

Attachment E

Submissions

From: David Haertsch [redacted] on behalf of David Haertsch [redacted]
<David.Haertsch@[redacted]>
Sent on: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 2:04:22 PM
To: dasubmissions
Subject: Submission - D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 - Attention Jessica Symons

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Ms Symons,

I note that the above application has applied for only a modest height variation of 6 metres in a few parts of the development.

The scheme has many commendable public aspects. It is a project of such great amenity so close to the city centre - mixed uses; public facilities; cross site public connectivity and so on and is of high design quality.

However, I feel that I must express a certain disappointment in the relatively low density of the development. A site with such great amenity could surely accommodate more population and that would better suit its central location and future urban character.

It appears the the maximum number of storeys is between six and eight.

I note that the height limit of 27 metres was given by the City Council some time ago.

I believe that this height limit was probably imposed well before a Pyrmont Metro Station was proposed nearby and before New Sydney Fish Markets (now under construction).

These additional metropolitan facilities will provide greatly increased amenity to the site that would more than justify an increase in density.

The Site already has a light rail stop and nearby bus routes along Harris Street. It faces a park that will be renovated and upgraded to become an even more popular recreational area once the greyhounds are gone.

It is within walking distance of Darling Harbour, Glebe's high streets and the Blackwattle Bay waterfront.

While I understand that the approximately 27metre high wall of Woolstores along Wattle Street is a significant component of the streetscape, I feel that away from Wattle Street towards Jones Street, the density could be made to match that of the ten storey building at No. 280 Jones Street.

I would further advocate that any increase in density above that in this proposal provide affordable housing as this is in limited supply in this part of the city.

In addition, the City's regulation of car parking maximums of dwellings and workplaces should be strictly applied given the ready accessibility of the site to several lines of public transport and the level of traffic congestion in the city centre.

Yours Faithfully

David Haertsch

David Haertsch Architect A A 5367
www.dharchitect.com.au
Level 4 68 Wentworth Ave Surry Hills
t [redacted] f 9281 3171

From: <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 10:09:33 AM
To: dasubmissions [REDACTED]
Subject: Fig/Wattle Street D2023/97
Attachments: Fig Wattle St Redev 31 March 2023.docx (88.71 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organization. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Please find attached Pyrmont Action's submission on this application. Elizabeth Elenius, Convenor, Pyrmont Action Inc. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

31 March, 2023

Ms Jessica Symonds,
City of Sydney,
dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Symonds,

D/2023/97 – 14-26 and 12A Wattle Street, Pyrmont

Following a briefing with representatives of the proponent, BVN (winners of the design competition) and landscape architects we wish to make the following comments:

- 1.0 *Building Heights* – We accept the increase in height of the terraces fronting Jones Street, as each additional storey will be set back from the new footpath and the widened street. However, we are very concerned that no attempt has been made to maintain the open views from Fig Park. Whilst the proposed retail space fronting Jones street associated with the commercial building to the South of the site may provide some community amenity, it will compromise the open vistas that currently exist from the park.

We have previously proposed that a trade-off of height could be achieved by keeping the views from the park and increasing the height of the commercial building towards the South West and recommend reconsideration of the treatment of this SE corner of the site.

We do not support the proposed increase in height of the central building. The Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy recommends that developments in the Wentworth Park Sub-Precinct recommend a stepped approach to building heights from Wattle Street which has not been fully achieved in this plan.

- 2.0 *Public Domain* – We support the widening at the top and bottom sections of the EW through-site link providing improved access from Ultimo to Wentworth Park. We also support the treatment of the public open space in the vicinity of the existing lift from the light rail station to Jones Street. We would like clarification of the ownership of the area at the top of the cliff between Harbour Mill and the existing stairs up from the LR to Jones Street. At present it is weed infested and unsightly, creating ongoing maintenance problems for volunteers from Pyrmont Ultimo Landcare who look after the public domain between the LR station and the Fig/Wattle Street development site. We ask that a condition of approval be that the developer arrange for clearance of the weeds from the cliff-top, in



consultation with PUL volunteers. Any plane trees removed from the development site should be replaced with local native trees in order to increase the canopy cover.

