

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: Saturday, 12 September 2020 10:58:41 AM
Attachments: [emily-bullock-ppps-submission.docx](#)

Submitted on Sat, 12/09/2020 - 10:55

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

emily

Last name

bullock

Council name

{Empty}

Council email

[REDACTED]

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

2037

Submission file

[emily-bullock-ppps-submission.docx](#)

Submission

Submission regarding the draft Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy

By Emily Bullock

The strategy plan has a great emphasis on economic development and increased density. Neither has any consideration to the existing community. As part of the community I want see more gains for the residents.

I will comment on each of your highlighted issues:

1 a World Class foreshore walk

This is a shared footpath and cycleway, which is not ideal. This is one of the gains the strategy is proud of, but foreshore walk is squeezed in between large buildings and a busy waterfront - Wharves and mooring one side, high rise on the other. It will be busy, windy, shady, smelly and noisy. As there is no buffer between the walkway and the buildings, it will be dominated by the businesses plying their trade. It will not be "world class".

2 a vibrant 24-hour cultural and entertainment destination.

As Kings Cross has been gentrified there is a need to revive Sydney's nightlife. Yes this could be done around the casino but not in the residential areas. Extending the New Fish Market Building and the shopping centre within the Old fish Market site to a 24-hour destination is abhorrent to the residents of Glebe, Jacksons Point and no doubt will be to the new residents of the development on the old Fish Market site. At early meetings re the proposed new fish markets the public were assured that the hours of the new fish markets would be no different from the present opening times. Now I see that you have reneged on that. I remind you there are 24/7 venues and shopping centres along Broadway. Surely that is enough nightlife! On Broadway there are buses 24/7 and lots of student accommodation. A much better place for "a vibrant 24-hour cultural and entertainment destination". Darling harbour could be developed in this way but I remind you that the light rail stops at around 11pm!

3 connect to metro

All the development hinges on this. What will happen if the station is put at White Bay?

4 low carbon, high performance precinct

As the area is one of the densest populations in Sydney all forms of pollution become an issue. This includes shade pollution caused by overdevelopment. Noise caused by 24/7 night life. Traffic noise and fumes - these issues are ignored in your policy.

5 more, better and activated public space

I see very little of this in your plans. Where are the tennis courts, football fields, schools, etc? Yes there are a few pocket park areas. When counting open space you include footpaths, roadways, etc. This implies there is more open space than there is. I wonder how much of this space will be available to throw a ball for a dog, have a picnic, have a snooze in the sun etc.

I will now comment on issues you excluded above.

The PPPS has excluded City of Sydney from the document. The City of Sydney has the community at its heart and once these plans are implemented

the mess will be returned to the council to administer. They should be at the centre of this strategy.

You make great generalisation which mean nothing like "recognising and honouring Indigenous heritage". Will that mean a couple of murals? Or will that mean a world-class museum or heritage centre or a public art gallery? I see nothing like this mentioned in the document. Sydney and all of NSW are lacking this kind of facility.

There is no new public facility – not a police station or a school. The old fish market site should be totally reconsidered as it is public land and should be used for public good – not privatised for private gain and maximise profit to pay for the massive, misplaced New Fish Market.

You use Wentworth Park reclamation as a justification to offset the development. This park has been used over and over again to offset the high rise along Wentworth Park Road, Wattle Street, and Bay Street. When will it stop being counted?

Darling harbour was originally vision was to be the cultural centre of Sydney with the Maritime and Power House museums, entertainment centre and the Tumbalong Park theatre area. The community of NSW has lost this grand vision with Darling Harbour now dominated of commercial building and casinos. And your PPPS does not halt this. There is reference to the remodelling of the failed shopping centre – this is the perfect place for an Aboriginal Cultural Centre.

This pro-development document fails to discuss Sydney's housing needs. There are plenty of private dwellings proposed but we have a glut of empty apartments in private hands. Investors buy but do not reside in the buildings and this is a wasted public resource. All new projects should be for social, co-operative, aboriginal and public housing only. This will create a vibrant community.

Again, PPPS proposes lots of commercial building to be filled by high-tech and media companies. Will they still be working from large office complexes in 5 years time? There is a lot of vague, wishful thinking in this document.

Every time I look at your visual images in the document I see a growing number wharves and mooring. You have no policy on this. Black wattle Bay has high usage of passive boating, yet the wharves are dominating the coastline of the proposed "World class foreshore walk". How can it be "World Class" when there is no access to the water?

The PPPS stress that the area will become more pedestrian/cycle friendly, which is good, but there is no detail. The intersection under the ANZAC Bridge flyover is appalling for cars, people and cyclists but there is no mention of any improvements to that. Every new building brings more people to the area but you seem to see buildings only and not deal to the people who will have to get in and out of them.

