

From: no-reply@planning.nsw.gov.au on behalf of [Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment](#)
To: [DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox](#)
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy
Monday, 24 August 2020 5:28:27 PM
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Submitted on Mon, 24/08/2020 - 17:24

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

[REDACTED]

Last name

[REDACTED]

Council name

{Empty}

Council email

{Empty}

I would like my submission to remain confidential

Yes

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

Pyrmont 2009

Submission file

[REDACTED]

Submission

Please refer to my attached submission.

I would be grateful if you considered my concerns and included within your final plans.

I agree to the above statement

Yes

{Empty}

Personal Submission on the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy.

Firstly, I recognize this was a significant amount of work to be completed in a short time and had to leverage the GSC and other past work.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and hope my feedback is viewed as constructive and helpful.

I am certainly not against development but pro good balanced and fair development. From my review of the strategy and accompanying attachments, I am concerned with a number of areas and would be very grateful if you considered my concerns in your final master plans as well as the overall 20 year strategy.

1. The priorities and big moves within draft place strategy
2. The risks associated around heritage/history and harbour foreshore versus potential redevelopment labelled 'growth'
3. The overall heights (RL) within the strategy
4. The lack of committed public/social benefit and transport infrastructure
5. Some additional suggestions.

1.

The strategy reads as a commercial or economic strategy with no public heart regarding the requirements and needs of existing or future residents.

Page 11, within the first paragraph of the draft states 'the NSW Governments vision to transform the Pyrmont Peninsula while meeting the aspirations of the business, industry, visitors, local and future residents'. This draft introduction states and is carried on through the strategy that commercial /business is a higher priority in this place based strategy and thus the settings appear to skew away from residents.

The 5 big moves appears to lack a 6th big move which should focus upon public needs – permanent schools in support of existing and future residents – perhaps located in Wentworth Park or Blackwattle Bay or Wattle Street.

My sense is there should be some real social and public benefit commitments within the 6th big move and overall strategy. My concern being that none will be delivered and or they will lag the commercial or business imperatives at the expense of current and future resident communities.

2.

The strategy speaks of respecting heritage and harbour but then appears in a number of areas to be compromised by big business opportunities regarding height or locations for potential redevelopment.

As an example – the strategy speaks of preserving Pyrmont Village but then proposes allowing The Star Casino to potentially build a high rise tower. I just cannot reconcile how a 50 odd storey tower would not impact Union Square as well as multiple view corridors, or the overall horizon around these historic Georgian and other heritage areas.

Another example would be within the Darling Island Peninsula where the heritage REVY buildings, and industrial wharves are located and should be respected and preserved. But again a number of locations –i.e. the google buildings that are on the harbour or are currently low rise in keeping with their location have been recognized as future development opportunities.

Again I cannot reconcile how the strategy speaks of preserving the harbour via a sloped or scaled approach of buildings from the water and harbour walk ways (which I support) to the higher ridges but then suggests redevelopment of locations that will impact and ignore heritage/ history and our harbour. Pyrmont from the water is a history lesson and should not be impacted by potential bulky and unnecessary high rise redevelopments of low rise buildings. The IPC in its recent findings of The Star should be revisited to assist in your final plans and strategy.

One of the remarkable achievements in the past 30 years of planning development around Pyrmont regards solar access and how sun light filters almost everywhere. The streets and buildings have a wonderful open feel. Where ever you walk, cycle and /or visit around Pyrmont it has an uplifting and welcoming feel due to amount of sun light. The low open heart of Harris Street / Union Square as well as low rise harbour buildings complements and enhances the feel and ambiance of the area.

Some of your key sites and suggested buildings of potential redevelopment should be revisited and removed as this place based strategy should not turn pockets of Pyrmont into a Barangaroo or the shadows and cold corridors of the CBD.

3.

Across the key sites are proposed RL /heights that I assume will ultimately be included in the amended planning controls of Pyrmont.

These suggested heights are just wrong and not in keeping with the area. My understanding is that these RL are somewhat subjective and value judgements regarding height. There appears limited public or social consideration regarding why these heights were proposed.

I can see no justification apart from commercial imperative which will place huge pressure on transport, livability, social infrastructure, education, safety and ultimately health pressures by allowing such high rise towers. I do not consider Pyrmont the gateway to the CBD nor do I understand why a medium rise strategy would not be as successful.

Pyrmont is a unique mixed established development that has achieved significant synergies over its past developments. This should be preserved and I think lower RL's across the Pyrmont Peninsula should be considered particularly in light of COVID.

I was also disappointed to see the scale and density of Blackwattle Bay included without comment particularly as there had been so much community concern regarding heights and number of towers.

4.

The draft strategy lacks a public heart and there should be far more written and committed. There should be a level of ownership / commitment in the final by Council, State or Private sector regarding social and public benefits. There should be more direct focus on public housing and I noted in one attachment an inference of some existing public housing being a potential location for future redevelopment.

As previously stated, for the community to embrace and ultimately champion this draft then far more should be clearly stated around education- which and what schools will be located = potentially Wentworth Park?, safety – where a police station can be located = potentially within the Metro?, transport = commentary regarding Metro only but increased residents and workers particularly with the new fish markets is not adequately decisioned and community = potentially a new community centre at Maybanke etc. etc. ?.

As a 20 year plan – it is imperative that the Metro is not just mentioned but agreed by the State and that other transport needs are delivered otherwise this strategy will fail.

5.

There are some excellent suggestions within the document regarding parks, linking up harbour walk ways as well as improved history and indigenous recognition – but I again emphasise this should not come at the expense of unnecessary high rise for gambling and significant bulk towers that will create overall infrastructure pressures and overshadowing.

Metcalfe Park - within the strategy there is a suggestion to place 'exercise equipment' in Metcalfe Park – which I consider is unnecessary due to the new exercise equipment being installed in Pirrama Park.

It is also suggested that 'electrical power points' be installed in Metcalfe Park – this carries a significant risk in attracting squatters and other unnecessary interests. Metcalfe Park is used by lots of walkers to relax, bikers to recharge their energy, its used for open festivals , google workers at lunchtime, by families, for picnics, people with dogs to exercise their pets and its doesn't need exercising equipment or power points to attract a different mix of people. Please reconsider these suggestions and remove them from the final document with the costs spent in better ways.

Time to Cross the Road - another suggestion is regarding the increased time to cross for pedestrians. As you would be aware, road traffic around Pyrmont is both dense and heavy due to the narrow roads and considerable foot traffic. I would encourage an increase in all traffic lights for pedestrians to allow for increased access and to slow/ control cars.

The draft highlights the need to improve presence and access to Harbour, Heritage and History – I would encourage a further review of the Strategy to ensure any planning does not impact or detract from these special and unique features of Pyrmont. I consider your draft did not preserve and protect all these uniquely Pyrmont historical features for future generations.

To conclude, all of my concerns are interlinked and I would be grateful if you considered them into your final master plans.

Good luck and as you conclude such an important public and private strategy for the next 20 years.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Pyrmont NSW 2009

[REDACTED]

24 August 2020.