Hard surfaces should be kept to a minimum in all areas of public open space to enhance water infiltration.

- 3.0 *Renewable Energy and Water Capture* – We commend the proposal for the installation of solar panels and battery storage for all buildings and measures to capture stormwater and run-off for re-use in areas of public parkland and on rooftop gardens.
- 4.0 *N-S Link* – We note the need to remove 2 lillipillis which line the existing path to the light rail station from Wattle Street in order to provide pedestrian access to the station from the proposed development. We do not oppose this removal on condition that more local native trees are planted on the proposed adjoining public land next to the new pathway.
- 5.0 *Access to the cliff face of the former Hell Hole sandstone Quarry* – We note that visual access to the cliff face will be provided from the public open space adjacent the proposed sports centre and from Jones Street. Physical access is available from inside the sports centre. We are satisfied with this level of access which should be maintained throughout the life of the development.
- 6.0 *Affordable Housing* – We ask that funds acquired by Council via an Affordable Housing levy on the development be used to provide new Public/Affordable Housing within the LGA and that Council provide public advice as to the amount raised and details of how it will be spent.

We are happy to discuss this submission further with those assessing the latest plans.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Elenius, Convenor



From: [redacted] <[redacted]> on behalf of [redacted]
<[redacted]> <Elena Akhromova [redacted]>
Sent on: Monday, April 10, 2023 8:31:44 PM
To: dasubmissions [redacted]
CC: cmoore@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au; clover@clovermoore.com; athomas@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au;
kobi@[redacted]; Jamie Parker MP <jamie [redacted]>; [redacted]
<[redacted]>; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]
<[redacted]>; [redacted]
Subject: Submission - D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 - Attention Jessica Symons
Attachments: 10 April 2023 submission FINAL.pdf (163.61 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organization. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Ms Symons,

Please kindly see a submission attached. We have a long history of submissions in relation to this proposed development, including participation in the Court hearing (mediation) and correspondence with the Lord Mayor and Mr Andrew Thomas. We will be bringing this to their attention, as well as Ms Kobi Shetty our Member for Balmain (we understand this development is in the Balmain electorate).

Thank you for considering our submission.

Kind regards,

[redacted] (owner of unit [redacted] at 280 Jones St, Pyrmont NSW 2009 known as the Harbour Mill)
[redacted]

10 April 2023

Submission regarding D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009

Made by owners/residents of the following units at 280 Jones Street Pymont NSW 2009:

1. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
6. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
7. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[Please keep the above personal details confidential]

Dear Ms. Jessica Symons

Delivered via email: [dasubmissions@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:dasubmissions@[REDACTED])

Copy to: Lord Mayor Ms Clover Moore [cmoore@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:cmoore@[REDACTED]), [clover@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:clover@[REDACTED])

Mr Andrew Thomas, Executive Manager Planning and Development [athomas@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:athomas@[REDACTED])

Ms Kobi Shetty, MP [kobi@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:kobi@[REDACTED])

Mr Jamie Parker, former Balmain Electorate MP [jamie@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:jamie@[REDACTED])

Re: D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009

We are delivering this submission in the following capacities:

- Owners of the properties listed above at 280 Jones St Pymont NSW 2009, known as the Harbour Mill building, which is adjacent to and overlooks the proposed development site;
- payers of taxes, duties and rates; and
- members of the public.

Each of us has lived in the Pymont and Ultimo area for more than 5 years. We represent the common consumers and the public who “live and breathe” the area. This is our neighbourhood and our home. We represent all those people who will be directly impacted by the proposed development.

We are disappointed that Landream Pymont Pty Ltd (“Landream” or “the developer”) is proposing a modified DA in excess of the building heights approved by the Commissioner through mediation (“the Court”).

