



# Community Submissions for Blackwattle Bay

---

<https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/blackwattlebay>

March 2022

Published by NSW Department of Planning and Environment

[dpie.nsw.gov.au](https://dpie.nsw.gov.au)

Title: Community Submissions for Blackwattle Bay

First published: March 2022

Department reference number: SF18/64013

---

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning and Environment 2022. Information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing, March 2022, and is subject to change. For more information, please visit [dpie.nsw.gov.au/copyright](https://dpie.nsw.gov.au/copyright)

## Acknowledgment of Country

The Department of Planning and Environment acknowledges the Traditional Owners and Custodians of the land on which we live and work and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

## Publishing Submissions

The Department has published all submissions received during the public exhibition of the Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct Study, proposed master plan and draft planning controls to ensure that all stakeholders understand and can respond to the range of issues raised in submissions. The Department has also published its Summary of Submissions report and a letter of issues and recommendations to Infrastructure NSW.

Making a submission is entirely voluntary and there is no obligation to provide the Department with any personal information when making a submission and some submissions have been lodged with the Department requesting that personal details be withheld from publication. Where privacy has been requested submissions and associated attachments have been redacted prior to publication.

Submissions have been grouped and published in the following documents:

- Redacted Submissions
- Redacted Submissions with Attachments
- Community Submissions
- Community Submissions with Attachments
- NSW Government and Council Submissions

## Contents

Surnames A-F.....	4
Surnames G-J.....	149
Surnames K-O .....	237
Surnames P-S .....	378
Surnames T-Z.....	479

161031

ADABIE

NEWTOWN

This is an opportunity to make a wonderful water side walking area for the residents of a city that has limited open space. Open parkland area would allow (almost) a natural green walk from Annandale to Walks Bay. This would add to and enhance Sydneys reputation as a beautiful city. To develop (unnecessary) high rise tower blocks, that create shadows and blight the skyline is nothing short of environmental destruction. Just look at the the eye sore of the Crown Casino to see how a City's skyline can be destroyed so easily for the sake of Corporate good. Design and build for the many, not the few

165726

Adams

Glebe 2037

Necessary alterations to the proposal:

1. Continuous WATERFRONT walkway, not diverted through retail
2. Separated off road cycleway where current temporary cycleway on Bridge Rd
3. Height of the towers on the current fish market site of 110m, 156m, and 120m, and 2 on Bank St of 91.5m, all have a MAXIMUM HEIGHT of 75m

181941

Adamson

Glebe, 2037

I wish to lodge strong objection, and call for the plan to be modified and reduced. Proposed skyscraper development is literally way over the top of acceptable scale for this precinct. It has severe negative impacts on this Blackwattle area and Glebe foreshore, including bad overshadowing in mornings, loss of sunlight, blocking views of city skyline, all due to the dominion of huge highrise towers proposed.

165911

Ahern

2017

My regards to the blackwattle bay development on the former fish market site - why not consider parkland?

Sydney is a city that feels for sale to developers. It's not a designed or planned city and that shows from the lack of green spaces that you see in well thought-out cities throughout Europe.

Adding greenery here will not only add value to the area, but it will provide enjoyment to thousands of people. Not to mention it's the least we should be doing in this time of environmental crisis.

Please consider the long term outcome of this development, over financial greed.

165411

Akbar

2040

There should be a limit to the number of stories that you're building. The limit should be a maximum of 10 stories rather than 45.

High rise will turn the natural leafy suburb into another high rise city



172051

Allen

2756

Why does there need to be residential development at this site? It is both a commercial & retail area now & with expanded facilities for those services that will generate fishing boat traffic, road transport traffic & if the rail link is utilised then rail as well. Then there is both car & foot traffic for the retail areas that require different spaces for both movement & static.

I am also going to suggest that the boat facilities be expanded so other water based services also be incorporated here as well. I am looking at those charter, harbour & water taxi services that can utilise this area for both east & west services. I would think this would reduce the water traffic around Circular Quay & concentrate the government ferry services.

I am submitting this from my personal experiences when using the fish markets & also as a motorist who either has used roads around there or see the traffic if passing it by & noticing the congestion, network of traffic lights, signs & arrows. Give it space & room to expand entries & exits.

I might also be good to expand the old concrete plant with the other side of the road to make open space areas for rest, recreation & exercise areas. Whether this is via overpass or under road tunnel is open for debate. We don't have a lot of accessible urban water access so let's keep this open to the growing Sydney population.

There are plenty of places already earmarked for development such as Parramatta Rd areas so please keep the Pyrmont area from Fish Markets to Glebe free from high rise development.

161516

Amaral

Pymont 2009

While I applaud the revitalisation of the waterfront which is a welcome change from the unused space especially that caught under the Anzac bridge, I do not understand the need for such large skyscrapers in the same vicinity. Pymont is already one of the most densely populated areas of Sydney and directly abuts this area. Adding an additional 2,800 people in such close proximity will create a massive impact on traffic in the area. The roads around the fish market are already chaotic with the connection on and off the Anzac and the channel 10 studios and other office space so close. Putting more residents alongside new business will add to this turmoil. I do not understand how the impact could be viewed as less than a major impact. I am onboard with the new fish market and the revamp of the waterfront but I cannot be supportive of massive towers to house that many people. Why can they not be 10-15 stories and blend with the buildings already in the area? Thank you.

163501

Amid

2238

This is unbelievable! Totally inappropriate for our Harbour foreshore. This area of Sydney already bastardised by construction of ugly complex transport corridors and over- development. This is our harbour, not to be blocked out and stolen.

Covid has doubled the importance of space and connection to land and natural vista for all of us to survive

I am totally against this ridiculous development. Stop it now

165221

Anderson

Glebe

The spectre of up to 45 story development around Black Wattle Bay is horrific! I have lived in Glebe for more than 30 years and can affirm that the area is appropriately characterised by low to medium density development, with very few building much more than 3 stories, in some areas up to 6 or 7 stories. And there are many historic buildings in Glebe and Pyrmont, alongside great parkland and some more environmentally friendly waterside development, such as that at Johnston's creek. Please do not destroy this historic and attractive character. Any development much more than 6 or 7 stories would be a terrible eyesore for residents and would damage the tourist appeal of the area.

168251

Ang

Pymont 2009

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

A link to our updated submission can be found here:

<https://tinyurl.com/4edwj2mj>

181981

Angove

2017

I'm really worried about the sheer amount of shade we are injecting into our spaces. This abuts the waterfront, the fish markets which are Sydney iconic and a park which a lot of people use.

I would also note that those roads are already over used (if you've ever tried to get onto bridge road around peak hour you know what I'm talking about). Public transport can take some of the brunt but, lets face it, it won't actually help that much for a system that's already overtaxed.

Really, the main concern is that shade issue. I don't want the new development to create cold spaces. I used to use the green space across from that development every week. I have since moved to Waterloo but I have really fond memories and I would hate that space to be ruined for others.

171371

Aoun

2011

I agree with the Blackwattle Bay redevelopment as it is in line with the strategy in place with the Bays precinct. With the incoming Metro planned with stations at Bays Precinct & Pyrmont this will continue to drive employment and housing growth required to grow Sydney.

Continuing to grow an additional cultural and entertainment precinct on the edge of the CBD will open up additional opportunities for both local Sydney residents and tourists alike.

Supporting this new area with residential will ensure we continue to allow the area to trade beyond the business hours and allow it to be safer environment and a new bustling hub just as Barangaroo has become.

In summary, I agree this decision is the correct decision providing wind channels and sun plane is considering in building size and design.



173381

Armstrong

2009

I wish to formally advise that I'm not in agreement with the redevelopment of the fish markets site, with that massive 45 level building going to happen.

This is not all about profits and politicians getting their own way. This is a community and it has been for a very long time. I'm completely disgusted, at those development plans. They look ugly, they're all about making money, and don't care about people. This is what's happening around the world let alone in our own community Sydney.

I have been involved in Pyrmont, for at least 48 years, and I am absolutely appalled at what rotten politicians intend to do to our community.

176381

Atkinson

Pymont 2009

This huge overdevelopment of Blackwattle Bay is an affront to any Sydney residents living in the city of villages who have been part of ongoing sensible proposals by City of Sydney council. where is the necessary infrastructure i.e schools sporting facilities and associated necessities for another 1500 or more residences.

174041

Avery

Ultimo 2007

Hello,

It would be wonderful if either a harbour swimming pool or a harbour side pool could be included in the new development.

Leanne Avery

182771

Aylward

2037

I'm concerned that Blackwattle Bay could end up as another over developed solid block of too high apartments. We need sun, nature, space to breath. Space to walk, views of the water. There should be far more affordable housing. 5% is not nearly enough. Let's make sure we have a world class human scale harbour side development, not a boring developer designed profit maximization exercise. Thankyou.

182211

Baban

2039

All these points should be taken into consideration

ŒŸ— Development in this area should be sensitive to existing character and promote job growth, not just squeeze as many people as possible between the Fish Market and free-flowing highway traffic.

ŒŸ± The excessive bulk and scale proposed will lead to more traffic, overshadowing and wind tunnels, with residents in massive apartment towers exposed to the damaging health effects of noise and air pollution.

ŒŸ” Adverse wind impacts make uncomfortable and unsafe public spaces, and losing access to sunlight makes is hard to grow trees and grass.

ŒŸ The requirement for 5% affordable housing is inadequate “ it should be at least 25%.

ŒŸfâ™Ÿ. Development should include Wentworth Park and Glebe Island Bridge being returned to public use “ developers should make contributions to upgrade local community and recreational facilities.

ŒŸ... Development here should secure a world class foreshore walk, public parks and places and cultural facilities “ not a sliver of a path between apartment lobbies and the water.

181916

Bagala

2040

Stop this !! Awful idea. We are to congested in this area already.

163486

Bailey

Pymont

The improvement of the fishmarket is long overdue and so is the removal of the concrete works along the prime real estate on the waterfront in front of Wentworth Park.

However the gross overdevelopment that is being proposed in the space currently occupied by the existing fish market is nothing short of abhorrent and disgusting abuse of planning powers by the government to cash in and line developers pockets. The heights proposed for the building adjacent one of the busiest intersection in Sydney already is a complete failure of the planning process and highlights no real consideration for the community nor what is best for the area.

The building heights proposed for all the buildings in the development is extremely excessive and will add to increased congestion in a location that is already extremely congested, not to mention heights that are completely out of character in the area.

Please reconsider this and ensure that the community concerns are actually listened to, rather than just collected and brushed aside as normally happens with this government and their hands in the pockets of developers destroying our communities.

181801

Baimbridge

2008

The current proposal for big, ugly towers which block Blackwattle Bay out from the city is atrocious. Surely you can come up with something that is more tasteful and creates a nice bridge between these inner city spaces. Green spaces connecting Blackwattle Bay to the CBD should be a part of the plan.



165706

Bain

SURRY HILLS

#### SUBMISSION TO THE DEPARTMENT

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted. The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Kind Regards

Bella Bain

20201 young Australian of the year - Finalist NSW

World championship Dragon Boater

Glebe Rowing Club state championship Rower

181856

Baket

Richmond 2753

This is a disgusting looking complex obviously just for monetary gain.

Scrap it and start again.

168371

Balfour

2037

What is the point of a mixed use residential/commercial precinct if only 5% of the houses are affordable houses? This is such a clear opportunity to provide space for families of lower socioeconomic status to live and work near the city, while enabling them to access the village-like communities of Glebe and Forest Lodge, and reduces transit time into work at the small businesses or retail spaces afforded by the development.

Please consider increasing the affordable housing requirement supported by the precinct to at least 20%. Anything else is just selling off Sydney's views to the rich and despondent, most of whom do not invest in their local communities in the way that the business case for this precinct has invariably stated they will.

161216

Balkizas

CAMPERDOWN NSW

- Foreshore along rezoned areas is not enough space for the number of people that will use this area for cycling and recreational walks. Statistical information from areas like this (the bay walk Drummoyne, glebe foreshore walk etc) show congestion with scores of people walking, sitting, cycling, picnics, walking pets etc. This space is valuable to people living in small spaces and a transport route to the CBD.
- Foreshore should have separate cycle route and expanded area for recreational walks. A small 'promenade' in front of tall residential buildings is not calming for people seeking space for mental health.
- Affordable housing is such an issue in our city and should be sincerely considered rather than a possible 5% mentioned. Freiberg in Germany has implemented ideas in their composition of who lives in dwellings. In today's society of people needing support, such development should aim to provide interaction of social hierarchy. Consideration needs to be given to affordable housing and the token 5% should be increased and mandated (not paid). We have removed so many people of low income from our city. The rezoned areas should include affordable dwellings (stipulated composition) for creatives, health sector workers, families on low income, young people and disabled - surely more than 5%
- The height of 45 storeys! People need sun, space, social interaction. In times of increasing mental issues these rezoned areas should allow sunlight, space, space for social interaction and a feeling of openness. This height is imposing. Developments opposite this rezoned area should be an example of good development.
- the rezoned area should consider space for pets. Many people in the inner city and innerwest walk their dogs along the foreshore. An expanse along the 'promenade' should be extended.
- RE1 and mixed commercial should be next to the new fishmarkets rather than a development site. Casual (picnic style) and formal areas for dining are popular. It should be a mix of soft and hard surfaces. Darling square is a good example of eateries and grassed area.
- many families tend to congregate along Glebe foreshore to catch a glimpse of the fireworks. Space needs to be given to this along the new foreshore.
- Proposed dwellings, ferry, light rail, water activities etc- this is going to encourage more people to visit this already busy and well used space. Greater area needs to be provided rather than so much development. Development is part of this project but more open space is going to be needed.
- Traffic flow will be congested and cars should be discouraged in and around the new area.

176306

BANFIELD

2009

#### Response to the Redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay

Many locals are requesting that the redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay include a Harbourside Pool in the Pyrmont area. We have been viewing the NSW Government plans for the redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay and hope that the plans could include a harbourside pool.

Such a pool would expand the public space to the community, while taking nothing away from the current plans. We live in this area with a love of the harbour and a pool would create that link between the water and the community.

The redevelopment of the Pyrmont Baths would be financially a drop in the ocean compared to the investment required to transform the area given the current plans.

In 1877 Council passed a motion to create the Pyrmont Baths which would later become a focus of community life in Pyrmont. We ask you to include in your response to the NSW Governments plans for Blackwattle Bay, the redevelopment of a harbourside pool, the New Pyrmont Baths.

After opening in the early 1900s, 1500 residents used the harbour pool each week, and there is no doubt a new pool would be equally popular.

Harbour pools are a huge focus point for community and family recreation, evidenced by the popularity of Neilson Park (Vaucluse) and Redleaf Pool (Double Bay) and, of course, the Dawn Fraser Pool in Balmain.

More adventurous residents currently swim in the harbour at Pyrmont.

Some residents have raised concerns about sharks and pollution. The danger of shark attacks can be effectively controlled through nets, as has been done at Neilson Park and Redleaf.

While pollution is more difficult to control, the residents can freely access apps that measure water pollution. Having recently followed the Water Quality Reports there appear to be very few times that pollution is an issue for swimmers.

However, there is much community concern about the height of the towers included in the development, and we ask that the NSW Government consider reducing the height.

178696

Bannon

Bondi Junction 2022

We write in response to the Blackwater Bay proposal.

We find these factors would rule out the proposal:

â€¢denial of light

â€¢increase populus

â€¢negatively affect infrastructure (e.g. transport)

â€¢affect amenity and access due to congestion

â€¢loading on services e.g. education, childcare

â€¢max building height should not exceed existing heights

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.



172686

Bartter

Birchgrove 2041

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

My examination of the Blackwattle Bay SSP documents, and particularly the Urban Design Statement, shows that the proposed development will re-create a scaled-down version of the monstrous Barangaroo precinct but without the benefit of the Barangaroo Reserve.

The proposed Blackwattle Bay development must have more open space than just a narrow strip of the waterfront promenade and the doomed attempt to create a green space at Bank Street Park UNDERNEATH the Western Distributor. Not only will this overbearing structure completely dominate this green space it is incredibly noisy underneath the roadway.

The Noise and Vibration Assessment goes to great lengths to deal with how noise should be addressed for occupants of the proposed buildings, but I can find nothing in Appendix 18 that shows the expected noise levels in Bank Street Park.

The lack of solar access to the Bank Street Park is glossed over on page 111 of the SSP by reference to its compliance to planning requirements.

I think it would be far better if the proposed retail/community/creative arts and amenities buildings on Bank Street be placed instead under the Western Distributor, leaving that area at the end of Bank St as open space.

I urge the planners to take a walk around the area underneath the Western Distributor to imagine for themselves what a park in this location would be like.

161456

Batchelor

Annandale 2038

I object to the size of the apartments at the old fish market site. They cause a lot of shadowing over green space and are an eyesore. There is not enough public use of this public land. More green space by the water would be preferred.

