

**From:** [no-reply@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:no-reply@planning.nsw.gov.au) on behalf of [Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment](#)  
**To:** [DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy  
**Date:** Thursday, 6 August 2020 3:10:01 PM

---

Submitted on Thu, 06/08/2020 - 15:08

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

**Submission Type**

I am making a personal submission

## Name

**First name**

Bruce

**Last name**

Hunter

**Council name**

{Empty}

**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 applaud the NSW Government Pyrmont Place Strategy July 2020 on its 10 Directions and 5 Big

Moves to make Pyrmont a “place for people to call home and a place that celebrates and enables what people love best”.

I feel that this needs to ensure that development in the area fully supports and complements:

1. Public Housing (this is a key part of the Pymont community)
2. Affordable Housing (affordability will worsen in the area so key workers must be supported)
3. Heritage terrace houses (development must not be at the loss of the area's history)
4. Small community business (must not be lost with development of large facilities)
5. Sustainable high technology industries

I also applaud the decision to keep the Powerhouse Museum in place as a vital component of the areas entertainment and culture. Its unique and valuable technical exhibitions and collections support the innovation and technology initiative of this plan.

This plan also provides a strong and overlooked opportunity to tangibly recognise our First Nation People's history in Pymont. There should be physical representations of their activity in this area prior to being disposed in the early colony.

In the Framework for key sites, I am concerned that this promotes the previously rejected Star Casino residential tower which was considered by the Independent Planning Commission as having: a "scale... not justified under... context of the site...; and "height, bulk and scale that do not represent good design in the context of the surrounding built environment and results in unacceptable visual impacts".

I cannot see how this development would support the plan's "Direction 2, development that complement and enhances the area". Even if the 237 metre tower is replaced by two shorter towers (south 180m and north 60m) as intimated in the special conditions, I can't see how these contribute enough public benefit to warrant ignoring Direction 2.

**I agree to the above statement**

Yes

{Empty}