We trust in the Council’s responsibility to protect our interests and list the following major concerns regarding this DA:

- **Building heights.** The DA approved by the Court already included heights in excess of the standards set by the Law. The developer is now attempting to increase the heights even further. We request that the Council does not allow further height increases.
- **Allowing +10% design excellence neither fair nor reasonable in the circumstances.** Given that the proposed Development is in breach of the height standard as approved by the Court already, we kindly request the Council to reconsider whether it is fair and reasonable for this non-complying Development to maintain eligibility for +10% additional height under SLEP 2012 provisions.
- **Not in Public Interest.** As the Council already outlined in its decision to refuse the original DA in July 2020, this non-complying development is not in the Public Interest. We agree that the scale of this proposed development is excessive for this site / area. Therefore, access to +10% heights and increases above DA envelope as approved by the Court should be disallowed
- **Consumer confidence.** The proposed material breach of the height standard undermines consumer confidence (including home owners in the area who made property ownership decisions in good faith relying on the height standard legislation).
- **Undesirable precedent.** The proposed height breach sets precedent for future developments in the area, exacerbating the issues described herein.
- **Developer opportunistically pushing the envelope for own benefit at the expense of the local community.** We note a long history of DA proposals, rejections, modifications and mediation for this development since 2019. The original DA was firmly rejected by the Council with independent consultant’s review. However, the Developer has pushed and pulled all possible levers to again propose yet a new set of modifications resulting in an envelope similar to the original DA heights and scale, thus must be firmly rejected again for the same reasons.
- **Integrity of the DA consent process.** Breaches of height standard of the magnitude as detailed in this DA would put a reasonable person on alert that the process may not have been properly followed to protect the interests of the community.
- **History of the site – failed school.** The community has suffered enough as this site was proposed for a new Public School, which the Council failed to sell to the State Government as they wanted a higher price. This should be taken into consideration in deciding on building heights.
- **Landmark site.** This site is a highly visible landmark with heritage. We request consideration of this before consenting to any heights in excess of the Court decision and before allowing +10%.
- **Overshadowing the Fig Street park.** The proposed height increases above those approved by the Court create additional overshadowing and locking of views from the public park.

- **Adverse impact on the historic and cultural significance of the area.** Harbour Mill has been faithful to the design of the original flour mill, and is the primary landmark for commuters travelling eastbound over the Anzac bridge. However, with the proposed DA heights the new building will dwarf Harbour Mill and be seen from multiple vantage points with out of character design and excessive height.
- **Harbour Mill adversely impacted.** Height increase will infringe on the privacy of existing units in 280 Jones St, who would have previously seen over the Wattle st proposed structure. Additionally, the height increase will overshadow 280 Jones St common amenities, including the internal courtyard and Level 4 shared rooftop.
- **Wind tunnel.** The height increase compared to what was approved can also lead to wind tunnel effects and exacerbate noise pollution, affecting all residents of 280 Jones St, the neighbouring terrace houses, and the proposed Wattle St structure.
- **Density increase negative impact - traffic.** Height increase means additional increase in density that will create an access issue and safety hazard for residents accessing the Jones St cul-de-sac. The street is narrow and an additional density increase and subsequent increase in traffic will make 280 Jones St inaccessible by car, including rideshares. The council should assess Jones St access as a destination for ride share vehicles. As a resident of the area for over 5 years, it is unlikely that ride share vehicles will be taken to Wattle St. They will instead create traffic issues on Jones St.
- **Density increase negative impact – public transport.** Height increase leads to increased density which will overburden the limited existing public transport, such as the light rail and local buses from Harris St.
- **Density increase negative impact – illegal dumping.** The increased density will promote and worsen existing illegal dumping in Jones Lane around the Western Distributor overpass. The illegal dumping is a safety concern due to sharp objects, and blocks the primary access point from Jones St to Harris St public transport.
- **Wentworth Park overshadowing.** The council should assess the compatibility of an increased height structure at Wattle St against its existing plans to reclaim Wentworth Park as a recreation site.