176441

Bates

Pymont

To: The Hon. Rob Stokes MP

Minister for Planning & Public Places

Sydney

Dear Minister

I write to you as a concerned resident of Pymont. In fact I live within a 5 minute walk of the Sydney Fish Market and as such have grave concerns for what I see in the proposal as a money grabbing exercise with little regard for the existing community and lack of balance between scale and bulk, commercial and residential mix (including affordable and social housing) and public spaces - creating a wall of concrete, with towers up to 45 storeys high will block the harbour from the rest of the Pymont community overshadowing any future public domain. The proposal is ill conceived and clearly has not considered the existing diversity and vibrancy of Pymont nor does it show its desire to build upon it.

While there is clear need for a substantial make over of this site (including the Hymix concrete plant and the Blackwattle Bay waterfront up to the Anzac Bridge), allowing towers up to 45 storeys high in an area that is already a densely populated neighbourhood will create a wall of concrete that will block the Harbour from the rest of Pymont. While development in other parts of the country and the world are creating liveable spaces by removing obstacles to connect neighbourhoods, this proposal is doing the opposite and adding to the concrete separation, that already exists between the community and Blackwattle Bay due to the Western Distributor. And, we all know walls are not good for anyone.

This is a huge missed opportunity to do better, improve the amenity, properly consider the infrastructure needs already at maximum capacity, and connect the existing Pymont community with our precious Harbour.

We already live amongst enough concrete with the Western Distributor at our doorstep. I understand from the modelling, the development will cast shadows on the future public domain and on the solar panels planned for the roof of the new fish market and parkland. Surely, reason to go back to the drawing board to design out these serious glitches. Especially important as we become more reliant on renewable energy.

## Housing

As an affordable housing tenant, I am most concerned that only five percent of the 1,550 proposed residential dwellings have been earmarked as affordable housing whether that be affordable or social housing. Given this small number I would imagine that engagement with First Nations people has been limited or symbolic in nature when I see no provision to include them in a mix of affordable housing options. This is most disturbing as Pyrmont (and the City of Sydney) have a history of ensuring affordable housing to some of the most vulnerable and poorly paid in our community (nurses, teachers, police, aged and disability care workers, single parents and people living with a disability and ageing) and without affordable housing these people are largely unable to live and work in the same neighbourhoods and/or where the services they need exist.

We are in a housing crisis with a 20 year waiting period for housing that is affordable and the current Corona virus is adding to this list as people lose jobs and businesses and more people become homeless as a result.

As this is a government project, you are dismissing best practice and humane advice that government redevelopment projects should provide at least 20 percent of new housing for social and affordable housing.

## Public Domain

Giving over a miserly 10m band of land along the waterfront is tokenism and again ill conceived. Limiting this space in terms of the land area available and its potential to create a world class waterfront promenade to grow the economy in this precinct is another missed opportunity to develop this site into a world class destination for locals and tourists.

## Animals and wildlife living in the Fish Market

Along with my concerns that affordable and social housing options be provided at the standard of 20 percent of new housing development, I am also concerned for the variety of animals who call the fish market home. Therefore I ask, what consideration has been given to the re-homing and concern for these creatures during the demolition and redevelopment stages.

This includes the pelicans, other sea birds and bird life generally. Hundreds of Rainbow Lorikeets for instance live and nest in the large fig trees at the boundary of the Western Distributor. Added to this is the clans of felines that live at the Market who have dutifully kept the rat plague under control for many years. Some of these cats are now quite elderly and deserve to have a safe home for the remainder of their lives. A number of people including Pyrmont residents provide food and comfort for them and keep their areas clean.

While we have in the past, and continue today to find new homes for these beautiful creatures, it would show some developer heart to consider the future of the cats during the demolition phase and to provide for their future safety. As such we would like to meet with the developers to discuss our ideas for their safety and housing.

Finally, to ensure that all decisions are open and accountable, this development must be subject to local government planning and management and that we, members of the Pyrmont community, have

continued opportunities to have input.

Regards

Julie Bates AO

173006

Bateson

2038

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Please!

Kind regards

Catherine

167551

Baumhammer

Glebe

In the visual impacts the the height of a 45 floor building will negatively impact the visual amenity of units in Lombard Estate. All of which look direct toward the proposed constructions.

I request a significantly lower building height be put in place for the development.

as the proposed height will intrude on our views, and likely cause shadows from dawn.



167501

BESSELL-BROWNE

Pymont

I am outraged by the proposal for residential towers of up to 45 stories high. This is a significant step change from the current tower height in the Pymont peninsula of 18 stories. This presents a huge environmental impact to the existing community and environment.

I also wish to complain about the lack of visibility of the height of the towers on the PI&E and Infrastructure web pages. Leaving the Sydney Morning Herald to provide more details visual documentation. Where is the model?

Please amend the residential tower heights to be compatible with the current local community and not more than 20 stories each

171636

Blewitt

Pymont 2009

Dear DPIE

I am reluctantly making this submission because my prior experiences with community consultation with this government do not inspire any confidence. As with consultations on the Bays Precinct (several) and the Bank St Cruise boat terminal, I have found that the exercise is tokenistic and there is no accountability being exercised with objections from a clear majority of residents being ignored. I trust there will be more transparency and accountability this time.

It is vital that the DPIE stands up for the long term public interest and the interests of residents who have made a strong commitment to creating a sustainable community in Pymont.

This area provides a once in 50 year opportunity to create a world-class gateway to the new Fish Markets. Other cities like Toronto and Vancouver, plus several European cities are benchmarks for urban renewal but we seem to have learned nothing. What we are being offered is a second class , developer driven piece of overdevelopment in which long established planning principles are being watered down to favour developers and the state government, rather than local decision making via the elected City of Sydney Council and its exemplary record ( eg Green Square).

Why are we not using a global architectural design contest to bring forward the best ideas? Another lost opportunity.

Where is the acknowledgement that the next decades will be dominated by dealing with climate change including in urban areas? Just for example where are the design principles mandating solar panels on all buildings, solar powered batteries, EV charging stations, waste water recycling? This reads as a tired plan from yesterday's planners. Sydney deserves much better.

My specific objections and observations follow:

1. A tower of 45 stories effectively adjoining the Western distributor is frankly a design obscenity and comes across as an extreme proposal to give the government wriggle room to reduce it. Such a tower is completely out of step with even the taller buildings further along the peninsula at Jackson's Landing. It will overshadow much of the development and deny solar access to other lower scale buildings. This is repeating the absurdity that the Crown Casino tower was permitted to block views of the southern sky for the Sydney Observatory. Public spaces will be shadowed and cold-all this

adjoining Sydney Harbour which cries out for public spaces and sunshine to appreciate it. I am certain that this is what both residents and tourists would expect.

2. It is not at all clear whether the foreshore promenade will be wide enough to permit pedestrians and cyclists and yet your glowing PR material talks about a foreshore walk from Woolloomooloo to Rozelle! Have you even measured how much foot and cycle traffic uses the existing path?

3. As a resident of Pyrmont since 2007, I can confirm that the vehicular traffic in the area covered by the plan is congested for much of the day. There is very little room to add road lanes because of the supports for the freeway so all additional vehicles will be funnelled onto the existing street grid. 1550 new dwellings plus the commercial tenants will add hundreds of vehicles each hour.

4. Sydney and much of Australia have been suffering from a decades long public housing shortage. Again, this plan is soft on mandating serious quotas for social and affordable housing and key worker housing. When I was living in London in the early 2000's, this world class city mandated compulsory quotas for social, key worker and affordable housing and I did not observe developers going broke! I expect to see plans like this provide for substantial proportions of space for social and affordable housing. The Pyrmont peninsula used to have a proud record in this field. Sydney must be much more than a developer's honey pot!

5. There seems to be no provision for additional medical and educational facilities for the new residents and commercial tenants. The recently rebuilt Ultimo Primary School is at capacity already so this infrastructure weakness will be a disincentive for future residents.

6. I am very disappointed that the Minister's very public statements about returning planning powers to the people have been traduced by these proposals. Planning regulations and local controls and balances are being subsumed in such a way to prevent scrutiny, input and accountability. This is the absolute antithesis of democratic planning principles.

7. The community I live in are concerned that the government will reallocate or somehow hide developer contributions which should support infrastructure in Pyrmont/Ultimo/Glebe etc. In truth, there is a high level of distrust of our elected politicians and this proposal for Blackwattle Bay does nothing to reduce that mistrust.

I fear this submission will be pigeon-holed and ignored but be assured that electors will hold the State Government to account if it ignores the concerns and submissions of residents. Sydney is too important a project to be the plaything of politicians, developers and tame planners.

Yours sincerely,

Allen Blewitt

162626

Bloomfield

Beaconsfield 2015

We know what the property developers will gain from this plan but of what possible benefit can it be to the people of Sydney? You want to impose on us a stretch of towers, ranging from about 5-20 storeys, right on the Blackwattle Bay foreshore, completely out of keeping with the area on the other side of the distributor, creating wind tunnels and potentially shadowing the solar panels on the roof of the proposed new location for the fish markets. These plans are a joke.

Sydneysiders want public space for recreation and entertainment at the foreshore – soft as well as hard surfaces. Yes, there is a place for development, but low to mid rise, in sympathy with the surroundings. Not this intimidating concrete jungle. Please tear up these plans and start again, using urban planners who understand socially and environmentally responsible design.

164536

Boakes

Pymont 2009

July 18, 2021. Re Plans for Blackwattle Bay and the Fish Market site.

I have lived in Pymont for almost 30 years. This is an extraordinary bad proposal. It completely ignores years of planning for the Pymont Peninsula Plan (PPP). The heights of the proposed buildings are excessive in that they will produce massive overshadowing throughout the area. Among other consequences, this will reduce production of energy by rooftop solar panels, including those planned for the new fish market. Also, the amount of public space has been reduced significantly from what is proposed in the PPP. It means that a lot of what is publicly-owned land is being handed over to private commercial interests; as at Barangaroo.

I failed to spot any reference to social or affordable housing. Both are desperately needed in the inner city in this time of ever-increasing house prices. It seems that what is planned is just more waterfront flats for the rich.

When I visit cities overseas, like Singapore or many European cities, I am impressed by their many interesting and often beautiful new buildings, especially those on prime waterfront sites. The buildings shown in these plans are remarkably drab and ugly; presumably designed on the cheap-as-possible principle.

One can only assume that the plan was the result of effective lobbying of politicians by property developers. But, of course, this is not something that the proposal is going to mention!

163411

Boath

GLADESVILLE

I strongly believe that firstly the "exhibition" of this development plan be extended by at least a month, given that it's such a huge plan, you need to allow more time for everyone to be able to go through it. The time allocated has not been sufficient. I would also strongly object to the plan as it is because not enough community consultation has been given, including by the City of Sydney's own Mayor. We've seen NSW government projects before, such as Barangaroo and what they do is create uninhabitable spaces for rich overseas people to holiday. Sydney needs to hold onto what little culture it has left, and grow that culture. More highrises and more concrete is not the way to foster grassroots culture and community (one and half football fields is nothing!! You're putting over 1500 more apartments - that will be at least double the residents, in addition to the residents that are already there). High rises are not nice to look at, they create so much shade (the fish markets won't even get use out of their solar panels) and they create a wasteland where culture goes to die. If we have learnt anything from Covid, it's how important culture and our outdoor spaces are to the life and vibrancy of the community and to people. Without it, what is the point of all this?

182361

Bogunovich

2015

I oppose the proposals contained in the Blackwattle Bay SSP Study.

As I am writing only a short submission, I will limit myself to commenting on my concerns about: (1.) overdevelopment; (2.) active transport; and (3.) design quality.

Firstly, what is proposed is a gross overdevelopment of the site. The 3D model on page 86 shows this extent of this, and how the proposed building heights bear no relationship whatsoever to the beautiful harbour foreshore or Pyrmont's existing built environment. The accompanying statements - that the proposal represents 'a sensitive design response to ... adjacent development' and that this consideration has been 'critical to the overall design process' - are nonsense.

Secondly, what is proposed in relation to cycling is unpromising. Attractive and effective cycling facilities are important, because the Study says a mode share of 80% for sustainable transport is aimed for (page 95) and, in general, claims to prioritise cycling and walking (e.g. pages xiii and 117). (Separately, the State Government claims to have a 'net zero' carbon goal and a plan to achieve this.) Just three quick observations: (a.) 'Shared paths' are unattractive for both cyclists and pedestrians. Here, they are proposed even where there is space for bicycle-only paths. If the central strip of the promenades was devoted to or at the very least prioritised bicycles, space totaling 8 metres in width would remain for pedestrian movement (Figure 49, page 123) . (b.) What the Study says about cycling in the wider precinct is unconvincing. The ideas on page 138 are expressed as 'potential cycling initiatives' and therefore will not be binding undertakings or development pre-conditions. This is a further concern. (c.) If the active transport goal is genuine, the \*quality\* of cycling facilities will be critical. A commitment should be made to apply the relevant AustRoads standards. The cycling paths recently completed at St Peters elsewhere in the same LGA as part of the WestConnex project demonstrate how inferior the NSW (as opposed to AustRoads) standards are and how easy it still is to deliver shabby and unappealing cycling infrastructure.

(3.) 'Mandating design excellence' and creating 'a place for everyone that is inviting' are stated principles. If that is truly the case, several aspects of the proposal fail these principles and must be reconsidered, such as: building apartments immediately adjacent to, above and below busy motorways; placing a dragon boat ramp underneath a cement bridge; devoting a coveted location to a 'corporate charter marina' (page xv). These are just three examples; I'm sure that other individuals and organisations will bring other sensible design concerns to your attention.



168866

Boland

Pymont

The project allows for 12 building envelopes allowing for towers of up to 45 storeys (RL 156 metres) transitioning to lower buildings of 4-8 storeys reflecting the context of the site.

It is difficult to understand how towers up to 45 storeys high are in context with the site. The nearest tall buildings, which are at Jackson's Landing, have the benefit of sitting at the base of a peninsula with no through traffic, and the highest of those buildings is less than half that height.

At the meeting on 22 July 2021 in regards to traffic issues, it was indicated that presuming between 85 - 100 % of residents of the 4 X 45 storey residential towers don't own cars then the increase in traffic associated with the development will be limited to 10%.

On what basis is the assumption made that those residents won't own cars? Doesn't Westconnex make it quite clear that the future of Sydney living is tied to owning a vehicle? A nearby train station is great but it doesn't replace our society's dependence on cars as necessary, or at least, highly convenient modes of transport in most settings.

There is clearly a commercial imperative in maximising height allowances to maximise profit derived from sale of the site to developers, but to put forward the notion that at some magical time in the future most people in apartments won't own cars is without foundation and totally out of context with the reality of the future as witnessed by the Westconnex project.

170946

Boland

2050

I wish to submit an objection to this disgraceful plan. I lived in Forest Lodge from 1980 to 2018 when I moved to Camperdown. I walk around Blackwattle Bay most days.

The proposal to have 45 storey towers on the current Fish Market site is a money grab. It will put overwhelming pressure on local infrastructure....transport, schools, open space. It will create overwhelming shadows across what little public land remains. There is also totally deficient in providing an acceptable level of affordable housing.

The proposal indicates that 70% of the site is dedicated to private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% is for walkways roads and some green space which is under the shade of the Western Distributer. . Is this really serious??is this because another 45 towers wouldn't fit there?

There is nothing about this proposal that suggests a real commitment to housing citizens adequately. Even the narrow walk along the foreshore shows that the planners had no concern for the mental and physical well being of residents. Do the planners know how many people want to use the fire shores? Even the walks around bicentennial park are now very crowded and this plan provides no opportunity for large numbers to access the foreshore.

I support medium development of the site with provision for access to appropriate infrastructure and access to the wonderful potential amenities of the site.

Sadly this proposal reeks of a money grab and leads to suspicion of corruption.

Who will benefit from it?

I wish to be kept informed of the progress of this plan. I pay huge taxes to the NSW government. I have an interest in this money being spent for the common good rather than personal gain.

Mary Boland

1202/7 Sterling Circuit

Camperdown 2050

0422535014

[sfboland@optusnet.com.au](mailto:sfboland@optusnet.com.au)

181961

BOLTON-HALL

2009

Pyrmont Heritage Boating Club Incorporated ABN: 28636113557

The club has been resident 19 Bank Street since 2006 providing opportunities for community participation and cooperating with local groups.

We strongly oppose the over development including high rise towers and excess traffic access.

We strongly agree with development of green open spaces and foreshore regeneration.

We strongly agree with developing facilities for community engagement with country and access to the Blackwattle Bay waterways and Sydney harbour.

165386

Boronyak

2009

As a resident of pyrmont who lives on Bulwara road I strongly object to the height of the planned buildings especially 3 and 4 that will block my water view and cause significant shading of my apartment block.

