

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au
Sent: Saturday, 5 February 2022 12:03 AM
To: DPE CSE Pyrmont Peninsula Mailbox
Cc: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Subject: Webform submission from: Pyrmont Peninsula sub-precinct master plans

Submitted on Sat, 05/02/2022 - 00:03

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

[REDACTED]

Last name

[REDACTED]

I would like my submission to remain confidential

Yes

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

Pyrmont 2009

Please provide your view on the project

I object to it

Submission

This is a submission that responds to the published Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy (PPPS) and the related, Proposed Pyrmont Peninsula Sub-Precinct Master Plan (PPSPMP).

This response will make objections and comments related to the Vision and Directions, presented in the PPPS and the Consultation Process.

I understand that the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy (PPPS) was approved by the Planning Minister in December 2020.

The proposed Pyrmont Peninsula sub-precinct master plans are to provide high-level guidance on how the seven sub-precincts could develop in relation to the priorities set out in the PPPS.

It is stated that as a result of these published plans, Pyrmont will change over the next 20 years, to create unique and liveable places.

From the outset, Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, Rob Stokes identifies the Pyrmont Peninsula as a site "of the most intensive land use in all of Australia." This statement sets an expectation for careful and considered planning and review of all proposals for further development in this unique and complex locality.

It is evident that Pyrmont is the home for thousands of residents and that it contains precious heritage and ecology. It is a location

that provides a unique and much valued village atmosphere on the footsteps of Sydney's CBD.

It is a population of long-term residential Owners. This great number of family-orientated community, maintains a rich continuity of place and culture. The majority of residents inherently provide a stable workforce. Our current population supports the economic sustainability for key local businesses.

The flow-on effect of the Pymont Community is a consistent provision for the vitality of the CBD.

There is also consideration to be made for the transient population who reside in this locale. They are here, in part, through their engagement of the services provided by educational institutions and various business that are found adjacent to Pymont and in the Sydney Central Business District.

Thus, Pymont is on the whole, a community that reflects a suburban ethos and lifestyle.

The Minister, is incorrect in stating that Pymont has undertaken "a number of incarnations."

This assertion must be corrected. Pymont has met the the evolutionary changes of need and use, as most other localities and it has grown naturally - where permitted.

The Minister states that Pymont has been "transformed into [a] commercial and entertainment precinct..."

The Minister may be referring to the targeted development of Darling Harbour Precinct as noted from Sydney.com: "Darling Harbour. This waterside pocket of Sydney has got it all; amazing entertainment, fascinating museums, incredible wildlife and delicious dining options right on the water plus a brand-new food precinct. Darling Harbour is a fantastic family-friendly destination right in the heart of Sydney that has something for everyone."

Darling Harbour, however, is not Pymont. Pymont lies adjacent to the established entertainment precinct at Darling Harbour.

The Minister continues by highlighting local and small business requests for greater and improved the accessibility and thoroughfares, streetscapes, and promotion for already-established "retail, entertainment, innovation and tourism destinations."

The investment to improve the locality will certainly be welcome and necessary to ensure the continued amenity of any growing suburb.

And it may be agreed that "everyone accepts that change is inevitable," a true review and account of the Pymont Community, will find that the Residents do not agree with the Minister and his Government, that "change" includes installing the type of contrived construction of an uncharacteristic form of imposing high-density housing and commercial buildings, as described in the PPPS.

The discussions that I have had with a variety and number of community members and organisations emphasise that residents of this local community, strongly oppose any proposal that inflicts the inevitable negative effects and issues that come along with a highly concentrated population. The NSW Government is forcing change upon a largely residential population with a higher number of transient and visitor/tourist-focused groups. Should the NSW Government it continue down this path, will be ignoring the actual needs of the Pymont Community and will be imposing undesirable outcomes.

Overpopulation of any community is undesirable but it is inevitable should this Government continue with the Plans exhibited.

Any overcrowding in the Pymont area, diminishes the quality of individual health and wellbeing, lifestyle and liveability at this peninsula. Intentional population transfer and growth -supplied by current standard high rise dwellings and the injection of businesses such as a casino and a 24 hour destination, within a primarily suburban landscape, is likely to compromise the amenity required and sought by Residents today.

The problems around high levels of population on a world scale may be seen equally, on a local scale. The statement below, highlights universal consequences of inappropriate construction and growth to our ecology.

"We are jeopardizing our future by not reining in our intense but geographically and demographically uneven material consumption and by not perceiving continued rapid population growth as a primary driver behind many ecological and even societal threats [italics ours]."

Yes, (Over)Population IS a Problem!

Alan Ware, Dave Gardner | November 15, 2018 |2022 Millennium Alliance for Humanity and Biosphere;

<https://mahb.stanford.edu/who-is-the-mahb/>

Pymont lies at the footsteps of the Sydney CBD. Within a radius of 1-2 kilometre of Sydney Town Hall, the Australian Bureau of Statistics population records show that in 2016, there were 12,813 recorded residents in Pymont.

