

Pymont Community Group

working for a better environment

To:

Ms Michele Nettlefold
Department of Planning and Environment
Level 22, 320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000

2 February 2017

Dear Ms Nettlefold,

RE: PROPOSED HARBOURSIDE DEVELOPMENT IN PYRMONT

You are asking the community to comment on the Harbourside Development, and one wonders why, as you are on record as not listening to their suggestions re density and social infrastructure requirements in previous developments such as Barangaroo and Darling Harbour.

If developments are to reflect community needs and wishes they need to be discussed before the plans are finalised. We see no community needs reflected in this proposal.

For example, a child care centre could easily have been incorporated to serve both the needs of the workers and the community. We have hundreds of children on the waiting lists for our available child care centres in Pymont/Ultimo.

The Pymont Community Group would like to remind you of the fact that there has been no meaningful open space planned for new developments in Pymont and Ultimo that was not community-driven. Every small/large green space in Pymont and Ultimo was fought for by the Community. Gibba Park, for example, was extended 20 metres only due to community pressure.

Mr Baldwin, then our Sydney MP, told me that the Whitlam Government had given \$146 million to keep the whole of the Pymont Point headland green. He said the money had been absorbed into public revenue, and the Feds would never give money again without strings attached. That was obviously how things worked in Sydney then. Is it so different now?

Pymont Point Park was destined for a thirteen storey tower, and five blocks of five storey buildings on the foreshore. Where was the planned open space for such a huge increase in the population in Pymont/Ultimo? Where would the children play? Where were their parents and friends to gather? What social infrastructure was in place to cope with the increased traffic and parking needs? There was none. It was handed over to the developers and small residual plots of land left over from the building sites were considered adequate open spaces for the community.

After a year spent negotiating with Lend Lease, Waterfront Park West at Jackson's Landing was redesigned from a terraced, over-landscaped park to a form more suited to children's play opportunities and family gatherings. This shows how long it takes to effect change when meaningful consultation could have effected a useful outcome within weeks.

While these large developments are considered in isolation they will fail as the traffic and social problems they create will not go away.

We do not support this development as it is too large, infringes on the public amenity of our suburbs. It is a blatant land grab of public land and delivers a monetary reward to developers but offers nothing for the community. It provides no affordable housing opportunities for our young people and it contravenes the 1988 terms of the lease for the Harbourside site.

THE LEASE

What is the use of a lease if it cannot be enforced? No development should be granted approval if it does not comply with the 1988 terms of the lease for the Harbourside site.

This would not be best practice planning procedure and would create a precedent for all the leases surrounding the Bays Precinct.

The proper development of this site is very important to the amenity of local residents of Pyrmont/Ultimo and we urge the following.

ACTION WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO TAKE

- 1. Adhere to the terms of the 1988 lease of the Harbourside site.**
- 2. Determine the development on environmental impact grounds.**
- 3. Remember it is on public land and public benefit must be included and weighted in as equal to developer profit.**
- 4. This development should not be considered in isolation but planned in the context of traffic and social infrastructure and other development proposals for the whole of Pyrmont/Ultimo.**
- 5. Prepare a traffic impact study for all major intersections in Pyrmont/Ultimo.**
- 6. Land must be set aside for public use such as schools, playing fields, child care, health, and community facilities. This development will bring some 300 additional residents and their needs must be addressed.**
- 7. Reject the proposed building envelope as the tower and the podium are too high, obscure sunlight over the waters of Cockle Bay and the public domain.**
- 8. Extend the walkway between the Harris/Fig Street to provide pedestrian/cycle access to the CBD. This should be the responsibility of the developer.**

9. The proposed retail component should incorporate elements needed by the local community and not be targeted only to tourists.

Darling Harbour turns its back on Ultimo and we do not want to see another large development blocking harbour views and overshadowing the bay. We urge the Department not to permit this development which shows little regard for the residents who will have to live with the congestion and overshadowing that this present development would bring.

We urge you to consider the needs and wishes of the community who will live here for generations to come.

Yours sincerely,

Jean Stuart
President
Pymont Community Group

cc. Ms Clover Moore, Lord Mayor of Sydney; City of Sydney Councillors; Anthony Roberts MP, Minister for Planning, Greater Sydney Commission