

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy
Date: Monday, 31 August 2020 10:42:58 AM

From: no-reply@planning.nsw.gov.au <no-reply@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Sunday, 30 August 2020 1:07 PM
To: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox <eplanning.exhibitions@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy

Submitted on Sun, 30/08/2020 - 13:06

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

Janine

Last name

Chrichley

Council name

Sydney

Council email

{Empty}

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

Pyrmont 2009

Submission file

{Empty}

Submission

I cannot understand the insistence in the draft Pyrmont Place Strategy in increasing the number and heights of new residential and business buildings in and around the suburb. Pyrmont is already one of highest-density

populations in Sydney and Australia and increased density reaching high into the sky is not necessary for the future of the suburb to those of us who call it our home.

Pymont is already realising its potential as a wonderful place to live and work, which will not be enhanced by high-rise tower blocks of luxury apartments that will skew the balance away from the current happy mix of luxury abodes with ordinary homes and social housing.

Surely COVID-19 is causing us to re-think workplaces and high-rise, high-density places to live that have proven to be areas of risk during a pandemic.

Where will all the inhabitants of the high-rise apartment blocks send their children to school, park their cars, do their exercise, do their supermarket shopping?

Already Pymont's skyline and outlook has been ruined by the new tower built at Darling Harbour and the awful and unnecessary casino being built at Barangaroo. The planned towers at Harbourside, The Star and the Sydney Fish Market site will further blight the skyline and overshadow more buildings and public areas, ruining the suburb for those of us that have called Pymont our home for many years, and spoiling the qualities of the suburb that attracted us in the first place.

Very close to the rear of the modest apartment block where my home is, there is already a dense development under construction that blocks sunlight from my building and brings the new homes uncomfortably close to my building with windows and roof terraces that look into our bedrooms and with roof heights that block our view of the sky and access to the light. Light and privacy were factors which were some of the attractions of my apartment when I purchased it in 2010.

It is difficult not to interpret the preoccupation of building high-rise luxury apartment and office towers as greed on the part of developers taking advantage of Pymont's proximity to the city and the harbour, when actually what we clearly need is social housing that enables more essential workers to be able to live in affordable housing close to their places of work, and for more housing to be found for the homeless to remove them from the streets and provide safe and healthy accommodation. Hasn't COVID-19 made us appreciate our essential workers more than ever, and see the need to remove the vulnerable from the streets and into housing where they can be safe and have the opportunity to prosper.

The draft strategy talks of Pymont's potential to sparkle like a jewel, but if the strategy is allowed to be realised, there won't be enough light for anything or anyone to sparkle. We'll all be overshadowed by ridiculous eyesores of tower blocks that will ruin Pymont's appeal as a liveable suburb with a unique character and charm that is close to the city but also far enough away to give the feeling of light and space with ready access to the harbour and green spaces.

I believe the strategy needs re-thinking in light of recent events and in consideration of Pymont residents who do not wish to be increasingly crowded in our suburb by being inundated by over-sized buildings. I welcome the ideas about increasing business and economic opportunities, but not at the expense of quality of life, both in lifestyle and in architectural aesthetic value.

I agree to the above statement

Yes

{Empty}