

From: 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: Tuesday, 8 September 2020 6:27:36 PM

Submitted on Tue, 08/09/2020 - 18:26

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

Christopher

Last name

Levy

Council name

Sydney

Council email

{Empty}

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

[REDACTED] PYRMONT NSW

Submission file

{Empty}

Submission

9 September 2020

To whom it may concern: -

Our objection to "Planning and Open Spaces". Attention Mr Rob Stokes

Dear Minister,

The grand plan known as the "Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy" is yet another glossy document which looks good on the surface yet delivers very little. Unfortunately you have a history of saying one thing and doing another, so I find it very difficult to accept that you really mean the high ideals you are espousing.

In your covering letter on page 5 of the Strategy document, you say: -

"Listening to everyone with a passion for Pyrmont there are some strongly consistent messages. Everyone accepts that change is inevitable – Pyrmont always has – but everyone agrees that the time is right to improve access to the harbour and to public spaces, to active and public transport, to education and jobs, and to provide a better built environment that respect the layers of history that have made Pyrmont the jewel that it already is." The bold type for "better built environment" is mine. You have written those words, but I can give you two recent illustrations proving you do not mean them.

1. You and your Department have allowed a really ugly building to be constructed as the "Blackwattle Bay Marina" at 5-11 Bank Street Pyrmont. The marina facility itself is fine — a floating marina with walkways which rise and fall with the tide. Even the landscaping has been well designed and executed. However the main building itself is a travesty — it looks like a tin shed some 15-year-old skateboarder put together with a few of his mates. How could you, with a PhD in Planning, allow such a dreadful building on the foreshores of the very harbour you say you wish to enhance?

Whoever built that complex had the funds to put in a proper wharf and mooring space, so they could also have constructed a well-designed marina building. You have also allowed the owners to use several ugly metal shipping containers, and an even worse looking shed. How did that get approved? It is not as though your department did not seek and receive a great deal of feedback. Obviously, you did not listen to anything that was said by local residents, and you allow this rubbish to be built. Perhaps it is functional, but its ugliness contributes nothing to good urban design and makes things worse. Please do not tell me "it is only temporary" because I will not believe you. That mess is there for the next 10 to 20 years, and you and your Department should be ashamed of letting that happen.

2. Early in 2018 the NSW Port Authority proposed they should build a Multi User Facility (MUF) on Glebe Island. There were more than 200 objections. The Port Authority then self-approved their own proposal. OK, that was legal, but did it contribute anything to the Sydney Harbour foreshore? Absolutely not.

You could have intervened and caused them to prepare a proper EIS, but you chose not to. Now you use the convenient excuse that what they did was legal, but as Planning Minister you should be ensuring what they did added to the design, appearance and functionality of Sydney Harbour and did not detract from it.

Around the same time Hanson Concrete lodged an EIS to build a concrete batching plant adjacent to the MUF. More than 200 objections were lodged, and Hanson has been given more than two years to respond. Together with other residents of Pyrmont I have worked hard to either stop the Hanson proposal completely, or at least to ensure they do not operate their plant and their ships at night, causing local residents significant sleep disturbance. That approval now sits with the DPI&E, and we understand they are preparing their recommendations to submit to the Independent Planning Commission.

I cannot understand how you can support all the wonderful things you say are in store for Pyrmont, yet approve the MUF, and very likely approve the Hanson plant, less than 250 metres away from this high-density residential area. In other words you want to be a part of developing Pyrmont whilst ignoring the re-industrialisation of Glebe Island less than 250 metres away from the most densely populated residential suburb in Australia. How can you call that good urban planning?

It is not as though we did not try to get your attention for much better and higher uses of Glebe Island. We put forward a proposal in 2018 to develop Glebe Island with a combination of commercial and residential areas, a technology park, an arts centre, and plenty of green spaces for walkways, parklands, coffee shops and cafes. However that plan fell on deaf ears in your Department, and we believe it was never given proper consideration. We believe the Port Authority put a lot of pressure on your department to approve their plans so they could get immediate rental income, and to hell with the aesthetics or the quality of life for local residents.

I would like to hear from you directly just why you approved the Blackwater Bay Marina, and why you allowed the MUF to proceed without your intervention. And even more importantly, why you are allowing yet another enquiry called the "Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy" when you do not yet have a Master Plan for the whole area, and when it looks as if you are happy to have Glebe Island turned back into a noisy manufacturing centre less than 250 metres from a high density residential area?

Yours Sincerely,

Christopher Levy

I agree to the above statement

Yes

{Empty}