

From: no-reply@planning.nsw.gov.au on behalf of [Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment](#)
To: [DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy
Date: Thursday, 10 September 2020 11:58:49 AM
Attachments: [pyrmont-peninsula-place-strategy-submission.docx](#)

Submitted on Thu, 10/09/2020 - 11:55

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

Gregory

Last name

Roberts

Council name

{Empty}

Council email

{Empty}

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

Mona Vale, Sydney, 2103

Submission file

[pyrmont-peninsula-place-strategy-submission.docx](#)

Submission

Gregory Blaxland Roberts, OAM, [REDACTED]

I agree to the above statement

Yes

{Empty}

Submission

Directions for the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy

Below I respond to the 10 draft suggestions:-

1 Development that complements or enhances the area

Agree with the essence of this

However, new development, including taller buildings, raises the serious questions – how tall, how many, and how will they enhance the area?

Plus where are they located? – how close to the foreshore?

Good Urban planning says that tall buildings should be located away from the foreshore, and in a place that doesn't throw shadows on the buildings behind (a principle disregarded over in South Barangaroo which has resulted in an awful mess, with a huge casino allowed to be built on Public Land)

Let's not have this situation in Pymont.

I'm not sure how they would be 'designed to enhance Pymont's dynamic, interesting and intimate places'. One would think they would be out of character.

2 Jobs and industries of the future

Set the stage for the industries of the future – the jobs will follow.

But let's be very aware – ½ the jobs of the future could be remote, so we won't need towering buildings

Let's ensure we don't stuff up Pymont as has been done with Barangaroo South .

3 Centres for residents, workers and visitors

Agree, but subject to further information

4 A unified planning framework

Agree

5 A tapestry of greener public spaces and experiences

Sounds good – as long as there is a least 30 metres of walkway/parkland along the foreshore, plus retention of any existing parkland/s.

Wentworth park will be a wonderful addition.

Again, good urban design says that buildings, especially bigger ones, should be well back not like not like the dreadful situation that was allowed to happen in South Barangaroo, with the casino given Public Land to build the massive, out of context structure close to the foreshore.

6 Creativity, culture and heritage

Agree with all of this

Plus, let's not forget the critically important Powerhouse Museum, now to be retained.

7 Making it easier to move around

Totally agree.

The light rail system should make it even better.

8 Building now for a sustainable future

Sounds good

Sustainability should be a key driver in the future of this area and, yes, careful retention and re use of the existing buildings to retain the character

9 Great homes that can suit the needs of more people

Agree, and let's have Social housing that is excellent design, clever Architecture, and economical, with a high degree of Sustainability – not the usual cheap, crappy stuff.

10 A collaborative voice

Agree, as long as large out-of-context unit buildings, as was originally planned by the Government, ie. knocking down the Powerhouse Museum.

The research said that the people wanted this Internationally known and respected Museum retained.

Conclusion

If you accomplish all of these 10 points, together with comments, such as the ones I have made, then we will end up with a very attractive, characterful area, where people can visit and stay in what they will be aware is an historic part of Sydney

They will stay in moderate price accommodation – not in huge glitzy hermetically sealed buildings, having no feeling for the essence of Sydney

It will be equivalent to the interesting out of the way places in England and the Continent

An area of great quality and interest!

I look forward to seeing the next stage of the development.

Greg Roberts OAM

The Star Casino

Having said all of the above, I ask – why is the Star Casino not addressed in this opportunity to make a submission? I realise it is under State protection.

However it is the subject that seems to have annoyed most people – including me.

This proposed building does not fit any of the criteria expressed in the 10 points

It is totally arrogant of the Government to come along and agree for the Star organisation to plonk a completely unacceptable building into the Pyrmont area. This is being treated just like the casino at Barangaroo – and look at what happened – a building totally out of context, jammed into Public Space, right on the waterfront, regardless of what people thought.

Government must open this building to serious public scrutiny, as happened before when it was rejected, but now following the same criteria as expressed in the 10 Points above,.

Just to knock off a few floors, as we have been told, is a cavalier attitude in the extreme

It suggests that the Government is more interested in facilitating and promoting gambling, just as with the Barangaroo casino

I look forward to advice on this matter

Greg Roberts

Gregory Blaxland Roberts, OAM, [REDACTED]