Thank you for considering this important matter and our submission. We trust in your responsibility to protect the interests of the minorities, rather than allowing those with money and power to over-ride the system.

If you need to discuss any matters in relation to this submission, please contact any or all of us via the email addresses listed above or [REDACTED] can be reached on [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely,



From: [redacted] > on behalf of [redacted]
[redacted] > <[redacted]>
Sent on: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 7:47:50 AM
To: [redacted] dasubmissions [redacted]
CC: Jamie Parker MP <jamie [redacted]>; athomas@[redacted];
clover@[redacted]; cmoore@[redacted]; kobi [redacted] u
Subject:
Attachments: Final submission D202397.pdf (51.36 KB), 10 April 2023 submission FINAL.pdf (163.61 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organization. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Ms Symons,

Please find my submission attached: Final submission D/2023/97
This submission is written in addition to but echoes the submission also attached: 10 April 2023 submission FINAL
I request that my submission and strong objection is brought to the attention of all recipients and I ask that it is to be included in the process of determining the DA modification application for the proposed development D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009.

Respectfully
[redacted]

----- Original Message -----

From: "[redacted]"
To: "dasubmissions [redacted]" <dasubmissions [redacted]>
Cc: cmoore@[redacted]; clover@[redacted]; athomas@[redacted]; kobi@[redacted]; "Jamie Parker MP" <jamie@[redacted]>; "[redacted]" <[redacted]>; [redacted] <[redacted]>; [redacted] <[redacted]>

Sent: Monday, 10 Apr, 2023 At 8:31 PM

Subject: Submission - D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 - Attention Jessica Symons

Dear Ms Symons,

Please kindly see a submission attached. We have a long history of submissions in relation to this proposed development, including participation in the Court hearing (mediation) and correspondence with the Lord Mayor and Mr Andrew Thomas. We will be bringing this to their attention, as well as Ms Kobi Shetty our Member for Balmain (we understand this development is in the Balmain electorate).

Thank you for considering our submission.

Kind regards,

██████████ (owner of unit ██████ at 280 Jones St, Pyrmont NSW 2009 known as the Harbour Mill)

██████████

████████████████████

12 April 2023

From:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Pyrmont 2009

Objection to the modifications for the proposed development D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street
PYRMONT NSW 2009

Delivered via email: [dasubmissions](#) [REDACTED]

Copy to:

Lord Mayor Ms Clover Moore [cmoore](#) [REDACTED]

Mr Andrew Thomas, Executive Manager Planning and Development

[athomas](#) [REDACTED]

Ms Kobi Shetty, MP [kobi@](#) [REDACTED]

Balmain Electorate [balmain](#) [REDACTED]

To Ms Jessica Symons

I object to and strongly oppose any **further** modifications proposed by Landream Pyrmont Pty Ltd (“Landream” or “the developer”) to D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009.

I wish to preface my objection with commentary regarding the process and personal observations - which may not be within the confinements of proper process, are context and common ways that the community communicate and as such, I feel appropriate to this objection.

This developer has a history of requesting multiple modifications to DAs of previous projects for example, Beecroft Place - 8 Hannah Street, Beecroft NSW.

In this case, the developer has presented City of Sydney Council (CoS) with a DA for the site and had it approved; modified the approved DA and applied for approval which was rejected by CoS; appealed CoS decision to the Commissioner which was approved through mediation (“the Court”). And now we have another application by the developer, to modify the approved modified DA.

If the initial DA was rejected by CoS, I would expect (based on this history), that this current application to modify the DA should not be approved based on similar grounds as the first

application. In fact, given that the developer wishes to increase the density and height of the build, the negative and non-compliant effects of this measure are amplified even further.

Again, given their pattern of behaviour and the methods employed by the developer, we may see that the developer again, takes this matter to court for an anticipated overthrowing of the CoS decision.

I implore CoS to take the strongest action to prevent this form of delinquency which makes a mockery of CoS processes and decisions.