The traffic on bridge road is gridlocked at peak time with drivers trying to get on Anzac parade, thus will exacerbate this issue that will not be resolved by a light rail stop.

Current owners should be compensated for the loss of their property values due to this development. I love living in pyrmont and now I will have to move as a result of this development it will ruin this area.

I am sure you don't care or even read submissions, this NSW is in the pocket of developers and do not care about the people's lives you destroy.

171556

Bosshard

2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

Sydney is growing and we can grow our city in a way that is 1) Sustainable - planning for a long-term future, 2) Community/people driven 3) Incorporates advanced environmentally-considered design. Please persevere to create the best situation for all who live and work in the Blackwattle Bay area - that is, take into account mine and the community's opposition to this absurd plan.

The points stated below are more vital than ever to consider, as the Blackwattle Bay foreshore is ever more crowded with locals wanting to access more open, green, sunny, public spaces that have a COMMUNITY FEEL and provide relief from what will become a busy tourist hub (the fishmarkets.)

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view totally unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I am concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also CREATE AN IMPOSING WALL OF TOWERS on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

#### Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

#### Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Elia Bosshard

Glebe, 2037

168906

Boucher

Pymont

Hello,

I would like to comment about the the major project proposal for the Blackwattle Bay Precinct.

There are some promising propositions for this development which would serve the community well if actualized. I believe that the community needs should be a driving force and not profits for developers. I therefore have some concerns as noted below.

1. I don't think that towers of 45 stories are appropriate so close to the harbour foreshore and residential area. Will the foreshore promenade be wide enough for pedestrians as well as cyclists?

2. I would like to see developer contributions raised in the Blackwattle Bay area used to support the infrastructure of the area rather than going into state consolidated revenue or other areas.

3. How will the Indigenous presence be achieved? Will any indigenous people be able to live there? It can't just be art works and lip service.

4. I would like to see affordable housing in the area guaranteed. There has been such a huge increase in homelessness because affordable housing isn't available.

Addressing this is paramount. It's important that money allocated for this does not end up in consolidated revenue.

5. I also have concern about the potential removal of requirement to protect public waterway views. Any development generating pollution must be scrutinized to adhere to environmental protection.

6. Removal of the requirement to develop a Master Plan for the Blackwattle bay area is a worry. The communities in the area were told that the area would be developed as a precinct so that the area from Pymont to Glebe would be planned holistically.

I would appreciate it if the Department of Planning would take on board my concerns when finalizing its plan for the area.



Kind regards

Tessa Boucher

182181

Bowron

Cammeray, 2062

This development is likely to significantly degrade the character of the Blackwattle Bay area and should not be implemented in its current state. Simply cramming high-density buildings into the fish market precinct does not constitute an appropriate plan for renewal, and in its current state the plan is likely to do nothing but increase traffic and wind and reduce the amount of sunlight the area receives.

It is also clear that the current plans place the welfare of developers and prospective wealthy buyers above the welfare of the general public (whom the government should serve as a priority). These plans should include redeveloping the Wentworth Park and Glebe Island bridges and restoring them for public use. Further, the existing plans should at the very least be adjusted so that there is a substantial distance between the buildings and the water, allowing for a publicly accessible promenade to be constructed and provide a fantastic foreshore walk for Sydneysiders - the existing plans for a path are woefully insufficient. Simply allowing this valuable piece of the City of Sydney to be exploited at the leisure of developers is woefully short-sighted and will be remembered as one of the many terrible planning decisions that have been made by the state government.

I urge all concerned not to go ahead with this plan in its current state. The plans should be modified to give the greatest focus to the public's enjoyment of the space rather than developers' plans for it. The Department should also pay greater attention to the views of Clover Moore, Lord Mayor of Sydney, as her views on the development have great merit and should be taken onboard in any future planning.

183301

Boyle

2027

Eastern side will be affected by Shadowing. Afternoon sun will be lost

Skyline is ruined from the western side. Doesn't fit in with existing low rise community.

181946

Brain

St Kilda

I write to object to Sydney being subject to more overdevelopment. After reading I cannot see any benefit to people just developers.

We need sun and parts not towers. The towers are owned.

Thanks

161451

Brown

2041

I live in the apartments near White Bay. Those apartments are a good example of sustainable low rise development adding amenity to the area with community and green space.

I also do not have a car and walk regularly around the Bay and into the city from Balmain.

Pymont is already over developed. The area does not need any more high rise apartments. What it does need is high quality sunlit public space.

There is an incredible, once in a generation, opportunity to create an amazing public space that makes the Bay Area an incredible place to spend time, walk and ride for tourists and residents.

Do not make the mistake of creating another soulless place like Darling Harbour.

Give NSW a place they can be proud of.

168146

buckingham

pyrmont

I do not think it is appropriate to have 45 stories on the foreshore.

182666

Buckingham

Glebe 2037

- 1] Stop all work on the Pyrmont Bridge Road site being prepared for the new fish market. Save and secure all heritage material e.g. coal (un)loader.
- 2] Prepare this site as temporary car parking for the fish market.
- 3] Construct a massive temporary fish market on the present parking area employing the external design being used to cover "dives" for transport/road construction around Sydney.
- 4] Build the new fish market on the old fish market site.
- 5] Demolish the temporary fish market.
- 6] Construct a multi-storey car park for the fish markets at the back of the site, adjacent to the eastern Anzac Bridge approach flyover.
- 7] Create all the appropriate open space between the fish market and the parking station and through to the base of the Anzac Bridge eastern pylon. - mainly passive open space with an appropriate amount of shading and seating and some restrained activity areas for children's play and small-scale sporting practise.
- 8] Turn the temporary car park along Pyrmont Bridge Road into passive open space to provide unhindered views from Wentworth Park through Blackwattle Bay to Anzac Bridge. Include the restoration of the heritage coal (un)loader to its original site.
- 9] Develop separate and safe passages from Glebe High School along Pyrmont Bridge Road and through the fish markets to the Jackson Landing waterfront path.
- 10] Create access between the entire new development and Wentworth Park by at least pedestrian bridges at Wentworth Park Road and Wattle Street.

NOTE: An option was in place twenty years ago to lower Pyrmont Bridge Road (as per Southern Cross Drive) at this section to enhance the opportunities here to create great open space and views. Please consider it again.

John Buckingham.

0418218729.

181471

Buckley

2134

I'm concerned about how dense population and housing already is in Sydney, and how this impacts on traffic and mobility, environmental sustainability/degradation, and quality of life available and balanced for residents and potential residents.

This includes the ability for all residents and visitors to access quality green and beautiful spaces vital for their mental and physical health, providing urban wildlife habitat, and maintaining an environmentally-sustainable living structure long-term.

I'm also concerned that many tradeoffs (that, fairly argued, need to be made) will be/are inequitable, favouring wealthier interest groups such as property developers above the interests of less powerful interest groups such as current and future residents, visitors, wildlife, and climate-sensitive development that contributes to impacts felt worldwide.



175046

Burgess

2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

171551

Burroughs

Warrawee 2074

The following submission is made in response to your letter of 6 July 2021 regarding the proposed development at Blackwattle Bay. My interest stems from the ownership of a property at 29 Ferry Road Glebe which overlooks Blackwattle Bay.

The proposal speaks of the revitalisation of the precinct which includes the relocation of the Sydney Fish Market to new world-class facilities which will support the NSW seafood industry etc. There is no substance in this statement or acknowledgement of the history of the NSW fishing industry which has been in terminal decline for a many years. The local seafood industry was many years past self-sustaining but an ever increasing amount of seafood entering the Australian market comes from overseas, which has now reached about 70%.

To the NSW seafood industry, with very little stock coming from local vessels, what if anything is to be gained from relocating the retail fish market? The rich history of the fishing industry and that of its retail market is not acknowledged.

As presented this proposal has nothing to do with the fishing industry but rather glamourizing a retail environmental concept which may or may not be successful. What is meant by world-class facilities? The recent NSW experience in building design and sustainability has not feature well in these endeavours.

The proposal as it stands appears to be just a gross overdevelopment of public space for short-term benefit of the construction industry and the financial gain of those involved in real estate. Why do we need 12 towers soaring into the sky over 45 storeys to 156 metres providing accommodation for those in 1550 dwellings and yet more commercial and retail space in an already overextended market?

When I first bought the property at 29 Ferry Road we could glimpse the Sydney Harbour Bridge. Alas that has long gone in further high rise development and I suspect this is going to again cause a loss to the visual amenity in this neighbourhood with yet another soulless windswept chasm where sunlight is at a premium.

163521

Cabrera

2009

Hello,

I would like to submit a disagreement with the proposed 1500 dwellings in the Fish market Development proposed.

I have been a resident of Pymont for 13 years and prior to covid, experience daily the challenges associated with the infrastructure particularly transportation.

Yes, there will be a metro line - but the metro line is SUPPOSED TO ADDRESS THE EXISTING TRANSPORTATION DIFFICULTIES IN THIS AREA. The light rail and bus public transport routes were already insufficient to support the existing population in Pymont.

I have had physical threats of violence laid by desperate commuters to get to work on peak hour traffic Monday to Friday. You should review the historic complaints number and now the 389 and the 501 buses are already challenged with meeting it's current capacity requirements.. what more 1500 dwellings!!!!

Please reconsider the dwelling. You should instead look at the dead zone behind Jones street? And also why is there no transportation in between Glebe and Pymont?

179936

Campey

2009

I live at 122 Saunders St Pyrmont, in close proximity to the proposed development. I believe that the negative impacts will be considerable.

The road infrastructure adjacent to Blackwattle Bay cannot cope with current traffic loads, the proposed development will put further pressure on roads and severely impact vehicles exiting and joining the Western distributor as well as inhibiting traffic flow for local traffic.

I worry about the shadowing effects on buildings such as ours on the other side of the western distributor and the road safety implications of such a high volume traffic corridor(the Western Distributor) being in shadow for a significant amount of time each day.

The Light Rail is already massively overcrowded for much of the day, the large increase in population proposed will add further to Light Rail overcrowding.

The proposal is completely out of scale with existing development, particularly the intended 45 story building.

I find it abhorrent that the proposal overrules and subverts current Sydney City planning regulations, setting a precedent for further out of scale, scanty scrutinized developments.

175121

Caro

2007

It is vitally important that we have at least 50% of the available land as public owned and accessible. The importance of sunlight cannot be underestimated. This is a very densely populated area already and access to sunlight is extremely important to human well being. There is no reason to have massive towers in this area and the amenity of already existing residents should not be compromised for private gain. It would also be advantageous to increase public facilities around the water by including a harbour pool as the heat is rising in our environment. That is also why we must make sure we have as much soft surface as possible including trees and gardens to mitigate climbing temperatures. Don't compromise on these aspects for private profit, there will still be plenty of that with smaller scale development and higher public access. In fact a focus on public amenity will only increase the desirability of new housing in the area and therefore increase prices. Please also consider affordable and social housing. We are fed up with developers being the only winners when areas of Sydney are revitalised.

161051

Carroll

GLEBE

As a resident in Glebe I do not think your plan is well considered or has appropriate consultation with local residents.

Within your plan, more time is spent explaining how the NSW government will apply for amendments and exceptions to the Environmental Planning guidelines, than what you plan to do to create a sustainable local ecosystem.

The most it is referred to, is a set of bullet points development 'should' follow.

Not good enough. This should only go ahead if there is:

- Objective environmental and sustainability KPIs development must meet
- More space allocated to public housing
- Glebe Island restored
- More public consultation
- Clear analysis and planning for increased traffic flow due to precinct

In summary this is a poorly designed plan and as a resident I do not support it in its current form.

Isaac Carroll

164486

Cashman

Balmain 2041

I believe that the current plan for redeveloping the Blackwater bay foreshore is missing a once in a lifetime opportunity to establish critically needed public green space. Building more apartments in this crowded area is not the solution and at least 50% of the space should be given to public use. I regularly run through this area and also cycle through multiple times per week. While making the foreshore path continuous is a great goal it should not be crowded by building high rise development. The current Covid crisis has brought to the fore an existing crisis of public green space. It's not enough to mark out a narrow path for the public while passing the majority of the site over for large scale development. Currently local governments are recommending local residents avoid areas like the bay run and Glebe foreshore as they are too crowded for safe public recreation during Covid. Building more housing will intensify the pressure on these spaces.

168001

Cha

Glebe

My property is in Glebe, SP 75377 14 Griffin Place, just next to the new fish market. The proposed high rise apartments will block my city view. Therefore I do not agree the height of the apartments higher than 50M.



165971

Chalwell

Sydney

I work in the the city and Pymont area.

I am shocked at the residential scale of development, and am deeply concerned the proposal is seeking to create a maximised financial return, rather than a focus on creating a more liveable city.

I do not believe sufficient time has been given for the public or for the Sydney City Government to feed back on the plans.

I firmly believe that, with a suburb that is already so densely populated, the focus must be on a more liveable environment, as opposed to stacking large towers so close to the waterfront and so close to a highway.

163276

Chen

2000

Lack of green space and public areas.

Shadowed and dwarfs surrounding area with high rise towers, not in best interest of community needs.

168071

Chiew

Forest Lodge 2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

183421

Chin

2033

A 45 story building creates over shadowing and brings in people and traffic in an overcrowded area that doesn't have the infrastructure to support it. Have you tried to drive down wattle street or Bridge road on a weekend? You can't move for days. Clearly not thinking about the community at all.

162476

Chong

2015

As a resident of the city of Sydney, I am very concerned about this development plan. These new towers will create a visual barrier between the bay and city. I am concerned about the on-the-ground experience of living and working in the precinct, surrounded by those tall buildings - shadows and wind tunnels similar to the effect now at Barangaroo. Of the around 1500 dwellings planned, will any be marked for affordable housing? I hope the Planning Department and Government Architect teams will find a way for a more humble and harmonious, yet dynamic and forward-looking design.

181826

Choy

2089

I am against this development proposal which is entirely inappropriate for the area.

It is completely out of character with its surroundings and massively exceeds the development codes.

It will generate significant vehicular traffic in an area which struggles in peak hour.

While it is not immediately next to good transport options, there is a light rail station but users will need to move around on short connecting options which I feel is inefficient.

There should be greater public benefit, including public housing and world class foreshore access suitable for both pedestrians and cyclists and public park land.

160991

churher

2006

I am appalled by the proposal to built high rise residential towers right on the harbour foreshore. Among other things, it will overshadow the new fish markets development and create problems for anyone using rooftop solar panels. This is a deceptive move from a government guided by poor, rushed planning, without a concern for the natural landscape. I am strongly opposed to the proposed development.

160951

Clapham

2250

I support this development. The Sydney skyline needs to evolve, reflecting its status as a world city. The bay areas to the west of CBD are perfect for large scale high rise development. Once these towers are completed, it will enhance our beautiful skyline. Please ensure that you proceed with this proposal and ignore the naysayers.



164596

Clarke

2037

I am a Glebe resident, who lives near to the monstrosity that you are intending to build. I am completely opposed to 45 storey buildings in this location. The scale will dwarf the entire area, massively increase traffic on the bay, leave the whole area in shade and ruin the feel of our suburb, all to satisfy wealthy developers. It's an absolute travesty. You asked for residents' opinions on three different plans some months ago. Did you take even one second to look at these? I cannot imagine that even a single resident chose the design with 45 storey buildings. How dare you ignore everyone who lives in this area. I'm utterly disgusted with these plans and with the government that proposed them.

181696

Clerke

Chippendale

Good morning

After having read through the material and other community submissions, I have concerns regarding the impacts to community infrastructure, maritime traffic safety and the protection of public water space and the harbour environment. I also would like to see at least 50% of the Blackwattle Bay space to be allocated for public rather than private use.

Thank you

Leslie Clerke

160791

Cohen

Pymont, 2009

My comment is with respect to the area under investigation for the metro station and the impact that has on the urban design you have proposed for Blackwattle Bay.

It seems clear the metro station must be at the western end of the investigation area to support the plan for Blackwattle Bay. Public transport services must be co-located, not spread across walking distances of several hundred metres.

A metro station within the proposed precinct makes sense from a transport interchange perspective but also to support the overall development of the plan. It also makes sense from the perspective that the area is under the control of the state government and a new metro station can be integrated into the development. I'm hoping this is as obvious to the experts as it is to the layperson.

160801

Cohen

2009

Putting the metro station at the new Blackwattle Bay precinct makes more sense than having it at the Star, because it is a better location to make an interchange with the existing light rail system and the proposed ferry wharf.

181851

Cole

2049

This development is a welcome addition to Sydney's built landscape. It will provide important new dwellings for Sydneysiders, and contribute to the thriving metropolis that Sydney is famous for. New homes, surrounded by large open spaces that all can share, is vitally important in the Inner City. It reduces urban sprawl, stopping the encroachment of suburbia on our national parks.

