this vision. Alas it is unlikely to eventuate. Development height has always been a concern. The existing Barangaroo Central Master Plan commissioned by the NSW Government in 2003 guarantees western sightlines from Observatory Hill to the harbour and to the horizon. Some years ago the government determined to override this and radically increase heights to pay for the Barangaroo Metro Station. This met the ire of Crown and Lend Lease. It conflicted with their Barangaroo South developments' views of the harbour, the Opera House, and so forth. Crown and Lend Lease won the argument. The building envelope was lowered. Their views were restored. One observes that these same Crown and Lend Lease constructions, for whom views are preserved, have removed views from thousands of offices and residential apartments in the area. Furthermore, the new development profile retains one tall building. This structure does not interfere with Crown and Lend Lease views. It only obstructs sightlines to and from a national treasure, Observatory Hill. Is there a message here? A rational review of Mod 9 can only determine it to be serious over development with absolute disregard for local residential and commercial communities, for Millers Point heritage and its value to the tourist industry, of view sharing which is allegedly an important Mod 9 consideration, or respect for this nonpareil Sydney asset. The ultimate insult is of course the 73.7 metre residential tower near Nawi Cove. Clearly located so as not to obstruct views from Crown or Lend Lease developments and showing no regard whatsoever for any other party or asset. Mod 9 is a short sighted, cynical cash grab. One hopes and prays that the NSW Government will review its stance on this Aqualand development, will show consideration for the local environment, the people, other party's assets, future generations, for one of Sydney's most valuable drawcards, and send Mod 9 back to the drawing board.</p>
353957	Harper Ihaia	I'm very unsettled by the fact that the beautiful of millers point will be blocked due to this development.
352593	Heather Gattone	As a resident of Pymont I apprise this development as an overdevelopment of the site. Where will the necessary infrastructure come from. Pymont is already overdeveloped and the rocks area is part of our history and most of the houses heritage listed how does this development fit in the the aesthetics of this area.
352639	Heather Smith	I oppose this proposal because it does accomodate providing new Women's health services including surgical abortions The original plan should be adhered to and include Women's health services

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353739	Helen Goritsas	Dear Sir/Madam, I strongly object to this proposal that triples the floor area and will obliterate almost all heritage views to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill except the Crown and Lend Lease's views. Millers Point and the Rocks precinct is historic and represents the heritage of Sydney. The proposed Mod 9 development overwhelms the heritage precinct and acts as a barrier to the west and the proposal further encloses Hickson road. View corridors to and from the High Street terraces are significantly diminished. The 73.7 metre residential tower near Nawi Cove destroys Observatory Hill's required uninterrupted sight lines to the horizon, further Crown took foreshore parkland and now Mod 9 encroaches on adjacent parkland. Mod 9 will obliterate almost all heritage views to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill. please don't allow this to happen. Sincerely, Helen
352635	Helen Meddings	I object to this proposal, especially the revised height when it was originally was indicated at no more than 8 levels. The effect of the height of the development will block the view from the water to the Observatory Hill, The Rocks and therefore the historical origin of colonial Sydney. This is a loss to all Australians and should not be permitted.
352645	Helen Psarakis	'Modification' of development proposals already agreed to is totally unacceptable. Public land is paramount in our city as is the case on a global scale. Overdevelopment will only benefit the few with the vast proportion of our urban community being affected. Green spaces in cities are the breathing portions we can all enjoy! Let's not destroy the beauty of our city by the influence of the greedy dollar
352709	Helen Reynolds	As a resident of the area I object to over development of Central Barangaroo. The development has increased from the original submission and I am outraged that foreshore land that was planned to be public land is now to be developed for private use. I also object to the latest request to increase size making Hickson park smaller. The foreshore will look overdeveloped from the water and the historical terraces will hidden which is a tragedy as Sydney is losing any character it had. It will also take the beautiful views away from the observatory Hill. For what? So a privileged few can enjoy the views and the general public can't? Disgraceful! This is terrible planning and should be stopped. Put people before money and greed so the generations to come will enjoy it too.
353637	Henry Zovaro	As an astrophysicist, I am extremely concerned that the proposed development will block large parts of the sky viewable from Sydney Observatory. In the words of Andrew Jacob, a curator at Sydney Observatory, "the modification application contains errors, including the claim that Sydney Observatory does not observe anything below 10-degrees altitude. This is demonstrably false." The NSW government must place the rights of the public to have an unobstructed view of the harbour and sky above the needs of the select wealthy who will be able to afford the extreme costs of living and working in the proposed development and in the surrounding high-rise towers. In a city with a rapidly diminishing amount of public green space, particularly in the CBD, it is critical that Sydney harbour remain open and accessible to everyone.
352545	Howard Gurney	I own a unit in Highgate, 127 Kent St. I object to this plan. This is nothing like the original plans first floated a number of years ago. My main objections relate to the fact that many of the resident apartments in Highgate will now have their western views obscured. The new high residential block stuck at the northern end is completely out of context with the surrounding area. Also, the view from observatory park will now be obscured. The developers have already made enough

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		money out of this. Please stop destroying this historic area of Sydney, the original European settlement in Australia and an important, and once natural area for the Garrigal people.
353721	Howard-Victor Renshaw	Please refer to the attachment
354175	Hunters Hill Trust	Please find attached the Hunters Hill Trust's submission to the Department of Planning & Environment objecting to Central Barangaroo Concept Plan Modification 9 development proposals. <a href="http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&amp;job_id=6378">http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&amp;job_id=6378</a> As the Major projects portal has now closed, please accept this submission from The Hunters Hill Trust for consideration.
353067	Ian Baseby	The proposed development on public land was always designed to be lower rise buildings in keeping with the village concept and is not consistent with the original approved concept. It does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill, Millers Point or the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan for the protection of public iconic views. The proposal completely ignores traffic movement and parking issues in the area despite planning a very large retail complex. Once built, the concept as proposed will be a monumental blight on the Government and person/persons who allows it to be built. We should retain the historic Heritage aspect of the area for the future.
353813	Ian Bell	I object strenuously to this proposal due to loss of views from Observatory Park in Millers Point. We like to visit as a former resident in Kent St who enjoyed the Old Sydney, and having friends living there now. My wife & I support Clover Moore, Philip Thalys and Wendy Bacon in their opinions on the undesirability of this project. Likewise we generally support the Miller Point action group. We are astounded that the development has gradually changed & is now so different even from Lend Lease's vision as shown by the attached excerpt from one of their web pages. Former Prime Minister Keating worked strenuously to achieve the Headland Park and this blotting out of many public views so downgrades what was achieved by that development that it puts NSW Planning and the Government in a light where the public should be given a say, so that the Aqualand proposal is cancelled/abandoned/retracted or changed fundamentally to protect the said views - even if that costs public monies. [See attached excerpts ( 3) from a Financial Review Magazine article by Andrew Clark in 2011 showing Paul Keating with a view of the Harbour and quite a different schematic of a Barangaroo plan vision at that time] In that article Barangaroo Central (labelled 4) was described as "A lively and active civic space". The "civic" word, in my opinion, should now be in capital letters and dominate decision making. Indeed I submit that a broader view of CIVIC also encompasses the broadest possible views from Observatory Park.
352547	Ian BULLUSS	My attached submission outlines my concerns and objection to the proposed modifications to development in Central Barangaroo. The proposed increase in height of Block 7 effectively removes the iconic views that are enjoyed by thousands of residents and visitors to Pyrmont Peninsula and Darling Harbour. The increased building heights within Central Barangaroo will remove the iconic views that visitors pay to enjoy. The effect on the tourism sector could be substantial: both monetary and reputational.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353509	Ian Curdie	I object to this proposal. It is an overdevelopment. It will ruin remaining views from Observatory Hill. It will create additional overshadowing of public spaces. It will not benefit the public at large. It feels sneaky, not widely known, and subject to the approval of one person. Such a significant change requires wider knowledge and comment.
353621	Ian Hamilton	I Object. This proposed development, on public land, which was originally planned to be public park space, then when sold to developers was supposed not to exceed the height of high street, and block the views of the heritage area or the residents. As such the proposal goes against the interests of the public of NSW and is only in the interests or the greedy developers. Proceeding with the proposal will only ensure the the loss of the next election for the current government. Proceed at your peril. Yours sincerely, Ian Hamilton
352991	Ian Higgins	Dear Sir/Madam I am writing to object to the proposed "Modification to Barangaroo Concept Plan (MP06_0162 MOD9) ", and specifically to the monstrous proposed doubling in height of Buidling 7 in Central Barangaroo. The building height of Building 7 must be restricted to the original and surrounding RLs of 35, not the incredible proposed expansion to an RL of 73.7 . This outrageous proposition takes the regrettable but now standard NSW "building size" creep to a new art-form!: An "art-form which benefits a few developers at the entire community's expense. If the proposed massive increase in Building 7 is allowed here's what the public would lose: - unacceptable overshadowing over part of Wulugul Walk and Hickson Cove. -a high negative visual impact on nearby areas and severe disruption to the continuity of views, -from a Heritage point of view, the proposed height and bulk of Building 7 would impact the setting of the Millers Point and Dawes village precinct, and - As PWC has noted, the proposed increase in gross floor area may "disrupt and undermine social cohesion and community well-being" - ie developer benefit over public good. With a potential permanent increase of more than 1,000 people to the area under the proposed "super-sizing" the transport "elephant in the room" is that it is already impossible in peak hours to drive the few kilometers from Hickson Road to the Anzac Bridge turnoff off Sussex Street in less than 30 minutes! Please act in the community interest and reject any increase in size to Building 7. Yours faithfully, Ian Higgins
354181	Irene Carson	Kindly refer to my attached letter.
353137	Isaac Situ	Reviewing the plans for the development, I believe that the mass of the development if grossly inappropriate on the harbour front location. Blocking sight lines from the Rocks and of the Harbour bridge, the buildings are inappropriate for this location. This is already following the large scale developments at Crown tower and IT1/2/3. This should be scaled down dramatically or turned into a space that benefits the public good and not commercialising (formerly) crown land.
353227	Jackson Andre	This is public land, yet there have been 4 years of secretive negotiations to create this travesty. Key public frontage of Barangaroo Ave, already shown narrowed to just 16m width, is impinged by 3m overhang, whose overbearing bulk comically described in Urban Design report as a `verandah'. There should be no encroachment at all permitted. There's no reasonable justification given for any further height increases in Central Barangaroo that could excuse a tower building rising to 73m at northern end, in front of Observatory Hill, blocking historic vistas. Diagrams (eg Fig 35) in Environmental Assessment. Community uses total just 19 000m2 (Cutaway void 18 000m2) out of total of 708 041m2 of gross floor area.



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		This equates to public buildings being just 0.025% of total floor area @ Barangaroo. No positive relationship to wider Sydney, intruding on historic vistas, lacks public streets.
353549	Jacob Harris	This will be a degradation of a historic area of Sydney and prioritises private interests over those of Sydney residents.
353987	Jacob Mamutil	I have worked in the city of Sydney all my life. To me and my family, the views from Observatory Hill are sacred - the views from our apartment will be compromised by the proposed increase in size of the Central Barangaroo development. I make my objection on the following grounds: The proposed buildings along Hickson Rd will only continue the mass degradation of our beautiful foreshores. They will be totally out of context with the surrounds of Nawi Cove, the Millers Point heritage streetscape and the the Barangaroo Headland Park. The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, which is effectively the last remnant of Sydney's Old Town. Based on my understanding of the design, there is woefully inadequate understanding of traffic management from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, and parking needs. Kent Street at Millers Point is already dominated by visitors parking there and walking to the Casino and Barangaroo shops. On what basis could there be a viable and acceptable plan to build a huge shopping centre (which I understand will be 28,000 square metres in size), with no additional parking facilities? I am also concerned that this proposal is now proceeding to approval with undue haste. Initially, submissions were to be made to the Independent Planning Commission, however, I am informed by the MPCRAG that the development application will be determined solely by the NSW Planning Minister. I implore you not to approve this application in the interests of preserving Sydney's history and also in helping to save our environment.
352800	Jacqueline Small	Too much overdevelopment & not enough parkland. Why do we need more high rise in Barangaroo when the whole piece of PUBLIC LAND was originally going to be parkland. The fact that the view from OBSERVATORY HILL is going to be blocked & views from the water will no longer make the historical buildings in Millers Point visible, is an absolute disgrace.
352539	James Barker	We and many others purchased units with a view across Barangaroo with the understanding that Central Barangaroo development in our sightlines would be limited to low-rise buildings. This revised plan will change what we believed we had purchased. It will affect many properties, not least a number of heritage properties. We strongly urge that the revised plan not be approved. Jim & Chris Barker, The Rocks
353515	James Donlevy	I oppose the Barangaroo mod 9 application - I feel it is not in keeping with the historical aspects of the area - the hungry mile - it detracts from the landscape and the accessibility of the view, the land and the water by all Sydney siders including traditional indigenous people, local residents, wider Sydney residents and visitors to the area. This land should remain intact and unchanged to be used and accessible to the benefit of all.
353463	James Hutton	I oppose it. None of the stated benefits could compensate for the crowding of development around Observatory / Flagstaff Hill and the loss of views of that hill, which is one of the principal historical sites of Sydney and loved by those who live here. This modification would see long-held planning principles sacrificed without any proper planning justification, apparently simply because it is politically expedient to do so.
353223	James Yang	I don't want to block the view to and from Sydney Observatory Hill.

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352826	Jane Heynes	To whom it may concern I strongly object to this proposal. This proposal has severe negative implications on the iconic Sydney harbour, the heritage neighbourhood and on public open spaces. The height and density of the buildings proposed at Central Barangaroo will not only cast shadow on the waterfront but also on the heritage and residential area of Millers Point. The heritage area of Millers Point should not be impacted by over development at Central Barangaroo. I am not anti-development however believe this plan shows a blatant disrespect not only for this historic area but also the original vision of the Barangaroo development that took into account a balance between the height and density of development, the heritage of the area, the harbour and green spaces. Not only will views from and to the heritage Millers Point be destroyed but also the historic panoramic views from and to Observatory Hill. Central Barangaroo, in it's original proposed form, could add to the current Barangaroo development to become a world-class attraction enjoyed and celebrated by locals and visitors, both local and international. If this proposal is approved, it will leave a second-rate legacy for future generations. I am urging the government to stop from ruining the harbour, the heritage area of Millers Point and iconic views to and from the harbour and surrounds by rejecting modification 9.
352510	Jane Lee	This is nothing like the original plan where there where to be grasslands and recreational lands for public use. It is a disgrace as it all comes back to money and ego and gambling. You are just trashing Sydney
352973	Jane Robinson	I object to the proposed bunker development at Barangaroo's in its entirety because it is extremely ugly. Extremely ugly and hideous. Extremely ugly and hideous and insulting. Thanks
354013	Jane Sanders	Just no. This proposal is a blot on the landscape which will block public views in all directions. Please don't treat our harbour and our heritage with contempt,
353037	Janet Shannon	The name Barangaroo is a token gesture to First Nations people. In France a First Nations Museum would be a priority. My objections are: Developers have a huge increase in value at the expense of the public 70% increase in GFA; Blocking views to the Harbour from historic Rocks and Observatory Hill. Increase in height. Overshadowing and another ugly, imposing building on public land. Reducing Hickson Park size State Government has a conflict of interest. They are owners and are supposed to protect Public interests and assets instead of handing over our beautiful landscape for private development and profit. Demolishing public housing to create elitist accomodation in times of homelessness and economic hardship
353571	Janice McClelland	I cannot believe that a present day government could consider further alienating the community from the harbour by seeking to increase the built environment of the area adjacent to Darling harbour/Hickson Road which is proposed in this modification. And then to realise that these buildings will also detrimentally impact on the Sydney Observatory and reduce its access to the night sky as well as blocking off the view of the Harbour bridge from the west and pyrmont. This is not a reasonable proposal; this is not a decision that you will be able to look proudly on in 20 years time; this is not a proposal that is able to stand up today, let alone in the future when people will mourn the loss of an exquisite and historically important area, site and view of the harbour, city and sky.
353341	Janice McGilchrist	Aside from obscuring views to the west from my property, the proposed development "modification" will severely impinge on the historical Rocks area. The vistas from the Observatory Hill area have been protected for good reason - this is public land which has a significant place in Sydney (and Australian) history. Obscuring the vistas to and from Observatory Hill is

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		nothing short of heritage vandalism dressed up as "progress". Building a fortress-like wall with these oversized commercial buildings will destroy views that are part of Sydney's charm and history. It will destroy the very thing that Sydney Harbour is famous for. The development does not respect the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan for the protection of public views. Again... this is PUBLIC land and should not be seen as a commercial cash cow.
352661	Jaqu Copeman-Hill	Historic views to and from observatory hill should not be blocked.
353889	Jaz Stephens OAM	I object to the ruining of Sydney City skyline and the stealing of our heritage. This is stealing from the people of Sydney. This is corrupt and dangerous. Implore the government to reject this current of many crazy applications. We remember that this was promised to be a low rise development. This has imploded into a massive tragic overdevelopment. Stop this Folly NOW. This is the last bastion of our early settlement and needs to be preserved. Views from and to Observatory Hill and Sydney Harbour must be maintained. Remember Jack Mundy and the successful green ban which saved The Rocks then. You cannot and will not wreck the Rocks NOW.
352888	Jean eames	I object to the proposal MP06_0162 MOD 9 on the basis of the loss of view from Observatory Hill, the bulk and scale of the development, inadequate assessment of the impact of traffic in our neighbourhood, and net loss of on street parking.
353185	Jean Rice	I write to strongly object to the Section 75W modification application as detailed in the attached letter. The current proposal increases the negative impacts of the previous scheme with increases in height and gross floor area. In particular the proposed tower at the north end would block significant views to and from Observatory Hill and The Rocks. It compromises the Observatory itself - an important heritage site, museum and educational centre. These sites and views are of exceptional heritage significance to Sydney and NSW in a precinct vital to international tourism in Australia. The proposed Mod 9 to the Barangaroo Concept Plan varies significantly from the 2007 proposal and should not be considered a modification rather a new proposal. I support the National Trust of Australia NSW views and I strongly assert that the modification should be rejected completely.
352585	Jean-Bernard Dumerc	The development proposal for central Barangaroo represents an overdevelopment of the site. It is excessive in height and scale and will have a detrimental effect on sightlines from numerous locations in The Rocks. It will encroach on public space and detract from the heritage values of the precinct.
352623	Jeff Stanger	In my work as a night sky tour guide at Sydney Observatory for almost 10 years I regularly showed the public objects below 10 degrees above the horizon. Planets and the moon setting in the west are of particular importance. Observing atmospheric effects on Starlight is also essential to show the difficulties astronomers face in observing astronomical objects. Buildings must be restricted to below the visible horizon at ground level since observations are also made from grindy level for large events that require many telescopes.
352773	Jeffery Smith	The proposed modification reduces the size of Barangaroo Park by 30% from that originally approved. This has been done by converting Barton Street (always intended to be a temporary street to give builder's access) into a permanent street, by bringing the proposed building 5B closer to Barton Street and by deleting that part of Barangaroo Park that will now be a shopping centre and Metro entrance. I am also very concerned that the proximity of building 5B to Barton Street will

**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	Submission
		result in the Park being in semi-permanent shade. The shade diagram prepared for Modification 9 was done at midday on the shortest day of the year. Realistically, except at midday in midwinter, the Park will be largely in shadow from the new buildings (illustration attached). If Barton Street must be retained, can the new buildings along Barton Street be set back at least 20m so that the shadowing of Barangaroo Park is reduced and some continuity of the Park across Barton Street is retained.
354055	Jennie Minifie	The current proposal for modified approval should be rejected for the following reasons: It will destroy the significant heritage values of the view lines between Observatory Hill and Sydney Harbour that have existed for many tens of thousands of years. Following colonial settlement, Observatory Hill became a significant landmark for mariners and residents of Sydney. It continues to hold this cultural significance for the people of Sydney in 2022. The proposed development fails to acknowledge and respect the historic and heritage values of the landscape setting of Millers Point and Observatory Hill for the people of Sydney. Many social and celebratory events take place on Observatory Hill given it's dominance over surrounding development and outlook over Darling Harbour. The proposed development would permanently destroy the unique and highly valued outlook from the public open space on Observatory Hill, which is enjoyed by many thousands of people every day of the year. It is irreplaceable as a public open space and setting for important social events. The proposed development will overshadow and overwhelm the foreshore public open space on Darling Harbour, with private use encroaching on the freedom of the public to enjoy the public open space. The scale of the development is incompatible with the long term objective of public foreshore access around the foreshores of Sydney Harbour. The Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan, deemed SEPP, established principles for the Harbour foreshores and development controls which protected the natural landscape setting of the Harbour foreshores from overdevelopment. Since 2011, the NSW Government has overridden the existing planning controls with new approval processes that prioritize development over conservation of the unique landscape character of the Harbour foreshores. The proposed development if approved will permanently cut off the outlook from Observatory Hill and obstruct the foreshore, preventing it's use for public open space activities in the future. The NSW Government has no mandate for overdevelopment and alienation of the historic and heritage listed foreshores of Millers Point and Observatory Hill. For the reasons stated above, the development proposed should be refused.
353673	Jennifer Abraham	My major concern is the overdevelopment of Central Barangaroo, specifically the sight lines from the Sydney Observatory. It's an enormously significant part of Sydney's early foundations and it has been my understanding for the 20 years that I've lived in Millers Point that these sight lines were to be protected and preserved as part of that early settlement of Sydney. It appears now to be surrendered to the over height buildings now proposed.
353585	jennifer morgan-nicholson	I object to this development proposal change because- This development changes the city skyline , blocks views from other suburbs, increases the urban heat in this part of the harbour foreshore, , encroaches on Hickson Park, affects traffic flows. Please consider NOT passing this development for teh sake of current and future Sydney dwellers.
353215	Jennifer Turner	As an indigenous woman, I am deeply disturbed by the latest modification request which is disrespectful of the local area and heritage of the public land. The buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, with insufficient articulation, setback, separation, etc. They are an urban planning disaster. The low-rise residential setting of the significant heritage Millers

**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	Submission
		<p>Point streetscape will be blocked as seen from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc. Important vistas from the aforementioned suburbs of iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge views will also be blocked. Northern Residential Tower · This building is totally out of context to: o Nawi Cove o Millers Point heritage streetscape o Observatory Hill o Barangaroo Headland Park. It is without merit as a standalone building. It does not contribute as an "exclamation mark" to the whole development nor will it contribute to wayfinding for people to locate the Barangaroo Metro Station. It is a gratuitous cash grab which will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Its comparison to Blues Point Tower is wholly warranted. It does not contribute positively to the urban planning of the precinct. The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, Sydney's Old Town. Other major cities around the world respect their Old Towns by maintaining sightlines - not the NSW Government it seems. 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 completely obscured by the Government's new buildings. 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. They have sold the views three times. If your view is impacted, you are encouraged to take a photograph of your view, or panorama of your view and attach this to your submission. A wholly inadequate assessment of how traffic will spill out from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues. The retail precinct will provide for minimal shopper parking necessitating out-of-area shoppers to park in Millers Point and Walsh Bay. The application does not seek to add additional car parking space (in fact it seeks to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road) despite planning a 28,000 sqm retail offering. Where will these shoppers park? Additional text from submitter (352480): Mod 9 is unreasonable and will have a negative impact on the community and historical ambiance of the area.</p>
353741	Jeremy Dawkins	<p>I object to the modification because it is so obviously against the public interest. The approved Concept and the Statement of Commitments stretched any notion of the public interest to the limit. This application breaks it apart. Today's (8 August 2022) judgement of the L&amp;E Court in relation to the floating dry dock at Berrys Bay proves the power of the Sydney Harbour-related SEPPs in protecting the public interest. The same reasoning would preclude approving this application. Protecting the heritage significance of Observatory Hill and Millers Point would also preclude approving this application.</p>
353787	jeremy eccles	<p>A new 19-storey apartment tower on the edge of the new Headland Park, will forever obscure the western views from Observatory Hill, which is the highest point in Sydney and has significant heritage values pre and post colonisation including its windmill, the oldest fort, communication and navigation hub, weather, astronomy and most likely an Aboriginal ceremonial site. Originally, it had views all the way to Botany Bay. Why does the Government think that commerce is the only way to go forward on such an iconic development site? How could such crass over-crowding of Harbour-front land be justified beside the potential for a First Nations cultural centre in the adjacent Cutaway??? This is not a modified plan for Central Barangaroo, it is a radical rethink that is wholly exploitative of the waterside setting.</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353969	Jessica Mackenzie	I am heartbroken to see this proposal. I bought my home in Millers Point with the belief the local council and government would respect the incredible uniqueness of this area. Once developed this area can never be returned to the historic area it currently is. Please don't do this. Not only for the existing community but also for the historic integrity of colonial Sydney. We shouldn't even be having this discussion!
352543	Jielin Li	Object
353749	Jill L'Estrange	Please see attached submission from the Headland Preservation Group.
353343	Jing jia Ji	It's bad for the residents
352921	JOANNE MARCHESE	We purchased our home in Kent Street Millers Point in 2015 when the NSW Department of Housing sold the public housing. During this process we enquired with McGraths regarding potential future build out of views. We were told 79 Kent Street would NEVER be built out as a precedence for a Heritage line of site view from the Sydney Observatory to the water line from its westerly view. They quoted the court case of the Observatory Hotel wanting to add floors which was rejected based upon this heritage requirement. We therefore purchased our property based on information that we would NEVER lose our views. All of the brochures and marketing showed and quoted Harbour Views and Water Views. We then proceed to spend \$2.2 million dollars on a top to toe renovation, respecting the Heritage guidelines for Millers Point. Brining one of the original homes of Sydney back to its original glory. This includes the widows walk which has 360 degree views of Sydney including to the waterline in the west. So we invested \$5.5 million dollars on our property with the belief based on information for the representatives of NSW Department Of Housing that those views would NEVER be under question. If these views are removed and blocked we will be taking our case to the Land & Environment Court and seeking damages and compensation for the lies we were told upon the sale of our property. The submission by Aqualand is a gross abuse of the previously approved scheme for Barangaroo Central. The increase in floor space and height and bulk and scale is not only illegal as this is not what has been approved, it smells of an underhand deal that has been done between Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW. Aside from our own personal loss, this proposal will have serious negative effects on the Millers Point suburb. No longer will visitors and Sydney siders see the views of the beautiful Heritage suburb of Millers Point from Sydney Harbour. These will be hidden behind a large wall of modern office buildings. The houses on High Street will have a complete removal of privacy and sunlight at various times of the day. The oldest Kindergarten in Sydney will have virtually no sunlight from overshadowing in the afternoons. Traffic which is already choking in Millers Point due to the number of residents vs car spaces will be untenable. The proposal includes very few car spaces for office worker, supermarket shoppers and residents. City residents and workers who flock to Observatory Hill to watch the sunset will no longer be able to experience this vista. they will be met with a residential tower block of apartments as the view. When the Barangaroo precinct was presented to the citizens of NSW. This was never the vision. It was low rise at the northern end with public outdoor event spaces and parks that tied in with the headland. Creating a beautiful connection with nature for all to enjoy. This vision has been decimated with this proposal. Sydney has an oversupply of offices including at Barangaroo South. Do we need this scale of offices and housing at Barangaroo Central? Low lying buildings that maintain the vistas from Observatory Hill , the site of the beautiful Heritage houses from Sydney Harbour and privacy