By creating "State-Significant sites" at the minister's whim, undermines this whole document. These sites must be subject to all council by-laws and protocols. The dominance of these sites undermines the communities right to build the local facilities they wish.

I agree to the above statement

Yes

{Empty}

Submission regarding the draft Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy

By Emily Bullock

The strategy plan has a great emphasis on economic development and increased density. Neither has any consideration to the existing community. As part of the community I want see more gains for the residents.

I will comment on each of your highlighted issues:

1 *a World Class foreshore walk*

This is a shared footpath and cycleway, which is not ideal. This is one of the gains the strategy is proud of, but foreshore walk is squeezed in between large buildings and a busy waterfront - Wharves and mooring one side, high rise on the other. It will be busy, windy, shady, smelly and noisy. As there is no buffer between the walkway and the buildings, it will be dominated by the businesses plying their trade. It will not be "world class".

2 *a vibrant 24-hour cultural and entertainment destination.*

As Kings Cross has been gentrified there is a need to revive Sydney's nightlife. Yes this could be done around the casino but not in the residential areas. Extending the New Fish Market Building and the shopping centre within the Old fish Market site to a 24-hour destination is abhorrent to the residents of Glebe, Jacksons Point and no doubt will be to the new residents of the development on the old Fish Market site. At early meetings re the proposed new fish markets the public were assured that the hours of the new fish markets would be no different from the present opening times. Now I see that you have reneged on that. I remind you there are 24/7 venues and shopping centres along Broadway. Surely that is enough nightlife! On Broadway there are buses 24/7 and lots of student accommodation. A much better place for "**a vibrant 24-hour cultural and entertainment destination**".

Darling harbour could be developed in this way but I remind you that the light rail stops at around 11pm!

3 connect to metro

All the development hinges on this. What will happen if the station is put at White Bay?

4 low carbon, high performance precinct

As the area is one of the densest populations in Sydney all forms of pollution become an issue. This include shade pollution caused by overdevelop. Noise caused by 24/7 night life. Traffic noise and fumes - these issues and ignored in your policy.

5 more, better and activated public space

I see very little of this in your plans. Where are the tennis courts, football fields, schools, etc? Yes there are a few pocket park areas. When counting open space you include footpaths, roadways, etc. This implies there is more open space than there is. I wonder how much of this space will be available to throw a ball for a dog, have a picnic, have a snooze in the sun etc.

I will now comment on issues you excluded above.

The PPPS has excluded City of Sydney from the document. The City of Sydney has the community at its heart and once these plans are implemented the mess will be returned to the council to administer. They should be at the centre of this strategy.

You make great generalisation which mean nothing like "recognising and honouring Indigenous heritage". Will that mean a couple of murals? Or will that mean a world-class museum or heritage centre or a public art gallery? I see nothing like this mentioned in the document. Sydney and all of NSW are lacking this kind of facility.

There is no new public facility – not a police station or a school. The old fish market site should be totally reconsidered as it is public land and should be used for public good – not privatised for private gain and maximise profit to pay for the massive, misplaced New Fish Market.

You use Wentworth Park reclamation as a justification to offset the development. This park has been used over and over again to offset the high rise along Wentworth Park Road, Wattle Street, and Bay Street. When will it stop being counted?

Darling harbour was originally vision was to be the cultural centre of Sydney with the Maritime and Power House museums, entertainment centre and the Tumbalong Park theatre area. The community of NSW has lost this grand vision with Darling Harbour now dominated of commercial building and casinos. And your PPPS does not halt this. There is reference to the remodelling of the failed shopping centre – this is the perfect place for an Aboriginal Cultural Centre.

This pro-development document fails to discuss Sydney's housing needs. There are plenty of private dwellings proposed but we have a glut of empty apartments in private hands. Investors buy but do not reside in the buildings and this is a wasted public resource. All new projects should be for social, co-operative, aboriginal and public housing only. This will create a vibrant community.

Again, PPPS proposes lots of commercial building to be filled by high-tech and media companies. Will they still be working from large office complexes in 5 years time? There is a lot of vague, wishful thinking in this document.

Every time I look at your visual images in the document I see a growing number wharves and mooring. You have no policy on this. Black wattle Bay has high usage of passive boating, yet the wharves are dominating the coastline of the proposed "World class foreshore walk". How can it be "World Class" when there is no access to the water?

The PPPS stress that the area will become more pedestrian/cycle friendly, which is good, but there is no detail. The intersection under the ANZAC Bridge flyover is appalling for cars, people and cyclists but there is no mention of any improvements to that. Every new building brings more people to the area but you seem to see buildings only and not deal to the people who will have to get in and out of them.

By creating "State-Significant sites" at the minister's whim, undermines this whole document. These sites must be subject to all council by-laws and protocols. The dominance of these sites undermines the communities right to build the local facilities they wish.