

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox](#)
To: [DPE CSE Pyrmont Peninsula Mailbox](#)
Subject: FW: DPIE Contact Us form - Enquiry from Mark Stapleton Ref ID: 20200913234848
Date: Monday, 14 September 2020 7:30:38 AM

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Name: Mark Stapleton

Email address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

Post code: 2037

Your enquiry is about: Policy and legislation

Enquiry details:

Project Leader Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy Department of Planning, Industry and Environment Locked Bag 5022 Parramatta NSW 2124

<https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/Pyrmont> Dear Project Leader The Glebe Society is pleased to provide feedback on the draft Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy. We understand that the draft strategy has been developed to 'enable a transformation that unlocks innovation and investment to create the jobs of the future, while celebrating the rich heritage and charm of the peninsula.' The Glebe Society understands that the envelope of the 'Pyrmont Peninsula- only contains a part of the Glebe community. 1. PRELIMINARY COMMENTS The Glebe Society is an incorporated body with a current financial membership over 430 and a wide sphere of influence among members of our local community. We have a 51-year history of community activism and advocacy from the perspective of our three core pillars: environment, heritage and community. The Glebe Society is not opposed to development, but is strongly supportive of good planning that gives appropriate precedence to the public good over private profit – especially when development is on publicly-owned land - and which respects the amenity of surrounding communities and the significance of all aspects of place. We are centrally focussed on our local Glebe community but are not insular in our perspective and have worked closely with the Ultimo/Pyrmont and other community organisations and the City of Sydney Council for many years. We have been deeply engaged in consultation and advocacy in relation to the redevelopment of the Bays Precinct for decades and in recent years have actively participated in the various iterations of Bays Precinct 'community reference' groups established by NSW governments to provide community input into this strategic planning agenda. This has not been without its frustrations. This submission will be the fourth one we have made in the last two years in response to proposals/inquiries relating to Pyrmont/Ultimo/Glebe and the surrounding Bays. We are always hopeful that reasonable and strongly supported community views, including ours, will be reflected in subsequent Government decision making. Sadly, the community has had limited success on this front in the Bays context in recent times. Nonetheless, we offer our considered views on the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy (PPPS) with continued hope they will be given serious consideration and will be reflected in the next steps of this planning process for the peninsula and its Bays. In summary there are significant positives in this draft strategy which we do support in relation to objectives, improved planning processes and some of the specific development proposals. However, we are deeply concerned about some of the non-explicit objectives that sit behind the strategy and the likely implications for the Pyrmont / Ultimo and Glebe communities if these are objectives are realised. Likewise we have some concerns that the loosening of planning controls and some proposed processes could undermine effective controls and facilitate ad hoc proposals and overdevelopment. We do consider it is possible to achieve many of the Strategy's positive objectives and to greatly improve the planning framework and process as broadly proposed but only if the Government reconsiders its most contentious planned developments that are either explicit in the PPPS, or are implied in the background. The Glebe Society's engagement is with the full scope of the PPPS but we have focussed our detailed analysis on the likely implications for Blackwattle Bay and its foreshores and Wentworth Park and its surrounds. We have discussed the PPPS in detail with the Pyrmont/Ultimo community groups and where appropriate we have formally

supported their analyses and recommendations on a number of issues in this submission. If necessary, the Glebe Society will campaign on those matters as well as those specifically relating to Glebe developments.

2. PLANNING PRINCIPLES

Our approach has been guided by key planning principles developed collectively by community, industry and government players over a series of consultative processes around the Bays Precinct in recent years. Of particular relevance are:

- priority of public good over private interest in development of publicly owned foreshore sites
- no unsolicited development proposals for publicly owned sites
- opening of the foreshores and heads of bays to public access
- no further alienation of publicly owned foreshores -including 99-year leases
- integrated transport / traffic planning preceding residential and other development
- prior /simultaneous provision of relevant social infrastructure
- affordable / social housing provision as a significant proportion of any residential development
- strong environmental values
- strong community and heritage values

The PPPS fails to deliver on numbers of these key planning principles in various contexts. This submission makes recommendations that will better align the draft strategy with these principles - and especially in relation to the protection of the public good over private interests.