**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	Submission
		to the existing residents is paramount. This scheme takes away all of these. The great wall of Aqualand should not be approved. It is not in ANY WAY consistent with the approved concept.
352900	Joel Cusack	I am writing to protest against the proposed ridiculous height increases by Aqualand & the planning Department of NSW to the approved building envelopes in South Barangaroo. I will stick to commenting on false & misleading claims in the submission to justify the proposed changes. The Environmental Assessment done by Urbis is full of unsubstantiated opinion and an obvious bias toward the development. The Director General in his 2014 requirements for Mod9 clearly states any increase in density should occur within current envelopes. Yet, the Environmental assessment sees no problem in massively increasing the envelopes and fails to justify any benefit to the public other than monetary to the development. Completely ignoring key tenants of the Development Plan for Barangaroo. The whole point of the current RL34-35m limit on Block 5, 6 & 7 is to preserve the water sight lines from Observatory park over the Langham Hotel and old houses. The proposed RL45m completely decimates this view. They dont address this complete loss of view of an increase to 45m at all in section 3.3.4 of the WSP Consultation Report. A 10m increase is 'sold' as, and im paraphrasing here 'Kent sits at 24m and some stuffs blocked at 35m high, so we might as well block everything at 45m'. Its a complete abandonment of one of the key foundations to be preserved on the site. Block 7 proposed increase from 35m to 73m is a joke and makes a complete mockery of one of the most important 7 key points for the development from the start. The justification of a `marker' and a `framing' of Nawi Cove are just rubbish. The justification too of height increases to `assist legibility' and `wayfinding' treat the public and the planning department as idiots. The only `wayfinding' to be done with that will be pilots of aircraft! A 35m high building next to a park frames it without over towering it like a 73m tower. The 73m building will dominate and detract the natural beauty of that area, not enhance it. The so called `increases" in public space in 3.2 section 2 of the WSP report arent actual increases. The Barangaroo Steps was in the original concept and isnt an `increase'. "Nawi Terrace" views West come at the expense of one of the main preservation points of the site, the view from Observatory Hill West. A 35m building there with a rooftop Terrace achieves the same views West whilst preserving Observatory Hills historic views. It adds nothing, and takes away other established public views. Barangaroo South was always meant to be low rise from concept through to now in sympathy with The Rocks end of town. The Major money for the project was to made by the huge towers & Casino already built. Raising the Soth envelopes has nothing to do with public amenity and everything to do with developer and Treasury greed.
353743	Johanna Watson	I object to this development. At a general level it is perhaps worth remembering: 1) that this entire land was PUBLIC LAND, with the government of the day having a duty of care to the public to reserve it for public good. This imperative was greater than usual as it was waterfront land in the CBD of Sydney and therefore the most prime of real estate. There was inherent in this, a duty to ensure that this beautiful waterfront area would be used to maximise the enjoyment of as many citizens of NSW as possible. 2) It was given to the developer without going to tender which called into question whether this was the most beneficial use of the land either in terms of economics or community well-being. 3) It was given to a group who were later found to be unfit to hold the business licence for the reason for which they were given the land. They were also found have turned a blind eye to money laundering suggesting a priority of profits over ethics. The increase of the maximum total permissible GFA from 602,345 to 708,041 square metres is an 18% increase in overall size which should require a new proposal rather than being portrayed a mere `modification', a term which suggests a minor amendment. Bearing this in mind, in relation to the 8 amendments proposed: (1) The increase of the maximum GFA from

**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	Submission
		<p>47,688 sq metres for the Central Barangaroo area from 47,688 sqm to 144,355 sqm is also far from a mere modification but TRIPLES the maximum GFA . (2) The 800 sqm increase in community use (a 0.8% of the 96,667 sqm increase and 0.6% of the whole this 144,355 sqm is for community use. Presumably the 99.4% increase is for the developers' private benefit. (3) The land to the south is part of Hickson's waterfront public park and should not be given to developers. (4) The Cutaway is a venue space for use of the public leased out by the Barangaroo Delivery Authority (government offices) and none of it let alone 18,000 sqm should be given to developers. It is at the northwest end of the headland in the parkland and was specifically reserved for public use venue for hire, after the southern end was allocated for development. This is some distance from the development and was not part of the proposed private development. (5) Roads are paid for by the public to provide access for the public. And should not be converted to service roads for the benefit of a few. (6) The initial height, building envelopes, block alignments of Blocks 5,6 and 7 should be retained and not be granted additional or flexible GFAs. Extra height blocks views of Observatory Hill from Balmain. These buildings already block sunlight and have created shadowing with cold, draughty wind tunnels very apparent within the newly built areas of the Barangaroo complex. (7) There should be no amendments to existing Design Guidelines for Central Barangaroo (8) State Significant Precincts, especially waterfront ones where that can be enjoyed by all citizens, have been chosen with thought and care and permissions for proposed use similarly granted over extended periods with great thought, care and broad and long consultation. Large modification proposals with only a few weeks of consideration should not be granted, especially where a few private interests seem to be given priority over the benefit of the public whose land it is. Given that this land belongs to all the citizens of NSW to enjoy, I sincerely hope that the letter from the NSW Department of Planning and the Environment requesting comments on `modification' proposals was not just sent to those neighbouring landowners/occupiers but to all of those who are entitled to enjoy the public waterfront park at Barangaroo.</p>
353283	John Brown	<p>I wish to object to the Central Barangaroo Development. 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. These include the views to and from Observatory Hill and views from the harbour towards the Heritage buildings on High Street. In addition the planned northern residential tower positioned alongside Nawi Cove and the Barangaroo Headland park will destroy the effort made to sensitively locate original native landscaped zone With a strong link to the original Aboriginal habitat. Barangaroo Headland Park is a new culturally significant element of the Barangaroo plan. The Northern Residential Tower will trash the landscape and views towards and away from the headland. Finally, Hickson Road is under pressure now. There is no updated plan published for the increased road traffic resulting from the over development of the central Barangaroo site. I currently have the Metro Access tunnel outside my bedroom window. With the new Arts Centre in Walsh Bay and the eventual reopening of the Overseas Passenger Terminal Hickson Road, Millers point, Kent Street and the Argyle Cut are a traffic nightmare. In summary my objections are: - Vistas to and from OH are sacrosanct and must be protected - Northern Residential Tower is totally out of context and destroys the impact of the adjacent BH Park - Hickson Road will now feed an increased traffic load into the Millers Point Precinct and the Rocks I believe the Central Barangaroo Development plan must be refined to overcome these problems or they will degrade the visual impact of our city forever, and cause complex traffic and movement issues into the future. Yours faithfully. John Brown M Des RCA Adjunct Professor Design QUT</p>



**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	Submission
353759	John Chivers	Vandalism! It's a second rate proposal and should be outright rejected. Start again with something that adds to Sydney and will leave land in the peoples hands, Now and into a long future.
352705	John Cusack	<p>Dear Committee Members,</p> <p>1. DISAPPEARING VIEWS My wife and I moved to Apartment 6A, 161 Kent Street in 2014. Our Apartment overlooks Barangaroo South, Barangaroo Central and Barangaroo Headland. Since 2014, most of our views of Darling Harbour, Pymont and Balmain have disappeared because of the development of Barangaroo South (see attachment 1 then, and attachment 2 now). However, we still maintain a narrow view, looking north, of Goat Island and Barangaroo Headland (see attachment 3). This view will also disappear because of the proposed excessive heights of buildings planned for Barangaroo Central, particularly the high rise building in Block 7. We were always prepared to lose some of our views, but never contemplated loosing all of them.</p> <p>2. MILLERS POINT UNIQUE HISTORIC HERITAGE COMPROMISED One of Sydney's unique shoreline vistas includes historic parts of the Rocks and Millers Point. Important Sydney history and heritage is visually on display along the shoreline of Sydney Harbour opposite Balmain. The current plan blocks views to and from both Kent Street and High Street, Millers Point. This means that residents living on the western side of Kent Street/High Street (including Langham Hotel), no longer have views to the west. Conversely, harbour traffic and Balmain view lines are blocked to Millers Point. The win/win is surely to significantly reduce the heights of proposed buildings (Blocks 5-7) planned for Barangaroo Central.</p> <p>3. FINAL THOUGHT We accept that development was always going to happen along the Barangaroo stretch of the harbour foreshore. We bought into a city lifestyle in good faith. The really disappointing thing for us has been the ongoing revisions and changes that have happened since the original winning concept vision by Hill Thalys. We think the State Government really missed a great opportunity to take over the redevelopment of Barangaroo Central after the failure of Grocon. With State Significance being the key to re-developing one of the most iconic and historic parts of Sydney, we feel that the State could have developed a lasting legacy for such an area. It would seem however, that over time, State Revenues and Commercial Profit have won out against a winning urban design concept that married all the factors that unite communities. Thank You, John and Joy Cusack</p>
353213	john deadman	The Existing Concept Plan Mod 9 Gross Floor Area Is Being Tripled The Height Of The Residential Tower Has Been Increased To 73 .7 M More Than Triple The Other Adjacent Proposed Buildings The Proposal Encroaches On Adjacent Parkland And Hickson Road The Proposed Banangaroo Central Development Mod 9 Is A Substantial Over Development Of The Site Verbatim duplicate of submission 353197
352675	John Dunn	4-page PDF attached
352526	John Flett	BURYING OUR HISTORY At what point did this Liberal Government decide that our history is worthless...that cash is more important than landmarks that have stood since the early 1800's? This soulless plan will bury our historic Rocks behind white glass walls, killing any residents' views to the west and destroying all prized western views of the Rocks from

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		Balmain and suburbs to the West. The Rocks were preserved for a reason - to protect our history- but this cynical development will hide them behind a wall. The Government must not get away with this. The development is now planned to be 300percent bigger than first envisaged. The bland Tower is planned for the northern end - so Crown will not again sue over loss of view, as it has already successfully done. But what of the views of the thousands of residents to the west and southwest? The tower and attached buildings will rob Pymont and Balman residents of the bridge view, significantly affecting the value of their apartments. This must not be allowed to go ahead.
353629	John Hackett	I object to any further building development on Barangaroo. It must be kept as public parkland.
352719	John HINDE	The never ending saga of Developer greed and cosy relationships between Developers and Government cries out for a Royal Commission which, of course, no Government will ever call. So the long suffering public with primary interest in the rational and reasonable development of the city of Sydney will continue to be faced with the ambit claims of developers which simply are unrealistic and merely part of the process of maximising developer profits. Of all the ambit claims by developers this latest takes the cake. Barangaroo South has been a classic example of overdevelopment of public land. This current proposal, given the sensitivity of the harbourside location is even worse. We have had more than enough of overdevelopment in the area, This proposal is way beyond the limit. The Tower proposed at the northern end of Barangaroo Central is notable for the adverse effect it will have on the views from Millers Point and Observatory Park but notably allows minimal interference to the views from the monstrous Crown towers and One Sydney Harbour. Pretty much says it all, does it not? No doubt in the light of public response, this ambit claim will be modified by a subsequent claim with a lower GFA, as the original Blackwattle Bay ambit claim has been. But the developers always start with a massively exaggerated proposal in the safe knowledge that after a number of minor modifications their bottom line will be greatly enhanced. And so the game continues. The GFA proposed in this modification is grossly excessive. The reduction in size of the proposed Hickson Park is a disgrace in itself. The tower proposed for the northern end of Central Barangaroo must be rejected out of hand and the entire development modified again to meet the rational and reasonable expectations of the long suffering public.
353375	John Houston	SUBMISSION to Department of Planning and Environment Development Barangaroo Concept Plan Modification 9 Application number MP06_0162 MOD 9 Location Central Barangaroo Personal Information private Political Donations made Nil Support or Object Object Reason for Objection The key reason: This proposal is unacceptable, the increase sought is a 146% increase in Gross Floor Area (GFA) and significant increases in building heights. I also object because this is our harbour, our reclaimed land, there have been promises made and broken. The strict guidelines documented have been ignored by developers profiteering from the misuse of public land! The objections: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to ANY increase in the maximum GFA above the approved 47,000m2</li> <li>2. I object to ANY increase in height above the approved RL 22.5 Block 5, RL 29.0 Block 6 and RL 35 Block 7</li> <li>3. I object to any modification to the approved block boundaries</li> <li>4. I object to the conversion of Barton Street from a temporary road to a permanent road against the existing approval</li> </ol>

**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	Submission
		<p>5. I object to proposed amendments to the State Significant Precincts SEPP</p> <p>6. I object to the loss of views and heritage aspect from and to Observatory Hill and Millers Point. Loss of quiet enjoyment due to Mod 9 My health and safety, my quiet enjoyment will all be dramatically affected by the proposed changes in Modification 9.</p> <p>I note that SSD-39587022 is at "prepare EIS" stage. The Bond has had ZERO consultation. The remediation project will again expel toxic substances into the atmosphere from the historic gas plant on the site and as the closest residential Strata Plan the health, safety and quiet enjoyment of SP72797's residents will suffer throughout the entire build process. Barton Street was NEVER proposed as permanent - it must be moved. Barton Street lies about 150 meters from The Bond Apartments. It has become a drag strip for loud "super cars" attracted by the restaurants, apartments and Hotel in Barangaroo and the noise especially at night and on weekends is totally unacceptable. We have "put up" with this on the basis of the temporary approval and stress that Barton Street CANNOT be left as permanent, see my comments on Hickson Park which relate. Hickson Park will be significantly overshadowed and was not approved to remain its current (limited) size. The NSW Independent Planning Commission increased the size of Hickson Park and removed Barton Street to improve the amenity of the park and improve pedestrian connection into Central from South. The Applicant seeks to restore the previous site boundary and keep Barton Street as a two-way road joining Hickson Road.</p> <p>* The applicant wishes us to compare this park to Bryant Park (a 9.6-acre park in Central Manhattan) - there is no comparison!</p> <p>* Hickson Park will be overshadowed in midwinter Hickson Park is small as is and was NEVER proposed or approved to remain its current (limited) size. In the Barangaroo Concept Plan MOD 8 Determination Report dated 28 June 2016 (MP06_0162 MOD 8) The Commission was presented with a building height of RL22.5 for Block 5. The Commission on page 20 states: "the footprint and building envelope of Block 5 is to be reduced .. Future above ground buildings in Block 5: (a) Are to minimise overshadowing of Hickson Park .. no more than 2,500sqm of Hickson Park is overshadowed .. (b) On page 21 of the Determination report it is stated "the Commission recommended a reduction in the footprint of Block 5 .. to limit overshadowing." Against this background the applicant has completely ignored the Commission's determination by INCREASING the proposed height of Block 5 from RL 22.5 to RL44.5. Outrageous! Zero consideration of the nearest residential building to the proposal in Mod 9: In making this objection, I would point out that I reside at The Bond Apartments, 38 Hickson Road Millers Point Strata Plan 72797 and have since 2016. I strongly object to the TOTAL lack of consultation and point out that The Bond Apartments is the closest residential Strata to the proposed Central Development, and there has been ZERO consultation with the owners of this Strata. Please see Appendix F in Mod9, revision 11 dated 10/12/2021, the View and Visual Impact Assessment report is therefore seriously flawed and a falsehood in that it does not consider the nearest residential Strata. Mod 9 proposal is destructive of the heritage of the area - Barangaroo is Crown Land Mod 9 destroys many aspects of the heritage value of the whole of Barangaroo. The proposal does not comply with the existing Approved Concept Plan planning controls. However, in this regard, all of the previous development within Barangaroo South has been successful in amending existing planning controls, often significantly so. This MUST NOT be allowed for Barangaroo Central. Appendix F_ View and Visual Impact Assessment Page 140 (Barangaroo Modification 9 : View and Visual Impact Assessment, AECOM, Page 130) There is repeated guidance and</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		determination in all previous reports such as: "Future development within the Barangaroo site is to retain views to Observatory Hill Park from public spaces on opposite foreshores." These principles have NOT been adopted in the present Mod 9 application. I OBJECT to the applicant's "Summary" which (erroneously) states (inter-alia) "Mod 9 often only marginally increases the extent of view loss". This statement made by the applicant is a falsehood. The heritage views to the Millers Point historical cottages are destroyed by Mod 9.
353493	JOHN McDONNELL	My wife and I live in Gloucester Street, The Rocks and wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed modification of the Barangaroo Concept Plan. In particular, we object to the proposed massive increase of 38.7 metres in the height of Tower 7 - a 110% increase from the approved height! From our Apartment, and from Observatory Hill, we can see two buildings (Blues Point Tower and Sirius) which, regardless of Architectural merit or otherwise, are clearly inappropriate, size wise, for their locations. What possible public benefit is there in adding a third memorial to bad planning? To allow an oversized tower to seriously impede the western view from Observatory Hill, and the corresponding view from the west, would be a disgrace. Surely, those responsible will prevent this happening by making the correct decision, and not allowing commercial greed to ruin what has been, to date, an outstanding redevelopment?
353567	John Namey	Does not respect the heritage significance of the area
353591	John O'Byrne	I would like to express my opposition to the proposed variation in the Barangaroo plans described in the Barangaroo Concept Plan (06_0162) Mod 9, in particular the proposed 74 m block 7 tower located directly west of Sydney Observatory. I have an aesthetic concerns on the appearance of a single higher rise building among a somewhat lower environment, plus the clear grab by developers for more space, but my primary concern centres on the impact on viewing from Sydney Observatory. As a professional astronomer currently working at the University of Sydney, with 40 years experience in educating the general public about the night sky, modern astronomy and light pollution issues, I have been to the Observatory many times and often refer the public to Observatory activities. The practical impact of the proposed building is shown in the image attached (from MAAS). It has the practical effect of blocking the western horizon across a range of azimuth angles, depending on location on the Observatory site. It is certainly true that astronomers would prefer to observe their targets high above the horizon, but this is not always possible. The Observatory site provide a unique location in the city that has a clear western horizon for those times when a view right to the horizon is useful. I believe the Observatory's own submission will list specific examples when this is true. It is certainly true that this impact will only be significant on occasions. However, the aesthetic effect of the building sticking up above the surrounds is there always. It was not my primary motivation in writing this submission, but I finish thinking that it is perhaps the ongoing impact on the visual panorama that visitors to the observatory will notice most often. Please do not allow this eyesore to proceed, with fundamentally no better justification than to provide more floor area for developers.
353089	JOHN SMITH	This is a totally inappropriate development for this site. It will obstruct the views from apartments on Kent Street. It will impact on traffic flow in Kent Street
354207	John Walters	This development will block the beautiful view from Observatory hil/park over the harbour for the thousands of people / tourists that visit this park during the year. Don't we have enough high rise in Barangaroo area . My understanding was

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		that this was park land and harbour shore walk ?? We have lived in the area on and off for last 20 years and are very disappointed with the scope of this development
353257	Josephine Davidson	Am objecting to the increase of the total permissible Gross Floor Plan (GFA) within Barangaroo from 602,354 to 708,041 sqm and increase in maximum GFA from 47,688 sqm to 144,355 sqm (including 116,189 sqm of above ground to 28,166 sqm of below ground GFA). Objecting to allocate up to 18,000 sqm of GFA for the Cutaway within Barangaroo Reserve (previously unallocated). Objecting to Blocked views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula & Pirrama Park including in height from 38m to 47m across most buildings, 140% increase in GFA from 47,688 sqm to 144,355 sqm & shocking proposal of 73.7m tower at the northern end that would block community views from the Rocks. Does not respect heritage significance of Observatory Hill, Sydney Harbour Bridge, Miller's Point, White Bay Power, the Hungry Mile historic terraces that I enjoy seeing from Peacock Point park. No towering buildings should ever block the view of historic Observatory Hill. I am outraged and dismayed by the greed of these government ministers who have given the green light to their developer mates to ruin our great city of Sydney (previously named Port Jackson with our proud maritime history). That Barangaroo foreshore had been originally designed for our cruise ship industry so that the cruise ships could line that foreshore that bring in billions of dollars in the tourism industry, now ruined by greedy developers (when there are many other places developers can build towers). This is prime real estate with prime maritime historic foreshore and that should be preserved for all generations to come to enjoy our great city and not just for the wealthy few.
352633	Josette Bull	I do not want to this development that is being proposed
353357	Jude Foale	I absolutely object to this overdevelopment. It is an insult to our First Nation particularly to Barangaroo after who this precious piece of land is named. I attended a meeting in June 2021 where Rod McCoy from Aqualand outlined how they would cherish this land with an outstanding development along the lines of the all timber building in South Barangaroo which would enhance the area. Was that just a big fat lie? Instead that are going to steal one third of our Hickson Park for what I ask. Just bigger buildings it seems. what happened to the Children's playground, the ampitheatre, the sunny laneways. Please do not pass this development application in its current form. We don't need another high rise. Build two smaller residential buildings to blend in not stick out. The NSW people who own this crown land can do so much better than this. We only get one shot at it. This land is historic to Sydney and Australia. Please don't let them stuff it up for our future generations. There are easy fixes that all those who live here would be very much in favour of. Then everyone's a winner. Thank you.
352683	Judith Martin	I am writing to you in regard to the Barangaroo Concept Plan Mod 9. I have looked at the plans and documents regarding the new proposal and am very concerned about how the heritage of the area is being affected. Raising the height of the already approved buildings blocks the views from the foreshore leading up to Observatory Hill which is an iconic view and should be maintained for all to enjoy . All people of Sydney and visitors should be able to enjoy and appreciate the heritage and significance of the Millers Point old streets and foreshore . It makes no sense to block views of some of the oldest streets in Sydney . In the past I have considered purchasing one of the old properties on High Street or Kent St but the heritage rules set down were so onerous . Maintaining the heritage of the facade and roofs of the properties were all that mattered . So what is the point of being so strict when those houses and flats won't be seen from the foreshore

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		anyway if this proposal goes ahead . It just doesn't make sense! I believe the plan should remain as it was with no raising of heights of any buildings.
353267	Judith Quirk	Please see attachments
352808	Judith tertini	I strongly object to this development application on a number of grounds. Firstly, in the past I have objected to this development - I have never received any acknowledgements of my objections. Barangaroo should have been turned into parkland, not given to developers. The area is unique - it is the gateway to Sydney's old history - the Rocks and Millers Point. The Grocon development, which was much smaller was 'knocked on the head' mainly because of Crown and Lend Lease - why are they dictating where a new development is going? The planned development includes a shopping mall - the area does not need more shops - shops already in the Barangaroo area are struggling in the present Covid situation. This is going to be with us for a long period of time. If this development goes ahead great views from Balmain and the waterways in front of Barangaroo will be obstructed. As you are fully aware, the developer will submit further modifications and the footprint will get bigger. The proposed development, including buildings, landscaping and roads, paths etc. will dramatically decrease the green space in the area. There will be more traffic in the area, and there are no traffic lights in the area - will this cause more traffic and pedestrian accidents? The planned development will not cater fully for the increase in parking needs. Already this is a problem. Please do not approve this development!
352959	Judith Tribe	As a resident of the Millers Point, my objections to the Barangaroo South development are these: o Break of trust leading to overdevelopment of the site o No consideration of the history and cultural significance of the site Over time the development proposals have increased both the height and density of the buildings with the addition of a residential tower block, block B5 from 34m to 55.5m, B6 from 35m to 38.7m and B7 from 35m to 38.5m with a 73.7m residential tower. The consequences of this will mean that the public spaces will only rarely, if at all, have any sunlight. It will become a shaded and not very inviting space. The Millers Point area is a vibrant village residential area, we do not need more residential, especially when none has been proposed until this last MOD 9 proposal, something tacked on without any thought for the consequences or overall plan. There will be 800 units in the Lend Lease development, 84 in the Crown Tower as well as the 300 hotel rooms in Crown Tower. The roads in this area were never designed or intended for the increased traffic flow this will bring. Visitors can be encouraged to come by public transport or to walk into the area, a positive plan, but residents need to drive and park. Cities that don't respect their history lose their soul, also their tourist and visitor potential. The Millers Point area has a foundation part in the development of Sydney and hence as a cradle for the development of Australia. From the indigenous use of the area through the maritime expansion of these waterways, so pivotal for our development, and now back to a living and leisure space. It is only in 1967 that the finger wharves along the Barangaroo area were changed to an apron for container ships. To pay respect to this history I would like to see a development plan to reflect the maritime history, instead of high blocks of buildings consider the potential of finger wharf building envelopes with walkways between as a reminder of the wharves and their loading areas. I am impressed with the suggested natural building materials and this plan would give a lot of scope for an imaginative suggestion of the maritime history of the area. The connection of High Street to the water is also important, this was a key aspect of the life in Millers Point that the waterfront workers could walk to the docks to work and have a drink in the surrounding pubs after work. I hope my point of view will be considered.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353683	Judy Hyde	As per attachment. Finding this submission page was a nightmare. This is unacceptable frustration.
353529	JULIAN Chan	I object to this modification submission for Central Barrangaroo. The heights and development are grossly overstated for an area that should remain as public land
353325	Julie Elliott	I object to modification 9 on the following bases: It is excessive in bulk and scale Its is a huge increase on the size and height of the original proposal A change of this scale should be undertaken via a DA not a modification The proposal should be considered by the Independent Planning Commission This proposal has a huge impact on the historic Rocks and Observatory Hill as well as Sydney Harbor It has a lack of public space We have not been properly advised on previous changes to Barangaroo developments The proposal will cast shadows over surrounding areas It will obliterate my current views of the Rocks and the Harbor Bridge - refer attached photo of current view from my property
352832	June Neary	The proposed concept modification would: Block public views west from Observatory Hill Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept: Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.
352567	Justin Cain	a. Mod 9 is not in the public interest. The modification application highlights the prejudicial legacy of the former Part 3A of the EPA Act which allows, through transitional provisions, broad ranging modifications with significantly less rigor than the approvals process that would have applied if the Proposed Development was being assessed under Part 4 of the EPA Act. b. The Proposed Development is of excessive bulk and scale. The amendments to Blocks 5, 6, and 7 include additional height, changes to the block alignments, and additional GFA across the blocks. c. The additional development height of MOD 9 would be to the detriment of the local community, cause significant view loss, and is contrary to the intention of the original Concept Plan.
353445	Kar Yee Chiu	The concept design is very problematic and needs far more consultation and stakeholder engagement to make it work for everyone. There is a lack of public and green spaces, the height of the buildings are taller than what they ought to be and they block off the city from the harbour. It blocks off views of the water from parts of Millers Point and other areas of historical and heritage significance. It also blocks off the iconic view of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont. There are too many issues with this Central Barangaroo Concept modification and Sydney Harbour is too important and iconic to anyone who lives in the area and everyone who frequents the area. The views must be protected for all now and in the future.
353971	Karen Dean	I strongly oppose this proposal. This will be the second-largest grant of public land to private interests in the history of the City of Sydney. There is absolutely no reason for this proposal that constitutes over-development to take public land, which entails accessibility and views, to be granted to private interests. Sydney still has heritage and green space in and

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		near the CBD because a number of groups opposed similar over-developments in the nineteen-seventies. I offer my opposition to this proposal in the spirit of the fight to retain public assets in public hands.
353025	Karen Fisher	I object to the proposal to further develop Barangaroo in a way which will destroy the special character of Observatory Hill. Observatory Hill has been a significant place for residents of Sydney for thousands of years, and the views of the harbour in all directions are central to that significance and must not be interfered with.
352935	Kate Kerr	The Barangaroo development is proceeding without regard to aesthetic considerations. Avarice is triumphing over the people of Millers Point, the environment, and the site lines to and from our beloved and historic Observatory Hill. The traditional view from the water will be destroyed for locals and tourists alike.
353521	Katey Grusovin	I am writing to stringently object to this abomination of a proposal for Barangaroo Central. The proposed concept modification would: - Block public views west from Observatory Hill - Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill - Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point - Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water - Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept: - Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept - Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development - Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views - Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views - Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill - Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.
353641	Kay Peacock	This concept will block views and it is a really ugly design. Why not make it more in character with the area. I object to it being built, why can't we just have a park? I'm sick of boring, bland architecture.
353609	Kay Podmore	I would like to oppose the destruction of the heritage homes and area that is being planned for Barangaroo. We are a young country with not much history and the homes that will be molested and other types of buildings etc will be a huge loss for Australia, NSW and especially Sydney. Please come up with a better plan that will include these precious pieces of architecture and heritage
353191	Keith Knapman	Views from Observatory Hill;- Vistas to and from the public space Observatory Hill are special 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. These views should not now be compromised on account of an expansion of the original agreed plans for Barangaroo. Bulk and scale of the new proposal;- The buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, with insufficient articulation, setback, separation, etc. They are an urban planning disaster. The low-rise residential setting of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked as seen from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pymont, Balmain, etc. Northern Residential Tower;- This building is totally out of context to Nawi Cove, the Millers Point heritage streetscape, Observatory Hill and Barangaroo Headland Park. It is without merit as a standalone building and nor does it contribute as an "exclamation mark" to the whole development. (comparisons have been made to Blues Point Tower, and these comparisons are fair) Millers Point Heritage precinct;- The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, Sydney's Old Town. Other major cities around the world respect their