Whilst legislation permits this developer manner of asking for more modifications based on no other justification but for **financial gain** it is both disheartening and worrisome. Whilst a motive for maximum profit may be acceptable in a purely commercial operation - the residential adjunct changes the completion of the decision making.

We must rely on legislation and evidence-based research in this matter in order to arrive at a decision that not just preserves the financial gains for this business group but also also accounts for any and all **human, social, cultural and environmental consequences** that are measurable and permanent.

I implore the decision makers in this matter to understand the history of this location and area; to know about the current issues of concerns that remain unresolved for the community; and to satisfactorily forecast the impending demands on the area once this and all other known developments are in place. Almost all of which, will occur in only a 5 -10 year period.

As a member of the community, invited to participate in the determination process for the application to modify this already modified proposed development, I draw your attention to the **considerable technical disadvantage** that I or other non-trained community members may face when opposing development applications.

Obviously, there may be a wider range of impacts, considerations, precedents and arguments that can be legitimately put during this process but which are not known or presented by community members. Given this, we rely upon your experience and expertise in the human, social, cultural, economic and technical data of consequences, to understand and draw together both, our explicit and implied concerns.

The modifications proposed by Landream Pymont Pty Ltd ("Landream" or "the developer") in D/ 2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009, seek to increase even further the high density residential and commercial buildings on this site, without commensurate planning to services and public spaces.

Given all known research and our most recent experiences around the Covid pandemic, the importance of residential and community liveability and wellbeing is amplified. Prudent decisions and measures applied conscientiously, must be undertaken in order to preserve the present and future community needs.

The decision to refuse the proposed **further modifications** by Landream Pyrmont Pty Ltd (“Landream” or “the developer”) to D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 is both in alignment with the legislated standards and conditions in the planning process but also satisfies the **highly relevant needs** of immediate and surrounding neighbours to be affected by the additional proposed modifications.

The proposed further modifications **will impose the effects** of overcrowding, access to light and quality air circulation that leads to disfunction for the amenity and healthy living of the residents established and moving into this development and the surrounding area.

The effects of overcrowding are numerous but specific to this area are the **higher levels of foot traffic** around Sydney Fish Markets, Wentworth Park, Wattle Street, Pyrmont Bridge Road, Wentworth Park Light Rail Stop, Jones Street, Upper Fig Street, Harbour Mill (280 Jones Street) thoroughway, Jones Lane, Fig Street, Bulwara Road, Allen Street and Harris Street are safety and logistic concerns.

I hold great safety concerns for locals including primary school-aged children, visitors/tourists and any future residents that walk along and cross eg corner of Upper Fig Street and Jones Street, Bulwara Road and Allen Street, unaware of current unresolved problems of a lack of pedestrian visibility on corners, a lack of footpaths contributing to people walking on the street, a lack of loading areas turning areas and parking. Increasing the residential and commercial capacity of this development site will only **amplify these hazards**.

The proposed further modifications to this DA will result in overshadowing to the general area and specifically to Harbour Mill and the heritage terraces on Jones Street. Objections by the owner of the terraces namely NSW Government Department of Social Housing, may not be provided and any residents of these houses may not participate in this DA process due to a range of factors one of which is a lack of awareness to influence the decision. I fear that the lack of input by these residents or even residents renting at Harbour Mill may create a skewed perception by the decision makers about levels of community interest or concern, that will favour the developer. I ask that in making the final decision about this development that due care is applied so that **all residents and community benefit** appropriately.

With specific focus on the effects of the proposed further modifications to this DA to the residents of Harbour Mill there will be a direct impact on the access to adequate **light and privacy** as the

proposed buildings **will** have views into windows, balconies and the common area of Level 5 (floor 4). When these are DA requirements for the construction of Harbour Mill, **what is the calculated impact to these features of amenity?** Will the needs of the residents of Harbour Mill be **negatively impacted** by an approval of the proposed further modifications to this DA? The open common space of **Level 5 will be affected** by and possibly impact on the proposed development in terms of noise/acoustic activities, privacy, possible quality airflow and access to light. **Have these been accounted for** by Landream Pyrmont Pty Ltd (“Landream” or “the developer”)?