3. INTEGRATED PLANNING

Integrated strategic planning, rather than the ad hoc one-off 'arrangements' that typified development decisions, was a core aspiration for the redevelopment of the Bays Precinct under both Labor and Coalition Governments until the demise of Urban Growth NSW and its vision. In recent times the Government reverted to the fragmented one-off planning mode with key decisions being made without consultation or any reference to an integrated planning framework. The most significant of which was the Government's announcement that the new Sydney Fish Market would be built on the head of Blackwattle Bay. The Glebe Society strongly supported a new and upgraded fish market, but we considered the chosen location to be a bad choice for a range of reasons – including the technical challenges (and therefore hugely increased construction costs of \$749 million), the major traffic and congestion problems particular to the site and the loss of the expected community access to the head of the bay foreshore with the departure of Hanson's Cement plant. This decision necessitated the widely opposed decision to relocate the Blackwattle Bay Marina (All Occasion Cruises) to a Bank Street site contrary to existing proposals for the site in the then Bay Precinct Transformation Plan 2015. This decision was also made as a one-off without any prior community consultation.

4. THE PPPS PLANNING FRAMEWORK

In June this year, community groups were deeply frustrated at having to respond to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Scenarios proposed by one part of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment without knowing what was being proposed for the rest of the Pyrmont peninsula by another part of the Department. It is therefore a positive that this Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy (PPPS) does now provide the community with a preliminary overview strategy for the whole Peninsula including the Blackwattle Bay sub-precinct – although the BB Scenarios and the PPPS appear to have been drafted quite separately. As is mandated, the PPPS provides a cursory description of its points of alignment with both City of Sydney and State strategic planning priorities including its key responses to the findings of the hastily produced Report of the Greater Sydney Commission on the Western Harbour Precinct including the Pyrmont Peninsula, and its general consistency with the NSW 2040 Economic Blueprint and City of Sydney plans including the draft Central Sydney Planning Strategy and the City Plan 2036. The passing reference to the 15 state and CoS local plans and policies as well as the 7 planning instruments with 'overlapping and potentially

confusing' controls which are relevant to the Peninsula go a long way to demonstrating the need to streamline the approach to planning. A 'unified planning framework' as recommended by the Greater Sydney Commission is one of the 10 Directions shaping this draft planning strategy. We agree with much of the explanation of this framework set out on pages 31 and pp 83-4. It correctly identifies "a complex layering of planning authorities and frameworks' as the source of confusion and uncertainty for community and business. It proposes three 'Considerations' for achieving the unified framework: • Consideration 1: Set a state significant planning framework for key sites identified in the Place Strategy • Consideration 2: Set a consistent planning regime for the Pyrmont Peninsula that responds to the appropriate planning authority and reduces complexity • Consideration 3: Explore the review of State planning instruments where layering of development is unnecessarily complex and can be better managed by the City of Sydney. We agree with numbers 2 and 3. We strongly support the proposal in relation to Consideration 3 "to explore opportunities to return planning controls in the precinct to the City of Sydney and allow them to be integrated into a single instrument." (p 84). We have concerns about Consideration 1. In the long struggle between community and various governments to constrain, or remove, political interference in planning decisions once the statutory controls and rules are set through a democratic process, the emergence of excessive discretionary ministerial planning powers via designation of numerous sites as having state significance has been a major problem in the NSW planning system. It is undemocratic, it opens the way to corruption and bad planning decisions. As Blackwattle Bay is already a site of state significance it leaves the community with no legal constraints on the Government's development plans. A key objective of the PPPS is clearly to remove or loosen planning controls to accommodate some of the key proposed developments: Meeting these ambitions will necessitate changes in terms of land use zones and building height and density. (p84)' The proposal under this consideration would identify key sites as state significant precincts. It is difficult to assess the precise implications of this proposal and how this proposed flexibility for these key sites would work in practice. The significance will be linked to the expansiveness of the specified maximums for height, density, etc. It may be that the next iteration in this PPPS process and the development of master plans for the key sites might bring more clarity. We, of course, support the centrality of the PPPS's 'strategic, place-based approach that was recommended by the Greater Sydney Commission. This is not a new approach. The City of Sydney has been doing it for decades and it has long been the central demand of community groups for integrated strategic planning for the Bays Precinct. Urban Growth was committed to place-based planning. We consider it particularly appropriate for this strategic 'revitalisation' agenda – if implemented with integrity it can act as a constraint against ad-hoc development proposals and developers seeking to exploit spot rezonings. However, at this stage not a great deal in recent planning experience with the NSW Government would inspire community confidence in the integrity of the process. Recommendation 1. The Glebe Society supports the PPPS's incorporation of a precinct-wide, place-based approach in the planning of the revitalisation of the Pyrmont Peninsula including Blackwattle Bay and Wentworth Park and surrounds. Recommendation 2. The Glebe Society supports the PPPS's proposal to create a unified planning system to encourage coordination and collaboration between state and local agency roles. Recommendation 3. The Glebe Society supports the proposal to set a consistent planning regime for the Pyrmont Peninsula as set out in Consideration 2. Recommendation 4. The Glebe Society