This project is vital and I wholeheartedly support it.

182406

Coleman

2305

As a former resident of inner Sydney I am dismayed by the lack of sensitivity in this plan. We need trees, which means less high rise, and walkways and cycle ways wherever possible. The project as it stands suggests even more developer input and greed with no acknowledgement of the nature of this site.

Please stop over developing our space. The unsightly, out of scale casino at Barangaroo should be a reminder that people and nature, not symbols of power and wealth, are what matters.

Think of the natural and built environment, please!

165661

Colusso

Glebe

Maximum building heights of 156 Metres (equivalent to 45 stories), is far too high in this area.

Such a development height would grossly out scale all nearby existing structures and development and result in gross over development of the precinct.

I am very much in favour for the development of the Blackwattle Bay precinct, but any development must be in line with existing or close to existing height limits.

160921

Cook

2015

I think this plan and development is completely out of scale with the local area. Towers too high and too close to the harbour and not enough public space. The area is already overcrowded with insufficient infrastructure.

Thank you

Sean Cook



167171

Cooling

Glebe 2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

172591

Coombes

Glebe 2037

As a resident of Glebe who owns and lives in an apartment which directly looks onto the fishmarket site (12 Bridge Road) I have grave concerns about the proposed development.

First and foremost, the height of the towers is abhorrent. 45 storeys will dominate the skyline and even overpower the Anzac bridge. Like many residents in the area, my views of the city will be greatly impacted. I am also enormously concerned about the shadowing effect these towers will have on the surrounding area.

While I am not at all opposed to the redevelopment of fishmarket, blocking the public space with sky scrapers and then - incredibly - only keeping the area under the bridge for public use is not at all a reasonable solution for the people of Glebe.

I implore you greatly reduce the height of the towers and do more with public space. This is a city which needs it.

Please don't squander this opportunity to make something Sydney will be proud of for generations to come.

177316

Cooper

2037

5% of the housing stock being dedicated to being affordable is insufficient. It is unreasonable that, when Council and Planning NSW have authority to mandate the level of stock that will be allocated to affordable housing for a new development, the rate will be 1 in 20 or less. Market for housing has already reached absurdity across the city, let alone Glebe and Pyrmont. Where government has the capacity to mandate more affordable housing from development that will remain profitable, they have an obligation to do so. The extortionate profitability of development should not come at the expense of the community itself.

181036

Coorey

2038

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KQnaDxxYzaatexwQ\\_pSGq1DwKmPpJ6rA/view?usp=drivesdk](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KQnaDxxYzaatexwQ_pSGq1DwKmPpJ6rA/view?usp=drivesdk)

183011

Coorey

Ryde, 2112

Iâ€™d like to put my personal support behind this entire proposal! Itâ€™s time that we transform our foreshore, just like the successful works that have been done in Barangaroo. As I used to live in the UK, and being an avid traveller, this development will truly regenerate this area for generations to come. With the massive investment in infrastructure, itâ€™s time we do something positive for the people of Sydney! My only point is like to make is that I want stress that we do need more progressive and state of the art architecture, to create new landmarks. We are too conservative in our design principles, casing bland and stunted opportunities.

164956

Coulter

2009

I strongly object to the extent of the proposed development in such a small area of land. The building heights are far too high for the suburb; and the amount of people it expects to house is outrageous.

As it is, traffic is horrendous coming in and out of Pyrmont. Pyrmont is already considered one of the most densely populated suburbs in the Southern Hemisphere and you want to increase this by 2300 more people ?

No other building in the suburb is higher than 20 floors and now you intend to more than double this?

This is an abomination to the suburb; to the environment and to the surrounding areas. You will catastrophically affect the existing residents and the safety of the area. You will increase traffic and pollution into the area as well.

I am all for development and employment but not at the risk of the current residents, and our quiet enjoyment that we experience at the moment.

I believe a cap of 20 storeys is more than appropriate; with a cap of the number of residents also.

I have always looked forward to the development of the fish markets, but not at the risk of the above.

Surely there can be a level of compromise here?

Regards,

Tatiana

174036

Croft

2040

I would like a harbour pool to be considered please

167816

Croker

Centennial Park 2021

This city does not need any more ugly, high density towers which block views, create wind tunnels and cast long shadows. We need more community spaces & green space.



160946

Crompton

Waterloo 2017

Please don't build giant apartment towers over the foreshore, for the love of god. Low-rise development only, please, and maximum public space and amenity over developer profits.

181911

Crompton

Waterloo 2017

For the love of god, stop trying to put high-rise apartment blocks on every single piece of land in Sydney.

Blackwattle Bay precinct should:

- be low rise
- include ample public open space
- not be just a massive giveaway to developers.

182931

Crosariol

Glebe 2037

20 August 2021

RE: Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct Study submission

To whom it concerns

I lodge these concerns regarding the above development:

#### Public Good

â€¢ the land is public land which has not been afforded sufficient requirement to give quality and inspiring ongoing public good. This is particularly important as public land, especially in such a prime location is key in a time of reduced available land and increasing environmental challenges

â€¢ The space â€˜givenâ€™ to public use has been insufficiently considered and is more often the leftover spaces between buildings, overshadowed and windy

â€¢ This plan does not sufficiently consider the reasons the area is popular nor attempt to align with it â€“ low-height structures, heritage buildings, open leafy spaces, sunshine and breezes. This development is an example of the CBD encroaching on a village, not the qualities of that area providing benefits to the CBD

â€¢ There is insufficient input from local indigenous communities â€“ their input is not sufficiently felt in this plan

â€¢ Ongoing local opposition and concern with the plan has not been given sufficient consideration and response here

#### Density

â€¢ Size and scope has been prioritised over all other considerations â€“ it is too high and too big. The area will create further traffic and parking issues which will impact locals greatly, reduce enjoyment and ease of travel in the area and cause bottlenecks. Public transport and access is not sufficient

â€¢ The plan needs a complete rethink now that Covid has changed CBD work patterns and Australiaâ€™s relationship with tourism. In addition, with the move towards more sustainable ways of eating, the merits and ethics of a huge fishmarket need to be completely re-considered. There is

already a considerable amount of vacant and underutilised buildings and windy, dusty, people-free spaces in Pymont and beyond in the city

Access to the water

â€¢ there will be less opportunities for locals and small craft owners to use the water safely and with enjoyment. This plan allows for commercial business and affluent organisations to swamp their recreation and voice.

Please note, while I look forward to future engagement on this subject, I will do that via existing channels and therefore donâ€™t give permission for the developer or any associates to contact me directly.

Sincerely

Claudia Crosariol

c.crosariol@agsm.edu.au

181026

Croucher

2038

Stop over-developing the harbour foreshore. The inner west was promised 50% public access to OUR little stretch of harbour foreshore. Enhance the area rather than yuck it up!

165201

Cummins

Hunters Hill

I read the whole thing.

Its quite a smokescreen of buzzwords referring to 'serving the people' but is really just a massive DA for high rise apartments/offices. Much like the Barangaroo towers that serve to block out the sun and create terrible wind tunnels down below.

The artists impression is so apt - the towers make it look like the cooling towers of a nuclear power plant. There is no need for the highrise in Pyrmont unless its the precursor to justify the 65 storey casino(that noone wants except the State govt and developers to collect rents from).

The fishmarket building looks good (which is the original purpose by the way). The precinct development is a disaster clearly hijacked by the corrupt politicians to generate income. The amenity is awful and will be a ghetto in 10 years. I dont understand why you people dont learn from your prior mistakes - Darling Harbour, Barangaroo etc.

We use the fish markets pretty much weekly so will definitely oppose this in whatever forum I can. Harsh words for you from a Hunters Hill resident who once voted Liberal. Not any more.

181821

Cummins

2037

very disappointing to see yet another monstrous plan for our beautiful city! please stop pleasing developers and cashing in on the revenue and think of future generations ! Its bad enough that you have jammed buildings up against the Sydney city streets, no more glimpses of our foreshores!

why oh why can't you leave our foreshores alone and step all future developments away from it?

its a disgrace Gladys!

172101

curnick

Sydney

Given the Covid pandemic's effect on front line workers, essential for all Sydney City business centres, who have to commute daily from the outer western / South western suburbs, it would make more sense to build social housing as part of all future big developments such as the new fish markets in the City of Sydney.

The fish markets project could lead the way for a post pandemic world to include social and affordable housing to accommodate current and future front line workers close to their workplaces. Why not show leadership and do this?



178811

D'Arcy-Irvine

Balmain 2041

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

The proposed height and placement of these buildings will destroy this historic area. It should be redesigned to compliment and integrate into nearby Glebe. Sydney CBD is losing its symmetry with Barangaroo now a wall of off balanced towers. Please allow our inner city suburbs to retain a big bright sky instead of being walled off and over shadowed by residential towers.

Yours sincerely,

Robert D'Arcy-Irvine

Balmain, 2041

181391

Da Rocha

Woongarra

I believe the redesign of Blackwattle Bay will cause an irrevocable change to the city's appearance and its historic character. This will be especially obvious from the shoreline. The current skyline is iconic, recognisable internationally, but will now be almost completely obscured. At ground level, erecting tall buildings along the water line will make an uninteresting and shrouded walkway for pedestrians - blocking the sky and view.

161221

Davidson

Forest Lodge 2037

I oppose the Blackwattle Bay plan, I think the existing fish markets site should be solely used for waterfront park and money should be used to clean up the harbour.

182956

Davis

Glebe 2037

I object to the proposed development because it overwhelms the foreshore site.

167196

De Groote

2015

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

182266

de Klerk

DARLINGTON

I think this is a terrible idea. The fish market should be revamped but a development of towers wedged between freeways is horrible. Please do not go ahead with this and respect the Glebe foreshore for what it is. We don't want it overcrowded with developments and darkness.

Best,

Ben

162046

DeBeers

Glebe

This will take away from locals in so many ways. We won't be able to do our daily walk for who knows how long while this horrible looking structure is built, you'll block some of our fantastic views, and we don't want heaps of construction around. This plan is in every way a bad idea.

165016

Dent

Glebe

Please do not build 45 storey buildings.

Totally out of sink with the surrounding areas.

Horrible sun shadowing of surrounding existing buildings, streets and parks.

Don't be greedy today. Don't just make money, for yourself. Leave some great low rise space for the generations to come. That is a legacy you can be proud of and will last long after you have consumed your \$\$\$ profits and returned to dust.



181481

Denver

2037

The SSP study and proposed planning controls for Blackwattle Bay DO NOT

• showcase Sydney's living culture and stories of Country;

• build an inclusive and iconic waterfront destination

• celebrate innovation, diversity and community.

The community wants more green space, not more residential high rises, more social housing, and a wider walkway. We want less parking for yachts and ferries and more support for the rowers.

And above all we want an honest recognition of the many faceted character of Glebe's residents, our love of nature, trees, bird life, space and play places when it comes to any redevelopment.

The SPP proposal appears to be informed by a projected increase in population close to the City Centre and a vital tourism industry. This is not the case now and is projected to radically change in the future.

The worlds of work and trade have changed. The recent census will demonstrate the critical need to green our cities, protect existing residents mental health and provide more, not less leisure and natural recreational facilities.

Please redo the proposal and when so doing consider the various detailed submissions from The Glebe Historical Society, the Friends of the Bay that articulate essential changes and amendments in detail.

A landowner of 30 years and local stakeholder.

173646

Derum

Cremorne 2090

I wish to propose two enhancements to elements of the Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct Study (the study). Both suggestions would create genuine points of interest and excitement, offering the public clear and unique benefits to the overall development. Such benefits would, undoubtedly, aid acceptance of the overall scheme, something which is clearly necessary, given the response the draft strategy in the media, which focussed on proposed building heights (and the proposition this were too high).

#### ABORIGINAL CULTURAL GARDEN

The proposal for a Gathering Circle in the foreshore park on the north-eastern foreshore of Blackwattle Bay is extremely welcome. There are limited opportunities to easily engage with Aboriginal culture in Sydney, outside of art galleries and certain paid performances, and the potential for a cultural offering is very strong. However, the proposal should be more ambitious. While the public craves harbour foreshore parks, and rightfully so, there is a great many, including a number in Blackwattle Bay/Rozelle Bay.

The proposal should be elevated by designating the whole foreshore park in which the Gathering Circle is located as an Aboriginal Cultural Garden. In practice, this would look a lot like a foreshore park, but with multiple facilities for the presentation of Aboriginal dance, music, story telling, visual arts and cooking. If these facilities were also backed up resources to secure a (daily) range of performances and other cultural offerings, this would create a top-tier attraction to bring people to the area, rather than “just another park”. It would also compliment the new Sydney Fish Market, by providing an adjacent activity for market customers to enjoy before or after their visit.

#### THE WORLD’S (EQUAL) BEST PLAYGROUND

The proposal for open space, including a children’s playground, at the north-western shore of Blackwattle Bay is also welcome but, again, should be elevated to provide a facility that will genuinely attract visitors to area. This would be achieved by committing to the development of not just a playground, but a playground that is better than any that currently exists in the world. The location of the playground should also be moved to the west of its current location in the study, placing it under the ANZAC Bridge. This is because while sunlight is generally a highly desirable feature of public open space, in the case of children’s playgrounds, shade (that is, protection from the sun) is the priority.

My proposal is for the playground to be presented as the “equal” best because its development should be accompanied by the creation of at least one other, and potentially more, similar facilities in other parts of Sydney and NSW. What will make the playground world class is the

equipment installed. This is unlikely to be an “off the shelf” product, meaning manufacturing and design would be bespoke. Accordingly, the cost of manufacturing additional identical elements would reduce significantly, compared to the first. This would provide a cost-effective opportunity for the benefits of the Blackwattle Bay development to be shared with the Western Sydney Parkland and potentially other parts of the state. I envisage that an expressions of interest process would be run, with local councils across the state offered the opportunity to “join” the procurement of the playground’s components, for use in their own areas. There would be costs associated with design and construction of each additional playground, to which the State Government would need to contribute. However, the benefits such facilities provide, in terms of offering families a highly cost-effective entertainment option with tangible benefits for child development, cannot be overstated.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to reading the final Study.

Best regards,

Oliver

164566

Deshpande

Pymont

Hello

I want to oppose the height of the buildings - 45 storeys. This is higher than Sofitel and there is absolutely no need for it. The building height should be 15-20 storey only otherwise there will be a permanent shadow over Pymont making us lose the little sunlight we get. Further this will impact the already bursting at seams Anzac bridge and Pymont bridge road traffic. Adding to noise and air pollution. I also want to oppose the density ( 1500 Units)

I want to instead encourage more greenery, parks, dog parks and walk ways by the foreshore for public.

181351

Desney

2040

Fish market site should be public space with the fish market function only continuing there. It is outrageous the amount of harbour foreshore that has been effectively privatised. Therefore this at least now should be in public hands with full public access to the foreshore.

164591

Diller

Glebe

I strongly object to the proposed new height limits for buildings (RL 156 metres) in the Blackwattle Bay zone. Building along the eastern shore of the Bay to that new height limit will significantly obstruct views toward the CBD from properties in Glebe overlooking Blackwattle Bay, with associated negative impacts on amenity and property valuations. I ask that the new height limit be reduced by half to RL 78 metres - still a significant increase, but a more tolerable one.

160956

Dobson

2009

The proposed towers are way too high, and out of keeping with the aesthetics of the area, will cause shadows and wind tunnels

169866

Dolan

2037

As I local resident who visits the Glebe foreshore on a near-daily basis I feel I am justified in making my feelings known about the development proposals.

Blackwattle Bay is a welcome oasis enjoyed by thousands of local residents, visitors and commuters beyond the high rise and inner-city sprawl extending west from the CBD. Whilst I welcome an modernised fish market (not something I visit myself) this appears to be at the expense of the natural beauty and potential the bay offers.

As my attached aerial photo shows, the proposed 45+ story towers right on the waterfront would dwarf the existing low-rise buildings in Pyrmont and those across the narrow bay in Glebe. They will also significantly detract from the architectural impact the iconic Anzac bridge has on the skyline. Not to mention adding thousands of journeys on already congested roads and an at capacity light rail (pre-covid). They would also cast long shadows across surrounding areas and the new fish market, especially during winter months.

Local residents have only to make a short trip into the city or to Darling harbour for a huge variety of shops and restaurants. I cannot see why the area needs more at the expense of rare waterfront open space and public amenities. Increased housing perhaps but this should be more appropriately sized for the area with affordable options which do not price out all but the highest earners.

Sydney's unique asset is its meandering foreshore and this should be protected at all costs. Endless, soulless high-rise developments, such as those commissioned in Darling Square, detract from the liveability of our city and the quality of life for its residents. I feel if this plan is allowed to proceed by NSW government in its current form it will set a grim precedent for future development applications in the area. Investing in more green space and viable public transport options such as Metro stations at White Bay, Pyrmont and Glebe within a decade would be far more beneficial for the area, and offer a more sustainable future for everyone.