Further residential and commercial intensity in this development will create **substantial traffic** to be generated due to visitors to and from this residential and commercial project. Irrespective of standard building parking facilities, the continual moving in and out of tenants and/or commercial deliveries and their parking requirements is well known and is a negative feature of our own Harbour Mill. The legislation fails to recognise and account for this type of traffic which is well above that calculated.

I have not elaborated on the specific **public services and assets required** to support such an increase in occupation and use of this site but please consider and evaluate the required needs for education, recreation, pollution controls, waste management, utilities supply. Please remember the impending needs of the Blackwattle Bay developments which are only a few streets away.

Finally, I will add that, based on past applications for proposed modifications to DAs I am **expecting many more changes** including those within the construction and those about the operation of the commercial premises that form an integral part of this development.

With each change, I ask that you consider the **whole picture and impact** to our homes and community and apply the available legislation to work for the community that includes those to come in 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009.

I support and echo the concerns presented to you in a previous email submission regarding D/ 2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 by owners/residents of units at 280 Jones Street Pyrmont NSW 2009 and presented to you by [REDACTED] – unit [REDACTED]

I genuinely believe, when I compare the existing buildings and commercial developments made in the recent past the appearance and character of the peninsula is irrevocably altered with the changes not benefitting the community.

Respectfully

[Redacted]

From:

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

To The Honourable Gladys Berejiklian MP The Honourable [First name] [Surname] MP The Honourable [First name] [Surname] MP or Minister for...

To:

The Hon. Gladys Berejiklian, MP

The Hon. (Rob) Robert Gordon STOKES, MP Geoff Gerring, Development Director, INSW Alex Greenwich, MP

Jamie Parker, MP

I object to the proposed development of Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct (BBSSP), because as they stand, as they do not comply with current planning controls.

I object to the proposed development of BBSSP because it relies upon changes to the existing planning controls.

The existing planning controls serve the Blackwattle Bay Precinct well and it is with these planning controls that the various communities encompassing the BBSSP have prospered and flourished into appealing, active and successful settings for both economic and social enterprises. To alter the existing planning controls for the sake of the stated but not guaranteed outcomes of the proposed development of Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct will alter the current environment and will impact upon the immediate and wider communities.

I object to the rezoning of the BBSSP in order to facilitate the proposed development.

The proposed BBSSP does not comply with relevant standards or guidelines that ensure commitment to the local character and amenity of the community in the following ways:

The proposal states “public domain network of open spaces, streets and lanes is central to the plan and defines building envelopes”. This suggests more than usual open spaces but what is to be delivered is simply a series of public pathways and access roads, typical of all streets and buildings described as “building envelopes”.

The proposal states that the urban design will be “formulated around aspirations for the public domain”. An “aspiration” is not a defined outcome.

It is stated that the “public domain network integrates streets and lanes with the open space and parks of the Precinct Plan” but the models provided show nothing more than a series of streets and small green spaces that do not reflect the unique opportunity that we have for 10 hectares of uninterrupted land to be used first and foremost for the Public.

I object to the inclusion of Wentworth Park as part of the open spaces formula. This area is separate to the foreshore space of the current Sydney Fish Markets (SFM). The purchase of

foreshore land to accommodate the move of the SFM, will block the site lines of the parkland and so, for this BBSSP, the community has already suffered a detrimental outcome.

Given the loss of community use of Wentworth Park to the temporary Public School and the Greyhound Race Course, there is a genuine argument and expectation that Public facilities and amenity is returned. The simplest and greater long term value will be derived by establishing a unique foreshore landscape that is substantially natural.

The community demonstrates daily, its use of parklands and foreshore. There has already been significant population growth because of residential and commercial developments in the adjacent areas of Darling Harbour. To create further high density residential and commercial buildings without commensurate planning to services and public spaces will impose the effects of overcrowding and disfunction in the amenity and quality of lifestyle for the residents moving into the area and those surrounding the area, as you are aware.