supports the proposal to explore the removal of unnecessary complexity imposed by State development controls by returning controls to the City of Sydney and a single instrument as set out in Consideration 3. Recommendation 5: The Glebe Society has concerns about the possible negative implications of the proposal to set a state significant planning framework for key sites in the Place Strategy – as set out in Consideration 1. It could function to facilitate ad hoc and over-development proposals. At this stage we do not support this proposal.

5. DRIVERS AND OBJECTIVES

The PPPS is explicit that its primary objectives and drivers are economic. Its key driver is, as directed by the Greater Sydney Commission, “to unlock the economic potential of the Pyrmont Peninsula”. (p18) Central to this is the objective of: “positioning Pyrmont to be an attractor for global investment, driven by the connectivity of the Peninsula to Sydney’s CBD, complementing and strengthening its position as a place at the cutting edge of the future of work....” ‘Jobs and industries of the future’ is the number 1 ‘Direction’ shaping the approach of the PPPS. The Glebe Society accepts that these are appropriate and potentially beneficial objectives - with a very large caveat. This priority objective must be balanced with other social and heritage values and must improve not undermine the amenity of the existing communities. There is strong community apprehension in Glebe, as well as Pyrmont and Ultimo, that the Government’s agenda behind the PPPS is seriously distorted towards economic objectives and has already determined that Pyrmont/Ultimo and Blackwattle Bay are de facto part of the CBD with all that may entail re appropriate future development. The origin of this PPPS is tied to the Premier’s concern at the refusal of planning approval for the proposed Star Casino tower. She has subsequently been very clear as to her intention: “We have successfully transformed Barangaroo into a spectacular waterfront precinct....” “Pyrmont is the next frontier”. Minister Stokes has made reassuring statements: “Some say that Pyrmont is a village, some say it is an extension to the CBD. I reckon Pyrmont is both of these things and more” (p3) “We can support larger-scale development and maintain the unique heritage nature of Pyrmont it is not an ‘either or choice.’” We don’t agree that Pyrmont is an extension of the CBD - nor is Glebe. They are inner city communities adjoining / close to the CBD. We do agree that a balanced outcome between ‘larger scale development’ and the maintenance of “the unique heritage nature of Pyrmont’ and other sites is possible. The problem the Glebe Society has, is that many of the actual proposals in the PPPS do not deliver on this optimistic scenario. For this PPPS to gain community support, key proposals in relation to high rise development and population density will have to be curtailed and provision of open space and social infrastructure expanded. As it stands there is justifiable concern in the community that the underlying agenda is to break the zoning constraints on building height and density to allow construction of mega-towers and much higher density commercial and residential development.

Recommendation 6: The Glebe Society does not support a development perspective that incorporates Pyrmont or Blackwattle Bay within the CBD and thereby blurs the distinctiveness of their existing character.

Recommendation 7: The Glebe Society accepts that the specified broad economic objectives of the PPPS are reasonable with the caveats that: a number of key proposals are strongly opposed as inappropriate and hostile to the character of their ‘Place’ and will significantly undermine the general amenity of the existing communities.

