

**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:** Sunday, 13 September 2020 1:18:11 PM  
**Attachments:** [20.09.12-submission-re-planning-for-pyrmont.docx](#)

---

Submitted on Sun, 13/09/2020 - 13:12

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

**Submission Type**

I am making a personal submission

**Name**

**First name**

Wendy

**Last name**

Thompson

**Council name**

{Empty}

**Council email**

{Empty}

**I would like my submission to remain confidential**

No

**Info**

**Email**

[REDACTED]

**Suburb/Town & Postcode**

Pyrmont NSW

**Submission file**

[20.09.12-submission-re-planning-for-pyrmont.docx](#)

**Submission**

Please see attached submission

**I agree to the above statement**

Yes

{Empty}

## DRAFT PYRMONT PLANNING PLACE STRATEGY SUBMISSION

1. I have been a resident in Pyrmont since 2005.
2. Pyrmont was already one of the most densely populated suburbs in Australia when I moved here. In the past 15 years its residential and business populations have expanded exponentially. The development of Pyrmont, a former industrial and working wharf area into a more residential suburb came about by government planning that encouraged the movement of the population back into inter-city areas.
3. When I moved to Pyrmont in 2005 the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2005* applied.
4. Clause 87 provided for mixed residential/business zones. Sub-clause (3) provided that: *“Consent is to be granted to development within this zone only if the consent authority is satisfied that carrying out the proposed development will be consistent with the planning principles for Ultimo-Pyrmont, particularly residential provision and amenity.”*
5. Sub-clause (4) provided: *“Residential development within this zone is not to be located or designed so that the amenity of the development is adversely affected by an adjoining or nearby use to a level that is considered inappropriate by the consent authority due to excessive noise or odour or any similar environmental impact.”*
6. The *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* defines “offensive noise” to include: *“noise that by reason of its level, nature, character or quality, or the time at which it is made is harmful (or likely to be harmful) to a person outside the premises; interferes unreasonably with the comfort or repose of a person who is outside the premises.”*
7. It takes little imagination to conceive of the increased detrimental environmental impacts of noise, traffic congestion and other impacts that will flow from the approved development of the tower at Star City, the proposed three towers to be built where the Fish Market is currently located, as well as the other commercial developments next to the Fish Market. Harris Street has been classified as one of the most congested streets in New South Wales. No amount of public transport will remove the negative effects of congregating and compressing so much traffic into such a small area with these developments. There is to be a corresponding increased demand for the present public amenities without any defined plan for how this increased demand is to be met.
8. The greatest folly of the planning proposed is to make the White Bay area the site for a cement plant and storage of raw materials that will impact on the Overseas Terminal and decrease the amenity of residents at Jackson’s Landing.
9. The draft Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy will undermine every key aspect of the former planning laws and regulations.

10. The draft Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy also fails to recognise the historic buildings in Pymont or inform one of how it is planned to maintain and preserve this heritage and streetscape.
11. I have observed the decline of the heritage listed public housing Ways Terrace, Point Street, Pymont, due to the lack of ongoing care and maintenance. This is a building that once stood as the model for public housing. Numerous school students, students of architecture and historical walking groups regularly attend this building to learn of its history and the importance of good public housing being integrated into a community. This is but one example of how the heritage of Pymont is currently being treated by the NSW Government.
12. The public are well aware of the New South Wales Government's transfer of the publicly owned historic buildings at Millers Point to private ownership and the proposals made about private development public housing sites at Redfern. The likelihood of the transfer of the public property and amenities of Pymont into the hands of private ownership and developers is of great concern to the Pymont community.
13. The Pymont community I speak to greatly resent being called 'Nimbies'. Our community can see very clearly what our planning regulators fail to see. The draft Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy will destroy the elements that make Pymont a wonderful example of how diverse and mixed socio-economic groups can form a strong vibrant community.
14. It is simply old-fashioned common sense that you cannot introduce into an already highly dense suburb the proposed level of residential/business populations with all of the consequent traffic, noise and other environmental impacts without any real plan of how these impacts with to be dealt with so that the amenities, aesthetics and quality of life of the existing residents and businesses is not permanently damaged. For any new residents, the present standard of amenities, aesthetics and quality of life will not exist. The future landscape is one of sterile overdevelopment accompanied by traffic congestion, noise and social disturbance.
15. My final comment is that the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy fails to take account of the changing work/life activities that have been introduced by COVID 19 and predicated on a model of development that is no longer relevant.