

**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](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy  
**Date:** Thursday, 10 September 2020 12:27:07 PM

---

Submitted on Thu, 10/09/2020 - 12:26

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

**Submission file**

{Empty}

**Submission**

Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy

As a resident of Pyrmont, I would like to provide the following feedback on the strategy which is now under consideration.

My overriding comment is that the whole strategy is commercially focussed and underplays the reality that a large part of Pyrmont today is a residential community which, despite high rise and mixed use manages to foster a 'village sense' of community. Nothing in this strategy serves to preserve that. It focusses on extensive commercial development, makes unclear the future of the proportion of public housing, and is inadequate in taking a truly innovative approach to environmental design.

Already a 'site of some of the most intensive land use in Australia' it proposes to increase population density extensively. While metro and pedestrian accesses increase public transport options it is unclear how additional traffic will be managed. Pyrmont is already heavily congested during peak times and heavy vehicle traffic from current developments has already made the area fraught at times. Extensive increase in residences promises more vehicles on the road, has that been factored into CO2 emissions.

The strategy states that Pyrmont has transformed into commercial and entertainment precinct with pedestrian walkways and the light rail – THIS IS A COMMUNITY WHERE PEOPLE LIVE. While the word 'live' is sprinkled liberally throughout the document there is little consideration of the impact of more people on the liveability of the area. Where is the plan for the services to support them apart from transport – where is a realistic traffic plan, where will they buy food (unlikely to be the shopping mall attached to the Fish Market), where will the children go to school? I want to see more focus on LIVE – and PLAY, LEARN, CONNECT, WORK, to be developed in the context of a residential community and not a 'corridor.

The strategy promises 'A world class foreshore' – let's not repeat the tragedy that is the developing at Barangaroo – a wonderful garden at the end of the peninsular does not compensate for the vast expanse of paving, concrete and hard surfaces that dominate the stretch all the way from the Pyrmont Bridge to the commencement of the parkland. The use of sandstone is in keeping with the natural landscape but there is limited integrity in honouring the natural shoreline. Hard surfaces are environmentally negligent, an alternative to green space that is no doubt cheaper to maintain but traps heat and wastes run off water. The strategy promises a 'Low carbon, high performance precinct', absolutely laudable and necessary however, planners should challenge yourselves to go further – plant trees instead of concrete.

'The harbour foreshore area was rich in natural resources, and a natural focal point' – honour that history! Yes, it was industrial, yes it was a quarry and now it is residential – protect the quality of residential life. It is already one of the most densely populated areas in Sydney. Protect the foreshore in a way that benefits the residential community as well as those visiting, provide genuine access for recreation that doesn't involve shopping on the harbourfront – more green, less paving, greater expanses of space for physical activities instead of unusable pockets of grass that break up the community. The proposed high-rise level on the Darling Harbour site and the towers on the current fish market site is a complete rejection of current development principles that have recommended lower level development close to shoreline. Comparing height to the Anzac bridge is a nonsense. This iconic, attractive gateway will be dwarfed and crowded by towers. This is a flagrant support of developers over community.

The strategy proposes heritage conservation areas. These are woefully inadequate. Look through the backstreets – what about the heritage buildings

that exist within the Jackson's Landing collection, the iconic public housing on Point Street. There needs to be a further consideration of the streetscapes throughout.

Finally, one of the outstanding features of Pyrmont as a residential precinct is the diversity of the population. This is enhanced by the inclusion of public residents. Community dinners promote connection and interaction and the sense of community is palpable. Affordable housing is commendable and I support the inclusion but it does not/ should not replace public housing. In any future increase in residential capacity public and affordable housing should be increased contributing to our diversity and the cultural fabric of the area.

**I agree to the above statement**

Yes

{Empty}