

From: 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: Monday, 31 January 2022 3:52:38 PM
Attachments: [pyrmont-precinct-plan-final.pdf](#)

Submitted on Mon, 31/01/2022 - 15:47

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

██████████

Last name

██████████

I would like my submission to remain confidential

Yes

Info

Email

██

Suburb/Town & Postcode

2009

Please provide your view on the project

I object to it

Submission file

[pyrmont-precinct-plan-final.pdf](#)

Submission

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

I broadly support the proposals however I as a Marina berth owner in ██████████ I object to the potential construction of a new link between Sydney Wharf and Darling Island, that effectively halves the number of berths available.

Access to the harbor should be encouraged, and the removal of berths that are freely available to members of the public to purchase, (and are currently owned) appears to be at odds with the objective to increase access to the harbour. It also will result in significant adverse financial impact to the owners of those berths that would be eliminated.

I agree to the above statement

Yes

I refer to the Pyrmont Peninsular sub-precinct master plans currently on exhibit, and wish to express my objection to certain proposals for the Darling Island sub-precinct.

I am a resident in Sydney Wharf, and elements of the proposals will have a significantly adverse impact on the quality of the life of my family and neighbours in terms of noise and safety.

I note the first statement in the relevant section 4.3 is:-

'Darling Island is a mixed use recreational, cultural and entertainment destination.'

This statement ignores the fact that there is a significant residential community housed in the sub-precinct, particularly on Sydney Wharf and Darling Island.

Accordingly the proposal evidences a total lack of consideration for residents in the precinct. I note almost all of this residential population has arisen from new developments that have, to date, been encouraged by the Government over the last 15 or so years as a means of instilling a community feel and source of economic activity to the area.

This lack of consideration is supported by page 60 of the plan *'Darling Island Character and experience'*, which makes no reference at all to the existence of a substantial residential community.

Particularly inappropriate is the objective to create *'a destination for 24 hour events'* in the vicinity of Pyrmont Park, incorporating a *'water event space'*. The intention to create an *'entertainment and culture driven landscape'* when this area has a significant residential community appears ill-conceived.

Of particular concern is the proposal for Pyrmont Bay to *'Establish better connections to the Pyrmont Bay wharf fingers'*, potentially via a new bridge between Sydney Wharf and Darling Island, (as per *'Secondary Foreshore Route'*, *'Pyrmont Bay pier connection'* and *'Establish better connections to the Pyrmont Bay Wharf Fingers'*).

This plan, seems to provide no discernible benefit as foreshore access is already plentiful.

The wharf promenades are already very popular routes for walkers, joggers, and cyclists, and are accessible directly from a number of separate foreshore points, including Pyrmont Park, Metcalf Park and surrounding walkways and roads.

There does not appear to be any impediment to accessing the character of the wharfs that would support the building of a new structure to deface a historic waterway.

The proposal option for a new bridge structure between Darling Island and Sydney Wharf will however result in the following significant negative impacts:-

- Increased noise and foot traffic delivered to Sydney Wharf and Darling Island residential areas arising from a 24 hour entertainment precinct, especially the water event space.
- Metcalf Park is an open separation zone between the commercial and residential component of Darling Island, and is heavily used by the community. I note also the only off leash dog park in the sub-precinct. Encouraging a '24 hour economy' is completely inappropriate for this recreational area.
- I note that as a result of its central location, residents in Sydney Wharf currently require 24 hour, 7 days per week security, usually in the form of at least one individual present on the Wharf. Increasing 24 hour activity on the Wharf will only add to the safety concerns for residents.
- Reduced marina capacity by approximately half, thereby reducing access to the harbour to members of the public. Berths of the size in this marina are already a scarce resource on the harbour, and their removal appears contrary to the objective of making the area a more attractive and vibrant area, and providing improved access to the harbour.

The affected Marina berths have been leased to members of the public, and removing the berths will have substantial negative economic impact to lease holders, unless compensated by the Government.

Residents of Sydney Wharf are required by the terms of their lease to maintain elements of the foreshore promenade surrounding the residences. It is particularly disappointing that we appear to have been given no consideration regards the impact the proposals will have on us.

I note the proposal includes the removal of Pymont/Casino Wharf and refers to the objective to *'Upgrade future wharf and ferry terminal to enable 24 hour foreshore access'*.

I support the proposal to remove Pymont/Casino wharf and potentially reposition this activity to the under-utilised Pymont Bay wharf area adjacent to the Maritime Museum. Removal of this commercial activity from the residential area has merit.

Pymont/Casino wharf is heavily utilised, with significant numbers of people congregating in the open space near Dalton House, either waiting for, or returning from commercial 'party' boats. The area is frequently noisy, especially after a trip when many are intoxicated, and is particularly active late at night. (I note the Police have considered it necessary to regularly place a surveillance trailer in the area to monitor and control undesirable behaviour).

I support much of what is proposed in the Plan, however the Darling Island sub-precinct proposal needs to acknowledge the significant residential population at its heart. At present it does not.

Increased residential presence in the sub-precinct has been encouraged by the various levels of Government in recent years, and it has provided a valuable contribution to the renewal of the area. The character of the area should be developed in a way that recognises and respects this contribution.

Kind Regards

██████████