Thank you for listening.



182151

Donahue

2041

While a good start, the proposed plan is significantly short on open, useable, tree-planted green space. 30% as proposed is at best half of what is needed and what the local and surrounding communities want. Lets start at 60% green space and bear in mind the disasterous decisions made regarding Barangaroo. Most of the community will realise that some commercial and low-to-medium density housing is needed but this needs to be kept to reasonable levels which includes restricting building height to, say, 4 or 5 storeys. This proposal must be considered in conjunction with over-ambitious proposals for the White Bay precinct. The NSW planners need to prioritise the community preferences in both locations to make the best of a once-in-a-lifetime chance. We do not want yet another shopping centre or sky-high tower blocks. What's best for the local and neighbouring communities will make this area a place well-and-truly on the tourist must-do list.

163316

Dow

Pymont 2009

I would like to express deep concern over the scale and height of the proposed towers at old fish market site.

Pymont is already Australia's 2nd highest density suburb, and adding an even greater number of high residential towers to increase density further, while creating massive shadow over foreshore public areas is a concern. A more sympathetic development is required.

Added to the port development on the Balmain side of White Bay, and having the large western distributor intersection, adjacent to this site, it appears creating green pleasant open livable public space in this area which is already quite industrial, is not a priority.

182036

Dowsett

Glebe

Many thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed plans for the current Fishmarket site at Blackwattle Bay.

The site is clearly in need of improvement. It is also a unique site with great potential. While I support the intention of the redevelopment, I have several concerns about the detail of the proposal – specifically building scale, housing tenure and open space:

- **Scale:** For the design to be successful, it must respond to its surroundings. Ultimo is characterised by terraces and converted wool stores 4-8 storeys in height. Pyrmont also has terraces, converted warehouses and newer apartment buildings up to 26 storeys. Glebe has a mix of terraces, 3 storey walk-ups, and some taller apartment buildings. Designing for place would mean respecting the ANZAC Bridge (rather than obscuring it from view with tall apartment buildings) and developing buildings more in line with the context – between 4 and 25 storeys.
- **Equity:** The renewal will only be successful if a range of income groups can enjoy it. Social housing should be included as part of the housing mix – as it was in the 1990s/2000s urban renewal of Pyrmont, where social housing residents now enjoy the same access to the fantastic park, light rail and other amenities as the private market residents. Affordable housing should also be increased as a proportion of housing – what a great place for key workers to live, so close to the city.
- **Health:** There is increasing evidence that urban environments have a significant influence on health. It is not clear that the proposed development will sufficiently encourage cycling and walking, or shield residents from noise and air pollution from the adjacent busy roads. Opportunities to encourage walking and cycling include reinstating the old Glebe Island Bridge as a pedestrian/cycling link to Rozelle. This would be a fabulous asset and way of contributing to the unique character and quality of the place.

The site currently leaves a lot to be desired and could be vastly improved. It is cut off from the Pyrmont and Glebe foreshore walks. It is overshadowed and dominated by road overpasses and intersections. It is largely inaccessible to pedestrians and cyclists. It is wasted being used as a carpark. Improving these elements and creating a desirable place to live and visit should be the driving force behind the renewal. It is impossible to see how buildings 150 metres high will do that. Instead, they would further add to overshadowing and create wind tunnels.

Unlike the Pyrmont renewal, which is a development set in a landscape, the current Blackwattle Bay proposal reads more like Barangaroo, a development that dominates the landscape. I hope the next

iteration of the Blackwattle Bay proposal will be more contextual and appropriate than the current proposal.

168491

Doyle

Glebe

I strongly oppose the proposal to allow maximum building heights up to RL 156 meters. This is significantly taller than the existing fish markets building as it is not in keeping with the buildings on the Blackwattle Bay foreshore. It will be an eyesore and detrimental to the area.

173971

Dulks

Pymont NSW 2009

I object to the proposed development of Blackwattle Bay. My comments are as follows:

#### High-Rise Towers

At up 45 storeys, the towers do not fit into the existing building fabric around Bank Street, Jones Street, Bridge Road and the other side of the Bay, Glebe. The excessive height will visually impair many other existing buildings.

The proposed number of apartments “ 1,500 ” on such a small site is excessive and will further contribute to Pymont being one of, if not the, most densely populated areas in all of Australia.

Sadly, the proportion of affordable housing at only 5% is not reflective of the increasing need for affordable housing in the Inner City.

The excessive height will result in overshadowing of nearby buildings and public space, as well as create wind tunnels across the site as well as the “public space” underneath the Anzac Bridge deck.

#### Traffic

The additional traffic from 1,500 apartments and several new offices will further increase congestion around Bank Street and Bridge Road. There are already massive delays and car jams during the daily travel peaks, and it will be near impossible for many current residents to escape these on their way to and from home.

#### Public space

The most disappointing aspect of the proposed development is the small size, narrowness and location of public space. It is completely inadequate and yet another example of excessive development trumping public amenity and space.

To claim that the public open space is equivalent to one-and-a-half football fields is cynical “ a vast part of that space is underneath ANZAC Bridge, a drab, dusty and permanently shaded grey area in which no plants will thrive.

Modelling for the foreshore promenade included arbitrary widths of 10, 20 and 30 meters. Not surprisingly, the 10m width was selected, demonstrating the clear bias towards development. Looking at the drawings and imagery in the Study it is evident that a width of 10 meters is totally inadequate for so many apartment residents, office workers and visitors to the fish markets. Instead, planning should have considered various widths of between 10 and 20 meters, and chosen a more adequate width of somewhere between 15 and 20 meters to achieve a better balance between public amenity and developers’ wishes.



165321

Durkin

Pymont 2009

I think most of the Blackwattle Bay plans will work and look good in the model EXCEPT the height of the residential towers which I believe would look ridiculous as well as have a huge impact on the area. Please re think those and reduce the height to 18-20 storeys to fit in with other precincts in Pymont e.g. Jacksons Landing.



162656

Durman

2009

It is very difficult to take seriously any part of this document when the covering artists impression is deceitful and misleading. Does this mean that the Planning Department is planning on deceiving and misleading the residents who will have to live with the final results of this planning proposal?

Let's start with the picture. Where is the allocated space and parking for Dragon Boats? Where is the already constructed party boat marina? Where are the existing buildings on Bank Street? When did a swimming pool become part of the planning? If those buildings delicately etched in are supposed to represent the 45 storey buildings proposed then I guess that's what's called poetic licence. It took me a few minutes to even recognise that this is Bank Street. Where the tiered seating is depicted appears to be in my apartment block's driveway. No one informed me that we were being given tiered seating rather than access to our driveway. The overall park depicted indicates a far larger area than is actually available. Is the planning department planning on reclaiming part of Blackwattle Bay to provide this park?

The proposed 45 storey buildings are a blatant disregard for the wishes of the community. Just 12 months ago the residents of Pyrmont objected overwhelmingly to the proposed towers at The Star Casino. Despite this, approval has since been given for an unsolicited proposal for the redevelopment of Harbourside Shopping precinct which means that the community does not get a say. It is everything that the local residents objected to regarding the Star development. It is too tall, too big and ruins the community of the Pyrmont Peninsula. What Pyrmont does not want is another horrible Barangaroo style development. And the Blackwattle Bay Development is exactly that. Too big, too tall and not what the local residents and community want.

This whole document is a load of gobbledegook and marketing speak with no substance and nothing that will give current and future local residents a better quality of life. We will be choked with congestion and too many people living in too small an area.

My objection is not because I do not want to see Blackwattle developed. What I am objecting to is inappropriate and thoughtless development. This is not a development to benefit people. This is a development to benefit developers who will leave when they have built their overdeveloped and hideous buildings and will not have to live with the overcrowding and congested streets that results from their state sanctioned buildings. In years to come, apartment blocks across Sydney will be called Berejiklian Era not because they are well designed but because many are reminiscent of Communist Era apartments. Just whack them up and squeeze the people into them.

It is distressing to constantly have to battle to have your voice heard and to have community opinion disregarded. If the government was prepared to actually listen to the community they may discover that the end results would be a great outcome for everyone concerned. Unfortunately the Planning Department thinks they know better than anyone who lives in the area.

I do not trust Minister Stokes (read The Premier) or the NSW Planning Department to develop the Blackwattle waterfront with residents and the local community at the forefront of their decisions.

I OBJECT MOST STRONGLY TO THIS PLANNING PROPOSAL.

167826

Ellershaw

2069

I'm very concerned by the design of the proposed development. It does nothing to support public space, will completely take away from the unique character of Blackwattle Bay, and make pyrmont area even more crowded and claustrophobic! This is a lazy, greed driven proposal, please reconsider.

181611

Ennis

N/A

This lacks any transparency. The towers are shown as transparent in imagery - which goes against any real attempt to show a visual impact.

The SSP is worrying. It is often used to put projects beyond real scrutiny. No lessons learned from the failures at Barangaroo.

The fact that the foreshore is in shadow for a significant part of the day - further highlights that the "public giveback"™ is simply just what is left over - not a genuine attempt to provide meaningful public space. At 3m wide the walking / cycling path is a token offering.

The lack of a reasonable % of public housing is indefensible.

The natural ventilation of the apartments needs to be looked at - if the starting point is this bad, it will only get worse.

This needs to start from a public perspective - not floor ratios . . .

162651

Epstein

Pymont 2009

I wish to lodge a strong objection to the development as currently proposed of the old fish market site on Bank St Pymont.

There is no doubt that the area needs a redevelopment and the new fish market is a beautiful building. However the idea of placing towers up to 45 stories along side it is ridiculous for many reasons

- 1) The proposed heights are much greater than any others on the peninsula
- 2) The intersection leading to the ANZac Bridge and Pymont Bridge Rd from Bank St is already extremely heavily congested. It can take up to 15min to access the bridge on busy days from Bank St with traffic being at a standstill
- 3) There will be shadowing on the new fish market.
- 4) With such a high density of build, how will there be sufficient public land. A drawing can hide multiple ills
- 5) Pre COVID19, the public transport options were at peak capacity. It was often impossible to get on the light rail at fish market in the morning. Currently there are no bus stops along Bank St or Pymont Bridge Rd. This may change but it is hard to see how this can be accomplished without impacting on the traffic. The proposal states that there would be a ferry to Barangaroo. This was trialled and although it was fun, it was not well patronised as it was expensive.

It is well and good to have 256 pages of soil profile and indigenous heritage reports but these are being used as retrospective justifications for a project that will enhance a developer's balance sheet but not for public benefit in any way.

Yours sincerely

Manuela Epstein

163166

Ersoy

2008

Blackwattle Bay is a recreational area for the community and it should stay that way. With limited access to public parks and greenery in the area, big development will only bring more pollution and more traffic. I'm not a big fan of the fish markets either. I would very much like to see this area turned into a public space for everyone in the community to access freely and enjoy.

161676

Estival

Surry Hills

The proposed plan for the "revitalization" of Blackwattle Bay is not acceptable in its present form. Buildings up to 45 stories will overshadow the public foreshore, which should remain for the use and enjoyment of the public. As a resident of inner Sydney, this is one of our regular walks and cycling routes and I strongly object to this misuse of government land for private profit.

This proposal also only earmarks 1550 dwellings as affordable, whereas we (the people of New South Wales) should be using this and other government land to provide more affordable housing.

181661

Etuk

2042

I have serious concerns about the proposed development at Blackwattle Bay. Please slow down and lengthen the public consultation process. There need to be clearer and higher targets for affordable housing allocations. There should be considerations for alternative uses of the space, perhaps a mix of park space and housing. And there need to be really clear environmental plans in place to ensure the Bay doesn't get polluted further by this development and that the housing will sustainably fit in this delicate ecological space.

Though I live in Newtown, outside the Sydney LGA, I am a neighbour and frequent visitor to the Blackwattle Bay area and hope that my opinion matters to you. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely, Lena Etuk



182296

Evans

2008

I am opposed to the state Berejiklian government's project - The Blackwattle Bay Revitalisation Plan.

It is proposed that the 10.4 hectare complex be built on the old Sydney Fish Market site. The government wants to develop 12 sites along Blackwattle Bay, with an apartment tower of up to 45 storeys. The towers include a shopping and business district.

I think this is going to seriously overdevelop a tiny block of public land.

The development will cast deep shadows over the foreshore, cast shadows on the solar panels of the new Fish Market development proposal, and limit public access to Blackwattle Bay forever.

The development proposal comes on the back of the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the cost of which is blowing out to more than \$750 million.

Moreover, I am opposed to this plan because Infrastructure NSW is seeking the approval of the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces to change the city's planning controls to allow towers up to 45 storeys to be built on the former Fish Markets site.

Many locals are opposed to the plan, as are local community organisations, such as the Glebe Society, Pyrmont Action, Bays Community Coalition and Ultimo Village Voice.

The state government needs to stop this project, abide by planning and heritage laws and properly consult with the local community.

181626

Everingham

2037

Please do not do this. It will absolutely break our hearts. We have so little of the old Sydney we love left: this is our home. Please do not build towers there.

178866

Falkner

Forest Lodge 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

The proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put forward are in my view unacceptable. They reflect priority being given to short-term profit for a small number of people, over long-term profitable and equitable use of land.

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and surrounding properties, and overwhelm local infrastructure

It does not take an expert in planning to see that allowing the tallest buildings to go up right on a shorefront is a fundamental, short-sighted mistake. It both denies the public (and tourists, who are vital for the ongoing viability of the fish market) enjoyable use of the foreshore, and shadows and blocks the view of all land behind the foreshore, permanently devaluing it and ruining its potential.

Tall residential blocks should be built on higher ground, where they do not disinherit everything and everyone behind them from access to the natural benefits of sun and sea, in which benefits the whole community is entitled to share and not only those fortunate enough to have a shorefront apartment.

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

The approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning. It is not right that the public funds which pay for its existence are used (abused, in fact) to enrich a few at the top of the property, construction and development industry at the expense of everyone else.

For the above reasons and others, I do not support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Falkner

Forest Lodge, 2037

163956

Fedele

Camperdown

After viewing the plans I would like to make my view clear that 45 storey towers would be abhorrent in the current proposed site for the following reasons:

- The foreshore is a beautiful place, and these buildings will ruin that
- The buildings will interrupt the view of the current asthetically pleasing cityscape for the apartments on the other side of Blackwattle Bay
- The buildings will overshadow the new fish market's solar panels
- There are already too many people walking and cycling around Blackwattle Bay. Adding hundreds of apartments will ruin the walk for everyone with a massive increase in foot traffic
- The area is already too crowded with not enough amenities such as schools, shops and green space. We need more green space not overcrowding of facilities. Rather than too much residential, we should have more commercial ventures and green space.

I am completely against the current proposal, and believe a new submission should be made.

172041

Fennell

Glebe 2037

As stated in Alex Greenwich's letter, this project needs to allow for full harbour front access by the public, and crucially a 20% affordable housing allotment for our most vulnerable. Glebe is home to a well established support network, and it is vital to keep our rough sleeping neighbours in their communities here, rather than being further pushed out of the city.

183261

FERNANDEZ

Pymont 2009

We believe that the new building will reduce our current view of the surrounding neighbourhood. It would also be great if when driving down Quarry Master drive that we still can see the water of Blackwattle bay. That aesthetic has been one of the joys of living where we do.

I also agree with the proposals on noise abatement works. With the proposed height of the new building it will create an echo chamber thus significantly increasing the noise in the neighbourhood.

161041

Fine

2023

Please reject this monstrous overdevelopment. I have outlined my thoughts below.

Walking through Sydney today, I am reminded of Churchill's dictum: "We shape our buildings; thereafter, they shape us". The anxiety of modern life partly arises from its conspicuous ugliness.

Beauty should not be the preserve of a wealthy minority. It should be a public dividend. The ambitions of the great civilisations are wrought in their architecture. The Classical order of Parthenon and the Pantheon, the Gothic treasures of Prague and Venice or the slender lines of the Sydney Opera House lift us, by their numinous beauty, beyond the maelstrom of appetite and instrumentalism.

Conversely, communities choked beneath a poultice of concrete and glass are being denied access to a fundamental aspect of human existence: the need for beautiful and well-planned spaces.

Bondi Junction lays bare the risks of piecemeal urban planning. An eczema of concrete and glass, it assaults the sinuous, shifting topography of the east, as if somebody had taken a Sharpie to a Turner landscape.

The problem with modern development is also echoed in the disposability of so many consumer goods: electronic devices, obsolescent within a year; cheap clothing manufactured by exploited labour; or the mountains of plastic that make up our supermarkets.

The repurposing of heritage architecture is key to sustainable development. The natural proportions and subtle ornament of a Federation house anchor our place in the world; they are distinctly Australian. Such a building is loved and appreciated and can be repurposed as an office, a surgery or a school.