Lucy Turnbull, former Lord Mayor of Sydney after being appointed as the chief commissioner to the Baird government's Greater Sydney Commission stated that it was important that Sydney remains as a "liveable and loveable city". Mrs Turnbull further stated that governments had failed to integrate land-use planning with other government agencies, such as transport, hospital and schools. The growth in the inner-city population had left the area short on schools, for example." <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/state-politics/none-of-pms-business-says-lucy-turnbull-of-greater-sydney-role/story-e6frgczx-1227633141894>

Mr Jamie Parker, MP has stated, "The obvious thing to do, given everything we have learnt about liveability and wellbeing over the past period, would be to replicate the success of the four Glebe foreshore parks—Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

Mr JAMIE PARKER (Balmain), Parliamentary Debates 06/05/21, Hansard(16:59) The BBSSP provides relatively, no more than a walkway to and from the SFM.

I genuinely believe, when I compare the existing buildings and commercial developments made in the past up until most recently, that the appearance and character of the peninsula will be irrevocably altered. There will most certainly be overshadowing eg. shadows cast by the proposed building onto existing residences.

Whilst several streets away, high rise structures will overlook residences and impact amenity and privacy as the proposed buildings will have potential views into windows and balconies.

There will be substantial traffic generated irrespective to building parking facilities due to visitors and to the people visiting SFM. The layout and density of the BBSSP buildings do not seem to provide adequate parking/loading/ turning and Anzac Bridge safety - which is already at capacity. I object to the BBSSP for the reasons stated by Mr Jamie Parker, "The development will monster the foreshore, cast shadows on the solar panels of the new Fish Market and limit public access to Blackwattle Bay forever.

Only five percent of the 1,550 proposed dwellings are earmarked as affordable when the government owns this land and must address the growing housing affordability crisis.

The proposal represents privatisation of the harbour and has little public benefit."

Finally, I object to the BBSSP because of its failure to recognise the increase in pollution and lack of investigation into the conservation of sea life, both aquatic and birdlife in the area. This area serves as a breezeway to the city and route for the activity of species endemic to the area. A large parkland space with conservative residential spaces that do not impact on the visual and social amenity of the locality must be paramount for this large parcel of PUBLIC LAND.

Respectfully

A solid grey rectangular box used to redact the signature of the author.

10 April 2023

Submission regarding D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009

Made by owners/residents of the following units at 280 Jones Street Pymont NSW 2009:

- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[Please keep the above personal details confidential]

Dear Ms. Jessica Symons

Delivered via email: dasubmissions@...

Copy to: Lord Mayor Ms Clover Moore cmoore@..., clover@...

Mr Andrew Thomas, Executive Manager Planning and Development athomas@...

Ms Kobi Shetty, MP kob@...

Mr Jamie Parker, former Balmain Electorate MP jamie@...

Re: D/2023/97 - 14-26 Wattle Street PYRMONT NSW 2009

We are delivering this submission in the following capacities:

- Owners of the properties listed above at 280 Jones St Pymont NSW 2009, known as the Harbour Mill building, which is adjacent to and overlooks the proposed development site;
- payers of taxes, duties and rates; and
- members of the public.

Each of us has lived in the Pymont and Ultimo area for more than 5 years. We represent the common consumers and the public who “live and breathe” the area. This is our neighbourhood and our home. We represent all those people who will be directly impacted by the proposed development.

We are disappointed that Landream Pymont Pty Ltd (“Landream” or “the developer”) is proposing a modified DA in excess of the building heights approved by the Commissioner through mediation (“the Court”).

