

Matthew Rosel

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 4 December 2018 10:26 AM
To: Matthew Rosel
Subject: Re: RE: The Star Casino modification application (MP 08_0098 MOD13) - notification of public exhibition

Matthew

Firstly thank you for your prompt response.

Having read The Star's response I remain very concerned that such a new development can be made under a 1979 rule.

I would like to comment on a number of areas that highlight why this modification should be declined and a new development sought under 2018 rules.

Within a number of objections from myself, Alex Greenwich and the City of Sydney Planning there was a common concern that the height of the tower was not in keeping with the area, would set a precedent and was incorrect and unable under zoning to include 204 apartments.

The Star -both its casino and hotels are commercial businesses and surely the 1979 transitional modification arrangement was to allow some commercial development.

I have no issues with a tower to include a new hotel but for The Star modification to include 204 apartments should be assessed as a new development under 2018 requirements.

I found it quite dismissive of The Star to respond that their 60 odd floor tower would not set a precedent as other developments would not use a 1979 modification!

The Star's response does not appear to understand the low rise environment of this part of Pyrmont and continues to defend its tower development in keeping with the programs of work in Barangaroo, Darling Harbour . Pyrmont is not the Darling Harbour and is not zoned as such.

The amount of significant transport disruption and public and social impact is not fairly recognised either.

The final new comment relates to the ongoing public and political debate around over development, density and the pressures on infrastructure which appear to be gaining traction to potentially ensure some changes are made to planning rules to ensure and improve public & social infrastructure going forward.

It appears almost illegal to allow a 1979 transitional arrangement to be used in 2018.

As previous Ministers have allowed this 1979 MOD to be considered then it would be a sign of progressive political leadership as well as genuine public recognition that the current Minister either declines this modification or requests in be assessed by the next elected Minister and /or declines the MOD and requests a new development in compliance with 2018 and all forward looking rules.

As an aside for The Star to rush this through in the final weeks of the current government is in itself a poor reflection of their attitude and process.

I would be grateful if my comments included in the due process around this application.

Regards

[REDACTED]