Suburban localities that are similarly situated around the CBD were found with the following populations:

Glebe - 11,532

Chippendale - 8,617

Redfern - 13,213

Woolloomooloo - 4,011

Rushcutters Bay - 2,547

There is a disparity in the distribution and burden of a "growing Sydney population".

Residents of Woolloomooloo and Rushcutters Bay appear to be better able to shoulder the "development" opportunities suggested for Pymont as there is a lower level of land use. Further, with a more economically affluent residential mix, there may be more likelihood of business growth.

Is our NSW Government missing an opportunity here?

Would it not make greater sense to share the demands of growth?

Would providing for the dispersment of the population in a more even manner, support the whole city's liveability according to recognised Indexes?

Has the NSW Government undertaken a fair and transparent review of all options for Sydney?

The Minister's reckoning that Pyrmont can be both a "village" and "an extension of the CBD" is confusing at best.

How does the PPPS show that it will protect the "past"?

Will this "past", presumably heritage artefacts, buildings and sites, be clearly identified?

The intention to replicate and spill the "vibrant 24-hour cultural and entertainment" features of Darling Harbour Precinct, across a well-loved suburb with a family-orientated, urban village existence, that holds quality expressions of land and heritage - is UNWANTED.

I object to the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy (PPPS) and the related, Proposed Pyrmont Peninsula Sub-Precinct Master Plan (PPSPMP), as exhibited to-date.

Considering the merit of the PPS and PPSMP requires a wholistic investigation, plan, design and review process.

I object to the approach and methods undertaken by the Government to divide the urban development planning and design into sub-precincts.

The Pyrmont Peninsula is one place and one suburb.

Any one change to the urban setting, impacts the whole community.

The Government's process to impose the PPS and its PPSMP that includes Development Applications (DA's), Community Consultation Process and sessions, Public Submissions fails to recognise the tremendous impact and burden on individual community members.

For the Public to clearly understand what the Government intends for the community - requires time to discuss, reflect upon and respond to understandable written documents, actual models 3-D and not just 2-D Artist's impressions.

The Government's method to create the PPS and to divide Pyrmont into subsections in the PPSMP - then, requires each DA, its own cycle of Community Consultation "opportunities" for the Pyrmont and general community to make submissions on.

I request that the Government considers the detrimental effect of causing Public "burnout"?

Any intention and effort to achieve true consultation with information of merit is grossly and detrimentally affected.

If it has been considered is it part a Government intention to "divide and conquer" in order to achieve other goals that do not prioritise its local community and State citizens?

Thus, in effect, the Government has failed to provide adequate time for proper and satisfactory community review.

Whilst I will acknowledge that at the Community Consultation Process and sessions that I was able to pose online questions with written and or spoken answers were provided, the majority of questions posed were answered with directions to read the relevant attachment to the main document. And there was a general invitation to call the relevant Management Team if we had other questions.

Problems with these methods of clarification is that understanding the relevant documents may be complex. The community would benefit from holding general meetings for frank and robust discussions.

Inviting one-to-one questions and answers with the consultants or Department disadvantages the general community as it does not provide the additional information that is gained from specific concerns expressed and the beneficial quality learning from "piggy-backing" questions and answers.

Significant impact to the community's ability to respond to all of these matters has been damaged by the events of the 2020-2021 Bushfires and the Covid crisis. These two matters alone, warrant careful and considered review of all NSW Government policies and practices.

The community is damaged physically, emotionally, financially and morally.

The outcomes of these events and their fallout have created changes.

In some areas of importance, the NSW Government has enforce delays in releasing documents or preceding with particular actions and reforms.

The changes to Pyrmont have been described by this NSW Government as "once in a lifetime" and "State significant".

With an importance on being consistent, it would stand that this NSW Government must review what it is proposing and how it is consulting with the local and wider community.

Surely, a Strategy Plan of almost a decade but more importantly, after a worldwide catastrophic event that is continuing to-date, requires reconsideration and an appropriate pause.

I say this, not as a measure of delay but as a measure to review new circumstances and opportunities arising from the events referred to.

To create and begin to implement a plan that does not incorporate these experiences is not being responsive to current and future needs. Nor is it utilising all opportunities that will work towards and integrate well with future settings.

The language relied upon to formulate the PPPS and the PPSMP, are highly reliant on interpreted projections and anticipated outcomes.

The master plans will provide high-level guidance on how the seven sub-precincts could develop over the next 20 years to create

unique and liveable places.

Planning controls will change height and floor space ratio controls that will guide future levels of density.

I concur with City of Sydney Councillor Philip Thalys said public interest and space needed to be prioritised.

"The fish market side is public land and yes, there will be a waterfront promenade, but in some parts it's as narrow as 10 metres, which is ridiculous," Mr Thalys said.

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-07-02/sydney-fish-market-redevelopment-plans-anger-locals/100261884>

The overshadowing of existing low-rise development in Pyrmont will be substantial and it will probably even reach across to the walkway and the public spaces in Glebe.

No models show this.

Respectfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

I agree to the above statement

Yes