Good architecture is not original or ambitious; it follows the forms and repetitions laid down by tradition. The genius of a Gaudí or an Utzon is too rare to justify the full creative licence which contemporary architects are afforded.

The continuing demolition of heritage buildings and the aesthetic poverty of contemporary architecture is deeply depressing. I urge you to reject this proposal.

170426

Fine

2023

Please don't spoil Blackwattle Bay with overdevelopment. Look at Darling Harbour - tacky, outdated, monolithic. Sensible, medium-density development - not Darling Harbour redux - ought to prevail.



161011

Fitzpatrick

2050

I would like to register my dissatisfaction with the NSW Dept of Planning's proposal for the Blackwattle development. It's completely at odds with the community's use of the space, with no regard for the surrounding areas (including overshadowing the solar panels on the fish market, and it demonstrates another clear conflict of interest in the Dept towards favouring developers' interests over those of residents, ratepayers, and voters. We don't get a say in the deals that happen between you and the consortiums who suggest these plans but we should have more consultation that gets seriously listened to rather than blatantly ignored like in recent projects (Barangaroo, Sirius, Powerhouse, Stadiums). Publicise these discussions and get our ideas about what the area needs! Rather than working backwards from the assumption we will be wanting 45 storey investment apartments built on the cheap.

163241

Flinn

Camperdown 2050

This proposal is simply not good enough. We must protect this land with the best interests of the community and the people who live there in mind.

160916

Forgan

2008

This is a ridiculous plan!!!

A wall of tall apartments will create wind tunnels and over shadowing. Natural light is so important for mental health! I live in Chippendale who ever did the planning for the Central Park area obviously had no idea wind tunnels dark cavernous apartments, horrible.

Secondly, as a school teacher, are you kidding me? There is no way Ultimo public will be able to cater for all the children coming from all those apartments. You have not done your research if you think that school isn't going to be well above capacity.

Finally, that intersection is a total bottle neck during peak hour. Good luck trying to manage another 2000 cars trying to get into apartments.

You really need to go back to the drawing board here. Stop trying to cram lots of people into already highly populated areas. It doesn't work!

163461

Frizzell

2037

I strongly object to the horrible proposed development. It prioritises profits for developers over the creation of sustainable, liveable spaces which compliment the current makeup of the area. It's already such a built up area, the last thing it needs is giant towers, particularly giant towers which shade the most popular outdoor spaces in the area.

It would be such a horrendous shame to ruin such a beautiful area so a bunch of developers could line their pockets more

180401

Gaida

2049

To whom it may concern,

I would like to see the blackwattle bay space open for public usage and not locked away for private viewing and use only. What are you doing to ensure this.

Kind regards,

Rebecca

178721

Gamble

annandale 2038

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am submitting my objection to the State Significant Precinct Study for the redevelopment of the old Fish Markets site on Blackwattle Bay.

I agree that this site needs to be renewed after the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets. However the proposed rezoning and changes to the planning controls that have been put to the public for comment are unacceptable.

Previous plans for what was referred to as "The Bays Precinct" included plans for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development, as per this proposal.

In particular, I am concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure and significantly negatively impact on the existing residential environment.

The proposal, which includes 45 storey towers, would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore. They will visually dominate the area and detract from the aesthetics of the Anzac Bridge.

Residential development of this scale on this site will overwhelm all existing and planned infrastructure. Why is no consideration being given to the existing Pyrmont, Ultimo and Glebe communities? All conditions / controls are designed to provide the maximum financial profit for the site and with no specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, such as proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints.

The proposal will dominate the skyline and throw shadows over the Bay and, as with other such developments in the CBD, create a wind tunnel. These proposed towers on the site which will also overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. Blackwattle Bay is also a passive boating, recreational and training bay for rowing and has been thus for over 100 years. Why does this not come into the discussions re what is appropriate development around Blackwattle Bay?

Why has no consideration been given to the acknowledged / recognised by many scientists, noxious sediments in this Bay? So bad are the heavy metals and other poisonous substances in these sediments that they have been determined by these experts as "never to be disturbed". How long before the developers demand large sections of the bay for the purpose of a marina as an added bonus for the residents and commercial outlets in these towers?

Infrastructure NSW has ignored every aspect of good planning. Excessive FSR, limited public foreshore access and green open space, solar access denial for much of the land and water, lack of infrastructure, lack of social and affordable housing within, negative visual impact and huge negative impact on the quality of life of current residents of Pyrmont, Ultimo and sections of Glebe. Financial

gain for developers has been the driving force here and has thus over ridden all other concerns, especially those of the living environment of the people of the surrounding suburbs. The impact of increased traffic from these and the new Fish Markets will be horrendous on health and quality of life of residents too.

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

gretchen gamble

annandale, 2038

183426

Garner

Pymont 2009

The buildings overshadow the bay. While increasing the spaces between the buildings is positive, the heights are completely out of character with the environment.

Both their imposing stature, and the impact on the morning sun undo much of the stated design goals of the space.

Both the bay itself, and the public park/green space on the eastern side contain little utility living in the shadow of buildings that would only suit the centre of the CBD, and do not belong in the low-to-mid-rise environment of Pymont.

The solar performance shows that large sections of the broadwalk will have almost no sun during winter months, with only the southern areas being spared from significant shadowing.

The parkland is also anaemic. I note that there is public space around the new fish markets, but the only other area of note is on the southern top of the eastern side. Areas for activity, rests and cafes should be a priority here, most of this area functions as little more than a pedestrian walkway.

I am pleased to see the work towards creating a continuous walkway from Rozelle to Woolloomooloo, as well as the work to keep the fish markets prominent in the area. I am also supportive of (smaller) structures to provide a barrier between the Anzac Bridge onramps and the space. However, the proposal as it currently exists has gone much too far with high-rise structures, and not far enough in considering open green spaces and keeping the area welcoming and in-keeping with the surrounding structures - in particular on the south/eastern side of Blackwattle Bay.

Thank you for time, and good luck with your ongoing planning and concept work.



182196

Garrett

Redfern

I cannot believe that the planning experts have not considered the beauty of Sydney Harbour as a place of historic significance and to be treasured. Instead they will plonk several huge tall towers overlooking Blackwattle Bay, and simply continue to destroy Sydney's unique character. Why? If the human race manages to control the climate and the destruction of the environment, and the various epidemics coming our way, and, and and.....cant the survivors have the forefront of the harbour to console them? Please please build something beautiful, interesting, and in tune with the water. Get a really, really good imaginative architect.....it looks terrible as it is. Kirsten Garrett.

167321

Garrington

Newtown

I do not believe the current proposal is the best option for the greater improvement of the area. There should be no high rise buildings nearby as this will greatly reduce the sun for the other side of the bay. It will highly congest the area and increase noise and other pollution to existing residents nearby. I feel the entire area, besides the fish market, should remain public land and be green spaces to encourage wildlife back to the bay. So many of us need access to healthy water spaces for improvements to our overall health. Do not provide special access to the few when it is at the detriment of others.

173961

Gavagna

Pymont

Please find my uploaded file entitled RG Blackwattle Bay Submission.

In case of error on my part in uploading, please let me know by email;

[gavagna@outlook.com](mailto:gavagna@outlook.com)

167931

Gembitsky

Ultimo 2007

Greetings!

I am a resident at Ultimo - the suburb has a unique and beautiful heritage, with the unique character of the working classes who created the area in so many of the buildings, structures and culture. It is unique even in the City of Sydney - once you step into Ultimo, Pyrmont and Haymarket, the character and feeling of the area is reminiscent of taking a step back in time.

The beauty of the area is paramount - it contains history and is beloved by all who visit. It's one of the most unique aspects of Sydney City and needs to be preserved and protected. Any new foundation that replaces or upgrades this architecture needs to be carefully planned to be tasteful and delicate in order to compliment and enhance the character that is already there.

The newly proposed fish market does not contain any of this careful planning required to maintain the beauty of the area, instead presenting a clashing, dull facade that does not relate to any of the history in its surrounding areas. It does not take into account the history of the area and the architecture bears no resemblance to the building it will replace. The design needs to be completely reworked and changed into something that honours the history it is replacing.

In addition, the fish markets and Black Water Bay present a semi-secluded, clear view of the water and bay. It is a place to relax and take in unobstructed and glorious views of the water. High rise apartments and skyscrapers, much like the proposed fish market design, completely disregard what makes this area special, and demolishes the character that makes this area so unique.

As a resident of the area and as a citizen who has fallen in love with this beautiful and unique space, I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal and take strides to consult with locals and instead create a design that emboldens and enhances the history and architecture that is already there.

164191

Genion

Chiswick 2046

While there is a need for housing in Sydney, such dense housing in this location is a poor idea.

As a public primary school teacher, I am deeply concerned that the schools in the area are not equipped to deal with the influx of children this would bring. Larger class sizes, crowded schools, deeply impact the quality of education teachers can provide.

While there is some public transport, far more will be needed to avoid adding to the intense traffic of the area, considering the major thoroughfare that is the ANZAC bridge is right next door.

The size of the buildings will change the face of the area for the worse and negatively impact the immediate area, including the solar panelled roof of the new fish markets. Energy-saving measures should absolutely be a priority and need to be supported by everyone.

160966

Georgeson

Ultimo

I strongly believe that the proposed height limits are completely inappropriate and irresponsible to Blackwattle Bay. ~45 storeys is out of keeping with the scale of the area, and would cause large areas of overshadowing over public domain and the new fish markets. Most residential towers will also struggle to meet minimum solar access requirements under SEPP 65.

The level of density is out of proportion with the amount of public transport or parking available, and the area is removed enough from businesses and the city that you'll be adding thousands of residents in an area which has very limited capacity to grow, and limited public amenities for an area which already has a high density.

Finally, the tall towers take no account for having any solar access to the ground plane within the development. As such, the area will be a wind tunnel with no warmth and any attempts at activation along the pedestrian walkways will suffer without this consideration. Barangaroo is a great example of a wind tunnel caused by tall towers and no thoughts of buffering and wind breaks. The proposal clearly looks to make the same errors rather than learning from past mistakes.

In summary, the heights, proposed density and lack of consideration for the ground plane are I'll conceived and should be amended if the development is to be in the public interest.

Regards,

Derek Georgeson

165936

Giacoppo

Annandale 2038

Please add a 3 lane public boar ramp in the bay with car and trailer parking. There is inadequate water access points for boat owners in our area.

168901

gibbons

2009

Hi there,

2800 residents

1500 Dwellings

5600 Jobs ... I DO NOT feel anyone has considered the existing PRE Covid traffic from Pymont sector to the site.

The Vehicular traffic access to even by the site from CBD to Pymont sector is at best ..woeful !

Simply ..this will be exacerbating the already poorly 'planned' traffic arteriesSeems the project will proceed but it should be a MAX 6 stories high (preferably 4 )

Have a look at the traffic jams from previous years at Easter and Christmas around the current Fish Market site..and that is WITHOUT all the additional proposed High Rise.

The Anzac Bridge is ALREADY (pre covid) often Standstill .

The Pymont Bay Ferry wharf (also poorly planned for The ferries to access) and only holds ONE ferry at at time .. will need to be duplicated.

Pedestrian access from Pymont is atrocious and this proposal will Jam the already too narrow footpaths and then the pushbikes will destroy any road space for cars.

This should NOT proceed UNTIL the traffic flow is improved from PRE covid times.

Thanks, Scott Gibbons.



168471

Giezekamp

2015

I went to school at blackwattle and know the area around the bay quite well. My concern is that sunlight comes across the city onto the surrounding bay, the school, the walk and high commercial or residential buildings would block out sunlight for most of the day.

Having more creative spaces and community parks and walks is a fantastic idea, as well as affordable housing. However, these can be kept to a minimum rather than building up every single piece of available land. Sydney will end up being little more than a series of tall buildings that create wind tunnels and block out the sun.

I would prefer we create our city to resemble those of Tokyo or Berlin where vast parks are included into the heart of the city, such that you can enter them and forget you're in a city at all. Building height restrictions in many areas also makes for a less claustrophobic environment.

Currently we run the risk of being a very 'modern' city but with no soul.

160931

Glasheen

2009

Sensational proposal, I look forward to this major revitalisation of the area.

183351

Golsby-Smith

2008

Overshadowing by 25 story buildings

Not enough community based decisions

164341

Gopalasamy

Concord West

There are way too many housing units being developed in the area. I object to the number of units that are being approved and to add another unsightly tall building in the area. 45 storeys seem excessive.

168101

Gornall

Pymont, 2009

I am extremely concerned about this development. I don't feel that the height of the buildings is appropriate for this suburb. This is already a busy road junction and adding more traffic is just going to make it impossible to get around at certain times of the day. I am also concerned that with adding this level of housing that we don't have the infrastructure in place such as schools, medical and community facilities.

I'm also not convinced that there will be an appropriate level of affordable housing and that appropriate measures have been put in place and are being followed in relation to ensuring a genuine indigenous presence in the area.

182236

Gowlland

2027

Development in the Blackwattle Bay area should be sensitive to existing character and promote job growth, not just squeeze as many people as possible between the Fish Market and free-flowing highway traffic.

The excessive bulk and scale proposed will lead to more traffic, overshadowing and wind tunnels, with residents in massive apartment towers exposed to the damaging health effects of noise and air pollution.

Adverse wind impacts make uncomfortable and unsafe public spaces, and losing access to sunlight makes it hard to grow trees and grass.

The requirement for 5% affordable housing is inadequate – it should be at least 25%.

Development should include Wentworth Park and Glebe Island Bridge being returned to public use – developers should make contributions to upgrade local community and recreational facilities.

Development here should secure a world class foreshore walk, public parks and places and cultural facilities – not a sliver of a path between apartment lobbies and the water.

Overall, the proposed development is a blight on the skyline of Sydney, due to its excessive scale.

167546

Graham

Kensington 2033

Although I am not a local resident, I know the area well and have been a frequent visitor to the Fishmarkets and to Pyrmont. I am pleased with the effort made to improve pedestrian access in the area. However I am very concerned that the construction of so many bulky high rise buildings will be detrimental. It was interesting that the published proposal shows these buildings as flimsy see-through edifices, whereas in reality they will be nothing of the sort. The number of apartments has not been finalised, but I doubt if an effort has been made to ensure that children have good access to educational facilities. Because these buildings are so large, the shadow diagrams provided ring alarm bells. It will not be pleasant walking from Bowman St, Pyrmont to the new Fishmarkets, especially in the morning, because of the shadows. I also note that there are no shadow diagrams for the area east of the buildings. I am rather suspicious of the wind-tunnel data, having experience of other parts of the city on a windy day, where the streets are lined with high towers.

Given the current nature of the Blackwater Bay Area, I would like to see a dramatic reduction in the height and bulk of the residential buildings. Pyrmont itself is an interesting mix of low and high rise structures, but the proposal would change the whole area and make it like the windy, ugly streetscape around Barangaroo.

Thank you for the opportunity to write a submission.

Penelope Graham

167146

Green

2009

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.



A link to our updated submission can be found here:

<https://tinyurl.com/4edwj2mj>

181261

Gunton

Sydney

The waterfront promenade across the "private lands" should be on a 15m wide reserve in public ownership and zoned open space.

The contribution towards affordable housing should be increased from 5% to 25%

On the "private lands" the building height of the residential towers should be restricted to 75% of the maximum height as of right, the remaining 25% available in bonusing

The affordable housing contributions from the "private lands" be consolidated into towers on the "public lands"

The "public lands" to remain in public ownership with development in leasehold

182786

Hacking

Rozelle 2039

I wish to object to the Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct Study.

Main concerns relate to the height and density, "green" credentials of the proposed towers, lack of genuine public access to the foreshore, overshadowing, traffic implications and pollution, open space / foreshore link and details for social infrastructure. Many of these points overlap so comments will not be repeated.

1. Height and density of the proposed towers and "green credentials".

The height of these towers poses detrimental impacts. Firstly, it will cause overshadowing of designated public space along the promenade. Shade until 12 pm is an unreasonable impact on the future amenity of the area. Stay at home restrictions during this Covid pandemic have shown that all residents need access to large public spaces for exercise in fresh air and sunshine " especially in densely populated communities like this. Restricting sunshine access to half the day should be removed at this stage of planning.

Furthermore, some of the proposed 12 towers, which vary in height between 21m and 156m, are adjacent and parallel to each other. As they are located on the Eastern side of the development, they pose another impact on access to direct sunlight. The logical conclusion is that future residents will be expected to exist in a perpetually air conditioned world. This is not good for the environment or for residents. It is not part of providing "5 Green Star" environments for our future.