6. BLACKWATTLE BAY FORESHORE

Blackwattle Bay is one of the sub-precincts designated suitable for significant development. It is described as offering ‘the greatest potential for change across the Peninsula.’ (p66) This is a factor of the size of the eastern foreshore site (over 8 hectares) that will be available

when the Fish Market moves in 2024 and the impact of the large and hugely expensive new Fish Market complex at the head of the Bay. This foreshore is a difficult development site. It backs onto the barrier of the western distributor and is a relatively narrow strip of land. It is however, largely publicly owned land which gives the Government a free hand- within the parameters of the new planning controls that will emerge from the current process. The Glebe Society considers that the public good of the surrounding communities - and Sydney - would be best served with this foreshore being largely maintained as open green space. It is one of the very few remaining parts of the Sydney Harbour foreshore still under public ownership and not developed. It provides a rare opportunity to provide much needed public access and open space on the Sydney Harbour foreshores. It would also help alleviate the shortage of open green space in the area – especially with the growth in population from the nearby Harold Park development. This pressure will be exacerbated when the new Fish Market complex is opened at the head of the Bay if its projected 4-6 million visitors per year materialises in a post -COVID world. We consider the development proposals for this foreshore put forward in the PPPS and the Blackwattle Bay Scenarios document are very much a second-best agenda in terms of the long-term public benefit to the local communities and to Sydney. There are other places in the innovation corridor where the proposed commercial and residential development would be more appropriately placed. There is no similar vacant Harbour foreshore site in such close proximity to the CBD. The justification for this particular Place being appropriate for intensive commercial and residential development is that it is vacant. There is no comparative analysis of benefit to the local and wider communities of additional open green space versus additional commercial and residential development. If the COVID-19 crisis continues for any length of time this imperative for open space near the inner city will dramatically increase. We appreciate that the Government is under financial pressure in the current context -including to pay for the expensive Fish Market complex- and the sale of the foreshore or of a long-term lease will deliver considerable funds. The short-term benefit of this cash inflow is poor compensation for the permanent (or 99 year) loss of irreplaceable foreshore open space.

Recommendation 7: The Glebe Society reaffirms its view that the proposed designation of the Blackwattle Bay foreshore as a site for intensive commercial and residential development is an unfortunate lost opportunity to preserve one of the few remaining Sydney Harbour foreshore sites in public ownership and as much needed open space.

7. SPECIFIC PROPOSALS FOR BLACKWATTLE BAY The primary objective for Blackwattle Bay is to create ‘a new urban quarter’ generating jobs and employment. Priorities include the provision of ‘commercial space for contemporary jobs and businesses to support the innovation Corridor’. The provision of new “entertainment, events and cultural space” is floated as a possible aspect of its redevelopment to ‘support a vibrant 24-hour entertainment and cultural precinct.’ (pp66-67) There is a clear priority given to commercial activity and job generation – more so that is evident in the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Scenarios document. If the foreshore is to be developed the Glebe Society supports this priority of commercial development and the creation of modern jobs linked to the industries across the peninsula and the innovation Corridor. We have a concern about the ‘vibrant 24 - hour entertainment and cultural centre’ -particularly as it applies to the new Fish Market complex at the head of the Bay given its proximity to residential areas. It is essential to maintain reasonable amenity for those residents and restrict noise generating activities to more limited hours of operation.

Recommendation 8: The Glebe Society broadly supports the proposal that the development priority for