**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	Submission
		<p>Old Towns by maintaining sightlines. 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 completely obscured by this proposal. Finally, the proposed modification to the Concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill or Millers Point.</li> </ul>
353603	Keith Tunnicliffe	<p>I want to express my abhorrence that such over development could be considered for such an iconic and historic area of Sydney. Instead of celebrating our historic heritage with views across to heritage terraces of Millers Point and Observatory Hill, and our Sydney Harbour Bridge, this plan will hide them and turn The Hungry Mile into a back lane. The land surrounding our harbour bridge should be excluded from high rise development. Wide views towards it should be protected from all parts of the city and surrounds. The high rise tower proposed at the north end of this development is far too close to our bridge. It will block views, particularly from the south and west and will pollute the wider view towards the harbour bridge. This should not even be considered. The tower would cast morning shadows over the Barangaroo waterfront and the planned Harbour Park, while the additional bulk of the development would overshadow much of Hickson Park during winter, as well as Fort Street Public School. The gross overdevelopment of this site and emphasis on commercial development will stand as reminders to the public of this Government's determination to sell off public land to developers for maximum financial gain. This is a disgraceful betrayal of the public interest.</p>
353699	Kelly Swindles	<p>I oppose the proposed increase in height of the buildings set out in modification 9. The new height limits will forever change, that is obstruct views from Observatory Hill. This site has been used for centuries as a place to take in our beautiful harbour. These views belong to all Sydney residents and all Australians, not a few residential dwelling sitting on the Harbour foreshore.</p>
352727	Ken Attard	<p>This proposed development is outrageous. The development will place a stain on one of Australia's most iconic locations that serves both the Australian community and draws the eye of billions of people internationally each year. The social impacts will be immense. For a city that is fighting for public land and making the City of Sydney more liveable, this is a significant step backwards. The suitability of the site for the development is terrible. A building of this scale should not be placed here. Barangaroo was a stretch too far, this is unnecessary. Millers Point represents the oldest history this country stands upon. Let's promote this proudly, not bury it in the shadows of a horrific development.</p>
353587	Ken Pritchett	<p>Frankly I am appalled by the new Central Barangaroo Concept for the following reasons -</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the 40%+ increase in gross floor area - a developer's grab;</li> <li>2. The 12 floor height of the Tower. When combined with the cynical allowance of the Crown Tower this will destroy the original concept for Barangaroo.</li> <li>3. The destruction of view from Millers Point and the lower city to the West.</li> <li>4. The ugly (to say the least) effect of such a long row of buildings at one height and the Tower on the views of the Ultimo, Jacksons' Wharf and Inner West including some doing of the iconic Harbour Bridge.</li> <li>5. The amplification of the already incoherent allowance of the Brown Tower.</li> <li>6. The probable destruction of this area's historic background and ambience.</li> </ol>
353805	Kenneth Hillier	<p>I believe that the proposed revised proposal for increase building heights and expanded space is a disgrace. Not only does it substantially block the view from Observatory Hill which tourists from the world are taken to view, but also not consistent with the Statements of Commitments for the Barangaroo Development or policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views. It does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill or respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. What is the Government thinking in approving a development to destroy this significant view point for all Australians and tourists. I and my family have regularly visited Observatory Hill for a family picnic but also the view significant Sydney events and celebrations. Send this development to the rubbish bin.</p>
352917	Kerr Neilson	<p>This appalling example of insidious development creep, while a testament to the developers skill at attempting to exploit bureaucratic disinterest in long term consequences, it must be resisted emphatically. Were this development to be approved, it would make a nonsense of the notion of development rights and controls. This is important as it impinges on property values in this location (Barangaroo) and any property, commercial or residential, in NSW. (To what extent this could raise liability for the NSW govt. in the future is an interesting diversion.) At the very time we are re-examining our relationship with this land and the displaced original inhabitants thereof, it is clearly in a contradiction of current societal values and sensibilities. While the assessor's may choose to downplay the uncharacteristic aspects of this DA amendment, the residents of Barangaroo, Balmain and of course the Rocks and Sydneysiders in general, have no such misconception. The often raised objections about outlandish scale, destruction of views, and therefore utility by this proposed development, overshadowing of public spaces and so on are self-evident from any photomontage one might present, however, these are minor in relation to the more insidious nature of this development. When will the powers that be enforce controls and encroachment protections that are such an important aspect of a civil society? By any reasonable persons standards, this is an atrocious over-development and exploitation of a well-practiced art of development creep. It must be stopped.</p>
353659	Kevin Eadie	<p>I don't have the resources to fully understand this proposal, so I endorse the views of Sydney Lord Mayor Clover Moore, who does.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353151	Kevin Beltrame	I object to this development as it is unsightly and does not merge with the current environment.
353477	Kevin Karp	The impact of the submission on the views from and to Observatory Hill are unacceptable.
353715	Kimball Knuckey	I object to the planned changes at Central Barangaroo. Keep the density limits the way they were set in the first place. The density settings aren't there to produce an ambit claim. Keep the low rise, community feel of the original plan. Once it's made into a tall tower it's lost forever. I think the new proposal stinks - it's an insult to the people of Sydney
353181	Kuldip Kaur	I OBJECT to the Modifications made to the CENTRAL BARANGAROO CONCEPT Plan : PART3AMOD: Application Number: MP06-0162 MOD 9 for the following reasons 1)This Buildings proposed are an URBAN PLANNING DISASTER . 1) The buildings are Too Big in Bulk , and Scale and Height and will totally Obstruct the Views and Vistas of the Western part of Sydney Harbour from Observatory Hill . This is Not a case of NIMBY ( not in my backyard ) The views from Observatory Hill of Sydney Harbour to the East or West or North are Sacrosanct historically and need to be preserved for the enjoyment not just current but for Future generations of NSW resident and indeed all Australians 2)The buildings proposed along Hickson Road are huge in Bulk and Scale with insufficient articulation, separation and setback .The Northern Residential Tower is without merit as a standalone building and will be an eyesore rather than a landmark building It is a grating 'Cash-grab" by the developers . The Concept plan Mod 9 proposal is o totally out of context to the adjoining Nawi Cove , The Millers Point Heritage and The historic Heritage Rocks Precinct as well as Barangaroo Headland Park . This proposed development to Central Barangaroo should NOT be allowed
353519	Kylie Robinson	I have recently moved to Dawes Point. I was drawn to this area due to its uniquely rich history, sense of community, low-rise development and that it is one of the few areas so close to the Sydney CBD that still has a soul. I am gravely concerned about the impact the proposed overdevelopment of Central Barangaroo will have on local and international visitors' accessibility and enjoyment of this unique area. We have a real opportunity here to be true to the uniqueness that is Sydney and not become another Hong Kong. The views from Observatory Hill and Millers Point are not only beautiful, they tell the story of who we are. We need to protect our iconic public views for all to enjoy, not just a select wealthy few. For the health and wellbeing of all who live and visit our beautiful city of Sydney, we need more open public spaces that can be shared and enjoyed by all, not more highrises. With this submission, I strongly object to the redevelopment of Central Barangaroo that is currently proposed. Sincerely, Kylie Robinson
353831	Lansheng Zhang	Submission to Object to the Modification Application for Central Barangaroo, Section 75W Modification Request Application No: MP 06_0162MOD9 I submit my ardent objection to the Modification Request (modification No9) put forward by Infrastructure NSW. It is beyond belief that the NSW Government continues to reject a decade of concerns and submissions raised over the development site of Central Barangaroo and continues to propose the expansion of the project in scope and scale each time. The original concept is now a thing of the past. I argue that this proposed modification is not a a modification at all but a new proposal and should be treated as such. Sydney belongs to all peoples of the State of New South Wales. This is the history of New South Wales and this must be preserved for next generations. I write this submission as an owner/resident of Kent Street, Millers Point. We purchased our property in August 2011 on a 99-year leasehold which legally bound leasees to undertake the conservation and preservation of residential properties within a strict timeframe to ensure the integrity of the Millers Point historical precinct, and an ongoing responsibility for

**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	Submission
		<p>maintaining its conservation for future generations. The heritage process attached to this involved a heritage architect, a number of government offices and total compliance - meaning that owners were unable to make minor amendments to properties without strict investigation on issues like sightlines, original materials to ensure historical integrity - ie a new dormer will detract the view from the water when looking up from the water, or an air conditioner unit be seen from the street or the water is against heritage- APPLICATION REJECTED. The conditions that have been imposed on owners throughout this historical restoration process to ensure historical and sightline integrity is retained is completely pointless for those of us that live on Kent and High Street. With Modification 9 none of the houses in Kent Street and High Street will be seen from the water. This hypocrisy in the name of development demonstrates that dollars before preservation of history is paramount. Key issues that affect me directly as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The buildings along Hickson Road Central Barangaroo are considerably higher than earlier plans and will create a block row of buildings, that together with the Crown, the three Harbour One buildings and the earlier three towers of Barangaroo mean that there is continuum of concrete and glass that line one side of Hickson Road. This area of Sydney is a wind tunnel. The developments to date has created new wind issues for residents in Kent Street and High Street, where the circulatory wind factor is ferocious and unsafe for both old and young people. I have lived in Kent Street since before the construction of any of the new Barangaroo South buildings and therefore speak with personal authority of the situation.</li> <li>2. Millers Point is a low rise heritage precinct whether individual houses have a water view or not, the important issue is the environment and care for retaining the integrity of its history. The sight of the water from High Street, Agar Stairs or Kent Street is breath-taking and every day many 1000s of visitors and residents pass by and admire the spectacular sunsets, the ships docked, the sailing boats across the western harbour, Darling Harbour, Balmain and Pyrmont. Even the glowing Crown Tower has found itself complementary in the South development but all this will be lost on the Central Barangaroo proposal. This is at street level. This issue is far more distressing from Observatory Hill the most important and culturally sacred place in Sydney's history.</li> <li>3. Observatory Hill and the Observatory itself and the National Trust attracts people from everywhere in the world. This is what visitors and residents do - they visit historical places to understand history. To steal this from the people and replace with concrete architecture lacks foresight by the Government. Countries around the world understand the significance of acknowledging history and places and the water views of Sydney Harbour both West and North from Millers Point are integral to the life of the city.</li> <li>4. A major issue that has not been given the appropriate assessment is the impact of traffic and parking in the area of Hickson Road and what that means for Kent Street and surrounding streets including High and Argyle Streets. With the exception of a few small restaurant businesses, a corner store and four hotels, Millers Point is residential. This is not a commercial district and therefore the impact of traffic and parking affects everyone that lives here in Millers Point. Millers Point is a family suburb with children in the local schools and kindergartens. The traffic situation is unsafe and unbearable at present, with the construction of South Barangaroo and the Metro line providing some indication of what traffic and parking will be like in the future - unacceptable. The increase in the scale of the development means the situation is compounded and our residential existence - one which we bought into to preserve on behalf of the NSW</li> </ol>

**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	Submission
		<p>Government the historical precinct of Millers Point , becomes little more than a sideshow alley amidst a concrete development. I Object to this Modification Request submitted by Infrastructure NSW as it does not respect the heritage significance of Millers Point or Observatory Hill and the long-term impact for the people of Sydney and future generations. The actions of the NSW Government in refusing to listen and act on behalf of the people and the State's taxpayers, in preference for supporting multi-national developers whose only interest is a return on their investment is an action that runs against the basic principle of integrity, equality and democracy. These principles separate Australia from totalitarian states who use development for their own interests and not for its citizens. Actions like this: to take land that forms the single most important area in the development of NSW from the earliest days of colonisation and act to develop it extensively beyond what is needed or necessary only provides profits for developers but disregards the needs and interests of the people. With the City precinct around the City North and Barangaroo a shell of vacant offices, closed business and missing people, seeking to increase the scope and scale of the development of Central Barangaroo beyond the original concept is an ill judged, unwarranted and unwanted addition to the City of Sydney planning. Under no circumstances can the current modification request meet the needs of the people of Sydney. Lansheng Zhang 121 Kent Street Millers Point 2000</p>
353203	Lauren Turner	<p>Bulk and Scale · The buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, with insufficient articulation, setback, separation, etc. They are an urban planning disaster. · The low-rise residential setting of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked as seen from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc. · Important vistas from the aforementioned suburbs of iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge views will also be blocked. Millers Point Heritage Precinct · The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, Sydney's Old Town. · Other major cities around the world respect their Old Towns by maintaining sightlines - not the NSW Government it seems. · 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 completely obscured by the Government's new buildings. Visual Impact · 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. They have sold the views three times. If your view is impacted, you are encouraged to take a photograph of your view, or panorama of your view and attach this to your submission. · A wholly inadequate assessment of how traffic will spill out from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues. · The application does not seek to add additional car parking space (in fact it seeks to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road) despite planning a 28,000 sqm retail offering. Where will these shoppers park?</p>
354063	Laurence Mather	<p>As a concerned private citizen, I write in sheer dismay at the overdevelopment being proposed for Central Barangaroo. This area was provided to the people of Sydney, in part, to balance the grossly also overdeveloped adjacent Crown casino structure, but the proposal fails the people by overshadowing neighbourhoods as well as capturing the landscape of this most prominent area of the heritage of Sydney. Construction of a set of another multimillion dollar apartments, no doubt destined to become trophies to overseas speculators, further alienates this important foreshore parkland with its</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		remaining harbourside heritage from the people of Sydney. I believe that the proposal should be summarily rejected, and I urge Minister Roberts to do so to honour his responsibilities to the people of Sydney.
353663	Leanne Wilson	I object to what I see as unnecessarily large commercial and residential development of Central Barangaroo. I believe the proposed development will further diminish the heritage value and appeal of this important area and in fact disrespects its heritage. The visual appeal of our city's history will be overshadowed by the large size and scale of the new buildings proposed, in my view. A further increase in traffic through the Millers Point and surrounds is another negative impact of the proposed development, for residents such as myself - as well as visitors.
353169	Lee-Anne Kent	Leave the Rocks as it is for the people, with the history, and with the existing view
352967	Lenka Zemanova	Dear Sir/ Madam I strongly object to this proposal. Since the beginning of the development of the entire Barangaroo area we have witnessed again and again that the set limits for the development have been pushed. More buildings with greater heights were passed against the original plan. Parklands kept being cut down and the views of the original residents restricted more and more. The images are always from the angle that doesn't follow the "Hightgate line" and basically show what they want us to see but never the true. I thought that the Crown hotel&tower was bad enough and a true nightmare that become reality. It is time that someone says STOP to this, enough is enough. Thank you. Kind regards, Lenka Zemanova
352818	Les Dalrymple	I write as a former astronomer and guide at Sydney observatory. A person who worked there for 17 years and promoted the science of astronomy to the public and intimately familiar with the Sydney Observatory site. During my time I presented to possibly 40,000 people and showed them various views of the cosmos and the unique history of the observatory. We ran (past tense used deliberately) one of the most widely respected public observatory programmes in the world. I am greatly saddened and frankly angered and sickened by the continuing deceit practiced by the developers of this site who originally promised hand-on-heart to limit their development so that it did not interfere with the purpose of our historic site by blocking parts of the sky from the site and direct light-trespass into our domes and the telescopes. We are now at the ninth iteration of this plan and every single step of the previous eight modifications has further seriously degraded the utility of the site and its programmes. The new proposal will greatly detract from viewing anything through the telescopes in the western parts of the sky with direct light-trespass and blocking the horizon. Solar system events and conjunctions etc frequently occur near the horizons and the view of these events will be lost forever. This must stop and the developers must be told enough is enough. No more! Les Dalrymple
352894	Lillino Luigi Pinna	I have attached a PDF to the form
354029	Linda Bergin	see attached
352816	Linda Nicolson	The changes to the development are inappropriate and don't respect the history of observatory Hill or millers point. We should ensure the public use of the land remains meaningful. The current changes are inconsistent with the plans and would unfortunately: Block public views west from Observatory Hill Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point Sever the maritime

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		relationship of historic Millers Point with the water Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park.
352555	Lindsay Walker	<p>I wish to lodge an objection to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). I do not believe that the modification is in keeping with the original concept, and that the new concept is neither good for the residents nor the city of Sydney. My objections are that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. it was central to the concept for Barangaroo central section's approval would be low-rise, so as to not affect the sightlines to and from Observatory Hill. This new concept includes higher buildings for no reason other than commercial gain.</li> <li>2. The original concept was trad-off between high rise towers and public space, this proposal seems to decrease the usable public space while adding more multi-level development. There has been no good reason given for this change. In short, I urge that this development proposal be rejected in favour of the original proposal on the grounds that there is no public interest merit to these changes, an a loss of public amenity for no other reason than financial gain. Your sincerely Lindsay Walker</li> </ol>
352691	Ling Hann Kim	<p>I object to this development for the following reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development only benefited the developer and ignore the public interest, especially those living in Millers Point and surrounding areas.</li> <li>2. The proposal will destroy the heritage of the Millers Point and surrounding area. We can never reverse the process.</li> <li>3. The argument of existing approved proposal already blocking the view and that the new proposal has only minimum incremental impact is not justified and cannot be accepted. The original approval shouldn't be given in the first place. We can't make the already bad decision worst by approving this new proposal.</li> <li>4. Over development in the heritage sensitive area cannot be justified no matter what the justification given.</li> <li>5. We are destroying our beautiful city. We will becoming another mega city like others without any historical identity.</li> <li>6. Public space should not be given to greedy developer. It should return to the public for all to enjoy, not the privilege few.</li> </ol>
353233	Lisa Donovan	As a new owner of an apartment in Millers Point I am very disappointed to now find out the plans you had in place for the Barangaroo area have now dramatically changed. I bought in this area as I love our beautiful harbour, as do our many tourist who visit this area every year. To have this eyesore of a building go up is just very very sad.
353189	Lisa Harrold	This proposal is ugly, intrusive and detracts from the ammenity of Sydney harbour. I strongly object to this development.
353647	Lisa Heinzen	I have lived in Millers Point for 18 years. I am very concerned about the height of these proposed buildings and the number of people that will be in the area. As a single mother I don't feel it will be a safe area for me to live in anymore.

**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	Submission
352868	Livia ODea	<p>I am writing to you in regard to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). I have reviewed the plans and documents provided and have put together the following summary of my concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Vistas to and from Observatory Hill are sacred 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.</li> <li>· These views have been seen for millennia. The Perrotet Government does not have the right to obscure them - forever.</li> <li>On the theme of Bulk and Scale:             <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.</li> <li>· The low-rise residential setting of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked as seen from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc.</li> <li>· Important outlooks from the aforementioned suburbs of iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge views will also be blocked.</li> </ul> </li> <li>On the Northern Residential Tower:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· This building is totally out of context to:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Nawi Cove</li> <li>o Millers Point heritage streetscape</li> <li>o Observatory Hill</li> <li>o Barangaroo Headland Park.</li> </ul> </li> <li>· It is without merit as a standalone building. It does not contribute as an "exclamation mark" to the whole development nor will it contribute to wayfinding for people to locate the Barangaroo Metro Station. It is a gratuitous cash grab which will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Its comparison to Blues Point Tower is wholly warranted.</li> <li>· It does not contribute positively to the urban planning of the precinct.</li> </ul> </li> <li>In relation to the Millers Point Heritage Precinct:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, Sydney's Old Town.</li> <li>· Other major cities around the world respect their Old Towns by maintaining sightlines - not the NSW Government it seems.</li> <li>· 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 completely obscured by the Government's new buildings.</li> </ul> </li> <li>In relation to the visual impact of the proposal:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 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. They have sold the views three times. If your view is impacted, you are encouraged to take a photograph of your view, or panorama of your view and attach this to your submission.</li> <li>There will be a significant traffic impact:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A wholly inadequate assessment of how traffic will spill out from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues.</li> <li>· The retail precinct will provide for minimal shopper parking necessitating out-of-area shoppers to park in Millers Point and Walsh Bay.</li> <li>There will be a significant impact to parking in this precinct:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The application does not seek to add additional car parking space (in fact it seeks to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road) despite planning a 28,000 sqm retail offering. Where will these shoppers park? Additionally, the following significant points should be considered.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The proposed concept modification would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> <li>Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> <li>Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water</li> <li>Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed modification to the Concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept</li> <li>Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</li> <li>Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</li> <li>Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</li> <li>Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill</li> <li>Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.</li> </ul>



MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352927	Loraine Rowland	I object
353849	Louisa Zhang	I OBJECT TO THIS DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT, This is an unnecessary development far from the original concept when we moved to Millers Point in 2011. I seek the Government of NSW to honour the words and the will of the people of Sydney and reconsider what this development will mean to future generations. I would like my children and grandchildren to see the same vistas from Observatory as I have been privileged to do. I OBJECT AND URGE THE GOVERNMENT TO HEAR TO VOICES OF THE PEOPLE!!
353937	Louise Finnegan	Gross overdevelopment, loss of heritage and history, views of Sydney from the harbour
352937	Luella Moore	Do not build this structure. It destroys the view of the equinox from Sydney observatory. It destroys the heritages of Barangaroo It's ruins the skyline and the picturesque waterfront It doesn't represent the values of Sydney
354019	Luke Miller	1) For 50,000 years our indigenous people were able to look out onto the water views from observatory hill, as modern Australians we are able to look out to the water, across to Balmain and Pymont from Observatory hill. What right does some development company to have to take that view away? The original plans do not "already block" the view as the developer propoganda would have you believe and this modification should not block the views either. There are also views from various streets in Millers point that will also be blocked by this monstrosity 2) Parking - there is not adequate parking in the plans which means that parking will max out in my street in Millers point. We already had to live through vivid where parking issues essentially made us prisoners in our own home, and the one time we had to leave at 4pm it took us 2.5hrs to get home a park Anywhere close to our home. During vivid there was a lot of fighting in the street for people arguing over parking spots, constant honking and mounds of rubbish left behind. With this new plan scenes like this could play out in my street every week due to lake of parking 3) Road congestion - this plan does not deal with traffic in a suitable way and will see the streets of millers point and surrounds inundated with traffic. The fact that the government wants to ruin one of the nicest residential areas in Sydney for the sake of a few thousand out of area Westfield shoppers is despicable. Please try to take better care of your heritage area like we the house owners do. Don't block the rocks!!! In summary this plan Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.
354291	Luke Signoretti	Good evening, David Hoping you have been well. Please see attached the Submission Letter prepared by Milestone on behalf of the Owner's Corporation for the Stamford on Kent Apartment Building located at No. 183 Kent Street, Millers Point (SP 61897) in relation to MP06_0162 MOD 9. If you require any clarifications or further discussion regarding the Submission Letter, please do not hesitate to reach out. Regards, Verbatim text from submission 354297.
352836	Lynette Jones	For the reasons set out in the letter from Shaw Reynolds Lawyers dated 25 July 2022: a. Mod 9 is not in the public interest. The modification application highlights the prejudicial legacy of the former Part 3A of the EPA Act which allows, through transitional provisions, broad ranging modifications with significantly less rigor than the approvals process that would

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		have applied if the Proposed Development was being assessed under Part 4 of the EPA Act. b. The Proposed Development is of excessive bulk and scale. The amendments to Blocks 5, 6, and 7 include additional height, changes to the block alignments, and additional GFA across the blocks. c. The additional development height of MOD 9 would be to the detriment of the local community, cause significant view loss, and is contrary to the intention of the original Concept Plan.
353381	Lynne van Veen	Modification 9 for Barangaroo is a disaster and a disgrace. This over development is excessive and ugly. Space that should be for the public will only be available for the very wealthy in this building and how is this fair. The bulk and scale is totally inappropriate and of no value to the public. The heritage value of this area is being eroded and once again developers have the control to do what they like with State Govt approval.
352729	M LEUNG	The 2021 plan is a gross over-development of the area and is leading to the following:- - Loss of public views as shown in the attached picture clearly shows that no public consideration is being taken care of. - Loss of afternoon sun causing shading to all the blocks on High Street, Kent Street -> especially in winter -> More heating needed.
353975	Macklin Powell	It is well known among the inhabitants of Sydney that the Barangaroo South of the Cutaway is legally and morally bankrupt. The land in question was intended for public use and recreation, but in this country's ambition to make its natural beauty as commodified as possible the waterfront is becoming covered in sky scrapers to the point where it is quite literally pushing Sydneysiders out of their own backyard. The proposed development will further diminish the ability for Barangaroo to be enjoyed by the public, but also eliminates views of our beautiful harbour from neighbouring areas such as The Rocks. I run with a group called Midnight Runners each Wednesday, there were 150 of us at pre pandemic levels. The group starts at King Street Wharf and runs through Barangaroo and surrounds. The enjoyment of this run is owing in a large part to the beautiful views of the harbour one has whilst participating, such as from Observatory Hill. The proposed development, threatens to take this away.
352929	Maggie Bowden-Smith	We do not need this. I object.
352898	Mahbub Patwary	Too many developments
353693	Malcolm Hudson	I object to the proposal, as it increases the number of residences in the Millers Point area - and by extension the amount of vehicle traffic. The notion that occupants of the proposed apartments will not add to the already congested traffic in the area is unfounded. The traffic in Kent Street and Hickson Road is already too heavy, and to enter/exit Kent Street from my residence is becoming increasingly difficult and dangerous. On these grounds I object to the proposal.
352761	Malcolm Steingold	I object to the the Barangaroo concept plan (Mod 9) on the basis that Sydney Harbour and Foreshore is a public asset and the concept plan is to the detriment of the public good by overdeveloping a precious piece of Sydney for the benefit private developers and investors. The concept plan ignores the State and National heritage value of the site blocking historic views from Observatory Hill and other historic vantage points in the Rocks, enjoyed by thousands of citizens and visitors to New South Wales. The visual impact detracts from Heritage value of the Rocks and visually is out of keeping with a heritage precinct already overdeveloped on the Northern end of Barangaroo. The views to and from Millers Point

