

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: Friday, 4 February 2022 1:16:33 PM

Submitted on Fri, 04/02/2022 - 13:16

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

Maureen

Last name

Barron

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

2009

Please provide your view on the project

I object to it

Submission

PYRMONT PENINSULA PLACE STRATEGY, URBAN DESIGN REPORT, DARLING ISLAND SUB-PRECINCT

.. Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission in relation to the Pyrmont Urban Design Report. This submission relates to the Darling Island sub-precinct where we live.

.. The Report raises significant issues for residents in the sub-precinct and, if implemented, will detrimentally affect residents of that area. The proposals in the Report do not balance the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.

.. The Darling Island sub-precinct is home to many people, most of whom live in residential developments. In the report the area is referred to as a mixed use recreational, cultural and entertainment destination, with no reference to the residential component and, as a result, no consideration of the impacts on the residents and their safety, amenity and privacy. This is a serious flaw, and is particularly evident in the proposed 24/7 entertainment and culture driven landscape at Pyrmont Bay Park and the link of that site with the Star Casino and Maritime Museum and the "pier connection". It is unacceptable to simply designate a residential area a "24/7 entertainment and culture driven landscape" with no reference to how this will affect people who live throughout the area, particularly including at Sydney Wharf, on Pirrama Road, throughout Darling Island, on Point Street, etc.

.. Pyrmont Bay Park is the closest parkland to Sydney Wharf (encompassing Wharves 8 and 9 in Pyrmont Bay) and is valued and used extensively by local residents and visitors to the area. Transforming the park into a 24/7 entertainment and culture driven landscape would substantially and adversely affect residents' use of the park as well as our ability to live healthy lives in the area through the changed usage of the parkland. Additionally, this park is bisected by road access to Sydney Wharf as well as Wharf 7 and Wharf 10 and egress should not be compromised by changes.

.. The Report proposes and includes a sketch of a Pyrmont Bay 'pier connection', effectively cutting off access to half of Sydney Wharf Marina, which is adjacent to Wharf 9 at Sydney Wharf and all of the western side of Wharf 10. Access to both sections of the marina is compromised by the proposal reducing the viability of the marina business, access to marina berth owners and the value of the berths. There is no mention of access to the Pyrmont Bay Casino wharf which would appear to be precluded or compromised by the 'pier connection'. Pyrmont Bay Casino wharf is an alternative public transport wharf and is used from time to time for public transport.

.. Any increase in on-water activities will create more noise pollution for residents than occurs with the current use of the Pyrmont Bay Casino wharf and adjacent businesses. There is continuing noise on days and nights when Dolton House holds events, and this increases with noise from private boats entering the bay to pick up and drop off passengers from the Casino wharf. Some of these boats carry high numbers of people and this generates considerable noise. The 24/7 entertainment usage inevitably will create unacceptable noise levels for residents.

.. The proposed relocation of some Maritime Museum moorings alongside Wharf 7 will adversely affect residents of Sydney Wharf, and also introduce unnecessary safety risks and noise pollution. This is a major issue as it involves repositioning the Pyrmont Bay Wharf, which was refurbished only 3/4 years ago. The F4 service is a busy and popular service, is an ideal public transport option for Pyrmont residents and visitors and serves those people well. Its links with the light rail service and to the north side of the harbour, Barangaroo and Circular Quay are working well as evidenced by the patronage of the service. The ferry service is a priority for Pyrmont which means that the removal of the wharf to the end of a long pontoon with priority given to the Maritime Museum and its collections is awkward and the wrong priorities. This potentially imperils the effective operation of the service and safety, particularly as ferry travel is projected to experience increased demand.

.. Ferry wharves are best placed as close as feasible to land and this is reflected in the commuter wharves around Sydney. Wharves need to be easily and safely positioned and accessed, so a wharf jutting out needlessly into one of the busiest parts of Sydney Harbour in a major tourist and visitor area is inappropriate and a poor choice. Also, the repositioning of the wharf does not enhance safety as it is inconvenient as well as needlessly expensive.

We don't need this waste when valuable funds can be being spent on sensible public transport options. With this distortion of the ferry service placement, there is a risk that services may be curtailed or not expanded in order to meet the Museum's needs in the future and this is not the right priority for public transport that serves a densely populated part of the city.

.. Increasing the accommodation of the Museum fleet in the busy part of the harbour is another poor choice and will increase traffic to the area by land and water in the course of the construction of oversized pontoons/wharves.

.. There are other options for the heritage fleet that residents and visitors would want to see on display, but not all vessels have to be at Pyrmont all the time. A proposal that allowed for some expansion and a medium-to-long term plan including other harbour locations is desirable. The current proposal does not look to the medium and long term future and ignores the potential expansion of the fleet, which is ideally located at other venues around Sydney Harbour.

.. While safety is paramount in relation to the location and use of the wharf, this proposal is a concern on other fronts. For example, Sydney by Sail does not need to be located in Darling Harbour and can easily re-locate to another location, such as Jones Bay Wharf, where there is much greater safety for their operations and vessels leaving and berthing and which is within walking distance of the ferry/light rail/bus service.

.. Sydney Wharf is unique in Pyrmont, being a development predicated on a lease which contains customary terms for the benefit of residents and consistent with healthy living. It is unreasonable and contrary to the terms of the lease to fundamentally change the nature of the lease environment in which its terms operate and under which residents purchased. These rights are significant given the ongoing costs that we fund to maintain the asset and meet the lease terms and use of its related facilities.. These terms and the residential occupancy of Sydney Wharf make us uniquely vulnerable to excessive noise during and after construction, to pollution and damage to the Sydney Wharf infrastructure and the need for ongoing security.

I agree to the above statement

Yes