Finally, the height is out of keeping with adjoining development. Low rise through Glebe should be given more consideration in this plan. Commercial and residential blocks in Ultimo do not reach this height. Foreshore access should be enjoyed with low rise, not as an after-thought with overlooking towers.

The two pylons of the Anzac Bridge were extensively discussed as landmarks during planning for the Fish Market. They should be retained as significant features on our city skyline, like the Harbour Bridge; not as competing structures with these 45 storey towers.

The Fish Market design includes an Aboriginal meeting place. This will also be overshadowed for half the day. The Fish Market will also be dwarfed by these towers.

2. Traffic Implications

Solutions to current traffic grid lock have not been sufficiently addressed. The addition of 1,500 apartments with a population increase of approximately 3,000 will have a severe impact on the existing road system.

A proposed ferry wharf will assist with transport for workers and tourists but not address the overall congestion that impacts on this area.

Noise and air pollution from the Western Distributor will also cause major health impacts on future residents. Towers should be lower and sited further away from this major road network.

### 3. Open space and foreshore link.

Less than 30% of this site will be considered as open space. That is unacceptable because it includes paths and road connections between the towers.

Foreshore links have been a long held community aspiration. Popularity of the Bay Run is an example of the kind of link around our harbour which needs to be extended in a meaningful way. A narrow strip, mostly in shade, is not welcoming for the extensive population which seeks passive or active exercise. Greater width is crucial for bikes, prams and disabled access to avoid collisions so that pedestrians and cyclists safely travel around the harbour foreshore. They should also be free from overlooking from towers or congestion along paths outside commercial premises.

### 4. Social Infrastructure

Too many aspects of the details needed for a community response are lacking. These include infrastructure which will adequately support the demographic for this development. Amenities for residents in the 50 – 64 age group seem to be omitted. For instance, tower dwellers of all ages would benefit from a community garden and community centre.

Only 5% of the development is allocated to social and affordable housing. Community suggestions have embraced a minimum of 15% to allow essential workers access to accommodation close to the city. Surely, the importance of these workers has been demonstrated and redefined during response to the Covid pandemic.

### 5. Pollution

Scientists have recommended that contaminated sediment in Blackwattle Bay should not be disturbed. That point is at odds with the expansion of berths allowing more boats access which will churn the water releasing contamination from previous industrial uses.

The community recognises competing issues in development but this is the only opportunity to give Blackwattle Bay benefits in good planning for a liveable and sustainable future.

Kath Hacking.

182911

Hacking

ROZELLE

Department of Planning and Environment.

I object to many of the aspects of the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study. There are many points to discuss - this response is limited to the most troubling aspects.

1. There has been a severe lack of community engagement. Meetings regarding the Fish Market are in clear contrast where the community was given an early opportunity to discuss the plans and have input into the design.

2. Social Infrastructure needs have been overlooked.

a) For instance, the new development proposal will have an expected major increase in population among 20 – 39 year age group but no extra schools have been provided. Existing schools are already at capacity and have had to be retrofitted as high rise because no suitable land was available. This is an opportunity to plan for the future infrastructure needs of the community.

b) Facilities are listed as possible “library”, “theatre”. Clear indications of what is mandated before development is essential. Other amenities for a population of 2,800 is necessary due to existing population shortfalls in services.

c) Affordable and social housing is limited to 5% which will not compensate for the urgent need to offer residential access to essential workers and to maintain a diverse community.

3. Height and Density of Towers

The 45 storey height or 156m is unacceptable. These towers will create unwelcome intrusion into the skyline which is currently dominated by slender pylons on Anzac Bridge. Our city prides itself on icons like the Harbour Bridge and opera House which do not suffer from encroaching towers.

These towers will also dominate and overlook the scarce amount of public foreshore access. Consider the walk opposite the Opera House under the Harbour Bridge as a design feature. Pedestrians and active exercisers are not overlooked by residential / commercial towers.

The towers will block sunlight for half the day. That is unacceptable when reducing height and configuration will achieve a much better outcome for the existing and future community.

4. Pollution

The towers are placed adjacent to the western Distributor. Air pollution from heavy traffic has widely been recognised as causing health problems in people of all ages. Reworking the design is essential. Noise pollution is another major factor that has to be addressed for future amenity of

residents. It is incomprehensible that this project would include high towers so close to the Western Distributor.

#### 5. Open space

There is too little regard in this study for public amenity. Much more access to the foreshore and sunlight are needed. Only 30% of the area has been allocated as open space. That is not reasonable considering the density of population. There is such a low ratio of open space currently and that is before development takes place.

Narrow pathways impeded by tower domination and retail activity do not equate with meaningful open space. Access for families should not be impeded.

Suggested changes to controls regarding public events need to be clearly articulated.

Michele Hacking

171671

Haertsch

Glebe

My comments relate to the Transport Management and Accessibility Plan. The cycling strategy and walking strategies are illustrated with the same figure (9.5 and 9.6). Walking and cycling are incompatible uses of the same through way and are dangerous for the users. The Bay Run (Iron Cove) has separated cycle and walking paths as a result of the users' different needs. The Bay Run is an example of how to promote active transport. The walking strategy should be different to the cycle strategy.

Walking is also an extension of public transport use. To make public transport an attractive option compared to a private vehicle, the public transport node should be within 400metres of the users' destination. NO light rail, heavy rail, bus route/stops or proposed metro station is within 400 metres of the new fish market.

The authors should try the existing public transport to verify its' redundancy as a means of accessing the new fish markets.

182751

Haertsch

Glebe /2037

## 1. URBAN LAYOUT

I generally support the structure and layout in plan of the draft proposal, however I don't feel the densities and heights of buildings have yet sufficient justification, given the location.

## 2. STREET LAYOUT AND HIERARCHY.

I feel that while the street layout generally connects well with the existing major streets and current and future amenity of Pyrmont, there are fewer back lanes and minor streets in the proposed scheme compared to the existing grain of Pyrmont. This street type should be better provided in a future developed scheme. Primacy should also be given to the experience on foot and from public transport of all new streets and the public domain. Private vehicle access should be greatly limited.

## 3. DENSITY.

The density proposed seems to resemble that of Barangaroo South and the floor space and building heights proposed reflects this. I feel this currently isn't justifiable given the lack of mass public transport available at this specific site. The future metro station site proposed for Pyrmont is on the other side of the hill near Pyrmont bridge and the light rail adjacent to the site lacks the connectivity and capacity to cater for the proposed population, whether it is for working or residing. Bus routes are currently away from the site. Unless this is addressed, the result will be that this development contributes to increased metropolitan traffic congestion and private car-dependency since the prime means of access to and from the new urban quarter will inevitably be either private car or bus, no matter what the ambition may be hoped for reducing this. A metro station with rapid transit connected to a metropolitan rail network at this site would provide a much better justification for the density proposed as would additional bus services and increasing the capacity of the Dulwich Hill light rail, currently limited by a single line at its terminus.

## 4. WATERFRONT PROMENADE.

The design of the waterfront promenade is wholly inadequate. The minimum reserve width in every other reserve along the Blackwattle Bay foreshore is 15 metres with 2.5 metre-wide shared cycleway/footpaths. This shared width has proven completely insufficient with significant over-crowding and conflict with cyclists, dog walkers and pedestrians apparent on weekends and particularly during the pandemic lockdowns.

The cross section through the cycleway and footpaths adjacent to the waterfront between Bridge Road and the Anzac Bridge indicates a reservation width of only 10 meters including landscaping overall and suggests that there need be no separation between cycling and walking, effectively making this another shared path.



This reserve should be a minimum of 15 metres and have a physically separated cycleway to avoid the conflict that currently arises between pedestrian and cycling use. Shared ways are downright unpleasant for both cyclists and pedestrians and would contribute to discourage active transport use for these paths.

## 5. CYCLEWAYS

Fully separated cycleways should be created by removing carriageway and parking lane width from all major streets. This needs to happen around the site and should be a prime focus of every state-significant development if we are to encourage active transport and greenhouse gas reduction. Within the site these should exist as shared ways with service vehicles rather than on footpaths with pedestrians.

## 6. FOOTPATHS

Unfortunately the plan is not comprehensive in advocating pedestrian amenity which is one of the fundamental characteristics of urban quality. Perhaps this will be addressed in a future plan but the specific elements of this are not provided. Proper connections to Wentworth Park, better footpaths and pedestrian crossings along Bridge Road and acknowledgement of all existing connections to Glebe, Ultimo and Broadway need to be added. The stair and path from Wentworth Park Light Rail connecting the park to Jones Street Ultimo, for example is not noted in this plan. Nor are many 'desire lines' away from the site. If the new urban quarter is to become a vibrant and beautiful addition to Sydney, then its integration and contribution to Sydney's future as an experience of walking with excellent public transport access must be more fully developed.

169596

Hafezi

Pymont 2009

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to raise my concerns regards the residential part of the plan. Pymont currently is one of the densest suburbs in Sydney and prior to covid was experiencing very heavy traffics during rush hours in all streets to the point that sometimes even getting to the main streets would be a challenge. Adding more residential apartments to the suburb will only worsen the situation and makes commuting to and from suburb even harder for current residence.

I strongly believe the neighbourhood can benefit more from a green area than new apartment blocks.

Kind Regards

Elham Hafezi

166621

HALL

2037

Dear Sir/Madam

Overall I am happy with the plans

I have 2 concerns however:

- 1) Lack of parking is likely to put more pressure on parking for residents in streets nearby such as Darghan St where my house is.
- 2) 45 floors seems egregiously high & will affect views, sunlight & make congestion much worse. I would favour a much lower, human scale height such as 8 stories.

Sincerely

Dr D Hall

182396

Hall

Balmain 2041

The proposed development for the fish market site is far too high. The infrastructure to support a significant increase in population does not exist. The local schools are already over 100% capacity. Pre Covid, there were regular long traffic queues, these queues will only get dramatically worse with increased people. Where will the required healthcare for these people be? The tall buildings will create a large shadow on the foreshore area, detracting from its aesthetic appeal.

There is not sufficient room for outdoor exercise for the planned population. We need more green spaces for the current population - local parks are extremely crowded now due to Covid restrictions. Adding extra people will only add to congestion.

Any future development needs to be of much smaller scale.

165056

Hanrahan

2009

To whom it may concern,

I absolutely disagree with building heights up to RL156 metres. The proposed buildings will create wind- tunneling, sparse access to sunlight, damage the existing views to many residents, pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and park visitors and turn what is a beautiful area in to an over-populated suburb with poor parking and even worse traffic than what exists.

These buildings are NOT WANTED!

Regards

Charissa Hanrahan

182161

Hansen

2009

Besides being an ugly proposal, have anyone given any thoughts to trafic congestion in an allready overpopulated area? Surely in such a valuable area frequented by tourists it makes more sense to enhance or increase current tourist attractions. If there isn't any other options why not stick to a height limit of 10 stories or maybe turn available space into a green zone, like park or garden.

178126

HARBINSON

GLEBE 2037

I am largely in favour of the proposal.

I am appreciative of the intention with which community insights and perspectives have informed changes and improvements to the plans.

My chief concern is that I do not believe that 5% allocated for affordable housing is sufficient.

The development being proposed will certainly encourage a gentrification of the area and its surrounds. Whilst there are significant benefits to this, it is also inevitable that this will further increase the cost of living and the cost of rent/property.

It is unfortunate that a household must now be earning \$120k+ to afford to live in the inner-west and the thought of this extending to Ultimo/Haymarket and the surrounds of the existing fish market is concerning.

I firmly believe that the government has a responsibility to ensure that there is sufficient affordable housing within 5km of the CBD, this is a key planning consideration in all metropolitan development (my background is town planning). There is a charitable dimension, but it also impacts on matters of transportation, DDA, and service provision.

My suggestion is that the allotment be increased, to 10% of residential space allowed for affordable housing - and that appropriate staff consult with Homelessness NSW and other NFP organisations in considering this edit.

Thank you for taking the time to address this response, and best of luck with the remaining work.

Matthew Harbinson

179811

Hardiman

Castle Hill, NSW 2154

Please find attached our Submission from FFB Dragon boat club.

Thank you

John Hardiman

FFB Dragon boat club President



183256

Harding

2009

-I'm concerned about lack of accessible public space

-Overshadowing

-Lack of affordable housing

-Developer profit put before public interest

-Increased traffic at the intersection at the bottom of Anzac bridge

161416

Hardy

Waterloo 2017

I am definitely opposed to this Massive HIGH RISE, so close to the foreshore. I'm sure you are planning to 'drop the height' of buildings dependent on the numbr of complaints.....So please do so !!!

There is insufficient supporting infastructure to support the excess of residents to be expected on this site. having witnessed first hand the direct impact of overdevelopment without suitable hospitals, swimming pools, walking areas, playing fields, shopping centres, parking and schools.. recently in the Green Square, and Rosebery area, due to unregulated over building.

The foreshore has a fragile infrastructure and shoud not be expected to take that kind of development (up to 45 floors).... Seriously, this is ridiculous.

Regards C.Moore Hardy RN

172166

Hardy

Coal Point 2283

We have enjoyed being able to approach the old fish market by water in our boat. Visitors, and in particular, overseas visitors are in awe at pulling up to the (old) jetty, walking up to the fish market and seeing the vast array of seafood. We make our purchases and return to our boat, then head off somewhere for lunch. This makes for a special day and is Sydney at its best. The old jetty had room for about 15 boats for short stays.

I have studied the plans for the new development, and although there is provision for fish trawlers to moor, there doesn't appear to be any jetties or pontoon for visitors or customers coming by water.

If this is the case, then one of the best attractions on Sydney Harbour is missing.

I am sure that a short stay berthing arrangement could be included in the plan at this stage and many would be pleased for this to be included.

162511

Harris

Glebe

As a local resident, I am not in agreement with the NSW government wanting to change the existing design parameters so that they can build monstrous housing blocks on what is essentially land currently owned by the people of NSW.

This is a sell-out and not what the majority of people want.

Shame on you Gladys for supporting this appalling proposal.

Where is the democratic process?

182226

Harwood

2009

To whom it may concern

As a long term resident of Pymont, I support the refurbishment and renewal of the fish market site, but what is proposed is far too much development and will destroy the ambience of the local area.

Please revisit the plans and drastically scale down the proposed development. The height and footprint is out of character with the local area and will cast a shadow, tower above local properties and destroy Blackwattle Bay. More public parkland near the water is also required to make this area liveable and accessible.

I do not support the current plans. Please listen to the community who are concerned about this proposal.

Kind regards

Jess Harwood and Matt Fellew

182146

Hayen

Annandale

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

Firstly, I agree that the site needs renewal. However I believe that the proposed changes to zoning and other changes to planning controls are not acceptable.

Our harbour is a gem and access to all is incredibly important. Green space and shared community space are also needed. We need to make the waterfront accessible and provide sufficient usable public spaces for our communities. The current proposal prioritises over development at the cost of access and usability. We also need to increase green space to ensure a liveable city.

My major concerns are:

Unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure

Local roads are already overcrowded and overcongested (eg the wait times at the intersection of Bridge Road below the freeway). Congestion will increase with the new motorway (all studies show the increase in car use and spill on effects to local roads of new large scale road development). The proposal fails to show how other types of transport will compensate for the increase in congestion.

The height of the towers is out of place and will cause massive overshadowing. It fails to meet minimum standards for solar access in green and public spaces. It will cause wind tunneling on the local foreshore access. It will not just place the new foreshore access in shadow but other areas of foreshore around Blackwattle Bay will be newly plunged into shadow.

The scale of the proposal will also put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

The proposal doesn't address the critical need for social and affordable housing. This proposal offers a 5% mix of affordable housing, other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments. It is really important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

#### Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site. Pedestrian access is also poor.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

The proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is not acceptable and misses a key opportunity to return our precious harbour foreshore to public access and use.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.



182261

Herriman

GLEBE

This is a massive over-development of the site. It appears the height of the tallest tower dwarfs the pylons of the iconic Anzac Bridge. The high towers will cast long shadows over the site and surrounds. The height of the buildings dwarf the area and residential surrounds.

A significant amount of the land of the old Fishmarket site is in public ownership. It is now to be transferred (sold) to private ownership. The terms of this transfer must be clarified as to whether 50 year or 99 year leases or outright sale are being planned.

There is a lack of clarity about education facilities planned to support the new population. I would like to see the plans for child care and children's recreation areas.

There is a lack of clarity about planned bus services to this area.

Will there be shops, supermarket etc within the development area?

From the public podcast it is unclear how a local library facility will be offered.

There are negative health impacts on the residents of towers. Being located too close to the Western Distributor highway residents will be subject noise and air pollution.

There is a lack of useable green space that is not in shadow.