**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	Submission
		<p>and Observatory Hill are blocked depriving thousands of residents and visitors of vistas towards Sydney Harbour and from Barangaroo Central towards the historic Rocks precinct. The bulk and scale of the concept plan is contrary to Urban design principles and the proposed development is completely out of scale relative to the area. Hickson Park, an oasis of green in an otherwise concrete landscape is substantially reduced in size. The concept plan ignores promises made by the NSW government to ensure Barangaroo Central would comprise of substantially of parkland and a cultural centre with a modest footprint of residential and commercial properties. The concept plan cuts Millers Point and the Rocks off from a significant part of public foreshore by constructing a wall of buildings along Hickson Road. The highrise apartment block proposed for the Northern end of Central Barangaroo sticks out like a "sore thumb" and completely unbalances the rest of the development. This development completely ignores the interests of the people of New South Wales and thousands of potential tourists to the area in favour of private interests.</p>
354017	Malini Sietaram	<p>As a resident of one of the Argyle Place terraces, I have always taken my duty to preserve the heritage of one of the oldest areas in Sydney seriously. I'm deeply disappointed that the government does not live up to the same standards it holds its citizens too. Prioritising filling the pockets of a few developers over the public interest is disgraceful. These developments are not in the public interest. The proposed developments will obscure the views of observatory hill, which are of historic significance. Why would you prioritise enabling more revenue for a casino over Aussie families enjoying a picnic at observatory hill or at Hickson park. Who wants to sit in the shadow and look at skyscrapers? It does not benefit the public. The bulk and scale of the new buildings lack foresight for future generations and do not have a well thought out strategy. The proposed shopping areas without parking will cause much harm to our area. We couldn't park in front of our house during Vivid, people were fighting over parking spots,, continuously honking their horns and most importantly blocking the firefighter trucks from getting to their destination. Not to think of the pollution of all the exhaust pipes from cars driving around trying to find a park. The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, a place young Australian kids go to on their school trips to better understand Australian history. I'm originally from Amsterdam and we respect our Old Town by maintaining sightlines - not the NSW Government it seems. Who frankly puts greed above public interest. The views from the west of Millers Point have been seen ever since they were built in the 1800's. They will be completely obscured by the Government's new buildings. The plans do not respect the historical significance of Observatory Hill and Millers Point and are not in accordance with the approved concept and commitments made before by Barangaroo. You have a choice to make, to be known as a beautiful historical city with magnificent vistas on the bucket list of many tourists or become a dark overbuilt city displaying poor taste and greed. I hope for the future of many generations to come you chose wisely. Thank you for reading my concerns, I hope you take them seriously.</p>
353745	Marc Carter	<p>Dear Committee I have just become aware of the scale of this profile and am horrified as to its impact on the views from Observatory Park. This is a park I have visited many times during my 60+ years including a childhood growing up in Sydney. I know progress and development are unstoppable but there should be some limits to removing iconic public asset views like those from this park. I would lend my support to the thousands of others seeking that the scale of the development be reduced.</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353989	Marcia Jolly	I object to the building of further large buildings or any building that would spoil future open spaces, There are more and more people living in the city and visiting the city we need more parks and vacant land not less.
352474	Marco LONGO	After the ridiculous increase in GFA that Lend Lease was given in Barangaroo South, we were told that Central Barangaroo would be predominantly areas for the public. As usual, developers enter into agreement under one criteria and then seek to increase the GFA for no reason other than profit. This is the last chance to keep harbour foreshore development at a scale where the public can enjoy the environment - instead of making a rich developer richer (at the city's expense). Just make them stick to the areas that they entered the agreement under.
352983	Margaret Cormie	I am a long term resident of Miller's Point and over the past years have watched the western harbour foreshore being destroyed by greed and overdevelopment. The Barangaroo South precinct is the most disgusting example of ugly bulk. Barangaroo herself would be horrified. Now, Barangaroo Central is the next victim of greed and overdevelopment. Where is preservation of heritage, Observatory Hill, the highest natural point in Sydney is supposed to always be visible from the water. Where is the protection of the heritage of Miller's Point.? What has happened to the parkland area.? It is just one modification after another, tripling the floor space. These bulky ugly buildings have also created wind shear. Not to mention the invasion of privacy and the impact of light pollution. You should hold your heads in shame. You are showing no reason to be proud if this concept goes ahead. Margaret Cormie
352528	MARGARET Hibbert	proposal will block views from Observatory Hill. The reat increase in bulk & height from the concept plan will be a disaster & will just continue the present overdevelopment of the Barangaroo site . It seemed an opportunity to create something pleasant to walk around of a moderate size which doesn't create wind tunnels & vast shadows but that will be lost with such increases in height & bulk. Please reconsider
353589	Margaret Szalay	I strongly object to the proposed height increases to the Barangaroo development which will dramatically impact on the waterfront and from the public areas behind and above from Observatory Hill and other locations in Millers Point. This was originally intended to become public land. Also, the proposed buildings are extremely ugly. I am totally against this development proceeding and definitely against the proposed new building heights.
354003	Margaret Wright	<p>Dear Minister I am writing to object to the Barangaroo Concept Plans Mod 9 released on 12th July 2022. I am outraged by both the scale and impact of the plans and how they have been introduced. Having reviewed the documentation and the results of detailed investigations into the critical documentation by other MPC RAG members with relevant legal, regulatory and planning expertise, I am extremely concerned about the current plans. I have provided more detail in Schedule 1 but have summarised my key concerns below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The B6-B7 development is too high, and blocks previously protected views. Specific past agreements with respect to building envelopes in Barangaroo Central have been totally ignored.</li> <li>2. The tower should be removed from the plans. It is both an eyesore and an insult given the shortage of affordable housing in Sydney.</li> </ol>

**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	Submission
		<p>3. With these changes, the NSW Government overrides longstanding controls that protect the views and heritage of this area. The foreshore is inalienable public land, yet we the public have limited to no say in influencing the outcomes.</p> <p>4. The summary documents and `views' provided are misleading and misrepresent the actual impacts. This lack of transparency must be called out and addressed.</p> <p>5. Having enforced strict controls over residents renovating historic houses in the area, the Government is abandoning those principles for this development</p> <p>6. The plans contain several practical limitations that, as well as affecting current and future residents, could impact the viability of the project and its return on investment. It's our money.</p> <p>7. Prior to/in parallel with approval process, a marketing campaign has focused purely on `positive' aspects as if the outcome is already decided. This is offensive and disrespectful of the community.</p> <p>8. The process of releasing information for public feedback has been confusing and made it more complex and difficult for those wishing to object to do so. The proposed plans threaten to take away Millers Point's special charms in the hearts of the people who live here and others who come to visit, many of whom stay. They will impact the scenic pleasures of walking our streets and the historic village atmosphere we have worked so hard to protect. An apartment owner, I have lived in Millers Point for over 20 years. I and others in this community have spent, hours, days and in many cases weeks in understanding the impacts and preparing submissions. The community includes many experienced professionals who have specific concerns which we have shared. As a former senior partner leading audits of major projects. I am concerned with an apparent overriding of formal agreements and plans, plus poor planning practices and multiple inconsistencies which, if subject to independent audit would be of significant concern. If allowed to go ahead, this project will destroy valuable and irreplaceable heritage views and spaces. By the time the State realises what we have lost, it will be too late for regrets. I have provided further detail on the above points in the Schedule below. Yours sincerely Margaret Wright Schedule 1- Further Detail Supporting Concerns</p> <p>1. The B6-B7 development is too high, and blocks previously protected views. These blocks have significantly increased in height from prior approved plans. The changes take away protected views from owners and residents the length of High Street and from those walking along Kent Street as well as our international hotel- the Langham. The timeless views of the water from Observatory Hill and even down High Street from Kent St are largely obliterated by the blocks and the tower- (See photo). The new buildings will completely obscure views from the west of the Millers Point streetscape (seen since houses were built between the 1800's and 1910's). The proposed modifications to the Concept fundamentally ignore longstanding principles and agreements. They are NOT CONSISTENT WITH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The approved Concept for Barangaroo Central</li> <li>* The original Statement of Commitments issues for the Barangaroo Development;</li> <li>* The Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views; and</li> </ul>

**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	Submission
		<p>* The policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan for the protection of public iconic views.</p> <p>2. The tower is an eyesore and unjustified given current housing shortage The tower is ugly and stands out like a sore thumb. It has no place in the landscape. Worse, it will clearly comprise very expensive apartments, most likely owned by foreign investors and remaining empty most of the year. This is a travesty given that many essential workers in the city are struggling to afford accommodation and when they can have to travel long distances often packed like sardines into public transport. This is not only a travesty, it sends the wrong message in today's environment. The point is exacerbated when we consider that Millers Point still has a large number of homes originally built specifically for local workers.</p> <p>3. NSW Government statements re pre-approval of heights are inconsistent with the facts The Government is claiming previous approval of building heights and envelopes in Mod 9. Detailed feedback from MPC RAG members indicate that approval has never been given for , for example, the heights and building envelopes of Block B6-B7.</p> <p>4. The future `viewpoint' mock-ups are misleading Visual impacts provided are selective with critical gaps/selective angles (for example views from Observatory Hill which were from one point only and the views looking down High Street from the Agar Steps, which appeared to be shot using a wide-angle lens, making the glimpse of the water between buildings seem much more substantial after the change and reducing the bulk of the water viewed before the change). Only one `view' is provided from Observatory Hill. Local experts have since produced more accurate and complete examples of these views and it is clear that the loss of view is far greater than represented in the official material provided on the Planning website. This concern also applies to the marketing /promotional material release months before the public exhibition was released. The views in the video from the water were clearly taken from a helicopter but designed to appear as if they were views from a boat on the water.</p> <p>5. One rule for Government, one for private owners Private property owners were forced to comply with complex and detailed heritage restrictions, often at considerable personal cost. Renovators of heritage houses in Kent St. were subject to specific restrictions on any changes to their roofs (no solar panels, skylights or tiles a different shade from the original) as these could be seen from the water. The planned changes mean these roofs will now be invisible/obscured from boats on the harbour. Owners who have complied with these requirements are understandably outraged that having set these rules, the Government will now override them itself for this project.</p> <p>6. Project planning is incomplete and poorly thought through Multiple practical logistical questions appear to have been overlooked. These include:</p> <p>* There does not appear to be a traffic management plan for the area or for the peninsula as a whole. It is unclear how traffic will safely exiting Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, without exacerbating existing traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>* The planned mall will be one of the largest in Sydney (28,000 sqm retail offering) yet limited provision has been made for additional parking to allow shoppers to carry anything other than small purchases home. Indeed, rather than seek to add</p>

**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	Submission
		<p>extra car parking space it plans to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road) despite planning. Shoppers are likely to park in the already crowded streets of Millers Point and Walsh Bay.</p> <p>7. Marketing the plans as if they are already 'a fait accompli' Release of information to the public outside of the formal Project Assessment Process appears more like a marketing/promotional process designed to encourage people to support the plans than an information exercise. For example: a video released in April and heralded by the Australian newspaper (at least 2 months before the Concept Plan was put on exhibit) was a glossy piece which appeared showing glossy renders of the planned buildings which appeared to be from a boat on the water and unlike the actual plans, provided a view of the roofs on Kent Street terraces. On further investigation it was clearly taken from a helicopter. The marketing of the concept has continued giving the impression it is a 'done deal'.</p> <p>8. The process of releasing information for public feedback has been confusing and made it more complex and difficult for those wishing to object to do so. A number of our buildings owners and residents found it difficult to follow the process for submission. The website for submission was not easy to use for many older locals. We provided instructions for residents on how to complete the forms and another local strata building provided a video. Further, late in the process, we were advised that the Planning Minister would make the decision, rendering work done locally on helping pull together unique objections a waste of time. We were also verbally advised that local residents would be granted an extension, only to find that this might not be true and that we needed to rush to finalise objections by the due date of 8 August. The papers provided to the public on the Planning website comprised thousands of pages of detail, which were challenging for Owners and Residents to absorb and understand. Most needed help to find the relevant documents. There also appear to have been multiple inconsistencies across documents.</p>
353115	maria bradley	<p>Objection The proposed construction of a 21-storey residential tower at Central Barangaroo and commercial buildings along Hickson Road is far beyond the Barangaroo concept plan. It is tantamount to heritage vandalism and sets a dangerous precedent. The quiet steal of precious parkland and overshadowing of a community: This proposal ignores every basic building, heritage, height, and other building restriction set by the Government's own building rules. The project should be referred to an Upper House Inquiry as it is not in the interest of the public</p>
353847	MARIA MONTEVERDE	<p>The application is ludicrous, we have strayed so far from the initial plan that was focussed on keeping the heritage of the this Harbour area protected , protect the views of existing landmark buildings and parks. The area North of the Crown was to be full of Public spaces for relaxing, taking in the Harbour views and enjoyed by visitors from afar. Too many buildings now. Where is the logic for that Monster of a 20 storey building! Come on, give us back the development we were promised, regardless of any excuses used to justify this latest proposal it's just wrong. Shameful really and disrespectful to the original owners of the land . The scale of this is now unacceptable. Creating dark areas that will never see sunlight, what kind of parks will they become? Cold and windy with no sun because we have over built. What will happen to the views from observatory Hill. a Heritage listed site that is there for a purpose. taking away views is unnecessary and yes, it was agreed to have 3 towers built and Crown and the Harbour towers but was also promised that's where it stopped. People that have purchased in Millers point, Barangaroo and surrounds did so based on their knowledge of future developments that would preserve the urban nature of north Barangaroo. The whole concept is hideous. Greedy and stupid. We already have incredibly windy tunnels that a " so called Wind Expert " was unable to plan for. What will happen</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		with this proposal 9, will we be creating wind tunnels that will be even worse than the ones in Barangaroo south that make working, living and visiting here very hard. A `ghost town" will eventuate where tourists and visitors stay away an residents and corporations relocate. We already have a huge traffic problem as well with residents being forced to move as they have to listen late at night to Taxis and cars honking horns due to a dreadful Taxi situation created in Barangaroo Ave. This has been controlled somewhat now as residents alongside Rocks police have taken action. We are also yet to see what the impact Crown will have on traffic and general feel of the area once the gaming commences Dont turn this into a concrete jungle, the world has enough of those. There is only one Sydney Harbour. I reject this plan ....Barangaroo resident
353523	Marian Parnaby	As a life-long resident of Sydney and frequent visitor to the Rocks, Millers Point, and Barangaroo I am concerned that this proposal is both excessive and out of keeping with the vision for this precinct. The proposal would severely affect vistas from Observatory Hill and towards the Harbour Bridge from Pymont, among many other things. Overall the enjoyment and quality of this area and its heritage, which is the legacy left to all citizens by those who fought to preserve, it would be severely eroded. I urge you to reject this proposal.
353441	Marilyn Wise	As the highest point in the city, Observatory Hill has been a significant area in the history of Sydney. I have had a personal connection since the late 1950s when I became a student at Fort Street Girls High School where I learnt about the history of Observatory Hill and Millers Point. I also enjoyed the expansive views of Sydney Harbour. The panoramic views are now advertised on the City of Sydney website and residents and visitors to Sydney now enjoy the history and beauty of the area. The proposed Central Barangaroo development will deprive the public of key parts of these iconic views of the harbour: eg.by blocking water views west of Observatory Hill; by blocking water views from many parts of Millers Point; by blocking views of the Harbour bridge from Pymont and Pirrama Park The proposed development modification does not respect the heritage of Observatory Hill or Millers Point or of Sydney Harbour itself. It will be a blight on a site which was important to the Indigenous people of Sydney and to the area since colonial times.
353221	mark bloustien	The Perrottet Government should leave the remaining Central Barangaroo area as a PARK LAND as it was agreed in the original plan The Barangaroo Park will benefit ALL Sydney siders, NSW and Australian tourists, not to mention International tourists The FULL Central Park area should be partly Botanical Park, partly picnic and recreational area NO ONE wants to have more Ghetto developments arranged by your government which will ONLY benefit developers and NOT the Sydney population as a whole
353173	Mark Fuller	The proposed concept modification would: Block public views west from Observatory Hill Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept: Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does NOT respect the heritage significance



**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	Submission
		<p>of Millers Point. Observatory Hill · Vistas to and from OH 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. · These views have been seen for millennia. The Perrotet Government does not have the right to obscure them - forever. Bulk and Scale · The buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, with insufficient articulation, setback, separation, etc. They are an urban planning disaster. · The low-rise residential setting of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked as seen from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc. · Important vistas from the aforementioned suburbs of iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge views will also be blocked. Northern Residential Tower · This building is totally out of context to: o Nawi Cove o Millers Point heritage streetscape o Observatory Hill o Barangaroo Headland Park. · It is without merit as a standalone building. It does not contribute as an "exclamation mark" to the whole development nor will it contribute to wayfinding for people to locate the Barangaroo Metro Station. It is a gratuitous cash grab which will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Its comparison to Blues Point Tower is wholly warranted. · It does not contribute positively to the urban planning of the precinct. Millers Point Heritage Precinct · The proposal completely ignores consideration of the impact on the Heritage Precinct of Millers Point, Sydney's Old Town. · Other major cities around the world respect their Old Towns by maintaining sightlines - not the NSW Government it seems. · 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 completely obscured by the Government's new buildings. Visual Impact · 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. They have sold the views three times. If your view is impacted, you are encouraged to take a photograph of your view, or panorama of your view and attach this to your submission. Traffic · A wholly inadequate assessment of how traffic will spill out from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues. · The retail precinct will provide for minimal shopper parking necessitating out-of-area shoppers to park in Millers Point and Walsh Bay. Parking · The application does not seek to add additional car parking space (in fact it seeks to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road) despite planning a 28,000 sqm retail offering. Where will these shoppers park?</p>
353139	Mark Kelly	<p>To the NSW Government, The redevelopment of the Barangaroo site is a much needed revitalisation of the Sydney Harbour foreshore. But instead of creating wonderful parklands on the best harbour in the world, the government is proposing development that will overshadow the beauty that is Millers Point. The development will block public views west from Observatory Hill, sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water and block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. It was bad enough that we had to contend with "Packer's Pecker" aka Crown Casino which casts a dreadful pall over the area and is an eyesore looking east to the city. The over development of Barangaroo is just a money hungry land grab by greedy developers. When I lived in Balmain East some years ago, before the development at Barangaroo, I loved the view I had of the wharves and all the activity therein. If this over development is approved, the whole area will lose its heritage value, residents will have monstrously high building across the road from them and it is NOT consistent with the approved Concept. Many residents in the area bought former public housing and renovated at great expense to make a home and foster a community. This now threatens the community. It is the same over development the Government is considering at the Sydney Fish Markets with multiple</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		towers completely out of character with their surroundings. Whilst some development is expected and has been completed at the southern end, the northern end will look like Blues Point tower at Milsons Point times 10. You will lose wonderful views looking west from Observatory Hill and just encircle the city in high rise after high rise. I am vehemently opposed to this over development and call on the government to return to the original plans before the area is butchered and is plagued with wind tunnels and over shadowing. Sincerely, Mark Kelly
353661	Mark Martin	The proposed concept modification would: - Block public views west from Observatory Hill - Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill - Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point - Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water - Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept: - Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept - Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development - Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views - Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views - Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill - Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.
353497	marnie ogg	There are very few places in Sydney that have an historical past that is as rich as Sydney Observatory - observatory hill. Whilst the site has seen many decades of growth and ingenuity - as have other areas in the city - what makes this site significant is its significance to the night environment. NO WHERE in Sydney can boast the invention, the ingenuity, the vast wealth of scientific information that has been generated in such a small space, as the Observatory. It is its connection to the night sky, like that of cultural significance to our first nation people, that have delivered information on Australian weather patterns, mapping of the southern hemisphere, and timekeeping. By preserving the space ABOVE the observatory, you are conserving a significant part of our history. Please do not destroy this for the sake of short-sighted, building developments. Things of generations to come. Marnie Ogg Director Australasian Dark Sky Alliance
352904	Marshall Gannon	I wish to register my objection to the proposed Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) based on the following issues – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.views of Millers Point and the Sydney Harbour Bridge have been seen by Darling Island residents forever. The government has no right to use public land in such a way that those views are obscured forever.</li> <li>2.The proposed modification to the concept is NOT consistent with the concept that was approved.</li> <li>3. Millers Point and the Observatory Hill area are part of Sydney's history and being able to see them should be protected.</li> <li>4. The Mod 9 proposed buildings are totally out of character and context with the current landscape.</li> </ol>
353311	Martin Crabb	Please see attached pdf. Duplicate submission 353547 with attachment
354011	Martin Ross	To the people elected Government, elected by the people and to represent the people, I am afraid that this proposal does not act in the best interest of the many. Only a few, the increase sought is a 146% increase in Gross Floor Area and significant increases in building heights, this is going to cause many overshadowing issues, not to mention a change in

**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	Submission
		solar access, eco-environment disturbance, and additional long-term health effects for current residences, in my view the Government has not taken into consideration the current access constraints under the new proposal, there has also been a lack of good work done to future proof the already stretched transportation system. The current bid will also hamper the current foreshore views from Sydney harbour; looking back onto the reclaimed land, developers are profiteering from public land! The proposed construction of a 21-storey residential tower at Central Barangaroo and commercial buildings along Hickson Road is far beyond the Barangaroo concept plan. An apartment tower would have a "devastating impact" on views to and from Observatory Hill, which is heritage listed. The total floor space proposed for the buildings at Central Barangaroo will be well over 100,000 square metres, more than double the size previously approved space. There is repeated guidance and determination in all previous reports, such as: "Future development within the Barangaroo site is to retain views to Observatory Hill Park from public spaces on opposite foreshores." I may also add that the "key" principles have not been adopted new Mod 9 application. "Summary" (erroneously) states (inter-alia) ", Mod 9 often only marginally increases the extent of view loss". This statement made by the applicant is a falsehood. Mod 9, "Heritage Listed destroys the heritage views of the Millers Point historical cottages." Please note that I would also like my following objections to be recorded; To the increase in the maximum GFA above the approved 47,000m To the increase in height above the approved RL 22.5 Block 5, RL 29.0 Block 6 and RL 35 Block 7 To the modification to the approved block boundaries To the loss of views and heritage aspects from and to Observatory Hill and Millers Point. I would ask that the Government strongly review the updated proposal and work within the "best Interest" of all the peoples and not just those of the few.
353263	Martin Schembri	I oppose the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) on the basis that it cause overcrowding, increased traffic and congestion, excessive shadowing to the surrounding community areas and a negative impact to the local heritage precinct.
352840	Mary atkinson	I object to the proposal
353349	Mary Doyle	I absolutely reject and object to Modification 9 of the Barangaroo Concept Plan. As a resident of Millers Point and a concerned community member of Sydney I regard the "Concept" as a complete disregard of Community, Heritage and my Personal Opinion. This Modification is not consistent with the original approved "Concept". Our "Old Sydney" Heritage will be swallowed behind Blocks 5,6 &7; Millers Point has an historic "Marine Heritage". Views will be blocked and lost from both Observatory Hill towards the west and from Pymont, Balmain and White Bay as well as those from the Harbour towards High Street, Kent Street and surrounding streetscapes, including the Harbour Bridge; views that are "Heritage Protected". The substantial increase in Gross Floor Area, height increases to Blocks 5, 6 and the Tower block 7 at central and northern Barangaroo, will only lead to congestion, lack of parking, redirection of traffic into established heritage areas and local school environments. Adding to the already unsafe community and residential areas and streets. To me Nawi Cove and the beautiful Barangaroo Reserve, Stargazer Lawn and surrounds is the start of a much needed and long awaited recognition of our Indigenous Heritage. Placing a 20 Storey Tower on the shore of Nawi Cove really goes against the story and history of this area. A place for Indigenous women to fish and provide for family, taken away 200+ years ago and NOW AGAIN, SHAME on the NSW Government and the Planning Minister. As a resident, I too will lose views - Presently my vista is to the west. I have lost views from the development of One Sydney Harbour and now fear that more and more will be taken away. I fully understand development will happen, but can not accept greed and money hungry

**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	Submission
		governments looking to make up for over budget blow outs on transport developments that have gone wrong. Please Mr. Perrottet and Planning Minister Roberts reconsider this Modification and reconsider the voice of the Community, Residents, Tourists and all concerned Australians. Regards Mary Doyle File Attachment 1: Cruise Ships - Loss of "Tourist View"; Night Sky from my apartment. File Attachment 2: High Street Houses looking over Barangaroo; View towards Stargazer Lawn from my apartment which will be lost behind North Tower.
353295	Massimo Marchese	<p>We purchased our home in Kent Street Millers Point in 2015 when the NSW Department of Housing sold the public housing. During this process we enquired with McGraths regarding potential future build out of views. We were told 79 Kent Street would NEVER be built out as a precedence for a Heritage line of site view from the Sydney Observatory to the water line from its westerly view. They quoted the court case of the Observatory Hotel wanting to add floors which was rejected based upon this heritage requirement. We therefore purchased our property based on information that we would NEVER lose our views. All of the brochures and marketing showed and quoted Harbour Views and Water Views. We then proceed to spend \$2.2 million dollars on a top to toe renovation, respecting the Heritage guidelines for Millers Point. Brining one of the original homes of Sydney back to its original glory. This includes the widows walk which has 360 degree views of Sydney including to the waterline in the west. So we invested \$5.5 million dollars on our property with the belief based on information for the representatives of NSW Department Of Housing that those views would NEVER be under question. If these views are removed and blocked we will be taking our case to the Land &amp; Environment Court and seeking damages and compensation for the lies we were told upon the sale of our property. The submission by Aqualand is a gross abuse of the previously approved scheme for Barangaroo Central. The increase in floor space and height and bulk and scale is not only illegal as this is not what has been approved, it smells of an underhand deal that has been done between Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW. Aside from our own personal loss, this proposal will have serious negative effects on the Millers Point suburb. No longer will visitors and Sydney siders see the views of the beautiful Heritage suburb of Millers Point from Sydney Harbour. These will be hidden behind a large wall of modern office buildings. The houses on High Street will have a complete removal of privacy and sunlight at various times of the day. The oldest Kindergarten in Sydney will have virtually no sunlight from overshadowing in the afternoons. Traffic which is already choking in Millers Point due to the number of residents vs car spaces will be untenable. The proposal includes very few car spaces for office worker, supermarket shoppers and residents. City residents and workers who flock to Observatory Hill to watch the sunset will no longer be able to experience this vista. they will be met with a residential tower block of apartments as the view. When the Barangaroo precinct was presented to the citizens of NSW. This was never the vision. It was low rise at the northern end with public outdoor event spaces and parks that tied in with the headland. Creating a beautiful connection with nature for all to enjoy. This vision has been decimated with this proposal. Sydney has an oversupply of offices including at Barangaroo South. Do we need this scale of offices and housing at Barangaroo Central? Low lying buildings that maintain the vistas from Observatory Hill , the site of the beautiful Heritage houses from Sydney Harbour and privacy to the existing residents is paramount. This scheme takes away all of these. The great wall of Aqualand should not be approved. It is not in ANY WAY consistent with the approved concept.</p>
352872	Matt Robinson	The Sydney CBD has to date been thoughtfully planned, designed and built. High rise commercial buildings and residential apartments have all been built south of circular quay which has continued to provide the general public with the same panoramic harbour views from Observatory Hill that have always been enjoyed. It is Sydney's favourite spot for

**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	Submission
		<p>wedding photographs, New Year's Eve celebrations and is well populated on any afternoon with prospects of a nice sunset to the West. The proposed structures at Central Barangaroo will significantly reduce this public utility and instead provide it to a small number of new apartment owners. As a resident of Kent street in Millers Point I am one of many who eagerly purchased a heritage listed house from the government with a more than comprehensive "Conservation Management Plan". Those who did likewise shared a common passion for the history of the Rocks and the significance of the Rocks Conservation Area. As a property owner we are forbidden from selecting particular paint colours, or externally visible materials/amendments because of the extraordinary importance placed on views of the Sydney's oldest precinct from the harbour. A decision to block views from the harbour of this historic area would directly contradict Heritage NSW's perspectives on what's important to retain the heritage significance of the Rocks Conservation Area. We also note any structures built adjacent or near to key heritage items are meant to be sympathetic to the heritage structure. This principle seems to have been ignored. The Barangaroo masterplan had included high rise commercial and residential towers in Barangaroo South, moving through to a low rise Central Barangaroo focussed on entertainment and leisure (restaurants, retail, theatres etc) before arriving at Barangaroo reserve, a purposeful and thoughtfully designed urban transition and sensible city scape. Central Barangaroo was to be a leisure precinct for all of Sydney to enjoy. The Government also sold houses throughout the area on the basis of the approved masterplan, a subsequent decision to overhaul would cause direct financial loss to those owners who trusted the government and in aggregate paid them \$600M on the basis of that plan and the views they well marketed. Premier Dominic Perrottet in 2020 listed 10 iconic buildings he would bulldoze in the Sydney Morning Herald. Blues point tower was rightfully on the list, "a depressing blight on a pristine harbour". Well summarised, presumably we don't need two? The proposed tower is completely out of context with its surrounds. I am sure the public will want a clear understanding of why such a structure should be placed near Nawi Cove rather than with all the other high rise buildings at Barangaroo South other than Crown Casino's views are more important than the general public when considering uses of crown land. For all of these costs what is the benefit to the public of using crown land in this way? It is not fit and proper process to bypass Heritage and City of Sydney planning to make this decision, designation of state significant projects may facilitate a legal avenue but does not pass the pub test. The community is highly energised with ~7,000 signatures currently on a petition opposing. This decision will be remembered for generations, I encourage a decision that our children will be proud of. Thank you for considering this submission.</p>
353457	Matthew Davidson	I object to this proposal
353455	Matthew Drake-Brockman	<p>Hello, I am writing to express my objection to the proposed Central Barangaroo Concept modification. I am against the concept modification for these reasons: - it will block public views west from Observatory Hill - it will block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill - it will block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point - it will sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water - it will block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. - it is not consistent with the approved Concept - it is not consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development - it is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views - it is not consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views - it</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill - it does not respect the heritage significance of Millers Point - the development itself it not needed in Sydney Harbour
353669	Matthew Mackenzie	We own two properties in Merriman St, Millers Point. In the short time we have owned these we have seen parking become near impossible not only in our street but also within 200m of the street. The new submission has not factored in the necessary parking for the projects/visitors. Homes in this area were purchased at a premium price per m2 based on the rare and unique location. We are all obliged to adhere to historic regulations to maintain the local aesthetic. New money making business proposals must also be held to the strict guidelines and for the City of Sydney to have a long term strategy to maintain this special corner of Sydney. Once gone it can never be returned.
353209	Maureen Franks	Please see attached file
352828	Melanie Tait	I object to the gross overdevelopment proposed at central Barangaroo. The proposed development will permanently block the water views from 37 High Street- one of Australia's oldest childcare centres. The shadow diagrams show that it will also plunge the street into shade for most of the day. The latest design fails to integrate high street as the Spanish stairs have been removed from the plans, it is a poor design and is coming at the expense of every Sydneysider and our future generations represented by those 50 children at ku lance on High Street. At a time when CBD commercial property is in vast oversupply, how can we possibly justify increasing the floor space at Barangaroo to create even more office space? It is so disappointing to see that a government that many of us voted for is allowing this desecration of public land.
353059	Melinda Berry	This proposal obstructs the outlook from Observatory Hill and is well above the initial limit
353803	Melissa Browne	We object to the changes in development. Part of the reason why we choose to live in Millers Point is the history and the village feel of the area. With the overdevelopment in Central Barangaroo and the loss of sight lines to Balmain but also from the water to the sandstone, it would irreversibly change the historical nature and village feel of the rocks area.
353061	Melissa Silk	The proposed building height exceeds the originally approved plan and obstructs the view over Sydney Harbour from Observatory Hill. This historic site must be preserved in its current form for all to enjoy. Positive user experience of the beautiful park and heritage site at Observatory Hill should not be jeopardised by unapproved additions to an unnecessary building.
353231	Michael Donovan	As a new owner of an apartment in Millers Point, I am very disappointed that the plans that were in place when I purchased the apartment have now dramatically changed. This major change to the plans you are now suggesting will have a detrimental effect on the beautiful harbour that we all love to enjoy.
352472	Michael Neary	This is an extensive modification damaging the relationship between the historic Millers Point precinct and the water. The observatory report focuses on the sky and the dome ignoring the historic views and the historic critical views too the flagstaff - all of which ar damaged. It also fails to consider adequately the visual impact from historic streets where this is looming in the background destroying the historic atmosphere. There is a study outlining the financial damage to the precinct by this proposal and widespread community objection. We go to this area to enjoy the historic ambience. Where else in Sydney does this exist? We see a push to remove the Cahill Expressway - this no builds a more damaging structure

