

Elizabeth Elenius, Convenor
9C/2 Bowman Street
PYRMONT NSW 2009
Tel: 9571 9727; 0409 552 117
Email: eelenius@bigpond.net.au
www.pyrmontaction.org.au

16 January, 2014

Mr Matthew Rosel,
Department of Planning and Infrastructure,
GPO Box 39,
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Matthew,

SSD 5878 – They Haymarket, Darling Drive Plot – Student Accommodation

We support provision of student accommodation, especially under the proposed management model. However, there are a number of issues that are not addressed in the DA.

- 1.0 Access – The DA still does not address the concerns raised at a consultation session and in comments on the concept plan regarding the removal of the Macarthur St walkway and provision of the unsatisfactory alternative accessway involving the need to drop down to Darling Drive and then zigzag through the site. This is an important accessway to the only bus service (501) currently available to serve the precinct, with a stop just outside the Powerhouse Museum. It should also provide a convenient, and direct link to UTS and SIT, but, as currently configured, doesn't.

Recommendation: That a direct overpass pedestrian/cycle link be provided from Harris Street into the student housing precinct in place of the circuitous link outlined in the DA. This link must also provide for the disabled and people with strollers.

- 2.0 Sporting/Active Recreation Facilities – It is absurd to propose the introduction of student housing, as well as residential development in an area completely devoid of public sporting facilities and fail to provide active recreational opportunities for the people who will live there. It's all very well to point to the proliferation of bars, cafes and restaurants as recreational outlets, but do we really want to exacerbate the already alarming incidence of drunken youths in the CBD? Far better that they



have recreational opportunities which promote their physical and social well-being. Again, the CUMULATIVE impact of all the new residential development either under way or planned in the immediate vicinity, with regard to active sporting recreation, has been completely overlooked by Infrastructure NSW which set the brief for the redevelopment tender.

At meetings with DHL we were advised that a half-sized court may be provided between the two student buildings. The plans do not show any such provision. It is our view that one or two full-sized courts could be provided either underneath the student buildings or on the roofs even if that resulted in additional height. Alternatively, a full-sized court could be provided on the Event Deck in the Entertainment Precinct.

Recommendation: That DHL, SHFA and the City of Sydney work together with community representatives to ensure provision of public sporting facilities to serve the Haymarket residents and those of nearby residential developments, as well as City workers.

3.0 Traffic, Transport and Parking

We note that there is no provision made for parking which, if there was adequate public transport serving the site, may be appropriate. If the students do not drive cars, it is unlikely that there will be adverse effects in adjoining suburbs. We do recommend, however, that carshare spaces be made available either within the development, or in nearby streets.

Recommendation: In the absence of adequate public transport, carshare spaces should be made available within the site or adjoining streets.

We deplore the lack of public transport to the site, and the attitude of Infrastructure NSW that it is not their problem. It should have been addressed when developing the brief for the successful tenderers. It is a long walk to Central or Town Hall and Pyrmont and Ultimo are very poorly served for public transport, especially with the removal of the monorail. The only relief is the as yet unfulfilled promise of an extension of the light rail down George Street and to the University of NSW. Furthermore, unless the fare structure is modified to enable students to obtain concession tickets, they are likely to be unable to afford to use the light rail services. We need far more details about the frequency of services to the Haymarket and Darling Harbour precinct and beyond before any more DAs are approved.



Recommendation: Detailed plans for improved public transport to Darling Harbour and the Haymarket involving community consultation, must be required as a condition of consent for this DA.

- 4.0 Community Facilities - We have held a number of meetings with DHL which have resulted in a verbal commitment to provide space for community facilities, including a Childcare Centre and Library/Community Facility. However, as yet there is no firm commitment to provide this facility. We were advised by DHL that negotiations with the City of Sydney on the designation of the North Building in the Haymarket would be completed by the end of 2013 but there has been no announcement. We also note the condition of approval of the Haymarket Concept Plans (Condition B35) which states:

An appropriate area of land shall be provided within the development for the delivery of a community building/facility by a community organization, or as agreed with the Director General. The developer shall provide infrastructure and services to the land and prepare a Future Development Application for the relevant works in accordance with SHFA and Council.

We cannot support any of the Haymarket Precinct DAs unless at least one of them includes a plan for a Community Building as required by the consent authority.

Recommendation: The provision of a Community Building as per Condition 35 for the Haymarket Concept Plan, and as per discussions with community representatives, must be a condition of consent for this DA.

We ask that our concerns be met in the evaluation of this DA and if it is to be assessed by the Planning Assessment Commission, we wish to make a presentation.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Elenius