We trust in the Council’s responsibility to protect our interests and list the following major concerns regarding this DA:

- **Building heights.** The DA approved by the Court already included heights in excess of the standards set by the Law. The developer is now attempting to increase the heights even further. We request that the Council does not allow further height increases.
- **Allowing +10% design excellence neither fair nor reasonable in the circumstances.** Given that the proposed Development is in breach of the height standard as approved by the Court already, we kindly request the Council to reconsider whether it is fair and reasonable for this non-complying Development to maintain eligibility for +10% additional height under SLEP 2012 provisions.
- **Not in Public Interest.** As the Council already outlined in its decision to refuse the original DA in July 2020, this non-complying development is not in the Public Interest. We agree that the scale of this proposed development is excessive for this site / area. Therefore, access to +10% heights and increases above DA envelope as approved by the Court should be disallowed
- **Consumer confidence.** The proposed material breach of the height standard undermines consumer confidence (including home owners in the area who made property ownership decisions in good faith relying on the height standard legislation).
- **Undesirable precedent.** The proposed height breach sets precedent for future developments in the area, exacerbating the issues described herein.
- **Developer opportunistically pushing the envelope for own benefit at the expense of the local community.** We note a long history of DA proposals, rejections, modifications and mediation for this development since 2019. The original DA was firmly rejected by the Council with independent consultant’s review. However, the Developer has pushed and pulled all possible levers to again propose yet a new set of modifications resulting in an envelope similar to the original DA heights and scale, thus must be firmly rejected again for the same reasons.
- **Integrity of the DA consent process.** Breaches of height standard of the magnitude as detailed in this DA would put a reasonable person on alert that the process may not have been properly followed to protect the interests of the community.
- **History of the site – failed school.** The community has suffered enough as this site was proposed for a new Public School, which the Council failed to sell to the State Government as they wanted a higher price. This should be taken into consideration in deciding on building heights.
- **Landmark site.** This site is a highly visible landmark with heritage. We request consideration of this before consenting to any heights in excess of the Court decision and before allowing +10%.
- **Overshadowing the Fig Street park.** The proposed height increases above those approved by the Court create additional overshadowing and locking of views from the public park.

- **Adverse impact on the historic and cultural significance of the area.** Harbour Mill has been faithful to the design of the original flour mill, and is the primary landmark for commuters travelling eastbound over the Anzac bridge. However, with the proposed DA heights the new building will dwarf Harbour Mill and be seen from multiple vantage points with out of character design and excessive height.
- **Harbour Mill adversely impacted.** Height increase will infringe on the privacy of existing units in 280 Jones St, who would have previously seen over the Wattle st proposed structure. Additionally, the height increase will overshadow 280 Jones St common amenities, including the internal courtyard and Level 4 shared rooftop.
- **Wind tunnel.** The height increase compared to what was approved can also lead to wind tunnel effects and exacerbate noise pollution, affecting all residents of 280 Jones St, the neighbouring terrace houses, and the proposed Wattle St structure.
- **Density increase negative impact - traffic.** Height increase means additional increase in density that will create an access issue and safety hazard for residents accessing the Jones St cul-de-sac. The street is narrow and an additional density increase and subsequent increase in traffic will make 280 Jones St inaccessible by car, including rideshares. The council should assess Jones St access as a destination for ride share vehicles. As a resident of the area for over 5 years, it is unlikely that ride share vehicles will be taken to Wattle St. They will instead create traffic issues on Jones St.
- **Density increase negative impact – public transport.** Height increase leads to increased density which will overburden the limited existing public transport, such as the light rail and local buses from Harris St.
- **Density increase negative impact – illegal dumping.** The increased density will promote and worsen existing illegal dumping in Jones Lane around the Western Distributor overpass. The illegal dumping is a safety concern due to sharp objects, and blocks the primary access point from Jones St to Harris St public transport.
- **Wentworth Park overshadowing.** The council should assess the compatibility of an increased height structure at Wattle St against its existing plans to reclaim Wentworth Park as a recreation site.

Thank you for considering this important matter and our submission. We trust in your responsibility to protect the interests of the minorities, rather than allowing those with money and power to over-ride the system.

If you need to discuss any matters in relation to this submission, please contact any or all of us via the email addresses listed above or [REDACTED] can be reached on [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

