

Department of Planning and Environment

Re: Pymont Peninsula sub-precinct master plans Submission

The Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy has many positive attributes and I generally support the key moves to improve the area's connectivity and green spaces as well as preserving its heritage and desirable aspects of its unique character.

As a resident of the Pirrama sub-precinct, this is the area that concerns me most. The precinct already demonstrates all of the attributes and character that the strategy proposes. It's already a fantastic place that we locals and people from outside the area already enjoy and love. It's not broken so it does not need fixing.

Waterfront Park, which is a low key but still spectacular park enjoyed by locals, and to a lesser extent, people from outside the area who may wish to use a quieter waterside park that is not as heavily frequented as Pirrama Park. While Pirrama Park is great for children's gatherings, large birthday parties and events and a place we enjoy visiting, it's important that the other parks provide different characters so that people have a choice of places to visit.

I object to the changes proposed to Waterfront Park for the following reasons:

- The function, character and qualities are already what the community loves and needs in contrast to Pirrama Park. We value its current use and character.
- As a family with young children, the existing playground is adequate for the needs of the children in the area.
- The inclusive playground proposed in the existing flat grassed area (3) is not desirable or appropriate to the area as it will displace members of the community who already use this area for recreation such as kids kicking a ball, flying kites and generally running around. The inclusive play area at Pirrama Park is more than adequate for both local and non-local children.
- While I am not a dog owner, this space is essential for the dog owners of the area who mostly live in apartments. It is one of few off-leash places where they bring their dogs to socialise with each other and it is something that I personally love to observe. A playground would displace these dogs and their owners; co-existence is not compatible.
- I also object to the proposed bike path which will bisect the park as cyclists pose a serious threat to pedestrians and young children who play in this park. Only last year a cyclist collided into my friend's five year old daughter as he raced his friend along the boardwalk near the Cadi Park Wharf. She was seriously injured and could have been killed. While not all cyclists are this irresponsible, these accidents will occur because of the few rogue ones. This bike path is incompatible with the current character of the park and will also displace the current users and use in the same way the playground will.
- It should also be noted that the Waterfront Park was the scene of a car accident on the 12th April in 2016 when a west-bound car crossed onto the wrong side of the road and mounted the footpath, flattening the light pole in the process. While the current speed limit of 40km/h has helped, this does not stop cars or motorcycles speeding in this area. I am always wary when I am walking on this footpath, or even standing near the edge of the park as it is a location where cars tend to accelerate as they drive downhill along the Waterfront Park. Therefore it is unsafe to place a playground in this location. Please see photos below.



Car mounted on footpath Bowman Street



Car mounted on footpath Bowman Street



Car mounted on footpath Bowman Street

I would have no objection to a bus route along Bowman Street but am concerned with its lack of resolution.

I also strongly object to downgrading Harris Street to local road. Ultimately people will not stop using cars so to reduce Harris Street to two lanes with wider footpaths will force cars into the local roads and clog up those roads. Many cars drive down Harris Street to get onto the Anzac Bridge, so unless there is a way to divert them, they will simply find rat runs in the local roads which is a negative outcome. For locals who need to use their cars, this will make life more difficult in getting in and out of Pyrmont.

In conclusion, the strategy has some commendable proposals but it is crucial that the community is closely consulted and their feedback incorporated in the refinement of the masterplan.

Maggie Lum

[REDACTED]

Pyrmont 2009