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		in terms of scale. There is only one stakeholder benefitting from this - developers. The area should be a community benefit Further there is an approved plan and this was the result of consultation This plan should be followed. I have never lodged this type of document before and I strongly object to this
352886	Michael Robinson	To Who it may concern, I am writing this email to oppose to the building of Central Barangaroo. There is a plethora of reasons as to why this atrocity should not be built as it will cause major impacts on the local community. First and foremost, the proposal completely ignores how much of an impact this building will have on the heritage precinct that is Millers Point. The NSW government should not be able to interfere with Sydney's Old Town as it is a part of history, other major cities with old towns respect the sightlines and heritage - Sydney should be no different. An Iconic Sydney landmark, local treasure and tourist attraction, Observatory Hill, will also be heavily impacted. The views have been enjoyed by generations and displays the beauty that is our water surrounded city - The current NSW government does not have the right to take this away permanently. The project also does not accurately consider the traffic and congestion it will cause throughout Walsh Bay and Millers Point areas - the excessive noise, traffic and parking issues that will dominate the area and cause major problems for the local community, including impact on property prices, as well as the safety of Children given the amount of young families and preschools / primary schools in the area. This building cannot go ahead, the NSW government does not have the right to permanently effect a suburb like this. Regards, Michael.
353309	Michael Tonkin	I strongly oppose the above development on the grounds that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The proposed development has a substantially increased floor space.</li> <li>2. Sight lines to and from the Observatory, the historical Millers Point area and surrounds are significantly compromised.</li> <li>3. Wind tunnels and shady areas are significantly increased in an area that already suffers from these problems due to over development.</li> <li>4. Access to the harbour, parking and flow of traffic and pedestrian walkways are compromised.</li> <li>5. Sight lines of current residents are compromised. In short, developments such as this and the money flowing to the few beneficiaries involved are no longer reasons to allow OUR city spaces and access to be compromised.</li> </ol> <p>Governments which allow such developments and those individuals allowing these decisions to proceed will be held to account. Do recent events, including elections, not deter you? Mark my words, those responsible will pay a price.</p>
353973	Michaela Marya WATSON	Refer to uploaded PDF.
353829	Michele Hacking	Submission re Mod 9 Central Barangaroo Concept Plan Objection to the heritage, bulk and scale implications of another Modification. Central Barangaroo Concept Plan Modification 9. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This proposal is out of character and conflicts with the spirit of long standing conventions and plans for the site.</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>2. Vistas need to be maintained for future generations. Heritage items eg Observatory Hill need to stand proudly without being dwarfed by the scale and bulk of more towers.</p> <p>3. Public space should not be further compromised and privatised.</p> <p>4. Bulk and scale is overwhelming.</p> <p>5. The proposal does not adequately address parking. Modification 9 introduces more overdevelopment of the Barangaroo site. Long standing conventions that this area would respect its heritage precinct will be destroyed by the impact of these towers.</p> <p>Each Modification that has been approved has eroded the open space and further privatised public land. This application is no exception and should be denied. Visual impacts to and from Observatory Hill should be preserved for the future. Open areas are needed, not only to allow perspectives to include human scale, but also allow heritage areas and buildings to stand without being dwarfed by modern monolithic towers. Views of the Millers Point streetscape also need to be maintained from the Harbour and adjoining suburbs. Public space has already been compromised by earlier proposals.</p> <p>This plan further erodes open space. Recent health events have shown the need the need for residents to have access to open areas for active and passive recreation. This proposal reduces the area available as well as increasing the population and demand for space. Overshadowing Hickson Park is another major flaw in this concept plan. The bulk and scale of this proposal is overwhelming. Moving from 47,000sqm to 144,000sqm in built form to compromise 6 office blocks, a residential tower and Westfield is a massive overdevelopment of the site. This area was supposed to offer respite from the towers in adjoining precincts along the Barangaroo development zone. Each development increase brings with it more traffic and this is no exception. Office and residential blocks require better planning for the increase in traffic. The retail space at 28,000sqm requires its own special attention because shoppers usually prefer to drive to the location. This proposal is for an overwhelming over development of a site which was earmarked as cultural and recreation space.</p>
354047	Millers Point Community Resident Action Group	Please see attached. (submission made on behalf of the Millers Point Community Resident Action Group)
352822	Mina Bui Jones	I am strongly opposed to the Concept Design Modification. The proposed new heights, scale and location of the design would have an appalling impact on the common heritage of Observatory Hill, Millers Point, Darling Harbour and even the Inner West by destroying views and severing historical spatial relationships between this highly significant headland and the harbour. As the granddaughter of a late Fort Street (Observatory Hill) High School student, the great-niece of a late National Trust Member, and as a former tour guide in The Rocks, I am particularly distressed by the proposal and shocked that a state agency (Infrastructure NSW) is proposing a design that would negatively impact the heritage values of such a renowned, significant and well loved place.



MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353513	Mitchell Beness	<p>5 weeks ago I walked with my 3 and 5 year old from the rocks, last millers point to the maritime museum. My children commented on these old terraces and the old building as we walked by which prompted a healthy discussion about Australia and its maritime history as we made our way to the museum. These buildings are an important part of our heritage and should be visible and remembered, not simply blocked out by new modern additions, of which Sydney harbour has plenty, including only a few hundred metres away. Sydney offers old and new side by side, a capacity that most new cities in the Asia Pacific cannot provide. Anyone can make new buildings, but not many can preserve and highlight the old ones. In addition: The proposed concept modification would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> <li>* Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water</li> <li>* Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept:</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.</li> </ul>
354137	Mitchell Bennett	Please see attachment.
354201	Monty Leventhal	No comments. Please see file Concep
353967	Morgan Heida	<p>Dear Premier and Minister for Planning I am writing to state my strong objection to this proposed concept modification. The way forward is sustainable and equitable planning. This flies in the face of what the right thing to do is - and that is to decrease the socio-economic and cultural gap rather than increasing it which is what this modification represents. I really feel for Gen Z, the Alpha's, and even the millennials - what kind of world and Sydney are we letting them inherit? Capitalism has not worked as can be seen by the ecological and social decimation occurring in front of our eyes and around the world. I cannot believe that Australia has the fourth-highest level of animal extinction in the world - we are far from being the 'lucky country'. We need to do better - differently. We need to move to corporate shared value (Porter &amp;</p>

**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	Submission
		<p>Kramer 2011) and consider the broadest range of stakeholders (see stakeholder theory at <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=epxmG3YRgok">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=epxmG3YRgok</a>)</p> <p>This is something that should be the core business and best practice of government but it is clearly not happening in Liberal government hands. The 2022 Elderman Trust Barometer placed 'distrust as society's default emotion' first, and business is seen 'as the only trusted global institution', and only 52% trust governments (World Economic Forum 2022). This is because of 'strategic moves' like this. Overturning and amplifying issues of past approved planning agreements, manipulating laws, and reshuffling ministers is dishonest and lacks integrity. I implore you to consider doing differently, to compete differently, listen to your stakeholders, consider that as the 'top' people's representatives in this state, you need to leave what you govern in a better state than how you found it. Taking away precious public land and handing it over to a developer for profit is not in the public interest of current and future generations. How many will miss out on enjoying iconic views and the opportunities of this public space? There is a huge opportunity to develop this land sensitively and socially consciously. In doing so, you can also set you and your government up as respected global leaders and role models and show that the Liberal government can change and listen, modernise and get back in touch with what's really happening. If you don't wish to consider the many good economic and social publications on this (that all saying similar things), commission a reputable modern organisation yourself to analyse global forces (eg PESTLE model) - the trends are very clear. It's how you address them that will show you as successful or failed leader in local and global eyes. Please reconsider this - it's not too late.</p>
353321	Namita Prakash	<p>This is my first home and I was so delighted that I could be part of this historic site. I bought this place for varied reasons , tranquil view , unique and historic surroundings, acoustic and visual privacy. I was really saddened to see the development eating into the public land but now more shocked and angered by the further development proposal to which I raise my strong and stern objection. I could afford only a one bedroom apartment but I read the statement of commitment issued for the Barangaroo development and I feel cheated. The Barangaroo reserve and observatory hill were places where I go on picnics on a bright day to relax with my family , especially during covid lock down days the freedom of walking on the grass lawns of these parks helped me stay sane. The other aspect which frightens me is the congestion and traffic chaos. Currently it is very tough to get a street parking in Kent street as most of the visitors to Crown, now park on Kent street. With these developments, naturally the congestion will get far worse. In short I feel cheated , deprived of my rights and extremely sad , as an Australian I believe my voice counts and my objection will be considered. Therefore I would strongly object to this modification as it would</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Block the views from my apartment and does not retain the current view</li> <li>2. Block the public views from observatory hill and the most iconic sunset from observatory hill</li> <li>3. Block the iconic views of White bay power station</li> <li>4. The modification of the concept is not what was promised to the public, the residential tower was never there in the original plan.</li> </ol>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>5. The modification is not consistent with the Statement of commitment issued for Barangaroo development, this for me is gov cheating its citizens.</p> <p>6. The modification is not in line with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</p> <p>7. Lead to severe road congestion and parking constraints Especially the Northern Residential Tower is totally out of context to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Nawi Cove</li> <li>o Millers Point heritage streetscape</li> <li>o Observatory Hill</li> <li>o Barangaroo Headland Park.</li> </ul>
352862	Nastaran Alavi	<p>I object to the proposed Barangaroo modification 9. Should this proposal go ahead, our current piece of public heaven enjoyed by both the locals and visitors will be destroyed. People travel, to come to, and experience this part of historical Sydney. We would be robbing them of the harbour views and the heritage we pride ourselves on. It is what makes this area special and unique. Apart from destroying valuable public views from Observatory Hill and surrounding historic streets of Millers Point, the additional towers will add a local population that the area cannot afford to have. The roads are already jammed, with heavy delays trying to get in and out of the area at peak times. There will be both traffic and parking issues for locals and visitors. The proposal will also be robbing Hickson Rd of current parking spaces, approx 100 I believe. This will only bring chaos to the area. I completely oppose the reduction of our public park area with the increase of Block 5. The increased height also means that the current park will be cast in shadow, which will make it less enjoyable. It is the closest park to where I live, and casting it in shadow and reducing the size would not only impact me personally, but all of our surrounding neighbours. My apartment views have already been reduced remarkably with the Casino and surrounds so far, but if this new Modification goes through then I will completely lose all of the Barangaroo Reserve Park views as it will be blocked by Block 7. The beautiful water views that drew me to this area will also be mostly blocked with Block 5. Please see attached pics below. Block 7 will be an eye sore and the height proposed is beyond acceptable. It will impact all residents in Millers Point. I urge the developers and the independent planning commission to keep their developments consistent with the approved concept. Respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill and Millers Point. And please do not take away our public iconic views which we have all enjoyed for decades.</p>
353119	Natalie Louw	Please see attached.
353265	Natalie Schembri	I oppose Barangaroo concept Plan (Mod 9) due to the impact it will have on the local neighbourhood. This area has many young families living in it & the lack of green areas, extra traffic, the shade these buildings will cause will have a big impact on their quality of life.

**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	Submission
353427	Natasha Pollock	I strenuously object to the proposed development. It is aesthetic and cultural vandalism. The area in question should be developed into an icon parkland for the people of Sydney to enjoy. This would also preserve views from Observatory Hill & the vista of the cliffs & historic buildings on those cliffs. What a tragedy for the people of not just Sydney but of Australia & the world to be deprived of open space that would only add to the Sydney's world class reputation. Where is the vision that will benefit the ordinary people of Sydney rather than developer's bank balances or wealthy individuals who will buy the resulting real estate. This development is just wrong on so many fronts and should be rejected.
353729	Nathan English	This proposed development shows no imagination or respect to the existing topography or views of the existing streets in Miller's Point or indeed Observatory Hill above - all of which have an historic affinity with the waters west of what is now known as Barangaroo. The current proposal is an unimaginative and non-integrated extension of Barangaroo South into Barangaroo Central. The idea that a high-rise tower, of the height depicted in these plans, should be at the far northern end of this development (closest to Barangaroo Headland Park) is offensive when so many towers already sit in unison at Barangaroo South where towers have become the norm. I would call for a redesign of what has been proposed with a green grassed hill-like roof providing continuous open public space on top, sympathetically built over slanting structures from south to north in the same footprint as is current. This hill-like structure should run downhill to mimic the existing slope of historic High Street, which currently runs parallel to Hickson Road. No part of the proposal should be above High Street - High Street itself is a lovely old part of Miller's Point to view from other parts of the Western Harbour. There should also be a southern entry point to the Barangaroo Metro platforms (ie. closer to Barangaroo South) and a pedestrian bridge into the precinct at the centre of High Street (ie. it's lowest point) with a lift to the Metro below so Millers point residents can access it directly. I believe a day-long shuttle service ferry (perhaps the size of the one that already serves Glebe into Balmain) should be planned for as operating regularly between Balmain East Wharf and Navi Cove. This would allow residents from the inner west to have direct and constant access to this Metro service, which will be able to deliver them to both North Sydney and the CBD in minutes every four minutes. In summary, this precinct should be about better active integration with the Barangaroo Metro and the surrounding urban landscape as it exists. I cannot see why such an unimaginative and non-complimentary plan has been proposed when the rest of Barangaroo was done so well. Towers (if required) should be reserved for the very southern end of Barangaroo Central where they would be complimented by those at Barangaroo South. What is currently proposed flies in the face of all that has come before. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this proposal - the designers can and should do better to ensure the whole of Barangaroo remains iconic for Sydney into the future and can serve a number of functions in one. Nathan English, Lilyfield (long term resident of Balmain East)
353543	Neale Towart	The proposed changes are a drastic alteration to the Barangaroo concept, which has already been terribly altered to benefit the few, This proposal undermines the great work many did 50 years ago to save The Rocks area for people. The reason developers want to grab more profit, and are confident in doing so, is because people made these places good for people not private developers in the 1970s. The original Barangaroo plan honoured that. This cuts it away even more. Don't let it happen. I support the National Trust viewpoint as set out here: The proposed concept modification would: Block public views west from Observatory Hill Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		modification to the Concept: Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.
353149	Nicholas Gordon	I strongly object to the scale of this proposed development. New structures on this site must not block views of Sydney Harbour from Observatory Hill. This proposal is grossly inappropriate to the area - it is has too large a footprint, the proposed structures are too high, and the proposed structures are too close to existing structures in the area. The scale of the development needs to be significantly reduced, and be in keeping with surrounding areas.
352577	Nicholas Ridgwell	as a long term resident of The Rocks and property owner, I am lodging a strong objection to the application to modify the Barangaroo Concept Masterplan (MOD9). my written objection is attached.
352878	Nicholas Tight	Like many residents of the Inner city we are appalled at this Governments complete disregard of local council planning rules and guidelines with over development proposals of towers higher that than the Anzac Bridge. From Bangaroo round the fish markets and the Bays precinct to white Bay. This is total destruction of our local environment. Bangaroo development's should be no higher than the cliff face behind , The fish market has take over half the Bay with no mandate for ever destroying the water views from Wentworth Park the Council sort to keep. The Bays precinct at White Bay should be no higher than the white bay power station to leave the Chimmnies as the focal point - what we want is the same planning rules to apply and outcome that happened at Pymont Point street. a good balance that leaves livable locality butt out of our LGA's planning .
353689	Nicholas Wolff	I object to this development in its current form on the following grounds It will result in the destruction of heritage significant views to and from Observatory Hill - These views are sacrosanct and must be protected. This includes views from Observatory Hill, of both the water and horizon as well as the roofscapes of Millers Point (High St and Kent St) These views have been seen for millennia and should not now be obliterated. The Bulk and Scale of the project is excessive - The buildings along Hickson Rd are too big, with insufficient articulation, view corridors, setback or separation between built form. As a result the low-rise residential setting of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked as seen from the western harbour and the neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pymont, Balmain, etc. I ask that the application be refused. Nicholas Wolff
353579	Nick Lomb	As an astronomer and curator at Sydney Observatory for over 30 years, I am very familiar with the site, its history and the way it operates. I can state unequivocally that the view down to the horizon in the west has always been a prized attribute of the Observatory. Breaking that view with a building jutting considerably above the horizon would be a most unfortunate and a serious detriment to the Observatory and its functioning. The windows in the west wing of the Observatory face due west. On coming up to the first floor almost every visitor stops to admire the view at one of those windows. During the day and on cloudy nights, the guides when leading a conducted tour, demonstrate the working of the telescopes in both the South and North domes, by observing the Balmain Town Hall clock. This is a particular thrill to children, with each child in a school group remarking to their teacher, "It's upside down Miss!". That view would be blocked by the planned building 7,

**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	Submission
		<p>at least from the North dome. In addition, it should be noted that a satisfactory view is obtained of the clockface even though it is viewed horizontally. Sunsets and moonsets in the western sky can be a highlight of a visit to the Observatory, whether by people casually wandering in the grounds or people on an organised tour. In the latter case, the guides can use the sunset to explain how the direction of the event moves from south to north and back again throughout the year and so could become the basis of a yearly calendar. There are many astronomical events that can only be viewed low in the western sky. One of these was the transit of Venus on 8 June 2004, the first transit of the planet for 122 years, that saw hundreds of people lined up on the western driveway of the Observatory to view the planet silhouetted on the Sun through the provided portable telescopes. This event was extensively covered in the media with newspaper, TV and radio reporters present plus live radio interviews as it was happening. Many other events, such as planetary conjunctions occur low in the west. Some, involving the innermost planets Mercury and Venus, can only occur low in the west, as these planets do not stray far from the Sun. Similarly, comets at their brightest are near the Sun and so often can only be seen low in the west after sunset; an example being Comet McNaught in 2007. Also, the first appearance of the crescent Moon can only be seen low in the western sky at dusk. In fact, some people come up to Observatory Hill to observe its first appearance for religious reasons. As indicated in the examples above, there is no "lower angle of viewing" from Sydney Observatory for the purposes of public outreach and education. It is purely fictitious. Though the Observatory's hours are 10 am to 10 pm nominally, I have been there for public events late at night and in the early morning. The hours are flexible, if there is an astronomical event of public interest that can best be viewed at other times. Lighting from new nearby buildings, whether just below the horizon or jutting above it would be a serious concern with regard to light pollution. Possibly, measures can be taken by Barangaroo Central with regard to public lighting, though the mention of blue lights along the shoreline does not indicate much understanding of the issue. Blue is not only bad for astronomical observations, there are hundreds of scientific papers indicating that blue lighting can have serious health consequences for nearby residents, such as increasing risks of breast and prostate cancer, heart disease and obesity. Not only public lighting is a concern when the Observatory's telescopes are pointed west at whatever elevation, but so is the direct light from office windows that are almost always left on and unshaded. As would light from the windows of apartments. To summarise, a building jutting above the western horizon would be most a most unfortunate detriment to the service that Sydney Observatory provides to its large numbers of public visitors, including adults, school groups, locals and tourists, during the day or at night.</p>
353707	Nicola Stephenson	<p>Whilst I am all for expanding the use of Sydney's foreshore areas, the current proposal blocks any view of the heritage High St terraces, which have had these views since they were built in 1860's. The proposal also significantly impacts the foreshore and should be reduced in scale and height to not encroach on such a beautiful and cherished piece of our history.</p>
353423	Nicoula Coroneo	<p>I am extremely opposed to the Section 75W modification application seeking to increase the height and gross floor area of Central Barangaroo. It is a greedy, crass attempt at overdevelopment, showing no respect, or consideration of the precious, historical, heritage areas of Millers Point, Observatory Hill and the harbour foreshore areas. It is short sighted to destroy the heritage and the vistas, from and to the Millers Point cottages and Observatory Hill, by building yet more commercial high rise, like a tall screen, in front of them. This old part of Sydney is a gem that the State Government and</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		the people of Sydney should protect forever. Build high rise commercial buildings elsewhere, not where they will destroy a rare heritage area.
352902	Nigel Dickson	4th August 2022 Submission in relation to Modification 9 Part 3A Mod Barangaroo Central Foreword This submission is made by Nigel Dickson of Dickson Rothschild Architects, Urban Designers and Planners. Nigel Dickson has been an expert in Urban Design and Planning matters to the Land and Environment Court of NSW in about 100 matters at Court. He has taught the master of Urban and Development and Design Program at the University of NSW for 20 years Objection This submission is an objection in which I request consideration by the Minister. The principal objection is that the Modification Application does not meet the Objects of the Barangaroo Act 2009 at 3(d) and 3 (e). (d) to promote the orderly and sustainable development of Barangaroo balancing social, economic, and environmental outcomes, (e) to create in Barangaroo an opportunity for design excellence outcomes in architecture and public domain design. The application shows development which is very excessive in bulk in relation to its context being primarily the Millers Point Conservation Area and the Observatory Hill Park. These are highly significant locations and the application fails to justify the bulk and scale of the buildings proposed in relation to those locations. More so the application causes serious exceedances in the proposed bulk in relation to those items. I request in the consideration of the modification application that the Minister does not permit the increase in building height more than the Approved Concept Consent. The amenity loss to the Millers Point and Observatory Hill Park in the application is considerable and the application does not demonstrate Design Excellence and does not balance social economic and environmental outcomes. The development heights proposed will have a highly marked effects on the heritage values of Millers Point and Observatory Hill which are State Listed and highly valued by the NSW public as well as visitors to the City. The material contained in the application fails to balance social economic and environmental outcomes. The application fails to demonstrate the need for an increase in the above ground bulk of buildings as nominated and shown in the Urban Design and the Visual Assessment reports. Furthermore the application by means of the bulk of buildings proposed underscores that the principal functions of Infrastructure NSW under the Barangaroo Act 2009 at Division 1 (e) have not been achieved. This clause requires Infrastructure NSW to seek best practice environmental and town planning standards, which is environmentally sustainable and applies innovative environmental building and public domain design. Underpinning this central concern is that content of the application fails to adequately show accurately the bulk and scale of the adjacent Millers Point Conservation Area in relation to the subject modification area. For such information to not be fully shown or to be shown selectively and inconsistently is remarkable and far removed from best practice town planning standards. This location is too significant in Sydney and Australia to have such an application granted consent.
353281	Nigel Hobbs	Please see attached.
353913	Olde Lorenzen	I object to the bulk, scale and massive increase of previously approved GFA of the proposed development on public land. The proposed concept modification would: - Block public views west from Observatory Hill - Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill - Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point - Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water - Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept: - Is not consistent with the approved Concept - Is not consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development - Is not

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views - Is not consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views - Does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill - Does not respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. - Reflects a missed opportunity to correspond with and complement Macquarie Street on the western end of the CBD.
354009	P Stewart	The height and bulk of this proposed modification to the Central Barangaroo Concept further degrades Sydneysiders' access to and enjoyment of Sydney Harbour. The degradation of harbour views from Observatory Hill - a public location currently and historically enjoyed by the people of Sydney - is particularly egregious. No satisfactory justification has been provided by Infrastructure NSW for this massive upscaling of the proposed development. How do these harbour-obscuring heights and gross floor space increases benefit the people of Sydney? The argument put forward by the developer - as reported in the Sydney Morning Herald - that the proposed upscaling is a response to the State government's policy to increase land use intensity around public transport hubs is not convincing. The current land use intensity at Barangaroo is already extremely high and there have been no recent additions to planned transport provision in this area to justify such massive upscaling of the Central Barangaroo Concept. It appears that the proposed modifications serve no one but the foreign-owned developer, who presumably wants to upscale its profit margin at the expense of the people of Sydney. Too much of our city and its shores have already been handed over to developments that offend and alienate us from our city. We need to preserve what little is left, not surrender it for the profit and enjoyment of a wealthy few. This massive modification to the Central Barangaroo Concept must not proceed.
353845	Pamela Richards	I submit that the proposed modification is too large to be simply a modification, that it will throw unreasonable shadows over surrounding amenities and parkland, and block views of iconic buildings like the observatory from neighbouring suburbs, and traditional homes in Millers Point. It is far too high, and will damage the surrounding heritage value of Millers Point, as well as damaging sight lines from these homes, and of these homes from nearby sites. It will not contribute to the existing community, and appears to be simply an attempt to squeeze more profit for developers.
353299	Patricia Bray	See attached letter
353159	Patricia Lane	I wish to strongly oppose the amendment to the Barangaroo Concept Plan. I live in Balmain East and look across the water to Barangaroo. I am really shocked at the development taking place around Sydney Harbour and we are really being taken over by developers. We have such little history which we need to treat with great respect but instead it is disappearing rapidly. I am not an architect and i have looked at the report . I am concerned that the 73 metre building at the end of Barangaroo will block out the view from Observatory Hill to the Harbour and will totally disfigure the street scape in the area. The Packer Casino is a blight on our city and although this increased height building is not as large it will still create shade. What is to say that the buildings between wont be increased in size at some later stage. Please stop this creep of large development before it's too late!



MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353961	Patrick Bennett	We need to maintain and indeed increase public space such as Hickson Park. It should never be given to private developers to exploit. When more people are encouraged to live closer to where they work, it is essential to provide adequate recreational space without overpowering high buildings. PUBLIC SPACE MUST REMAIN PUBLIC.
354053	Patrick Lawnham	I admit to a personal interest in opposing the development because of my ownership of an apartment in the Quay West building looking across Barangaroo Central. Attached are views of Barangaroo Central from Quay West and of Quay West from Barangaroo Central. Obviously the proposed tower would further detract from an urban landscape and harbour outlook already reduced in quality by Barangaroo South, which has been allowed to become a windy and unwelcoming forest of skyscrapers, adding to an oversupply of office space. A view is attached. But what matters most is the damage that would be done to public amenity that had been planned for the western CBD, Walsh Bay and The Rocks, appealing to all residents of Sydney who might visit the area. There has been much anticipation of the gain to the city of a low-rise, half-park Barangaroo Central, and once again this vision is now threatened. There has also been the dread of the design over-compromises that Paul Keating warned against in 2015 (attached) from the Davis Hugheses of today. ["I had the buildings level with High Street," Keating said, referring to his time as chairman of the design panel. "Nine stories was all right, but the temptation will be to take it to 15 or 20 storeys," he said.]. Please, may the authorities resist the other temptation to try to push this through before the March state election. Let the people make a judgment on this, which appears to be another development for the benefit of a very few at a loss for the many.
353195	Paul Franks	Please see attached
353595	Paul gibson	The high rise is totally out of line with the surrounding historic buildings and will be an eyesore.
352931	Paul Upham	I strongly object to the proposal. The original Concept Plan ensured western views from Observatory Hill to the water and to the horizon were not lost. Mod 9 changes this to the negative. Heritage views to and from Millers Point and Observatory Hill will be lost. The 73.7 metre residential tower near Nawi Cove eliminates uninterrupted sight lines from Observatory Hill. This private commercial building should not be permitted on public land. NSW Government is reminded that public space belongs to the public and should not be leased or sold off for private enterprise for any price.
354197	Paul Upham	Hello David, Please find attached the submission from the Highgate Owners Corporation. Please confirm receipt? Greatly appreciate the submission extension provided. Thank you. Yours Faithfully, Paul Upham JP Building Manager Highgate Owners Corporation SP49822
353531	Penelope Winn	I own Apartment 1205/183 Kent Street, Millers Point. I object to several aspects of Barangaroo Central's proposed Mod 9. 1. I believe that the proposed concept will adversely affect public views both west from Observatory Hill and east from the White Bay precinct.  2. The proposed development is excessively high and will lead to shading of new parks - especially in Hickson Park which is likely to be in shade year round.

**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	Submission
		<p>3. Traffic is already congested in the area and the new development proposes to bring an additional 800 apartments that will bring associated cars. Plus the deliveries to retail and residential apartments will lead to further noisy heavy vehicles.</p> <p>4. The proposed Northern residential tower is totally out of context with Nawi Cove, Millers Point heritage streetscape and the Barangaroo Headland park. It is an ugly building that is without merit. If built it will likely be a blight on the landscape similar to Blues Point tower.</p> <p>5. The overall proposal is inconsistent with the original vision for the Barangaroo precinct. Thank you for considering this submission.</p>
353953	Penny Dean	<p>The modifications to the original plan should not be agreed to or passed. To increase the size and height of the new buildings will impede the unit erupted views from Observatory Hill. It will block the view of the Harbour Bridge from Pirrama Park and Pymont Peninsula. Previous developments at Barangaroo has already had public space removed and have been changed and altered significantly. The public have been ignored for long enough - this is an overreach once again that does not benefit the general public and destroys the essential character of our historic Millers Point and must be stopped.</p>
353079	Peter Coates	<p>I will commence by saying how disappointed I am that the NSW Government should even entertain a further modification to the approved development plan for Central Barangaroo. The massive increase in the approved GFA can only be described as a gift to the developers at the expense of the NSW public. I see no public benefit in the proposed modification. It would appear to be purely designed to enrich the developer at the expense of the general public. Central Barangaroo was always designed to be the civic heart of Barangaroo with lower rise buildings and community facilities adjacent to a harbour foreshore park. The argument that the views and public amenity are already lost is wrong. The approved Concept Plan envisages retaining views across the site, to and from the harbour and opposing foreshores. It is quite clear that the balance of public versus private interest has not been maintained with this proposal. The rights of the public to amenity, heritage protection and enjoyment are being ignored in favour of a project which will provide limited public good and dubious economic benefits to other than the project developer. I live adjacent to Observatory Hill and feel privileged to be able to walk in the park and enjoy the wonderful views to the North east and West of Observatory Hill. This proposal will have a very serious negative impact on the Western view from Observatory Hill. These views have been enjoyed for centuries and I do not believe that the State Government has the right to obscure them forever. The buildings along Hickson Road are far too big and will create a claustrophobic effect in High Street. Not only will these planned Hickson Road buildings destroy the outlook from the iconic heritage homes in High Street but they will also interfere with the view of these heritage homes from neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pymont, Balmain etc. The Northern Residential Tower is totally out of context to Nawi Cove, Observatory Hill, Barangaroo Headland Park and the Millers point heritage streetscape. it has no merit as a stand alone building. As I mentioned earlier, it is simply a gratuitous cash grab which will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape. Future generations will look at this tower and view it in the same context as Blues Point Tower. They will wonder how any sane government could approve another Blues Point Tower type mistake. The proponent's visual impact study is totally inadequate. It is highly selective and does not include any visual impact images from High Street or Kent Street. Many of these homes were purchased from the NSW Government. They were marketed using the current views and understanding of the approved Barangaroo development</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		plans. This proposed change is a significant breach of trust and good faith by the State Government. Traffic and parking will be significantly affected by this proposal. The retail precinct provides for minimal shopper parking and will require out of area shoppers to park in Millers Point or Walsh Bay. We will have a 28000 square metre retail facility with no additional parking provided and, in fact, it would appear that 100 on street parking spaces will be removed. Finally, I want to say that I do not understand why this proposal is up for public comment. It is quite clear that it has no merit and should not be approved.
354217	Peter Knight	Dear Mr Glasgow Please find attached my formal Objection to the Aqualand Proposal to Modify the Central Barangaroo Development Plan (Mod 9) which I understand I can send to you even though the formal objection period has closed. I confirm that I have not made any Political Donations of any kind. I also confirm that I am happy to have my name in the public domain. I look forward to your further advice on this matter. Regards, Peter Knight
352516	Peter Mangano	RE: Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). I strongly object to the concept plan, which obliterates the western views from Observatory Hill. I have, over many years, watched the sunset from this beautiful vantage point. This is socialisation of losses and privatisation of profits taken to the extreme. It is also just plain ugly!. A high school student would have produce a better design.
353087	Peter Mcnally	Please do not destroy the prominence of Observatory Hill by interrupting the sight-lines to and from this historic and culturally significant site. Nor should Hickson Road become more like a canyon than a thoroughfare.
352583	Peter Osman	Dear Minister, I object to the modification called: Concept Plan for Barangaroo (MP06_0162 Mod 9) and seek your support to stop it proceeding for the reasons I outline below. I regularly use the facilities at Sydney Observatory in public educational outreach activities organised by the Sydney City Skywatchers. Having such facilities in the city is increasingly important for hands on science and STEMM education with increasing population density, light pollution and apartment living without backyards, rapidly removing traditional opportunities for families and children to learn the science and history of astronomy. Sydney observatory and its volunteers with the Sydney City Skywatchers (SCS) have addressed this educational deficit by providing access to telescopes and astronomical equipment for use in a unique city environment that combines the technological resource with the natural amenity of a mostly clear skyline. Such work has been carried out at Sydney Observatory since 1895 and regularly draws large crowds of enthusiastic adults and children. I've been informed by the SCS that this amenity and its educational opportunities are about to be destroyed and they support this claim with the information provided below which is of great concern to me and is the main thrust of my objection. Central Barangaroo development was approved to be below the line of the rockface/landform and not interfere with Sydney Observatory and Sydney City Skywatchers. We and all the people of NSW and beyond gave up a lot of sky for the Southern Barangaroo development. There are major errors in Appendix G - the report titled "Central Barangaroo - Sydney Observatory Sky View Impact Assessment", dated 7 July 2021, prepared by Unisearch (UNSW) (reference UN59699): Highly significant astronomical events are viewed below 10 degrees above the horizon. These include the Sun, Moon, planets, comets, bright stars, constellations, sunsets, moonsets, supermoons, Blue moons, lunar and solar eclipses, planetary transits across the Sun, planetary & lunar conjunctions. To lose this viewing for 4 months of the year is an unacceptable loss for our generations and generations to come. Most of our telescope viewing is using telescopes on the

**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	Submission
		<p>ground from the north, south and western sides of Sydney Observatory. Our society undertakes to learn more about the First Astronomers from this site. The Gadigal People of the Eora Nation used their observations to track the seasons. The ability to track the Sun and Moon as they set throughout the year is destroyed from the highest natural point in Sydney (Sydney Observatory) by the increased height of this proposed building modification. This building, now it is much higher, will add to skyglow significantly in the direct line of our telescope viewing to the west - where a large number of astronomical events occur throughout the year. Sydney Observatory is listed on the UNESCO portal for astronomical heritage - this development diminishes its heritage significance. This modification destroys Aboriginal heritage of the night sky, heritage of Sydney Observatory and restricts opportunities for our society and the public, including school children, forever. Yours sincerely Dr Peter Osman</p>
352838	peter salt	<p>to whom it may concern:</p> <p>I wish to formally present my submission to this proposed development as a concerned local resident of Millers Point. I would greatly appreciate it if Minister Roberts would take the following issues into consideration, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> <li>* Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water</li> <li>* Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pyrmont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. Of key concern is that the proposed modification to the Concept: * Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views * Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. Sydney is an international destination and boasts one of the most iconic harbours in the world. As iconic as the bridge and Opera House are, the heritage precinct of Millers Point and The Rocks is an intrinsic component of the experience for visitors to Sydney and will be lost. The proposed development has no heritage merit and shows no consideration for the indigenous focus the development has shown to date with respect to the headland. Parking and traffic is already a concern. This development will greatly exacerbate this problem as the application does not seek to add additional car parking spaces despite planning for a 28,000sqm retail shopping precinct (Westfield?). I urge you to consider these and many other compelling reasons to return to the previously agreed</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		development which was previously approved and in keeping with its environment rather than an obvious attempt to maximise financial returns at the expense of the amenity of this precious heritage area.  your sincerely, peter salt director salt & Shein
352491	Peter Takos	Millers Point and The Rocks represent early Sydney. They are our most significant heritage assets. The proposed Mod 9 development overwhelms the heritage precinct and is an impenetrable barrier to the west. Crown and Lend Lease's views (to the harbour, Bridge, Opera House etc) are guaranteed but views from Observatory Hill, Office Buildings and Residential Buildings are lost The proposed Mod 9 building heights preclude clear westward sightlines from Observatory Hill to the water. The 73.7 metre residential tower near Nawi Cove destroys Observatory Hill's required uninterrupted sight lines to the horizon. The existing Concept Plan Gross Floor Area is being tripled.
353405	Peter Tzannes	I have studied the proposal. I strongly believe that it diminishes our city, destroys important features which make our city livable. It is an overdevelopment of an already overdeveloped site. It destroys site-lines from Observatory Hill. It destroys the balance of Barangaroo by making the whole development overcrowded and compressed. It loses the openness which should be Sydney. This is our latest big addition to Sydney's waterfront. It does the exact opposite. It makes our open shores look cramped and constricted. Gone will be the sense of freedom and relaxation. Gone will be Sydney's charm and attraction to overseas people and certainly will be an insult to those of us locals who love their city and state. It should be rejected outright. This is Sydney, an open airy city. Let's not destroy it by making it feel overcrowded, cramped and lacking in sensitivity and proportion.
353393	Peter Wilson	I object to the proposed height allowance for new buildings in the Barangaroo Central development. Low rise buildings only are appropriate here. I would accept buildings of four floors or less.
353919	Philip Tapsall	I would like to register my objection to the proposed development. Verbatim text from submission 353917
353791	Philip Thalís	See attached Letter of Objection - same text as REALM submission
352775	Phillip DENNISTON	Objection and comment to proposal uploaded
352856	Phillip Meddings	Several things are deeply disturbing about this Mod 9 to the Barangaroo Concept Plan. Firstly, and most importantly, this is being developed on public land and as a public asset the proposed size and bulk of private development makes a mockery of that balance. Even the first item stated ( increase the maximum GFA from 47,688 sqm to 144,355 sqm (including 116,189 sqm of above ground GFA and 28,166 sqm of below ground GFA) is without explanation and one can only deduce it is a gratuitous money grab, either for the government to subsidise the Metro station or for the co-developer Aqualand, or both. What happened to the winning plan of Hill Thalís Architects which dealt sensitively with the building heights and volume accommodating the heritage importance of the precinct and the view lines from Observatory Hill and back to it from the Western harbour? This has been abandoned and the current proposal will mean they are lost forever. Is that the legacy the current government wants to impose on Sydney and the nation. Millers Point, Walsh Bay, Observatory Hill and The Rocks are the birthplace of European colonial Australia and this plan is creating a wall around it forever. Secondly, the scale of the development will increase traffic enormously onto a road with only one way in and one way out.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		The excess traffic will spill out into Millers Point and Walsh Bay dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues. Finally, the proposed modification to the Concept is NOT consistent with so many of the Government bodies' own requirements or guidelines such as: - Statement of Commitments for Barangaroo Development - Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan for protection of public views - Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan and does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill or Millers Point. It remains a mystery how this proposal can be independently assessed by a government which is effectively a co-developer and yet, I understand, it is not proposed to refer it to the Independent Planning Commission. It will be determined by the Planning Minister, an integral member of the government which is jointly proposing this Modification. Is it any wonder that the public become so cynical of politicians and governments and will rightly see this whole charade as a box-ticking exercise? Needless to say, I strongly object to the bulk and scale of the Mod 9 proposal in its current form.
352725	PYRMONT ACTION Inc	Submission attached
352858	Rasoul Alavi	I refer to your letter dated 8th July under Ref MP 06_0162MOD 9 and write in the following the ground of my objection: - It is already too hard digesting several high riser developments came up during last few years at Barangaroo. These buildings have blocked almost 90% water views I had from my apartment. Proposed modification 9, makes worst. Please see uploaded images 3 covering current water view and if modification 9 goes ahead. built buildings and more impact overlooking from my apartment should modification 9 goes further on while it takes away about 30% of the Hickson Park. Impact on general public: - Loss of views from Observatory Park if B Block goes ahead With minor windy days, Barton Road experience high wind & noisy whistle under current exiting buildings. This situation will worst if modification 9 goes ahead About 30% of the Hickson park is lost Barangaroo station will be in shade. Park will be in shade ( Image 2 attached) The restaurant area is already overpopulated that can not walk during weekends nights. Imagine how worst it will be there by building more apartments at Barangaroo. New building 73.7 height( Image 2 attached) Create a critical Traffic situation In view of the above I strongly object to modification 9 that proposing buildings exceeding 25 Meters Hight and any buildings that impact sunlight into the park along Barton Street.
353315	Rebecca Couani	I object to the proposal. It totally block my view
352589	Renee Huang	I wholly object to this development and do not support it.
352735	RICHARD BAYLEY	I strongly object to the Mod 9 proposed redevelopment of Central Barangaroo. My reasons for doing so are provided in the attached paper. With limited time and an excess amount of documentation which has been years in preparation, it is unreasonable to expect NSW citizens to be able to respond in the timeframe allowed. Therefore my submission has not been as comprehensive as I would like in challenging the detail provided in the papers.
352524	Richard Beattie	Dear Director Please see the attached objection to the subject development proposal. I understand objections submitted online are managed automatically. As it is hard to imagine proper weighting could be given to an objection without human analysis of the reasoning for the objection, I will also submit by mail a hard copy for such an analytical review for advice to the Minister. The following ministers who I believe would have a serious interest in what I have written, and should be

**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	Submission
		strongly opposed to the preposterous proposal, will be copied with letters in the mail. The Premier, Mr Dominic Perrottet Mr John Roberts, Minister for Planning and Homes Mr Rob Stokes, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Cities, and Minister for Active Transport Mr Kevin Anderson, Minister for Lands and Water, and Minister for Hospitality and Racing Mr James Griffin, Minister for Environment and Heritage Regards Richard Beattie Additional submission with attachment from submitter (354087)
353399	Richard Dale	<p>I refer to the Modification to Barangaroo concept plan (MP 06_ 016 MOD 9). I am a resident of Millers Point. I strongly oppose the proposed modification (Mod9) of the Central Barangaroo Concept Plan in its entirety as a gross overdevelopment and a betrayal of good planning. My specific objections are:</p> <p>1. Loss of public domain views from and to Observatory Hill and Kent St</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Loss of views from Observatory Hill. Spectacular heritage-significant views to the west, including of the opposite shoreline and the harbour will be blocked by the bulk and scale of the proposal.</li> <li>* Loss of views from Kent St at High St, their lanes, and the Agar steps. Wide and significant view corridors of the harbour and to the west will be completely blocked by Mod 9 proposal.</li> <li>* Loss of views to Observatory Hill and Millers Point. The Mod9 development significantly damages landmark heritage and iconic views of the Kent St terraces, Sydney Observatory, Observatory Hill and the Harbour Bridge from Darling Harbour, Pyrmont and Balmain. The original Central Barangaroo concept plan acknowledged the significance of these views and was approved on the basis that views would be maintained over and between the built form. The concept plan did not allow for buildings to fill the whole design envelope. The Mod9 proposal ignores these clear principles and asserts falsely that views are already lost to the concept plan. More egregiously, the Mod9 proposal uses this falsehood to justify further height, bulk and scale increases that amplify the view loss. The proposal also ignores the Independent Planning Commission's Condition C1 that development of block 5 does not impact on key views from the Millers Point and Observatory Hill region. I object to the Mod 9 reassessment of the importance of these views and its bid to steal them from the public! The gross loss of views proposed in Mod9 is not in the public interest and will have a severe and adverse heritage impact.</li> </ul> <p>2. The bulk and scale of the Mod9 proposal impacts the amenity of local residents and the people of Sydney and hurts our heritage. The bulk and scale of the Mod9 Central Barangaroo buildings will significantly compromise the amenity of residents and visitors and the heritage of the suburb. I object to the massive increase in GFA achieved by reductions in setbacks, height increases and limited penetrations, as well as the decrease in the size and overshadowing of Hickson Park. Mod9 proposes a 140% increase in the GFA from previously approved modifications and results in a development that now severely impacts the amenity of Millers Point. The proposed height and sparsely penetrated canyon-wall of buildings along Hickson road severs Millers Point from the harbour and destroys 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 Mod 9 proposal. The built form of development blocks 5, 6 and 7 proposed by Mod 9 ignores agreed setbacks, ignores agreed block controls, and ignores agreed height limits. The proposal fundamentally ignores agreed design principals attached to the agreed block controls</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		(June 2008). The Mod 9 proposal seeks to replace agreed Design Principles, Design Requirements and Development Controls with a new maximalist 'design guidance' (Hassell-Dec 21) which maximises GFA for the developer over public space and amenity. Barangaroo Ave. and Nawai Cove are claimed in Mod9 as public open space to maximise development elsewhere. Against the public interest, the Mod9 design guidelines allow for overhangs over public space, the reduction of Hickson Park, and a tiny comparative increase for community uses in GFA (+800sqm out of +96,667sqm proposed). The Barangaroo steps public space as currently approved and its penetration to and view corridor from High St are severely reduced in size and scale by Mod9. The Mod9 design building massing along Hickson Rd is higher and wider with fewer and narrower penetrations. Previously approved design principles to not build to the whole envelope are ignored and Mod 9 pushes the building envelope further still by modulating the buildings upwards and outwards. The bulk and scale of the Mod9 proposal is excessive and robs the public of the amenity provided by the original low-rise campus and community-use vision for Barangaroo. The Mod9 increase in GFA to 144,355 should be rejected and should not exceed the Central Barangaroo GFA of 47,688 approved for Mod 8. This proposal squeezes the development lemon too hard and has a negative development impact that will leave the people of NSW, Sydney and Millers Point with an eyesore for years to come. 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. Mod9's high wall of building across Blocks 5, 6 and 7 and a new tower would severely diminish our precious state heritage. Please preserve our shared heritage and our public amenity! Reject this modification.
353691	Richard Downer	I object to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) on the grounds of gross over development. It will destroy our view of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, Barangaroo Headland Park and Millers Point heritage buildings. As if the Crown Casino and One Sydney Harbour weren't ugly, oversized buildings enough - dwarfing the iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge - this promises to complete the ruination of Darling Harbour and surrounds.
353911	Ricki Colville	I object
352882	Rita Pinna	As a resident of Millers Point and of NSW I would like to strongly object to the defacing of our Rocks Area at Central Barangaroo. It is a gross insult to our beautiful Rocks precinct. This is Sydney's heritage area streetscape which will not only be lost to us as we travel on ferries and as we walk in our backyard but to EVERYONE. The absolute greed of our government that has not only allowed three ugly residential buildings to be erected at One Barangaroo with no consideration to the traffic and parking impact to our small village but to also add more at Central Barangaroo is outrageous. Please do not allow this, save our Rocks area, and save our faith in our government remembering that you are only in power by your voters. This is Public Space and should be respected and used as green public space.
352579	Robert Gavagna	My submission is to endorse the earlier submission made by Mr. Ian Bulluss. In addition to supporting the points made by Mr. Bulluss, I would add the following observations: Whether it be in New York, San Francisco, Budapest, Prague, Rome or London, all the bridges for which those cities are famous, are clearly visible in terms of their bridge approaches, pylons and actual bridge structures. They are easily visible for tourists and for local citizens. Yet here we have our own world famous Sydney Harbour Bridge and this Central Barangaroo development proposal will blot the view of the Bridge approach and Pylons to all those south west of the Bridge! Of course this view obstruction also applies to views of its



MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>neighbouring Observatory and surrounding green fringe. Surely a re-think of the proposed RL73 for one signal building should be scaled back. If not to the original plan of RL33, then at least a level that doesn't give such a view monopoly to those within this obstructive building. Perhaps a slight RL raising of other neighbouring buildings to compensate the bidding developer for an RL loss of their standout building? This development proposal as expressed by such a huge RL increase for the showplace building is exaggerated and defies common sense. As I suggest, lower its RL and raise the others slightly to provide a more reasoned outcome for our city and its future.</p>
352505	Robert Luxford	<p>Dear Minister, I object to the modification called: Concept Plan for Barangaroo (MP06_0162 Mod 9) and seek your support to stop it proceeding for the reasons I outline below. I am a regular visitor to Sydney Observatory and a member of Sydney City Skywatchers, previously called the BAA NSW Branch. We are an active astronomy society, with members of all ages and have been associated with Sydney Observatory since 1895 and value the opportunity to view astronomical events from this highly significant heritage site. We encourage others to understand and engage with astronomy and Sydney Observatory is very important in STEMM education of families and school groups, which our society also supports. Central Barangaroo development was approved to be below the line of the rockface/landform and not interfere with Sydney Observatory and Sydney City Skywatchers. We and all the people of NSW and beyond gave up a lot of sky for the Southern Barangaroo development. There are major errors in Appendix G - the report titled "Central Barangaroo - Sydney Observatory Sky View Impact Assessment", dated 7 July 2021, prepared by Unisearch (UNSW) (reference UN59699):</p> <p>* Highly significant astronomical events are viewed below 10 degrees above the horizon. These include the Sun, Moon, planets, comets, bright stars, constellations, sunsets, moonsets, supermoons, Blue moons, lunar and solar eclipses, planetary transits across the Sun, planetary &amp; lunar conjunctions. To lose this viewing for 4 months of the year is an unacceptable loss for our generations and generations to come.</p> <p>* Most of our telescope viewing is using telescopes on the ground from the north, south and western sides of Sydney Observatory. Our society undertakes to learn more about the First Astronomers from this site. The Gadigal People of the Eora Nation used their observations to track the seasons. The ability to track the Sun and Moon as they set throughout the year is destroyed from the highest natural point in Sydney (Sydney Observatory) by the increased height of this proposed building modification. This building, now it is much higher, will add to skyglow significantly in the direct line of our telescope viewing to the west - where a large number of astronomical events occur throughout the year. Sydney Observatory is listed on the UNESCO portal for astronomical heritage - this development diminishes its heritage significance. This modification destroys Aboriginal heritage of the night sky, heritage of Sydney Observatory and restricts opportunities for our society and the public, including school children, forever. Yours sincerely Robert Luxford</p>
352532	Robert Marriott	<p>I wish to lodge an objection to the proposal and request that it be subject to review. Reasons for my objection are as follows:</p> <p>1. The changes proposed are not in the public interest, in that they are a significant modification to earlier approved plans which envisaged a low-rise development on this site, on which existing residents made decisions to reside in The Rocks, as well as them being detrimental and unsympathetic to retaining the historic values of the precinct.</p>

**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	Submission
		<p>2. Sight-lines from all areas in The Rocks to the western reaches of the harbour will be detrimentally impacted by the proposed multi-storey buildings, especially by planned the taller tower. This will certainly affect buildings and apartments situated on the eastern side of Darling Harbour and in the west of the CBD. Not to mention other buildings, the Langham Hotel and other apartment buildings included, and particularly as well as the historic Observatory Park.</p> <p>3. It is an unwarranted overdevelopment of and out of scale to the site, excessive in bulk and scale. In an area that has restricted road access, the new Metro Station, notwithstanding, the additional apartments and commercial spaces in the proposed new buildings, added to the already high-density apartment and commercial buildings, will create significant traffic congestion.</p> <p>4. The proposal reduces the area of public space and parkland, a valued commodity in our part of the city.</p>
353631	Robert Merrick	<p>Mr Anthony Roberts MLA Minister for Planning Dear Sir, You will have received thousands of objections to the proposal for a new development in Barangaroo Central.. I add my objection also, but can I add further. Sydney is regarded as an attractive place to visit, and pleasant place to live, built on a beautiful harbour, often referred to as one of the nicest in the world. At the stroke of a pen, much of this beauty will be spoiled through the overdevelopment of the shoreline with a high rise tower obstructing views and sightlines from many parts of the western side of the Millers Point / Dawes Point ridge. Historic sites like the historic Sydney Observatory with its iconic working Timeball - one of only six left operating in the world - will become insignificant relics of the past. The Barangaroo Headland Park, a restoration of a natural headland from an industrial port, demonstrates what can be done to enhance our city and benefit Sydney's reputation as a place to visit, a place to call home and a place to leave following generations. That is now about to be spoiled. There is nothing attractive or beneficial about the latest modification to the Barangaroo Development plan. The beneficiaries are the developer Aqualand and off-the-plan apartment purchasers. Any arguments about people employed during construction are quite spurious as the developer will simply go on to bid for the next site as a normal part of its business. Sir, the massive over-development is simply unwanted, un-needed and will be a mistake that can have been avoided. You have the power to leave an enduring legacy that enhances Sydney for future generations, or you can approve this over-development and leave a legacy of an opportunity lost. forever. Please use your position to represent the wishes of the community to reject the opportunistic money making proposal put forward by the developer. Robert Merrick Millers Point</p>
353131	Robert Williams	<p>Here are my wife and my objections as owners of the subject property: Observatory Hill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Vistas to and from OH 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.</li> <li>* These views have been seen for millennia. The Perrottet Government does not have the right to obscure them - forever.</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.</li> </ul>

