

From: [kyrsty.macdonald](#)
To: [DPE CSE Pyrmont Peninsula Mailbox](#)
Cc: [OLG - Sydney City Council](#); [kyrsty.macdonald](#); [Jamie Parker MP](#); [clover@clovermoore.com.au](#); [jscully@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au](#); [lscott@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au](#); [Tanya Plibersek](#); [Rob Stokes](#); [willoughby@parliament.nsw.gov.au](#)
Subject: Pyrmont Peninsula
Date: Sunday, 13 September 2020 11:26:41 PM

Dear Planners Involved,

SOME REASONS WHY WHAT IS PLANNED FOR THE PENINSULA IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE AND MUST BE REVIEWED.

There are many reasons why you should not seek to carry out the current proposals for the Pyrmont Peninsula without considerable modification. The current Fish Market which still has historical charm was intentionally allowed to fall into disrepair. It now does need an upgrade but especially in the current climate does not need three huge towers: I understand it is proposed to be 45 storeys in the case of two and the third being even higher. It is unbridled greed as well as being the plan of people with no sense of beauty or scale

As much of this is being done to appease Star City Casino, it is extraordinary that we now have a state which has the highest access to gambling options of any where in the world. This in itself is socially shameful. With the building of Barangaroo and Star City Towers we seem to be trying to increase the options and to bring in high rollers from elsewhere in the world to benefit. I might point out that high rollers from China may not be able to come in in the current climate or in the foreseeable future.

That aside, as a long time resident of Glebe living on the hitherto quiet hill side facing the fish markets for 40 years, there are many environmental problems to solve. Firstly the contamination of the bay. Then will be traffic congestion in both the build and the projected 100% increase of traffic predicted for Bridge Road. This and parking in our residential streets as well as a huge pressure on our green space presages an unacceptable loss of amenity.

Speculative development has got a very poor record in the City of Sydney (it is not alone) and this can be shelved home to Compliance Certification being outsourced from the council and placed in the hands of firms employed by the developers. That in itself is a clear conflict of interest especially as the size of these developments means they are done through the State Government auspices and not the Council which has established guidelines in sympathy with the residents. Presumably if the Developers and Certifiers fail to do their jobs the project will be too large to fail and through the auspices of our State Government the taxpayers will pick up the tab.

The other loss of amenity is having a new shopping precinct- it is suggested that the 'new' Fish Markets will be a shopping mall serving customers for 24 hours a day. That is an extraordinarily poor outcome. First there is the issue of noise which is amplified by the shape of the waterway. It will be a problem in daytime but even more intrusive at night.

Secondly the residents of Glebe would seek to protect the livelihood and vibrancy

of Glebe Point Road. Retail Sydney- wide was in difficulty even before the Pandemic drove people to change some of their shopping habits but community needs to enjoy its commercial interactions for it to continue to exist. Placing unbridled competition so close to Glebe Point Road is extraordinarily harmful. Can you also note that the glorified shopping and eating area, aimed primarily at visitors, if it follows current trends will, without a strong presence of Chinese tourists, find it difficult to make the kind of profits their forward financial estimates presumably predicted. Past experience will suggest that the developers will choose to economise when building on materials and architectural beauty. They may well request even higher towers.

Glebe has always been famous for social housing. It is one of the excellent levers in this community. Including and serving disadvantaged inhabitent which has provided a far more balanced less greedy element in the social interactions here as well as providing a wealth of other benefits. It is missing from the mix proposed. This needs to be rectified.

Whist I do not know what submissions you have had from Glebe Secondary College I cannot feel that its co- location with the new development a desirable one and think that it too needs great thought and careful planning and management to minimise poor educational outcomes.

You have a chance to stop or more realistically modify your plans. It is a matter of urgency. There are many elements to address and lock in before you let the development proceed. PLEASE DO SO. and in your reply address my reservations.

Thank you.

Kyrsty Macdonald



Glebe 2037

|
|

.

.