Blackwattle Bay should be focussed on commercial activity and job generation consistent with the innovation Corridor. Recommendation 9: The Glebe Society opposes any carte blanche approvals for 24-hour operation of noise generating venues in the Blackwattle Bay sub-precinct. Appropriate operating hours should be agreed on the basis of genuine consultation with residents and should ensure reasonable protection from late night noise. Residential density The PPPS proposes considerable residential development with the caveat that it: 'does not compromise the quality and attractiveness of Blackwattle Bay as a place for commercial or entertainment uses and includes the provision of affordable housing.'(P67). We agree with this caveat and further consider that residential development on the foreshores should be limited and diverse. The proposed population density for this sub-precinct is a major issue. The PPPS indicates that there could be an additional 2055 more people and 5770 more jobs by 2041. (p66) This appears to align most closely with the midway option in the Scenarios document which proposed 3 options ranging from 1045 to 1700 homes and from 4000 to 7000 jobs. More detailed data provided to the Glebe Society by Infrastructure NSW indicates that the projected density per hectare for Blackwattle Bay will be much greater than that of the recent Harold Park development: 419 versus 245 residents per ha at Harold Park which is a nearby development on the foreshores of the linked Rozelle Bay. It is less than Central Park (1160 per ha) and Green Square (620 per ha). However, these developments, which are at the top end of Sydney density are both in very different localities which are more suited to this very high density. (We do note the Green Square development has caused considerable dislocation to the community and suffers from severe traffic congestion.) The Glebe Society is concerned about both the overall density of workers, visitors and residents and the residential density proposed for the foreshore development - in conjunction with the extremely high volume of projected visitors to the new Fish Markets. Apart from its general impact on the amenity of the area, the concern with this proposed major increase in density directly relates to the need to incorporate very high-rise towers and the capacity of the proposed improved transport options to prevent even greater traffic congestion in the area than is currently experienced. Recommendation 10: The Glebe Society proposes that the overall proposed density of development on the Blackwattle Bay foreshore be considerably reduced and that the residential density per hectare for the Blackwattle Bay sub-precinct be reduced to a range similar with that of the Harold Park development. High rise towers The proposed high-rise towers for Blackwattle Bay are not given much coverage in the PPPS. They are referenced obliquely in notes at p72: Sun access plane not breached, diversity of building heights with upper ranges limited to RL-120 – RL156. The proposal to build high rise towers on the Blackwattle Foreshore is almost certainly the most contentious aspect of the proposal. The RL specifications translate to three towers of 44/45 storeys. It is very difficult to conceive how these intrusive and dominating towers could be consistent with the character of this Place and buildings in the vicinity. They will destroy the view of the Bay and foreshores from Glebe, will deprive areas of sunlight (notwithstanding the assurance on the Scenarios document that they will not overshadow Wentworth Park in mid-winter) and will transform the overall feel and character of the site. Depending on the future trajectory of the COVID-19 crisis, such high-rise towers for commercial or residential purposes may not be a practical option. They are not necessary and while they may be in developer's interests and may generate a higher sale/lease return for the Government, they are not in the public interest. The residential density for the site should be reduced to remove any need for high towers on the foreshore. Recommendation 11: The Glebe Society is

strongly opposed to the construction of the proposed three high rise towers of 44/45 storeys on the Blackwattle Bay foreshore. They should be removed from the redevelopment proposal. Recommendation 12: The Glebe Society recommends that the maximum height of buildings on the Blackwattle Bay should be in the mid-range of 8-10 storeys. Diverse and affordable housing Given that residential development will be included on the Blackwattle Bay site, the Glebe Society strongly advocates for a very significant proportion of any housing development on the site to be affordable and social housing – in recognition that the site is largely publicly owned and the inner city is desperately in need of affordable and social housing. As the Glebe Society has been arguing for some years, these two circumstances make it an obvious site on which to get serious about a more balanced, socially just and economically responsible mix of housing types. We note that the Affordable Housing Policy Review technical report for the PPPS process has indicated that two of the four major inhibitors for the ongoing provision of affordable housing on the Peninsula are lack of available development opportunities and the high cost of land and the challenge from residential and commercial developers (p26) Neither of these inhibitors will apply in the context of Blackwattle Bay as the most of the site is publicly owned. Given this we consider a significant allocation in the vicinity of 20-30% is achievable and reasonable. If we cannot achieve a substantial share of affordable housing stock when the land is publicly owned in an area where the need is great, we will have little chance of ever addressing the current housing crisis. It should not be beyond the capacity of Government to devise a workable funding and delivery model to achieve this. It would be some compensation for the distressing sale of so much public housing stock in the Rocks area and the dispersal of the residents. It has been suggested that the fact that the proposed development is on the Sydney Harbour Foreshore and therefore likely to attract affluent residents willing to pay high prices for harbour views is likely to discourage the Government from any significant increase in affordable/social housing on the site. That would be a distressing betrayal of the public good. Recommendation 13: The Glebe Society recommends that, given the very urgent need for affordable and social housing in the inner city and the public ownership of much of the Blackwattle Bay foreshore site, that a target of 20-30% of the total residential units be set for affordable and social housing. Pyrmont examples....? Open green Space and the Foreshore Walk The PPPS gives a strong emphasis to green space – it is signalled as one of the 10 key Directions to shape the redevelopment of the peninsula: A tapestry of greener public spaces and experiences. (Direction 4) The Scenarios document indicates that 30% of the Blackwattle Bay foreshore site will be open space. That includes the walkways and fragmented areas. Much of it will have limited hours of sunshine and a considerable portion is likely to be in the shadow of the ANZAC Bridge and subject to considerable noise. It is important that a greater proportion of the site is set aside for green open space and that as far as possible it is not fragmented into small portions and receives significant sunshine in winter. Recommendation 13: The Glebe Society recommends that the allocation of green open space is significantly increased from the current 30% (including walkways etc) and is not fragmented into small portions and receives reasonable winter sunshine. The commitment to extend the Foreshore Walk around to Walsh Bay is a welcome re-commitment to a long-standing Government commitment. Our understanding is that it will be at least 10 metres wide. We know from the experience of the Glebe Foreshore portion, that this has always been dangerously inadequate width for a shared path (people, pedal and electric bicycles, dogs, skateboards). The major increase in usage from the influx of residents from the Harold park development and then an even greater