**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	Submission
		<p>* The low-rise residential setting of the significant heritage Millers Point streetscape will be blocked as seen from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc.</p> <p>* Important vistas from the aforementioned suburbs of iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge views will also be blocked. Northern Residential Tower</p> <p>* This building is totally out of context to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Nawi Cove</li> <li>o Millers Point heritage streetscape</li> <li>o Observatory Hill</li> <li>o Barangaroo Headland Park.</li> </ul> <p>* It is without merit as a standalone building. It does not contribute as an "exclamation mark" to the whole development nor will it contribute to wayfinding for people to locate the Barangaroo Metro Station. It is a gratuitous cash grab which will be a permanent eyesore on the Sydney landscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Its comparison to Blues Point Tower is wholly warranted.</p> <p>* It does not contribute positively to the urban planning of the precinct. 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 - 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 completely obscured by the Government's new buildings.</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. They have sold the views three times. If your view is impacted, you are encouraged to take a photograph of your view, or panorama of your view and attach this to your submission.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>* A wholly inadequate assessment of how traffic will spill out from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, dominating these residential areas with excess traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>* The retail precinct will provide for minimal shopper parking necessitating out-of-area shoppers to park in Millers Point and Walsh Bay. Parking</p> <p>* The application does not seek to add additional car parking space (in fact it seeks to remove over 100 on-street parking spaces in Hickson Road) despite planning a 28,000 sqm retail offering. Where will these shoppers park?</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>I also note that the National Trust are advising their members to object principally on the grounds that the proposed concept modification would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Block public views west from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point</li> <li>* Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water</li> <li>* Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park.</li> </ul>
353773	Robin Mountstephens	<p>Tripling of Gross Floor Area from 47,588 to 144,355sqm is of no public benefit and gross over-development of the precinct. Hickson Park reduction in size decreases public amenity and will mean increased over-shadowing in mid-winter . Observatory Hill Panoramic Views to and from historically significant Observatory Hill will be permanently lost from certain areas or marred elsewhere. Millers Point The proposed buildings along Hickson Rd and the proposed tower at the northern end will mean that the original and characterful views to and from the water will be lost thus severing Millers Point from its Maritime history, Scale Barrangaroo South has been developed with city scale tower blocks. The original intention for the whole development was that the scale would taper down towards the northern end of the precinct. The proposed new tower at the northern end continues the line of taller buildings and confuses the step down in scale and will be not in keeping with Millers Point.</p>
353649	Robyn Bushell	<p>Like so many in the wider community, I am also outraged at the proposed modification to the Barangaroo Concept Plan and write to express this great concern. The modification will greatly increase building heights and floor space, which with no regard for the disastrous impact on our heritage. These modifications will obstruct historic views to and from Observatory Hill, and to parts of the Harbour Bridge from the Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park, and block public views of the harbour from key places and streets in historic Millers Point. This will affect all who enjoy and love Sydney harbour, now and forever. It is an iconic cultural landscape that deserves the highest level of protection. To approve these modifications, now 15 years after the original DA approval, would be a reckless act and one that would surely find the Minister of Planning held culpable by present and future generations, of a gross lack of judgement, favouring a developers greed over the common good of protecting an iconic heritage landscape that belongs to all. The vistas to and from Observatory Hill must be protected. The view across the harbour to the horizon have been seen and enjoyed for millennia. The Perrottet Government does not have the right to obscure them - forever. Is this the intention? Gross lack of judgement and foresight. The heritage values of the area has been the subject of huge controversy for many decades. Residents and visitors to Sydney all recognise the beauty of Sydney and the harbour. All understand our beautiful historic area of The Rocks, was protected not by good government planning but by valiant efforts of the community. To have a government yet again ignore consideration of the impact of a development on the heritage precinct of Millers Point, is incredibly reckless. Both in terms of community sentiment, the economic value of tourism and protection of the signs and sites that tell the story of Sydney. This is not just any old corner of town. As well as blocking views, sunlight and vistas, it will also serve to sever the historic maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water. Our beautiful working</p>

**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	Submission
		<p>harbour. Most global and successful cities celebrate their historic cores and precincts with huge and lasting benefits. Does the NSW Government not actually understand the immense value of heritage? Of views? Now and in the future? The bulk and scale of the proposed buildings along Hickson Rd are simply too big, with insufficient articulation, setback, separation, etc. With increases from 38m to 47m across most buildings, and a 140% increase in gross floor area (from 47,688sqm to 144,355sqm) and an ugly 73.7m tower at the northern end, this will be a complete eye sore. This modification represents an urban planning disaster given the low-rise residential setting of the highly significant heritage streetscape of Millers Point, will be blocked from the western harbour and neighbouring suburbs of Darling Island, Pyrmont, Balmain, etc. Important heritage and tourist vistas, already mentioned, our iconic Sydney Harbour Bridge views will be lost forever. Unbelievable arrogance, to think any developer would be allowed and any government would dare obliterate the signature identity of our wonderful city and historic views from The Rocks. Unbelievable. The Northern Residential Tower is entirely inappropriate and out of context in terms of scale, look and location in relation to: - Nawi Cove - Millers Point heritage streetscape - Observatory Hill, and - Barangaroo Headland Park. The building is entirely without merit as a standalone building. It is simply a unwarranted cash grab, resulting in a permanent eyesore on the Sydney cityscape on what is critical harbour foreshore public land. Has the Government not learnt from the disastrous mistake made decades ago with Blues Point Tower? Is this the legacy the current Government plans - more major mistakes in urban planning on a prime Sydney waterfront location? I reiterate, this is an iconic cultural landscape, it deserves the highest level of protection, not destruction. The visual impact assessment is completely inadequate, and highly selective of the visual impact images. 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. Assessment of how traffic will be affected as vehicles spill out from Central Barangaroo into Millers Point and Walsh Bay, has also been inadequately addressed, as has parking itself. The retail precinct (a 28,000 sqm retail offering) will provide minimal parking necessitating out-of-area shoppers to park in Millers Point and Walsh Bay. In summary the proposed modification to the Barangaroo Concept Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views</li> <li>* Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill</li> <li>* Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. The modification plan should NOT be approved.</li> </ul>
353653	Rod de Beer	Return to the plan approved in 2007, with no buildings adversely affecting the site lines and amenity of Observatory Hill and the terraces of Millers Point. The history of these areas trump the further proposed over-development of Barangaroo Central. Retain the full size and amenity of the proposed Hickson Park.

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353923	Rod Hallewell	This plan seems to override the original agreement about maintaining a height restriction to preserve outlooks to Observatory Hill. Seems to have been years of secretive back room planning with developers which raises question. This is public land and as much we have the right to determination, say and input. Developers have too much hold over State Government with interests in a financial gain regardless of the long term consequences. I strongly object to an increase it building heights that will impact and restrict views on our over crowded skyline. This is public land and a refreshing lung for the city and every amont free space and views must be preserved for future generations.. I appeal to all concerned to listen to the voice of the people and don't change the original guidelines to suit developers desires. Rod Hallewell
352715	Rod Halstead	I have lived in 168 Kent Street for decades and watched the over development of the Rocks are and Hickson Road/Baragaroo over these past 10 years.....and it is so disappointing to see that the public assets that are Sydney Harbour and the foreshore being totally disregarded by this latest development...It was enough to see the huge high rises in Barangaroo,, including the monstrosity of the casino but to now see further destruction of the heritage of Millers Point and Observatory Hill and its vista is a total disregard of State and National heritage and in my view flies in the face of sensible urban design principles. I strongly object to the proposed development and the destruction of a public asset and the total disregard of public good and amenity...in this proposed re development. It is a direct affront to the heritage of the area
353881	Rodger Muir	Please see attached
352812	Roger Hemingway	<p>Re Modification 9 The Existing Approved Plan has a GFA of 47,688 SqM. A Maximum Height of 35M A block area of 11,505 SqM Modification 9 proposes to increase the GFA to 144,355 SqM or 40% over the existing plan TO ACHEIVE THIS IT MEANS....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Increase height above maximum allowable</li> <li>* Ignore Block Controls</li> <li>* Take back all of Block 5 (Hickson Park)</li> <li>* Overhang by 3 metres</li> <li>* No setbacks (3 metres minimum required)</li> <li>* Treat Barangaroo Avenue as public open space</li> <li>* Treat Nawi Cove as public open space</li> <li>* Ignore minimum setbacks for residential tower</li> <li>* Provide no vehicular access * Provide no parking (remove parking!</li> <li>* Increase height above maximum allowable</li> </ul>

**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	Submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Ignore Block Controls</li> <li>* Take back all of Block 5 (Hickson Park)</li> <li>* Overhang by 3 metres</li> <li>* No setbacks (3 metres minimum required)</li> <li>* Treat Barangaroo Avenue as public open space</li> <li>* Treat Nawi Cove as public open space</li> <li>* Ignore minimum setbacks for residential tower</li> <li>* Provide no vehicular access * Provide no parking (remove parking! ....</li> <li>* Increase height above maximum allowable</li> <li>* Ignore Block Controls * Take back all of Block 5 (Hickson Park)</li> <li>* Overhang by 3 metres * No setbacks (3 metres minimum required)</li> <li>* Treat Barangaroo Avenue as public open space</li> <li>* Treat Nawi Cove as public open space</li> <li>* Ignore minimum setbacks for residential tower</li> <li>* Provide no vehicular access</li> <li>* Provide no parking (remove parking! .... Impacts on Amenity</li> <li>* Heritage</li> <li>* View loss</li> <li>* Overshadowing</li> <li>* Traffic</li> <li>* Parking</li> <li>* Bulk and Scale</li> <li>* Height</li> </ul>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>* Acoustic and Visual Privacy</p> <p>* Setbacks</p> <p>There are numerous serious negative impacts on Residents and Sydneysiders generally. Loss of Heritage and view lines to Observatory Hill Traffic Overshadowing of Hickson Park which is also reduced in area The sheer bulk and scale of Modification 9 The Height of the towers which will lead to loss of visual and acoustic privacy for families backing onto or facing the site. In one sentence IT IS TOO MUCH, a financial deal which Sydney will come to regret for generations.</p>
352667	Ronald Langley	<p>The modified plan for Barangaroo Central break all previous guidelines and promises. The additional space and height and lack of public parking and open areas is a disgrace and will lead to untold damage to the existing residents of this area. While we are in a high rise and will not be severely impacted as will others, we will look down on a development, the worst part of which is the 20 storey building towards the northern end. This part of the plan should not exist. We started with 2 storey buildings, some of which were dedicated to arts and crafts and community needs. I walk the area every day and the loss of sight lines from Observatory Hill and High Street and Kent Street would very much affect my enjoyment of the area. I also think that if the current plans go ahead with a major retail development with no car parking, streets surrounding Barangaroo will be parked out with loss of space for locals. I strongly oppose the modified plan in its current form. The developers need to work with the local community to come up with a plan that doesn't do damage but at the same time, allows them a way forward.</p>
353657	Ronald Smith	<p>Over built, over crowded, too narrow, over shadowed by the high buildings</p>
353329	Rosaline Monaghan	<p>Developer Aqualand's modification of the proposed development of central Barangaroo is breathtaking in its cynical attempt to change the original concept. Under the guise of vague promises of "a variety of well designed indoor and outdoor public spaces" - whatever that means - "campus style offices" (when Covid has completely revolutionised the way we work, many choosing to work from home now), we, who live in the area are also asked to approved the proposed massive increase of the gross floor area including the height of the Tower block which will dominate the foreshore. I therefore wish to protest MOST STRONGLY at the proposed modification</p>
354057	Rosemary Webb	<p>RE Application MP06_0162 MOD 9, Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) I object to Modification 9 on the following grounds: It facilitates further gross commercial overdevelopment of this unique urban and maritime public space; It is inappropriate to the essential public nature, and embedded public ownership, of the Harbour foreshores, perspectives and views, and would further decrease public enjoyment of the site and Harbour surrounds; crucially it defies requirements in the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan for the protection of public views; In proposing this further alienation of public land across the Barangaroo site, NSW Government persists in a breach of executive trust and is failing in its of duty of care to the people of NSW. Should Modification 9 proceed, it will effectively cement transfer of control of this public land from the people to private commercial interests; Already we face accumulating tragedies of the commons in NSW, including in Sydney. The Packer/Crown Barangaroo Casino is an ever-present sad reminder of the consequences for a city when insensitive, inappropriate development overruns urban integrity. Modification 9 represents more of the same; The proposal would block public views from Observatory Hill to the west, and across to White Bay Power Station. It would of</p>



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		course block views to The Rocks. The proposal rides roughshod over the heritage significance of Millers Point and of Observatory Hill. It denies the rationale behind the naming of Sydney's iconic Observatory Point, the headland used by the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation for thousands of years before colonisation, and since then a focus for all peoples living in and coming to the Harbour; Modification 9 would not only erode public amenity, its built impact would savagely erode the tourism value: that tourist dollar critical to Sydney's commercial health. I appeal to the Minister: do not approve this Application. (Dr) Rosemary Webb, August 2022
352488	Ross Mackenzie	The latest modification to the Concept plan for Central Barangaroo includes a high rise building blocking views to and from Observatory Hill and the heights and close proximity to each other of other buildings block views to and from the heritage terraces and public views to the harbourfront from High St and Gas Lane. Mod 11 was approved to protect Hickson Park from major overshadowing and make it a usable space. Mod 9 removes this approved and justified modification. Mod 11 was approved shortly after allowing the 3rd building of 1 Sydney Harbour adjacent to Hickson park to be increased from 10 to 29 Storeys. This development is a disgrace. On what was a good design originally by Hill Thalix architects has been turned into a nightmare of overdevelopment with concrete towers along the waterfront with very little public space.
353525	Ross Corrigan	I wish to register my objection to Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9. This plan represents a gross over development of the site with yet another collection of non-de script buildings. It will impact adversely views from Millers Point. I support the opinion of Alex Greenwich who said the plans are "a second-rate proposal that should be outright rejected". We can do much better than this and the plan needs to be re-worked.
353751	ross nicholas	A tower of about 20 storeys is proposed adjacent to Harbour Park and Nawi Cove where it will erode amenity including obstructing the sun from these important public harbour attractions. The tower will block historic links that form part of the heritage values of Observatory Hill, the National Trust Centre and the Millers Point Conservation Area - Observatory Hill Park has almost 270 degrees of uninterrupted views of Sydney Harbour dating back to when the park was used to signal incoming ships. The massive increase in floor space across Central Barangaroo will creep onto the Harbour Park and Hickson Park, betraying a promise that Hickson Park would be preserved when Crown was permitted to build over what was meant to be Barangaroo South's harbour park. Yet again, we see a Barangaroo proposal that ignores the looming housing crisis with no affordable or social housing allocated and priority given to privatising the harbour for short-term real estate profit - I object to the current proposal.
353187	Roy Shackley	Hi I believe that: The proposed concept modification would: Block public views west from Observatory Hill Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposed modification to the Concept: Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		protection of public iconic views Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.
353385	Ruby Haase	I object to the mod 9 develop as it would block the views from Millers Point and Observatory Hill and cast a shadow over Fort Street Public School and block the sunlight from other parts of the area.
353123	Russell Olsson	<p>The proposed increase in building heights and GFA in Mod 9 are inconsistent with the history of Sydney, Including the original settlement, the Sydney Harbour Trusts work in the early 20th century and the Masterplan for Barangaroo which has had built form principles embedded into it from the outset until this unwarranted modification. Observatory Hill was named as a place to observe. Surrounded by the Rocks and Millers Point it was always the highest point at the northern end of the city except for the Sydney Harbour Bridge. It is an ideal place for the interpretation of the city's history and natural environment to tourist and citizens. The Sydney Harbour Trust built one of the finest urban projects in Sydney and indeed Australia with the Hickson Road housing and Kindergarten for the children of the dock workers. This perfectly formed and symmetrical urban project can be appreciated and interpreted to tourists and citizens. One of the few and most robust built form principles of the Barangaroo Masterplan was that the towers remain to teh south of the casino and the Barangaroo Central remain low rise to complement its setting of Observatory Hill and the Sydney Harbour Trust built legacy. Modification 9 flies in the face of these 3 urban history and urban design principles, to propose generally higher building than the Hasell Masterplan, but particularly to propose Block 7. The justification for Block 7 by Aecom as servants to Infrastructure NSW would be incredible if it wasn't so serious and so imminent a disaster : "The existing wide, open landscape view is substantially conserved with (the Approved Concept Plan)..Figure 34. Mod 9 moderately increases the general height of the Central Barangaroo Development". My comment : I do not agree with the moderate increase as it blocks the view of the water's edge interface around Rozelle Bay. The Tenacity Principle places a high value on views to water's edges around Sydney Harbour". Aecom goes on to say "Block 7 is a visually prominent feature within teh view, breaking the continuity of the horizon" My comment : This contradicts the horizontal built forms of Barangaroo Central and Millers Point. There is no justification for it in terms of the built form that has developed over 230 years. Aecom goes on to descend into irrational attempted justifications " The tower (Block 7) does not block the view of the water any more than currently approved as part of the Concept Plan". My comment : A ridiculous statement, as the tower blocks 30-40m of the sky view above the water. It is incredibly disruptive to the horizontal views created by the Approved Concept Plan and the horizontality of the distant hills, the harbour's edge and the built forms of Millers Point. Aecom then compares Block 7 and the higher proposed buildings of Mod 9 with the Barangaroo South towers, saying that they are lower than Barangaroo South. Apart from being a statement of the obvious not worth saying, the proposal does not abide by the urban design principles of the Approved Concept plan, which were based on the fact that Barangaroo South contains a massive amount of floor space and building height that was justified, in part, by keeping Barangaroo Central low. Any pretence at design or principles have been cast aside in Mod 9 in a disdainful insult to Sydney's history and its citizens.</p>
352955	Russell Smith	See uploaded document Objecting to the Application

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
353053	Ryan Atkins	Again, public land and public views are being sold off. The latest plan for a 21 storey building is a long way from the low rise 'garden city' we were initially sold for central Barangaroo. Do better: keep heights as planned, and retain a human scale plus the views from observatory hill, so it's name continues to make sense for the next 150 years.
352733	S Hsu	- There should be NO INCREASE in the GFA. Quoted from concept plan: "An increase in total permissible GFA from 602,354 sqm to 708,041sqm" We should not allow developer to increase GFA after being selected. The winning bidder knew what the maximum GFA was when NSW government selected them!!!!
352507	Salim Rodriguez	I unconditionally reject the new plan for the following reasons: The proposed Mod 9 building heights preclude clear westward sight-lines from Observatory Hill to the water. The original and approved concept plan guaranteed views from Observatory Hill to the water and to the horizon and now the new plan for Mod 9 will obstruct almost all views to and from Observatory Hill and Millers Point so the 73.7 metre residential TOWER near Nawi Cove destroys ALL Observatory Hill's required uninterrupted sight-lines to the horizon. The public park area has been reduced. Crown and Lend Lease's views (to the harbour, Bridge, Opera House etc) are guaranteed but views from Observatory Hill, Office Buildings and Residential Buildings are lost. Photographs used in the Mod 9 documentation are deceptive because the levels and angles used diminish the plan's impact on view sharing. View sharing is an important Mod 9 consideration. Reality is distorted. By commencing at level 15, 50% of the Kent Street residential buildings suffering total loss of views is ignored. View corridors to and from the High Street terraces are significantly diminished Crown took foreshore parkland and now the Mod 9 encroaches on adjacent parkland Hickson Park is further enclosed. Millers Point and The Rocks represent early Sydney and they are our most significant heritage assets. The proposed Mod 9 development overwhelms the heritage precinct and is an impenetrable barrier to the west.
353083	Sally Colgan	I strongly oppose the proposed development, Barangaroo Central. This development will obscure and damage vistas and views that make our city beautiful and strengthen ties to our heritage and the land we entrusted caretakers of. I question the relevance or suitability of the proposed architecture of the construction - it seems rather ugly and out of place on our beautiful harbour. The proposed construction does not benefit the Australian public or local Sydney residents and I strongly object to the proposal.
354041	Samuel Seit	I am a stakeholder who have bought into One Sydney Harbour. The 23 story building on the north west will be blocking my view and so will the proposed low level office buildings. It would also cast a shadow and block out light on a my commercial property In Hickson road. I oppose to the proposed change in GFA and height increase. Yours Samuel Seit
353303	Sandeep Pillay	This is my first home and I was so delighted that I could be part of this historic site. I bought this place for varied reason , tranquil view , unique and historic surrounding, acoustic and visual privacy. I was really saddened to see the development eating into the public land but now more shocked and angered by the further development proposal to which I raise my strong and stern objection. I can afford on this small apartment but I read the statement of commitment issued for the Barangaroo development and I feel I am short changed. The Barangaroo reserve and observatory hill were places where I could go and relax with family , especially during covid lock down days the freedom of walking on the glass lawns of these parks helped me stay sane. The other aspect which frightens me in the congestion and traffic chaos. Currently it is very tough to get a street parking in Kent street as most of the visitors to Crown now parks here and walks down. With these

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>developments this will only create more congestion. In short I feel cheated , deprived of my rights and extremely sad , as an Australian I believe my voice counts and my objection will be considered. Therefore I would strongly object to this modification as it would</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Block the views from my apartment</li> <li>2. Block the public views from observatory hill</li> <li>3. Block the icons views of White bay power station</li> <li>4. Block the most iconic sunset from Observatory hill</li> </ol> <p>5. The modification of the concept is not what was promised to the public, the residential tower was never there in the original plan.</p> <p>6. The modification is not consistent with the Statement of commitment issued for Barangaroo development, this for me is a gov cheating its citizens.</p> <p>7. The medication is not in line with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views 8. Severe road congestion and parking constraints Especially the Northern Residential Tower is totally out of context to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Nawi Cove</li> <li>o Millers Point heritage streetscape</li> <li>o Observatory Hill</li> <li>o Barangaroo Headland Park.</li> </ul>
352681	Sandra Matthews	Strongly object to this project
353701	Sandra Van de Water	<p>I have viewed the proposed changes to building heights and deem the changes considerable and inappropriate to the site, The original proposal was in keeping with the topography and surrounding public spaces and heritage buildings and site lines. However, the changes as proposed are well out of proportion to the Rocks, the harbour and the foreshore. Such buildings at the proposed heights provide significant financial gains to the builders and other commercial stake holders. But ALL residents of Sydney and Australia are stakeholders and this is a travesty. Put simply, we do not want towers to dominate this landscape. This "modification" would change forever one of the most beautiful and iconic harbours and how Sydneysiders and international visitors will perceive it. This part of Sydney has historical and cultural significance going back thousands of years and then hundreds to settlement. Yet these plans have been modified in unseemly haste to maximise developer returns. We need to build a liveable city that is planned for the people not for large corporations and a handful of wealthy people able to afford those apartments. We have a unique harbour city where the foreshore should</p>

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		prevail, with greenspace and sympathetic low rise development as the overriding features . The State government and Minister owe a duty of care to ALL residents, current and future, to follow the recommendations of bodies such as the National Trust and STOP the increased building heights. I do not endorse Barangaroo Concept Plan, modification 9, number 1-the max increase GFA from 47,668 to 144,355 sq metres. I strongly oppose on the grounds this is not a modification but a completely new development that could potentially bypass due process if given the go ahead to proceed by the Minister. Massive increases to the built form in this part of Sydney would be a planning disaster. Dr Sandra Van de Water Author of Parks, Play and People
353675	Sandy Temperley	Object to any structure that will block views to and from Observatory Hill
353747	Sarah Bickford	The new proposals represent an over development of the site and block significant views. This area is public land - it must stay public with open space, social infrastructure and public facilities. Private interests have extracted so much profit at Barangaroo - the NSW Government must put public interests ahead of private profit to ensure that the final piece in the Barangaroo puzzle is a legacy for future generations.
353533	Sean O'Sullivan	We object to the revised plans for Barangaroo Central. We purchased our apartment on the understanding of the original development plans. The additional height and changes to the park in front of us will reduce our enjoyment of our apartment and reduce its value.
352985	Selina Shen	The massive modification (Mod 9) of the Barangaroo Concept Plan will destroy the view of Harbour Bridge from Darling Island side, it will seriously damage the interests of all residents from Darling Island and nearby complexes in Pymont.
353011	Seung Bum Hong	Scenic water views from the apartment have slowly minimised over time and with over construction and further development these views will completely disappear. Over construction and further development of the area will over populate the area and the increase the amount of foot traffic that comes in and out of the barangaroo precinct severely impacting on the residents of the area.
354277	Shane Jolly	Dear David, Greetings from The Langham, Sydney I hope this finds you well. On behalf of NSW Hotel Management Pty Ltd (trading as The Langham, Sydney) in relation to the above application regarding Central Barangaroo, please find our submission via the below link. We look forward to receiving confirmation that the report has been well received. Should there be any concerns, please do let me know at the soonest. Best regards, Shane Verbatim text submission from 354275
353939	Simon Ashby	I object to the application. In my opinion, the application does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill. Additionally, the application will result in the removal of too much public space, as well as the removal of access to one of Sydney's greatest views, sunset over the Harbour, and restrict it to only certain people - the residents and tenants of the new buildings.
353651	Simon Wilson	The current proposal is unacceptable to me as a resident of the City of Sydney.. I support the City of Sydney Council and their submissions for this and future proposals for this important public owned spaces.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352651	Siobhan Ferguson	I object to this development in its entirety. The hermitage value of this area will be compromised. This is public land and should remain accessible. This area should resemble the Domain for example and remain open public space.
353503	Siun Gallagher	This is an area of enormous heritage value and amenity to the Sydney community. Its character is what makes it a social and economic drawcard for families and individuals from across Sydney and the world. Giving it over to more profit-making enterprises will kill the goose that lays the golden egg - and, of course, run the site for present and future generations.
352534	Sofia Morales	Hello, I hope you're doing well.. I'm very shocked and concerned for the development that might happen as the main reason of getting this place was the views. Without them, would be absolutely pointless to be here. Please be mindful of all the affected people that planned their job location and stay in this building thinking that the view was the seller point and now will be destroyed. Thank you
352919	Sonal Shah	Submission/Objections on behalf of Strata Plan 100247 are uploaded in PDF format.
353469	Stephen Duchesne	I am attaching a submission.
353597	Stephen Kovacs	Based on the EAR document, I have concerns with two aspects of the plan as follows. The increase in the RL for the Block 7 tower is inappropriate. The high visual impact on Sydney Observatory and Observatory Hill Park cannot be justified by the proposed additional height and floor space. While an urban marker for the Metro station is valid, that function would be fulfilled more simply by the northern termination of the Block 7 built form. The increase in car spaces is inappropriate. The location will be amply served by on-site facilities and transport connections, and any encouragement of private transport is not justified. Given the objective of favouring pedestrian amenity, consideration should be given to a reduced number of car spaces. End.
353193	Steve Starr	I will to oppose the current development proposal for Barangaroo for the following reasons. The proposed plan will increases building heights and floor space, and will block historic public realm views to and from Observatory Hill, and to parts of the Harbour Bridge. The development will block public views west from Observatory Hill Block public views of White Bay Power Station from Observatory Hill Block public views of the water from key places and streets in historic Millers Point Sever the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water Block public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. the development by is not consistent with the approved Concept Is not consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is not consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views Does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does not respect the heritage significance of Millers Point. Sydney Harbour is too valuable, too sensitive to intrusion after so many years of treating the visual environment as nothing more than a raw asset.
353897	Steve White	The buildings on Hickson Road are too big. The park/garden should be larger.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352949	steven lee	Dear Sir, I strongly object to the modications that the developer is attempting to continually creep for a higher buildings, and an increase in gross floor area, to the North of the casino building. . Everyone , including observatory park to the east will be detrimentally affected, by loss of views and open space. During the extensive consultation period, it was negotiated that North of the Crown Casino, everything would be low scale and open for the public benefit , to preserve views, and a good amenity with parks and open sight lines. I believe enough is enough, the council must protect the residents and public amenity to the east and not allow this further intrusion,
352549	Strata Committee SP 85578 of the Stamford Residence, 171 Gloucester Street, The Rocks (Submitted by Shaw Reynolds Lawyers)	Please see the letter attached to this submission.
353943	Stuart Murray	As a resident of nearly twenty-two years I am strongly objecting to this project. For years I have enjoyed the magnificent views from atop Observatory Hill - a view stretching from the south-west to the east over Sydney Harbour. This development will stop all current and future people of Australia enjoying what is probably the most magnificent harbour in the world. All Australians and visors to our shore must have the opportunity to enjoy this unique panorama. This development will take that right away forever. The desire for monetary profit by the developer will be paid by all of forever if it is allowed. Please stop it. Money should not be a motive. This view is priceless. It belongs to all of us.
353607	Sue Anderson	I have only just heard about the extra development proposed in Barangaroo and because submissions close today, I haven't time to research it in detail. However I object to the proposed, apparently huge development on the grounds that it will destroy this unique, historical corner of our city and further block the night sky from the observatory. Please leave some areas of the city so that the sun can get through and we are not totally surrounded by sky-scrapers - for our health and sanity.
353633	Sue Wright	This proposal destroys the residual pubic access park space. It makes money for developers who don't live here and don't care
353063	Sue-Ann Stanford	The proposed additional tower at Barangaroo - at 20 storeys - is well above the initial limit and will block the view from Observatory Hill. We don't need another Toaster: we need space and distance
352933	Susan Mackey	It is so very disappointing that government organisations cannot be trusted to be upfront and honest about central Barangaroo planning concepts. For years we have been told views from Observatory Hill would not be obstructed, heights and GFA would be much less than is now proposed under Modification 9 etc, etc, etc. .It is so important to retain the

