

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au
Sent: Friday, 4 February 2022 10:53 PM
To: DPE CSE Pyrmont Peninsula Mailbox
Cc: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Subject: Webform submission from: Pyrmont Peninsula sub-precinct master plans

Submitted on Fri, 04/02/2022 - 22:52

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

Izabella

Last name

McFadden

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

Suburb/Town & Postcode

PYRMONT 2009

Please provide your view on the project

I object to it

Submission

Dear Sir, Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Pyrmont Peninsula Sub-Precinct Master Plan (the master plan). Objection is raised in relation to the master plan as it is too narrow and only accommodates for two main stakeholders who appear to have won political favour.

The Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy, Protecting Sunlight to Public and Open Spaces, outlines criteria for the height of future developments within the broader Pyrmont peninsula. In the Urban Design Report (p.38/39), it is noted that areas are evaluated based on the following three (3) categories:

1. Merit based assessment for any future development;
2. Sun Access Plane used to inform master planning; and
3. No additional overshadowing.

However, the master plan fails to identify the high-rise development potential of the following sites that are older low-scale non-heritage buildings in need of significant urban renewal located within close proximity to the proposed Metro station:

- SP 18021 Nos. 313-369 Harris Street, Pyrmont; and
- SP 30156 Nos. 1-19 Allen Street. Pyrmont.

The above sites are well located with respect to existing services, transport and facilities and are able to accommodate greater heights and FSR without creating any significant adverse impact with respect to sunlight limitations and overshadowing.

As the saying goes, 'a plan is worthless unless it is implemented' and this master plan includes Special Infrastructure Contribution (SIC) rates that will hinder the implementation of the plan with too much emphasis on cost recovery rather than good planning outcomes for the community. The Star Casino and University of Technology, Sydney benefit considerably, but this is not the case

for other sites that contain significant merit and deserve greater consideration.

There is a noticeable disconnect between the political rhetoric of past and present Premiers and former Planning Ministers, such that the intention to develop the peninsula for high rise development is not reflected in the planning documentation on exhibition by the department. Even the relationship between the master plan and the Place Strategy exhibited in 2020 is questionable.

The masterplan does not address the substandard pedestrian connectivity from Harris Street (along Alan Street) to either of the existing light rail stations located at Wentworth Park and the Convention Centre - which is not direct and, in some cases, requires access via private property. This improvement to the public domain is long overdue and pedestrian-friendly street lighting is not provided in front of Nos. 313-369 Harris Street, Pymont despite being provided elsewhere in Harris Street – both to the north and south).

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment should abandon the current master plan and instead prepare a document that reflects community values without being at risk of never being implemented due to SIC constraints.

The master plan needs to serve more than just two major stakeholders in the locality and not adopt such a narrow strategic planning approach. Forward planning should not be about taking backward steps – which certainly appears to be the case with the master plan that is on exhibition. Thank you for the opportunity to outline my strong objection to the Pymont Peninsula Sub-Precinct Master Plan. Please keep me informed of the status of this master plan.

Regards,
Izabella McFadden

I agree to the above statement

Yes