

**From:** [noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au](mailto:noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au)  
**To:** [DPE\\_CSE Pyrmont Peninsula Mailbox](#)  
**Cc:** [DPE\\_PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Webform submission from: Pyrmont Peninsula sub-precinct master plans  
**Date:** Wednesday, 12 January 2022 1:14:01 PM

---

Submitted on Wed, 12/01/2022 - 13:13

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

**Submission Type**

I am making a personal submission

**Name**

**First name**

Donna

**Last name**

Bridges

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

No

**Info**

**Email**

[REDACTED]

**Suburb/Town & Postcode**

Pyrmont

**Please provide your view on the project**

I object to it

**Submission**

I do not object to the overall Master Plan but note that there is a lack of recognition about the needs of those residents that live on or within the sub precinct identified as "Darling Island". There is no reference to residents (likely some 750) that reside on or within a 500 metre radius of what is known as the Darling Island sub precinct. This lack of use of the term "resident" in describing the area and its future use therefore disregards our needs. This is extremely disappointing as all of her matters and issues I have with the proposal relate specifically to the lack of identifying resident needs.

To that end, the identification of Pirrama Park as a 24/7 activation precinct, as opposed to the community park that it is and functions as currently, is also disappointing. It also alludes to the removal of this space as an open, community green space and the use of it as a 24/7 entertainment and activation precinct. While I understand that this may be due to the NSW Government's Vision for a 24/7 city economy, and the lobbying of interests such as The Star, Dolone House and the Maritime Museum, the further commercialisation of this area again disregards its current use as open green space used by residents and workers alike.

Further the planned relocations (yet again) of the Maritime Museum wharfs to be adjacent to Wharf 7, strikes me as yet further overdevelopment and obstruction of waterways. People have been actively encouraged to move into this area, with future development also planned by the NSW government for new residential towers in and around the sub-precinct - please don't disregard our needs in this future plan.

As mentioned, I do not object to the need for the plan but please do not over weight the interests of some at the expense of others. The area needs to also work for current, and future, residents too.

D Bridges

**I agree to the above statement**

Yes