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		history of Millers Point and the Rocks for generations to come. Don't destroy this for a one off cash grab. Honesty and integrity do matter. Deceit does not win elections or respect. Shame !
353841	susan sandercock	I object to this proposal. The land in question belongs to the public of NSW and ought to be open, green space for all to use and enjoy. The NSW government needs to remember that even the most loyal of Coalition voters (me) will not tolerate this kind of vandalism to our beautiful harbourfront city. DO NOT let this development, or any other building development, to take place. Return the ground to open parkland. Giving over public land to private developers is criminal. I OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL ON ALL LEVELS.
353165	Susan Steedman	I object to the proposal that bears no relationship to the original 'vision' for Barrangaroo, which with its frontage to the harbour, should be protected from such gross overdevelopment as that proposed. Is NOT consistent with the approved Concept Is NOT consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development Is NOT consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views Is NOT consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill Does NOT respect the heritage significance of Millers Point.
353551	Susan Walsh	Observatory Hill needs to be protected from losing its view. This space is for the public to enjoy Sydney not looking at ugly buildings which have no right to be built there.
353853	suzan clear	In no way can I support this modification. Views to and from: As far as views are concerned this is theft from the whole of Sydney and is much bigger issue than views from individual dwellings The notion, expressed as "you've already lost your views anyway" shows complete lack of insight: it's not views from individual dwellings that are important, it's the rhythm and grace of views to and from the salient parts of the city that will be further eroded. Throughout a lifetime of my living in Sydney, Observatory Hill - and indeed the working docks that have now been erased to support the establishment of an already adequate development along the Western edge of Sydney - has given me and my visitors endless delight in the views from there across to the far Western edges of Sydney. Living in Lilyfield, there were elevated views to the city and back to Observatory Hill before Barangaroo was even conceived. Visual access to the maritime history of the city is already in decline. This will exacerbate that decline. The White Bay docks are still visually available. The public vistas from the Hill and across from Balmain to the Hill and to the row of cottages along High Street are a tangible reminder of our colonial history. As a teacher I have taken hundreds of students along quasi mandatory historical walking tours of the area. Observatory Hill and a discussion of its place, along with the discussion of why it was called Observatory Hill and why it was built there in particular, were essential. The views it afforded to the South are long gone, and most of the South West, but there are still excellent vistas over to Balmain and beyond. Catching a ferry from Balmain still enables a view of both the Hill and the High Street cottages which encourage reflection and pride in the decisions that have allowed Millers Point and the Rocks to be almost world class historical destinations. Allowing this development to be further enlarged will be squandering our colonial urban history and shows a complete lack of broad imagination, or appreciation of assets, in our State Government and planning processes. Local amenity: There is simply not enough parking in this area to accommodate the traffic that residential and tourist movement already needs. The Metro will provide some relief but the



## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		public transport infrastructure of the broader city does not allow for enough diversity and linkages to really do the job required. Further, it does not adequately support the needs of older citizens, users with prams, those travelling with limited movement or disability, or those who travel from suburbs and have limited time to spend on public transport (so who turn to cars). This project has already left the population of Sydney poorer. It has been incrementally enlarged and enlarged and enlarged again, eroding public assets for corporate gain. It's no wonder that people think "they" are playing us for mugs. Kind regards
353769	Suzanne Holcombe	I object to the proposal MPO6_0162 Mod 9 for the development of Barangaroo Central in the strongest possible terms. My partner is the owner of unit 701, Observatory Tower, Kent Street and therefore I have a personal interest in the proposal. This however is not the primary reason for my objection. I object as a proud Sydneysider. I have always been aghast that any building has been proposed for the site which should be retained as public parkland. The proposal has structures that ignore the heritage value of the Millers Point and Observatory Hill precinct and destroy the iconic vistas of the area. In years gone by we have seen the same madness proposed for the Rocks area and across the harbour in Lavender Bay. Fortunately common sense prevailed in both instances. I am even more aghast that anyone would even consider putting forward such a second rate proposal along the foreshores of our beautiful city. It is impossible to believe that such a nondescript failure of design would sit on the next headland after our world famous Opera House. Clearly there wasn't a worldwide competition to find an architect. The buildings are grossly oversized and the design is totally unsympathetic with the area. The ill-conceived plan smacks of greedy short term financial gain and fails to demonstrate one jot of appreciation for what will be permanently lost. Instead it will be an eyesore. On a political level the stench of cynicism is breathtaking. Firstly we have had the removal of public housing in the area replaced by the seriously wealthy - at least in that case the heritage footprint was retained. The present government proposal casts aside any of these considerations. Appalling! Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.
354205	Suzanne Meredith	A really disappointing development plan obliterating the outlook from our historic early Sydney and shoehorning in yet more gross overdevelopment with no concept of community.
353965	Suzie Gold	I strongly OBJECT to this application on PUBLIC LAND. &#8252;&#65039;I repeat PUBLIC LAND &#8252;&#65039;I say to Minister Roberts - you must reject this blatant privatisation of PUBLIC LAND
353155	Tamara Davis	Please don't destroy the iconic viewing of the night sky from Sydney Observatory by building Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9), which will obscure the western view from the observatory. Please keep the height of the towers below the skyline so viewing of astronomical objects that are close to the horizon remains possible.
353097	Tanya Dalgleish	I OBJECT to these proposals. I am concerned about the height of the buildings negatively impacting views from other buildings at Millers Point and views of the foreshore from the harbour. I am concerned that Hickson has been reduced in size from the initial plan and if the proposal goes ahead it will be in the shade of the new buildings and heights except between 12 and 2pm. I am concerned about all the extra residential units planned and the impact of all these extra people on transport and traffic which is already a nightmare. I feel that the government has betrayed our trust in allowing this private development to go ahead and then be altered and revised with little consideration of the people of Millers Point.

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352864	Tayebeh Alavi	Reason to object on modification 9 Barangaroo project It is already too hard digesting several high riser developments came up during last few years at Barangaroo. These buildings have blocked almost 90% water views I had from my apartment. Proposed modification 9, makes worst. Please see uploaded image A covering current blocked water view and imaging if modification 9 goes ahead. Impact on general public: - Loss of views from Observatory Park if B Block goes ahead With minor windy days, Barton Road experience high wind & noisy whistle under current exiting buildings. This situation will worst if modification 9 goes ahead About 30% of the Hickson park is lost (Image 1) Barangaroo station will be in shade. The restaurant area is already overpopulated that can not walk during weekends nights. Imagine how worst it will be there by building more apartments at Barangaroo. Create a critical Traffic situation More impact see images 2 & 3 uploaded In view of the above I strongly object to modification 9 that proposing buildings exceeding 25 Meters High and any buildings that impact sunlight into the park along Barton Street.
353113	Terence O'Rourke	I consider the Mod 9 proposal represents a gross over development of the site primarily due to the increase in height of the tower component with its significant impact on the loss of views and detriment to the amenity of this historic neighbourhood. The current modification should not be approved.
353491	Terry Carter	I believe the proposal for Modification 9 is out of character with the original plan for the area. There should be no obstruction from the Observatory Hill to the waterfront. The tower on the north end of the proposal is over size and too high. There should be no more towers overshadowing the public areas in Barangaroo. I request the developers follow the original vision for Barangaroo.
353353	Thomas Lynch	I object. This Government has already ruined what should be a wonderful, public space for the people of Sydney. Barangaroo is a soulless, cold commercial space built solely to promote the profits of private developers and Crown. The public park at the point is lovely, but completely overshadowed by the Casino building, which is perhaps the most disgraceful development in the history of this city. The current proposal continues the shocking overdevelopment of public space. it ruins the view of residents in Millers Point and will cast horrible shadowing over public land. The development must be rejected and the entire space returned to the public, through public park space and community buildings.
353293	Thomas Marchese	We purchased our home in Kent Street Millers Point in 2015 when the NSW Department of Housing sold the public housing. During this process we enquired with McGraths regarding potential future build out of views. We were told 79 Kent Street would NEVER be built out as a precedence for a Heritage line of site view from the Sydney Observatory to the water line from its westerly view. They quoted the court case of the Observatory Hotel wanting to add floors which was rejected based upon this heritage requirement. We therefore purchased our property based on information that we would NEVER lose our views. All of the brochures and marketing showed and quoted Harbour Views and Water Views. We then proceed to spend \$2.2 million dollars on a top to toe renovation, respecting the Heritage guidelines for Millers Point. Brining one of the original homes of Sydney back to its original glory. This includes the widows walk which has 360 degree views of Sydney including to the waterline in the west. So we invested \$5.5 million dollars on our property with the belief based on information for the representatives of NSW Department Of Housing that those views would NEVER be under question. If these views are removed and blocked we will be taking our case to the Land & Environment Court and seeking

**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	Submission
		<p>damages and compensation for the lies we were told upon the sale of our property. The submission by Aqualand is a gross abuse of the previously approved scheme for Barangaroo Central. The increase in floor space and height and bulk and scale is not only illegal as this is not what has been approved, it smells of an underhand deal that has been done between Aqualand and Infrastructure NSW. Aside from our own personal loss, this proposal will have serious negative effects on the Millers Point suburb. No longer will visitors and Sydney siders see the views of the beautiful Heritage suburb of Millers Point from Sydney Harbour. These will be hidden behind a large wall of modern office buildings. The houses on High Street will have a complete removal of privacy and sunlight at various times of the day. The oldest Kindergarten in Sydney will have virtually no sunlight from overshadowing in the afternoons. Traffic which is already choking in Millers Point due to the number of residents vs car spaces will be untenable. The proposal includes very few car spaces for office worker, supermarket shoppers and residents. City residents and workers who flock to Observatory Hill to watch the sunset will no longer be able to experience this vista. they will be met with a residential tower block of apartments as the view. When the Barangaroo precinct was presented to the citizens of NSW. This was never the vision. It was low rise at the northern end with public outdoor event spaces and parks that tied in with the headland. Creating a beautiful connection with nature for all to enjoy. This vision has been decimated with this proposal. Sydney has an oversupply of offices including at Barangaroo South. Do we need this scale of offices and housing at Barangaroo Central? Low lying buildings that maintain the vistas from Observatory Hill , the site of the beautiful Heritage houses from Sydney Harbour and privacy to the existing residents is paramount. This scheme takes away all of these. The great wall of Aqualand should not be approved. It is not in ANY WAY consistent with the approved concept.</p>
353001	Tim Cassidy	<p>This is a gross over development. Once again we are making decisions for short term again that will be regretted in the future.</p>
352737	Tim Gordon	<p>I object to this proposal in the strongest possible terms. The scale of the proposed development is completely inappropriate for the site, it will block views to and from some of Australia's most beautiful and significant sites from a variety of precious public places. It is clearly inconsistent with previous planning approvals and guidelines and is totally contrary to the public interest. Increasing the proposed building heights to 38.2 to 44.5m will have an enormously detrimental effect. Observatory Hill is enjoyed by locals, tourists and daily by the public school students from a diverse socio-economic background at Australia's first public school. The View and Visual Assessment document says of these "lower" buildings that "The lower block obscures a portion of the view to the water of the Harbour, and a portion of the Pymont rideline development, retaining the view to the tall residential towers on Pymont Point and the ANZAC Bridge towers." The idea of "retaining" views to towers is laughable, the view to the harbour is the treasured beauty of Observatory Hill and is a critical condition of planning guidance for the area. Equally the views to the harbour for pedestrians on Kent St are a thing of beauty, enjoyed by countless commuters and visitors. The View and Visual Assessment document describes these as being "Identified as part of an important view from this location in two local heritage studies City Plan Heritage (2006) and Davies (2006)" and that "The location provides a surprising view when walking north along Kent Street, where this may be the first occasion that the observer has been aware of how close they were to the Harbour." Bob Carr said Barangaroo was a "historic opportunity to return a substantial part of Sydney's foreshore back to the people" - when in fact this proposed development is threatening to steal some of the most beautiful views from various public places around the harbour. The proposed tower in particular is an outrage. It will block and</p>

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		dominate the views from, and to, these iconic parts of Sydney. The proposed 73.7m height, is literally more than double the previously approved height and wildly out of context in a historic, low rise area and in front of Observatory Hill. This proposed tower will, amongst any number of issues, overshadow Australia's oldest childcare centre and will destroy views from Observatory Hill, a place of incredible beauty and significance where, by way of example as to its social significance, so many people from all around Sydney have their wedding photos taken. The View and Visual Assessment document describes the tower as "an anomaly in the view creating a disruption to the horizon line. It is seen in high contrast against the skyline, partially removing the view towards of Rozelle and White Bay Power Station." This proposal is an offence to public interest and planning guidelines regarding an area of enormous significance and amenity to all Sydneysiders. I request the commission act upon this proposal which threatens a terrible impact on a precious part of our shared built, natural and cultural heritage.
352820	Tiong Wee	<p>The reasons for my objection to the proposed Mod 9 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Taking away the historical height restriction and by approving the additional building height, the historical The Rock heritage will be destroyed forever. Why do we need to do this? -</li> <li>2. The idea that your are increasing the community used GFA to 2800 is "misleading" as you are taking away "precious green" and open space.</li> <li>3. There is now over-development in this "Rocks precinct", without providing more school places, "open spaces" etc.</li> <li>4. Sydney is one of the most beautiful harbour in the world with different characters - some new some old heritage with character. This new development will block the old heritage buildings with new concrete/steel.glass structure with no character. Are we transforming Sydney to be like Hong Kong or Singapore or Dubai - nothing but concrete jungle.</li> </ol>
352553	Titus Theseira	Dear Officer, I would like to object to the latest modification 9 to barangaroo central by aqualand. The barangaroo development has been plagued by scope creep with backing from big developers without planning controls being considered relevant at all. This is the latest expansion of the plans as of 2022. I object to the tripling of floor space from the approved concept plan. Historic views from observatory hill to the water and shoreline will be obscured. View sharing from a large number of Kent St residents is not considered and largely blocked by this latest expansion. Thankyou, Titus Theseira
353697	Tom Forrest	Submission attached from Urban Taskforce Australia
353723	Tom Rivard	Hi David- Attached please find our submission on the recent Modification to Barangaroo, for consideration in the planning assessment. I would appreciate if you could confirm receipt of this correspondence. Thank you, Tom Rivard Principal - Urban Design Same text as Phil Thalys submission.
353031	Tommy Derek	The proposed reduction of the Hickson park is not desirable. The increased height should not be considered. This area should remain park land.

**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	Submission
353389	Toner Stevenson	<p>The Honourable Anthony John Roberts MP, Minister for Planning and Homes The Honourable James Henry Griffin MP, Minister for Environment and Heritage Dear Honourable Ministers, As a resident of New South Wales, advocate for STEM education and practise, history affiliate with the University of Sydney, past Manager of Sydney Observatory with considerable experience managing other heritage sites and as a NSW resident I object to Concept Plan for Barangaroo (MP06_0162 Mod 9). Objections: - The height of the buildings in Central Barangaroo which block the horizon. As past manager of Sydney Observatory (until 2015) I was promised, and the then Director of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences (MAAS) and the citizens of NSW were promised, that none of the western horizon would be blocked. This promise has been broken under a false and misleading premise that 10 degrees above the horizon is not used for astronomy purposes. - The blocking of historic sight lines between the harbour and historic Timeball on Sydney Observatory. - The blocking of sightlines that relate to pre-colonial Indigenous Heritage. This modification has state, national and international impacts. Sydney Observatory is as significant to NSW, Australia and beyond as is the Royal Observatory Greenwich (ROG) to the people of the UK and beyond. A building that blocked the views from ROG would not be approved. Modification 9 specifically impacts - All generations to come. This Modification denies future generations the opportunity to view historically significant events as they set in the west. STEMM education - Sydney Observatory is a fundamental part of the education of many (over 10,000 each year) school children in the city, regional and rural NSW, as well as scout and girl guide groups. This modification shows disregard for the educational values and STEMM initiatives. Thousands of school children witnessed a transit of Venus from Sydney Observatory- this was a memorable event when the Sun sank on the western horizon. - The preservation of Nationally and Internationally significant heritage. Sydney Observatory is well-known internationally. Papers about Sydney Observatory are part of a UK based program initiated at Royal Observatory Greenwich about Observatories and natters such as the preservation of historical sightlines. Errors in the heritage and environmental assessments There are significant errors and inaccurate assumptions in regard to viewing the sky below 10 degrees above the horizon in Appendix G of the report titled "Central Barangaroo - Sydney Observatory Sky View Impact Assessment", dated 7 July 2021, prepared by Unisearch (UNSW) (reference UN59699). Appendix F is based on erroneous Appendix G It is most unfortunate that GML Heritage, a highly respectable company, has relied on erroneous reports as a basis for Appendix F: Heritage assessment and impact statement. Appendix G disregards and is erroneous because: - Many important astronomical events are viewed below 10 degrees above the horizon. In the location of the sky to be affected by the new Barangaroo Central tower western and setting views of the Sun, Moon, planets, comets and even the International Space Station would be blocked significantly. - Events like eclipses, planetary transits across the Sun, as well as planetary and lunar conjunctions may well be obstructed. - To lose these viewing opportunities for several months of the year is an unacceptable loss for our generation and generations to come. - Most amateur astronomy and special event viewings use telescopes on the ground from the north, south and western sides of Sydney Observatory. - The Gadigal People of the Eora Nation used their observations to track the seasons. The ability to track the Sun and Moon as they set throughout the year is destroyed from the highest natural point in Sydney (Sydney Observatory) by the increased height of this proposed building modification. Errors in the social impact assessment I object to the report by PWC as erroneous and inadequate in its assessment and written without full consideration of the existing and future loss of cultural and social benefits caused by the height of Modification 9. Appendix J disregards: - The loss of tourism due to the negative impact of Modificaiton 9 on Sydney Observatory and Observatory Hill. There are plenty of retail oppourtunities in southern Barangaroo and the Rocks. The tourism on Observatory Hill is unique and irreplaceable. -</p>

**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	Submission
		The loss of indigenous and post-invasion culture by Modification 9. - The loss of educational opportunities due to modification 9. NSW Heritage adds to the economy and reputation of our State Whilst tall towers and buildings can generate income it is important to quantify the and support the economic importance of heritage. Sydney Observatory and Observatory Hill are important cultural and tourism contributors. Many voters such as myself want to be proud of our heritage and the way our State Government manages and cares for the culture of our state. This is always at risk of developments such as Modification 9 Central Barangaroo, Yours sincerely Toner Dr Toner Stevenson Honorary affiliate, History, the University of Sydney Previous Manager Sydney Observatory (2003 to 2015) Vice President and past President Sydney City Skywatchers Email: tste4134@uni.sydney.edu.au
352979	Tony Clarke	The development will destroy the history of the area in the rocks and Millers point. Views from Observatory hill, office and residential buildings will be lost. The photos of the development are misleading and try to minimise the size. The new plan trebles the floor area of the original proposal. I can see absolutely no benefits and many detrimental features.
353143	Tony Wright	As a resident of Millers Point for 20 years I have watched with horror as the harbour side strip of land government gazetted to be part of a "working harbour" promised by Bob Carr when NSW Premier has been lost to the people of Sydney to rapacious developers in league with state government planners easily manipulated. The further erosion of public land and destruction of sights lines through to the harbour has left the historic Millers Point precinct without the character that makes it historically so important a part of Sydney and its history.
353111	Tracey Clancy	Sydney has enough monuments to corruption. We don't need any more.
353895	Trisha Dean	I object to the development proposal for Central Barangaroo, which has been significantly changed since 2007. The approvals were unacceptable at the time. The height, mass and floor space of proposed buildings will further dominate the Darling Harbour, Barangaroo foreshore and diminish amenity for visitors and residents of Sydney. The proposed concept modification diminishes expansive views from Observatory Hill and Millers Point. It severs the maritime relationship of historic Millers Point with the water. It also blocks public views of the Harbour Bridge from Pymont Peninsula and Pirrama Park. The proposal is not consistent with the Statement of Commitments issued for the Barangaroo Development and is not consistent with the Sydney Harbour Regional Environmental Plan requirements for the protection of public views. It is also is not consistent with the policies in the Sydney Harbour Bridge Conservation Management Plan, for the protection of public iconic views. It also does not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill or Millers Point. As a resident of Sydney, I am a regular visitor to Millers Point, The Rocks and Barangaroo with family, friends and visitors from interstate and overseas. What we need more of in the area is public open space and vegetation. Since COVID the outdoor amenity needs to be increased - not decreased - more parkland for Barangaroo precinct and spaces for workers and residents alike to enjoy the water- not more buildings. Please review this proposal in accordance with the health and well-being and the preservation of the heritage values of our beautiful city.
354221	Uwe Kramer	I am writing on behalf of the owners corporation of 1-13 Grafton Street, Balmain. No 1 Grafton Street is a 28 unit residential waterfront apartment block on Cameron Cove next to the Water Police with gun barrel views into Barangaroo. The proposed changes will block views to the historic landmark of Observatory Hill and to the significant Millers Point precinct. The bulk and scale and the visual impact of the changes are completely out of proportion and do not only impact

## MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		the view from No 1 Grafton Street, Ewington Park and the wider Balmain peninsula but also the views from Observatory Hill and Millers point residences into historic Balmain. The proposed modification to the Concept do not respect the heritage significance of Observatory Hill and Millers Point. As an owners corporation we object on behalf of our 28 unit holders to the proposed changes of the development .
352757	Valerie Mills	This is supposed to be public land and the reduction in public space is ridiculous. The Cutaway at Barangaroo does not count as public space - it is only open for a few large events and it is cold and damp! Barangaroo and the waterfront is for everyone - not just those who buy offices and expensive apartments.
353481	Vicki Wakeling	I've never made a submission before, but I've been increasingly distressed by what has been happening at Barangaroo. I've tried to find information, but there's been a lot of secrecy over the past few years. Today I've read about the latest developments - and I'm appalled. Where's the beach? Where's the public access/park on the waterfront? How come these proposed buildings are so high? There's nothing here similar to the initial plans. Most access to the harbour - and the views from Millers Point - have been removed. Please don't approve this travesty. This land is owned by the people of NSW - don't give it away to developers and private companies, and exclude us from enjoying the pleasure and beauty of the harbour.
352703	Vittorio Brescia	To whom it may concern, We are writing to you in regards to the Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9). We have reviewed the plans and documents provided and have put together the following summary of our concerns. The proposed concept plan does not fit with the established character of the area and is considered out of context for the locality. The proposed concept plan results in a total obstruction of the existing view that we currently enjoy, we were promised that it will never be built out when we purchased our home in a good faith from Aqualand. After paying a hefty premium for the view we worry that we will suffer a substantial financial loss if the concept plan goes ahead. We hope that common sense will prevail.
353569	Warrick Dobbie	I object in particular to the tall building proposed for the northern end of Barangaroo Central. This building completely disregards the existing building alignment for tall buildings at the northern end of the CBD. It is an unsympathetic outlier which will completely block existing harbour views to the west to and from the public park at Observatory Hill. Private interests for short term profit should not prevail over existing public rights. The increase in height of shorter buildings should also not be permitted as they will further obscure views of the harbour from public green spaces. The 2007 plan should be maintained.
353861	Wayne Olling	This is a monstrous proposal. I object to it. There should be green space in this location rather than exploiters of public land making a fast buck out of the public's Sydney Harbour Foreshores.
353705	Wendy Bacon	I very strongly object to this proposal.  1. I am strongly apposed to approval being given to a proposal that overrides previous agreements. The fact that this has happened in the past should not be used to further diminish the original concept for the site.

MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
		<p>2. I do not think that the proponent's claims for the economic potential for the site are warranted. I note that these claims are contested by other planners who have no doubt submitted their own objections. I personally know of small food businesses nearby that tell me they are only back to 60% of pre Covid levels. Not so many people are coming to the CBD for work on five days a week and this trend will continue. This proposal may in fact put others out of work. Even allowing for the Metro Traffic coming into the retail section, it would not surprise me if many of these retails spaces take years to open and that eventually it becomes a desolate place as has occurred at the Harbourside Development on the other side of Darling Harbour.</p> <p>3. We do not need more luxury apartments in Inner Sydney. We need affordable housing. Why should the public interest be overridden by the desire of a few people to profit out of a few other rich people getting spectacular private views. This is the opposite to what a project that was supposed to prioritise public and community interests should be about.</p> <p>4. I am very strongly opposed to the bulky buildings including one of 20 stories. These buildings will block public views that have been there for people to use and enjoy for thousands of years. Crown Casino already interrupts the view but this should definitely not be used as an excuse to further destroy the wonderful views from Observatory point. 4. There is insufficient provision for community buildings and spaces. The open ended situation at the Cutaway should certainly not be used as an excuse for the lack of community spaces.</p> <p>5. I have looked at the developers' promotional video. I do not think so many hard surfaces are suitable for this site. It looks like every other development with none of the imagination or flare that I would expect on such an iconic site.</p> <p>6. I think the heritage values in this area should be prioritised not trashed. I urge you to consider and adopt the National Trust submission. 7. There is huge opposition to this proposal including from local community organisations, leading architects, the City of Sydney, local MPs who are responding to the concerns of their constituents, heritage groups and the National Trust. DPE should listen and respond to these voices.</p>
353719	wendy Harmer	<p>The proposed development is a flagrant disregard of not only the existing concepts, plans and statements of commitment for this site, but also of the wishes of those in wider Sydney, like me, who value the history of this precinct. It's here where all Australians can view and understand the beginnings and nature of Colonial settlement. It is precious to ALL Australians, not just those who can afford to take in the vista from enclaves of private development. Once again favouring the private over public, which seems to be this government's modus operandi. This is vandalism. Disrespectful to our heritage and MUST not proceed.</p>
354119	William Chan	<p>Dear David, On behalf of Councillor William Chan, please find attached his Letter of Objection to the Modification 9 amendments to the Concept Plan for Central Barangaroo. Kind regards, Melissa Hoang Office of Councillor HY William Chan</p>
353099	William Lai	<p>Please kindly refer to attached objection issues on captioned modification plans. Our petition for your re-consideration for the livelihood of the residents in the area ! Obligated in gratitude for your favorable decision. Best regards, William LAI, Resident in Barangaroo.</p>



MP06\_0162 MOD 9 - Public Submissions

**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	Submission
352721	William Marynissen	<p>I object to the proposed Barangaroo Concept Plan (Mod 9) I have reviewed the plans and find the concept plan completely inappropriate in a number of aspects;</p> <p>* The blocking of views to and from the Millers Point precinct, these views are iconic and have been so carefully guarded by various planning and heritage authorities for this reason. One of the last remaining Harbour Vistas that show a well preserved part of our city's heritage. These views are considered so valuable that when we renovated we were not even allowed to have a skylight on the northern side of our roof because it clashed with the preservation of the optics of Millers point from various vantage points across the harbour.</p> <p>* The significant over shadowing and detrimental impact to Solar access of buildings along High Street. Walking there last week the impact on the Kindergarten - KU Lance Childrens centre, struck me as being devastating for the kids and staff. The residents in High street being completely blocked also. Residents of Millers Point have controls imposed on the use of skylights and now they are facing a proposal that would allow someone to virtually take the sky away!</p> <p>* The blocking of the iconic views to and from Observatory Hill are another indication of the grotesque scale and bulk of this proposed development. This much loved part of our Harbour and History must not be blocked by a modern development that is being contemplated simply for short term budget reasons.</p> <p>* if you have spent any time in South Barangaroo you will have noticed the extreme wind vortexes that occur as Harbour winds get concentrated In the streets and alleys. Allowing the massive over development that is proposed will have horrendous consequences for residents, the KU Lance centre and tourists. This will turn our neighbourhood into a dark hurricane alley. Lowering temperatures and light will severely impact the amenity of residents and the community</p> <p>* I object to the usurping of this public space, Harbourside space at that, and Hickson Park for private use. The opportunity to maximise this area for public recreational use is irreplaceable and shouldn't be subjugated to private interests and budget expediency. The area should be preserved for current and future public recreation and a counterbalance to the existing built environment and a transition to Barangaroo Headland I implore you to reject the Concept Plan ( Mod 9) in its entirety as a gross over development and an a miss use of a irreplaceable public asset</p>
353959	Yasmin Powell	The Barangaroo and Millers point area is a beloved area by myself and many others, to block such a special view would be a travesty
353095	yi u key ho	i do not believe it fits the present environment
353345	Yue ya Zhuo	It's detrimental to the neighbourhood