recent increase resulting from the COVID restrictions has greatly exacerbated the safety issue, as well as leading to periods of uncomfortable congestion. The numbers using the Walkway will increase hugely with the new Fish Market complex and the commercial and residential development on the Blackwater Bay foreshore. It is essential that width of the Foreshore walk is greater than 10 metres. Experience would indicate that 30 metres is a more realistic width. Recommendation 14: The Glebe Society welcomes the commitment to extend the continuous Foreshore Walk to Pyrmont and recommends that for safety and amenity reasons the Foreshore Walk must be widened - ideally to a minimum of 30 metres.

8. WENTWORTH PARK SUB-PRECINCT

Wentworth Park The Glebe Society welcomes the proposals in relation to Wentworth Park especially the proposal to investigate the return of the Greyhound racing track to public space on the expiry of their lease in 2027 although we had always presumed this would be the case. Wentworth Park provides precious open space for the adjoining communities. The Glebe Society would resist any proposed development of this public park which restricts public access and use of all the space. We would oppose any proposals build a major sport arena on this site – for reasons of public access and congestion issues. The need for maintenance of this open space in this area is an imperative – and the provision of more open space is a very high priority for the area. Recommendation 15: The Glebe Society supports the intention to return the Greyhound racing track to public open space and its reintegration into Wentworth park. Recommendation 16: The Glebe Society considers the community would oppose any development (eg a major sports arena) of any part of Wentworth Park which would restrict public access.

Wentworth Park sub precinct The designated sub-precinct is bounded by Bridge and Pyrmont Bridge Roads and the Western Distributor and William Henry Road. The revitalisation that is proposed for this area will add 1,115 people and 1,200 more jobs. The focus will be on creative industries, galleries and events. The redevelopment will involve adapting urban warehouses and wool stores for these new jobs and industries. Nothing specific is indicated re heights of adapted buildings beyond the note that “building design will take advantage of sloping land between Jones and Wattle Streets and will not overshadow or detract from the amenity of Wentworth Park”.

(p62) Not a great deal can be deduced from this. The proposal to extend the Jones Street cycle way north to Pyrmont Bridge Rd and provide a crossing of Pyrmont Bridge Road, considering 2-way traffic on Wattle Street south of Fig Street to Broadway and the widening of the Wattle Street footpath are all improvements to movement that we support. Most if not all of the community groups in the area would support the construction of a junior public high school on the only vacant site suitable for high rise development in the area – that is the Sydney Council owned site on the corner of Fig and Wattle Streets. It is not clear if this will be available- and it has previously been rejected by the Department of Education – we understand the issue related to cost. If it does become available the Glebe Society recommends the possibility of the site being acquired by the education Department for a junior secondary school should be again explored. With the caveat that there is not much detail or clarity as to what is entailed with some of the proposals, we support the 11 priorities that are set out for Wentworth Park sub-precinct on page 63. Recommendation 17: The Glebe Society notes that there is not detail given for the development proposals for Wentworth Park sub-precinct -but with that caveat we broadly support the identified priorities set out on page 63. Recommendation 18: The Glebe Society supports the need for a junior secondary public school in the area and recommends that if the Sydney Council owned site on the corner of Fig and Wattle Streets becomes available that the possibility of the site being acquired

by the education Department for a junior secondary school should be again explored.

