

Department of Planning Industry and Environment

Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy Implementation

I would like to provide some observations and some 25 required action bullet points regarding this huge amount of information.

To begin I am not against development but want good development that is considerate to the community, well planned and does not create double standards in its implementation.

It is hoped these can be considered in the following phases of work both by the Department and the City.

General Observations

For such an important strategy, it is somewhat surprising there is not a clear governance framework and decision making process/ protocol provided that includes the Community.

- Across all ‘next steps’ and in particular the implementation of next phases I would like NSW Planning and the City of Sydney **to establish a stakeholder steering committee to include empowered Community representatives.**

The precinct called Darling Island is described as commercial and entertainment. This is incorrect. The precinct has a large residential community and there is no recognition of Darling Island residents/community.

Darling Island is a mixed precinct but this is not recognised or included in any descriptions of this large residential community so the proposed next steps and outcomes are not balanced nor take into account the potential impacts on the residential population.

- Please **amend your overall documents and improve the wording around the Darling Island Precinct to properly describe its mixture of commercial entertainment and significant number of residents /residential buildings.**

The transition zone was not part of the early work around this Pymont strategy and I do not understand its inclusion. My concern regards the “scope creep” that may occur as developers attempt to increase RL. As well there is already a significant double standard where by the transition zone appears to set an approach going forward with higher buildings on the ridge and only lower buildings around the harbour and foreshore. Then why has The Star been allocated an RL of 110!!

- **Please remove the transition zone** – or be far more explicit of its area, please further describe the rationale and more importantly please include further clarity around the key site as a one off as it contradicts PPPS 2 Direction 2 and sets a significant precedent.

The Star northern tower is still too tall and of significant bulk and should be further reassessed. I note that within The Star in the Design Guidelines point 11 page 6 – states the hotel tower will require further investigation to determine and understand the tower’s impact on Pymont skyline and nearby residents.

I found The Star master planning submissions ambiguous and more work is required around public benefits.

I note within the Planning report as well as Design Guidance the required podium and tower RL, setbacks and street wall heights and understand that the Star has formed a different view.

- Please **ensure The Star provides a more complete master plan for the State, City and community to consider and to consult upon.**
- **I oppose the removal of mature healthy trees around The Star –Pirrama Road, Jones Bay and Pyrmont Street and Darling Island Road Pyrmont.**
- Please **reconsider and reduce the overall RL of the Star northern tower now.** The current RL is inconsistent with the Harbour Interface definition which calls for low built form.
- If we are to have a tower then ensure its **built form and set backs are conservative and a minimum 10 m** to not overly impact the low rise area that it will reside.
- Also **please make it explicit around who and how the recommendation for further investigation of The Star plans will be undertaken, and by whom; and how and by whom the determination of the next iteration of the hotel will occur and determination of the hotel tower; will occur.**

I do not agree with Pyrmont Bay Park being remodelled as well as labelled a 24/7 function area nor part of the night time economy and entertainment zone. This is both dangerous, potentially removes an open green space from community usage and will bring a heightened safety risk to our area.

- **Please do not allow Pyrmont Bay Park to be a green open boozy and dangerous bar! 24/7 –** this is not required, too close to residences and we do not want Pyrmont to be the next Kings Cross.
- **Please do not extend to include seating and encroach into the harbour and marina.**

The “thought bubble” to place a bridge and create an alternate harbour walk is a poor decision and should be removed – how would the Sydney Wharf Marina operate? And what impact will it have on various pockets parks which have developed their own personality and uses.

- **Please remove this bridge concept** between Metcalfe Park and Sydney Wharf.

We do not want Metcalfe Park joined up with other parks. Metcalfe Park is used by a lot of older residents and close by workers for sitting, families gather & meet and sit on the grass as well as the various dog groups’ use this open space. Most importantly being a small pocket park it allows the residents that surround it to enjoy the open space – we do not need super highways of joined up parks.

- **Metcalfe Park does not need a fitness station / exercise equipment** as these were just recently installed in Pirrama Park, its current and future use should be preserved as is.

It is a well maintained tree lined place of peace and relaxation.

- **Please review the usages of Pymont Bay, Metcalfe and Sydney Wharf and DO NOT change their current access and use** – these small open pocket parks are critical for the mental health of the nearby residents and do not need to be altered at all.- NO bridges, NO fitness /exercise equipment, NO 24 hour parties with violent consequences. I would certainly support the return of the Growers Market in Pymont Bay Park. It was popular and well attended.

Under potential sites capable of change – I am very concerned by this generalisation as almost all are close to residential apartments and a lot are public and affordable housing.

- **Please do not allow public and affordable housing to be sold off to developers.**
- **Please revisit your plan and add and identify** to your legend residential towers say with more than 20 apartments.
- Within the Darling Island Precinct are the former Fairfax building and Accenture building –now part of the Google campus are highlighted as capable of change which **I totally oppose.**
- **Please do not allow any proposal that raises the height (as per your Harbour Interface requiring only low built) of the Fairfax and Accenture buildings in Darling Island to above the height of the heritage Revy Buildings. These heritage buildings should be respected and seen from all aspects of land and water!**
- **Please add a well-staffed Police Station to be built within the new Metro site.** This is an important and needed site of change!

Within Darling Island Precinct page 16 – it talks of a Vibrant 24 Entertainment Zone recommending integration between residential and 24/7. This is a very open direction and requires far more work and it greatly concerns me that the community are being ignored.

- **Please reconsider and redefine how and what the key success factors** are for both residents and the 24/7 economy. **Pymont does not want to be an extension of the CBD nor do we want to be another Kings Cross.**

Your statements are probably well intended but are too broad and are a health and safety risk to the local residents, community.

Stating the obvious - Tourists, visitors and party goers enter the precinct but then go home – but this strategy sets in train some material directions that we the community will live with here 24/7 and your guidelines are of material concern.

- **Please provide more details around how residents and the proposed vibrant 24 economy will safely integrate to assist The City and the Community**

Infrastructure Program needs community input

- **Please consider a steering committee to include community** representatives to provide input into projects to be funded by developer contributions.
- **Please consider a secondary education school within Wentworth Park.**
- The current junior school in Ultimo are already at capacity and my concern is what will happen when all these children attempt to go to High School. More so the PPPS calls for additional residents – where will their children go to school. PPPS is a 20

year plan – and I see no recognition around schooling which I would be grateful if you escalated to the relevant area /NSW Dept. of Education as part of your review of my submission.

Construction across key sites, Metro will be material and I cannot see any strategy around how this will be managed.

- **Please add further consideration around how the Pymont community will be impacted around such significant construction.**

I remain very concerned around the growing numbers of helicopters across Pymont. Your strategy currently allows for select higher buildings across the Peninsula and I would ask that a more explicit direction be given around flight paths ensuring they do not pass over Pymont – they should run down and over Darling Harbour but now appear to cut across various aspects of Pymont.

- **Please consider your Aviation approach by consulting with the community** as these are becoming more frequent, increasingly noisy and a risk to health and safety going forward.

I am very concerned about the over development and built form of the Blackwattle Bay development. The podiums, towers and sheer volume of buildings is just excessive. The recent montages from the City of Sydney compared with Infrastructure NSW as well as the thousands of submissions against this over development must be taken into account.

- **Please stop the Blackwattle Bay development and start again.**

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]