9. Transport and Traffic planning Glebe Island Bridge A specific priority for the Pirrama sub-precinct in the PPPS is to 'restore/reinstate/interpret the historic Glebe Island Bridge structure to provide active transport access to Bays West.' (p71) While this is vague as to what exactly will be happening with the Bridge, it does make an explicit commitment to maintain it as a non- motorised transit route to the Bays West which is an important link. It would a blow to heritage values and a disregard for the public interest if the lobbying from the Super Yachts Marina and those associated with them were to block the active use of, or achieve the demolition of this historic bridge.

Recommendation 19: The Glebe Society welcomes the commitment to 'restore/reinstate/interpret the historic Glebe Island Bridge structure to provide active transport access to Bays West' and awaits further detail as to what is intended.

Transport/traffic plans From the perspective of the Blackwattle Bay Precinct, the most challenging issues have related to the difficulty – if not insolubility – of the traffic congestion problems and the provision of adequate transport options – including active transport options – to cope with the major increase in people and vehicle movement that will be generated by the major commercial and residential developments that are proposed. There was a last-minute Blackwattle Bay Traffic and Transport Strategy made available to the community in July 2020. It was not a plan but 'a high-level document outlining short to medium term modal strategies to support the new Sydney Fish Market development and re-zoning of the wider Blackwattle Bay. It was localised plan only relating to the new Fish Market. It was premised on an optimistic 80 active/public transport and 20% private vehicle mode share but had little consideration of broader traffic /transport impacts. It did include good and achievable proposals but did not come close to a comprehensive transport/traffic plane. The Scenarios document and this PPPs include a wide range of imaginative proposals about 'making it easier to move around'. The most significant proposals relate to improvements in access to public transport – most notably the apparent commitment to a a Metro station in Pyrmont. The PPPs also proposes a new bus route. The community is also hopeful that more ferry services will become available. Beyond that the solutions are focussed on promoting active movement: walking, cycling, skating. Many of the supporting proposals are sensible and likely to make moving easier. Parking will perhaps remain insoluble although the PPPS proposes some novel solutions including mutli-utility hubs situated throughout the Precinct. At this stage many positive and innovative proposals have been put forward to improve options and ease of moving around but the transport and traffic problems for the whole Precinct – and particularly the Blackwattle Bay sub-precinct are far from resolved.

Recommendation 20: The Glebe Society strongly supports the (almost definite) decision to build a Metro Station in Pyrmont and urges Government to make this a definite commitment.

10. OTHER MAJOR POSITIVE PROPOSALS

Museum of Applied Arts The Glebe society strongly supports the State decision to keep the Museum of Applied Arts site at Ultimo as well as building a new branch at Parramatta.

Recommendation 21: The Glebe Society recommends that the Museum of Applied Arts maintains coverage of a full range of the applied arts at its Pyrmont site.

The Star Casino Tower The Glebe Society strongly opposes the proposal for the Star Casino tower. The strong objections of many in the community to this Tower, which was correctly and appropriately rejected by the Independent Planning Commission in a proper process last year, will not change with its relocation and the slight reduction in its height as proposed in the PPPS. The persistence with this proposal and the Government's determination to have it approved, create

reasonable concerns as to the rationale for the more flexible and looser zoning rules and planning controls. There is a widespread perception that an underlying agenda in relation to the unified planning framework may be to remove controls which constrain the construction of super high-rise towers. No new justification has been put forward in support of this tower which is out of character with its surrounds in Pymont and still has the problems of overshadowing and creation of wind problems that were previously identified. Recommendation 22: The Glebe Society strongly opposes the construction of the Star Casino Tower in Pymont for the problems previously identified and because its continued support by the Government undermines confidence in the integrity of the planning system. CONCLUDING COMMENT We appreciate that the planning process around the PPPS will be lengthy. As indicated at the beginning, the Glebe Society is hopeful that its views and those of other community groups will be given serious consideration and are of assistance to the Department in its further development of this major strategy. Mark Stapleton President The Glebe Society 13/09/20 [REDACTED] Contact in relation to this submission: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]