The width of the foreshore promenade will no doubt have to support the outside tables of the restaurants as well as recreation and other users. It is only 10 metres wide in places. It will be used by those walking to work as well as cyclists, joggers and recreational walkers. As it is the missing link in the connected foreshore walkway, this harbourside promenade will be heavily used. Planners should observe the congestion and danger to walkers and pets posed by those cycling at speed in parts of the Glebe foreshore walk. City of Sydney has advised that we should all be respectful of one another's needs "too many cyclists are oblivious to the recommendation.

There is insufficient affordable housing (only 5% of the total GFA or financial contribution in lieu). Who will receive this financial contribution, which I note may be reduced by the of value contributions made by the development to public amenity.

In places the foreshore promenade will be overshadowed by the height of the buildings and there is the possibility of a wind tunnel effect.

Codes SEPP - Including Blackwattle Bay as a "major event site"™ to facilitate the holding of events in the public domain. This is another possibility for noise pollution as the sound ricochets between the tall buildings.

Given the "major event site"™ possibility, the new fishmarket and the Blackwattle Bay area being designed to be a public attraction, the issue of visitor car parking and of bays for buses should be explicitly stated. There is no room for buses to be parked on Bridge road, and the traffic along that section of Bridge Rd is very dense already.

167596

Higgins

Pymont 2009

As a landholder living in Pymont, close to the proposed Blackwattle Bay development, I agree with the stated purposes of the redevelopment. But I strenuously object to the height of the proposed towers (156 metres), the addition of the intended 2,800 new residents to an already densely populated suburb, and the niggardly allocation of just 5% of the new residences to affordable housing, and the inadequate provision of open spaces.

These features of the proposal undermine the character of the suburb I live in, and will overshadow significant areas. I also hold grave concerns for the traffic flow around the intersection of Bank St and Pymont Street, which already hosts gridlock during peak hours.

167896

Higgins

2065

As an inner city resident and a patron of the fish markets, I welcome a new proposal for a facelift, however the development that is proposed is way out of proportion for the area. My rugby club trains at Wentworth park, and the new towers would cast a huge shadow over the playing grounds, making it a cold and redundant space. Large towers would also make it feel closed in, hardly something you would want for one of the few inner city parks. The development should be reconsidered and scaled back, with the towers reduced in size vastly. If this proposal went ahead, it would destroy the surrounding area and be a massive eyesore.

181631

Himmelreich

GLEBE

As a resident of Glebe I am strongly against the proposed plans. This is an excellent opportunity for the gov to provide affordable, high quality public and private housing in an inner city location. Living in such a beautiful, central place should be for the many and it makes sense to have high density housing, however it also needs to be affordable and suitable for the area.

There needs to be a high proportion of public housing and there also needs to be consideration of the area and its beauty. The proposed towers will create wind tunnels and send shadows over the area, and not enough space is given for the public. This is an incredible opportunity to make beautiful public space, public transport and public housing in the inner city and by the water, it shouldn't be just a money making machine.

181491

Hogue

Annandale

The overall size of the apartment buildings in the proposed plan is not in the spirit of the original submission. We expected 50% of the land to be made public space, and a 45 story apartment block taller than the Anzac bridge will restrict access to the waterfront. and encroach on that commitment.

I urge the NSW Planning Department to reconsider as a resident from Annandale.

181671

Holler

2037

We object to high density rise development at the current fish market site.

Pymont and Glebe is already over populated with very low infrastructure.

Bringing more people in to the area will only increase the problems.

You are hitting towards creating more problems than good.

There is not enough schools, roads, hospitals, public transport, car spaces, parks for people you intending to settle in your buildings.

181896

Hope

2011

The proposed development is out of scale with its surroundings and unsympathetic to the current and historical usage of the site.



164581

Howard

2040

Please don't let any of the buildings be higher than the building with the Nova FM sign.

Please increase the public space and ensure there is continuous public access/right of way to the foreshore. Please ensure the public space is the best of the development and not just the areas underneath and shaded by the bridge and its on and off ramps.

Please ensure community and club use and access to the actual water way is equal to that of private marinas and commercial operations .

Thank you for your consideration

Regards

Megan Howard

180956

Howard

2007

Dear unknown people.

It is a real shame that Sydney and it's governing bodies have not yet realised that the harbour (our jewel) can be seen by wealthy apartment owners from any high tower in the area, not just those next to it. The ambience of the harbour foreshore is best experienced by everybody when there is airspace on all sides... yes - even the wealthy apartment owners would enjoy their walk to the foreshore rather than look down upon it. Therefore, why approve waterside over developments?

Can those people deciding about the future of this development please think about the harbourside enjoyment of all, rather than just a few? People in 2060 won't thank you for approving such developments, so make some positive and progressive decisions now that will give a long lasting and acceptable outcome.

Yours faithfully,

Greg Howard

181926

Howard

2034

Development of this site and surrounding areas should be low impact and restrict building height and width to avoid overwhelming the unique maritime atmosphere

175056

Huggett

Rozelle 2039

45 stories is a massive overkill, will put incredible pressure on the already stressed traffic congestion, be overcrowded when there are ever increasing need for public space that needs social distance.

Develop but within the bounds of reason for the area and surrounds.

This looks far too much like a grab for cash to recoup poor decisions and other poorly managed budget blowouts. There is no other logical reason.

183156

Hunt

Balmain 2041

This proposal is massively over scale for the precinct. It will overshadow the neighbourhood terribly, reduce the visual amenity of Pymont, the visual links to the water that are so precious.. It will reduce accessible public space. It's a gross and oversized developer profit grab.

Please look at countries like Denmark where sustainable and liveable communities are being developed which don't destroy heritage precincts like Pymont, whilst still allowing for mixed use residential development. Not this.

175071

HUNTER

gLEBE

I fully support the plans. The public access is great and extra denser housing near public transport is needed throughout the city. I do hope the shadowing is minimized but I understand the conflicting objectives. I think you have the balance about right.

165356

HUNTSMAN

Pymont

This submission relates to the report on the PPPS commissioned by DPIE and undertaken by Cred Consulting (October 2020), Social Infrastructure assessment, Part 5: Gap Analysis and Action Plan – Open space and recreation facilities, p.118, Specifically Need 6: Increased indoor and outdoor courts for informal recreation. The Pymont peninsula is a sub-precinct of Blackwattle Bay and the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy (PPPS) feeds into planning for the Bays precinct as a whole.

I draw the planners’ attention to the Maybanke site in Harris Street Pymont and its eminent suitability and availability for the above purpose. A survey was done of the site in 1969, DP 576037.

Maybanke: its history and current status

1965: The General Manager of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company at Pymont offered the site to Council for perpetual use for recreational purposes;

1970: Council accepted CSR’s gift;

1979: The site was acquired by Council.

Thus Council owns the site. A small basketball court occupies the lower level, a difficult-to-access small-sized tennis court the upper level, and there is a small cement-block building.

2007: The potential for redevelopment of Maybanke was acknowledged in 2007, when Council received the Open Space and Recreation Needs Study it had commissioned from Stratcorp Consulting. That document proposed a Capital Works Program, with an accompanying Direction: Continue capital works allocations and funding to the open space network and recreation facilities.

Under Projects Initiatives/Actions and the heading Key current major park and recreation facilities projects three – recreation facilities – were listed and rated as short to medium priority, that is, to be finished by 2012:

Ian Thorpe Aquatic Centre

Waterloo Youth Centre

Maybanke Youth Centre.

The first two projects were completed and are operating, but for whatever reason there has been no subsequent redevelopment of Maybanke.

The difficult topography of the site and Council's failure to redevelop means that Maybanke Centre, as it is currently called, is largely unused and unusable.

However, the site has significant advantages which make it ripe and highly suitable for redevelopment:

• It sits on an area of Council-owned land which is large enough to accommodate a several-storey multipurpose sports and recreation centre.

• The difficulties of the site align with a significant potential asset: it sits on the sandstone for which Pyrmont is famous. In 2017 over 1000 blocks of high-quality yellow block sandstone were excavated from a building site almost adjacent to the Maybanke site. It seems likely that similar high-quality sandstone, which is highly sought after for heritage and restoration purposes, could be harvested from the Maybanke site. This would defray the cost of redevelopment.

• A redeveloped Maybanke could accommodate:

1. Outdoor and indoor recreational activities for children and youth;
2. multipurpose sports courts;
3. a gym for adults aged 20 to 35 and young people with focused programs, including those who cannot afford private gym membership;
4. exercise space and equipment for over 55s;
5. space and equipment for sporting teams; and
6. café, meeting spaces, change and shower rooms.

This submission has been adapted from previous submissions made by the community over recent years, viz. from:

Friends of Pyrmont Community Centre

Council of Ultimo Pyrmont Associations (CUPA)

Pyrmont Action Inc.



Pyrmont Cares Inc.

Pyrmont Community Group

July 2021

166106

HUNTSMAN

Pymont

It is not clear from the Infrastructure and Contributions Review that the authors were aware that Sydney Secondary College has three campuses – Balmain, Leichhardt and Blackwattle Bay. Balmain and Leichhardt are for years 7-10 only, so they go to Blackwattle Bay campus for years 11 and 12. Anecdotally, this campus has the largest number of HSC students of any school in NSW.

I would not attach much credence to the Department of Education’s advice that “the development will not trigger demands for new schools”, given the Department’s abysmal record in predicting school enrolments, especially since the occupation of any new apartments will be some way into the future. It seems highly likely that more accommodation will be needed, and students from Pymont are not in the zone for any other inner city high school.

The site of the Wentworth Park grandstand, to be vacated by the Greyhound Racing Association in the next decade, could provide another campus for part of Sydney Secondary College. There is already precedent for the Department of Education occupying part of Wentworth Park, as a “pop-up” school was erected adjacent to the racing track while Ultimo Public School was again being rebuilt. That school is now occupied by Fort Street Primary as its site near the Observatory is being renovated.

The Department should have learnt that flexible response is necessary as populations of school-age children rise and fall with demographic change, and this “temporary” school is likely to be useful into the future.

180776

Hutchinson

Glebe NSW 2037

Submission: Blackwattle Bay Redevelopment

We raise a number of major objections to the proposed Blackwattle Bay redevelopment. In summary, these are as follows:

- 1) If it goes ahead in its present form, there will be massive overdevelopment of the site. 4 of the 12 proposed buildings will be 25 up to 45 storeys in height. This is excessive.
- 2) Under the existing proposal, highly inadequate provision is made for useable green space. The total footprints of the buildings is disproportionate to the size of the land, and the so-called "planned" green space would appear to be something of an afterthought rather than integral to the overall redevelopment plan. Much of the proposed green space will be adversely affected by shadow. It should be revised so as to take into account best urban planning practice.
- 3) The foreshore promenade is far too small in width given the likely concentrated usage with people walking, jogging, riding bicycles, children in strollers, dogs at play or on leads etc. In places it will be only 10 meters wide and wedged up against multi storey high rise.
- 4) The foreshore promenade needs to be wider if it is to meet the likely heavy usage that may be projected, as it is the "missing link" in the Sydney harbor side walking trail. Moreover, with the opening of the new Fish markets more pedestrian, cycle etc traffic can be expected.
- 5) The proposed redevelopment is likely to have adverse effects on both Pyrmont and Glebe. Pyrmont will be further disconnected from Blackwattle Bay by a towering bank of high rise buildings. There will be from various vantage points on the Glebe side of the Bay(eg views from the walk way near the heritage listed Bellevue House or the Walter Burley Griffin architectural site) a city vista of a monstrous wall of towers.
- 6) The proposed redevelopment makes insufficient provision for social housing and for affordable housing for essential workers(eg nurses, community care workers, residential aged care workers, preschool teachers, public transport workers, super market workers, cleaners etc). The only 5% provision for social housing under the present redevelopment proposal compares very poorly with best practice nationally and internationally.

Yours sincerely

Dr Francis Hutchinson

Ms Lynette Waddell

21 Arcadia, Rd

Glebe. NSW. 2037

August 18, 2021

165651

Iâ€™Donnell

Annandale 2038

Thanks for the reminder. I've put in my submission that I'm happy for people to borrow parts to put in their submission if that helps.

Dear Sir/Mdm,

I am writing to express concern regarding the proposed area of development at Blackwattle Bay.

#### 1. High density apartment complex with associated local population increase

##### 1.1 Lack of sufficient primary and secondary school places for the local catchment area

- additional families moving into the area will worsen the current congestion and will impact students about to start or who are already in the school system
- these additional families may not be able to enrol their children into local schools
- Or if they are able to, they will be putting increased pressure on the public education system and teachers
- please reconsider the density of the apartments OR engage with Department of Education on increasing of public school places for local students either through increases places at per-existing local schools or starting a new school.

##### 1.2 Lack of public transport options

- currently the 2 viable public transport options are the light rail and buses in Pymont
- both are already experiencing increased congestion from the surrounding built up areas with no associated increase in transport services
- please reconsider the density of the apartments OR organise improved public transport options with Transport NSW (eg Ferry, Increased light rail services and increased bus services)

##### 1.3 Lack of improved road infrastructure

- current there is significant congestion in the intersection between Wattle St, Fish Markets, Anzac Bridge and from Pymont.

- as there is no associated increase in the public transport options/services available in the area, more people will elect to drive and this will increased traffic congestion in the local area.
- this will impact the current residents of the local area
- please reconsider the density of the apartments OR apply for improved road infrastructure options which ease current and future congestion

#### 1.4 Lack of public parking

- With the increased community area proposed, is there also associated parking available?
- Parking is already limited in the Blackwattle Foreshore area and not all individuals are able to use the limited public transport to reach the area.
- please reconsider the density of the apartments AND ensure sufficient public accessible parking

### 2.0 High tower buildings residential/commercial

#### 2.1 Blocking of natural light

- While higher tower buildings are more efficient for housing/sq m, the higher the tower buildings, the greater the shadow thrown.
- there are already a number of tall buildings in the area
- increasing the size and number of a dense apartment complex does not improve the living conditions for current persons, wildlife or aquatic life.
- please reconsider the height of the towers OR rework the architecture to allow for more light

#### 2.2 Less natural environment

- With the increase of the concrete/built up foot print, we and wildlife will lose access to the natural environment.
- Wildlife does not exist on concrete/industrial areas.
- please reconsider the height of the towers

#### 2.3 Light pollution

- Wildlife is often confused by light pollution.
- By building large tall towers with multiple lit windows, there is increased light pollution which disrupts natural wildlife cycles
- please reconsider the height of the towers OR find ways to reduce the light pollution produced by these towers at night time

## 2.4 Heat increase

- Concrete buildings tend to retain heat
- The density of the towers proposed is likely to retain heat and reflect heat onto the local surrounding areas
- please reconsider the density and height of the towers AND source means of reducing the heat foot print from both heat retention and heat reflection onto the surrounding areas

### Summary :

I think a lot more should be done to take into account the flow on effects of such a large site.

While there have been some improvements in general to the Blackwattle Bay Foreshore area, this current proposal regarding the fish markets sites requires more forethought, consultation with stakeholders, consideration of flow on effects and involvement of Department of Education, Transport NSW and RMS prior to commencement of building.

I object to the current proposal as it stands.

178731

Ienna

Glebe 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable. I find the move to the new site for the fish market terrible as i live right near that site and i am being impacted by the construction right now. The noise is terrible and it will just get worse. the impacts on the land, water, animals and residents is too much. The fish market needs to be somewhere else. it is NOT supported by the people that live here and a 45 story building will ne be either. we need more open space and an actual view of the water. i live in public housing and my feeling is you will make it so impossible for us to live here that you will take our buildings too. push us out during the construction fazes then gentrify the whole area so only the rich and able bodied people can live here.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, iâ€™m concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project canâ€™t even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does. Public housing is for the most marginalised and we are not getting a say in anything.

Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking



Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development. The noise and pollution levels have gone up too much. I have lived here almost 3 decades and in the city for a very long time. Yes there must be change but not to the degree where the most vulnerable people, environment and animals are impacted (to an extreme degree).

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade. I walk around this area a lot and it's a mess right now but the above things will worsen it....not better the area.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable. The classism of this is highly offensive.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

carolyn ienna

Glebe, 2037

182551

Ingleton

2017

Please donâ€™t do this.

It is near impossible to imagine a future in Sydney with the cost of living and the skyrocketing housing prices, not to mention the overarching threat of climate change.

Clearly, this government continues to prioritise lining the pockets of the rich, while the middle class and younger generations are being pushed out of a city thatâ€™s known in part for its beautiful views.

Stop ruining the essence of Sydney by funding these hideous, poorly built monstrosities and focus your efforts on something that will actually benefit the majority, not just the rich.

DONâ€™T BUILD PLEASE

180551

Ippolito

2039

I believe that the current proposal for the residential towers is excessive in height. Having a tower that is taller than the Anzac bridge is ridiculous and causes too much shadow for the public enjoying the area.

The use of the foreshore is also very heavy on private business area and there should be more area for the public to enjoy, in line with the Glebe foreshore.

Any update to the area is a huge improvement on what is there now, but some care should be taken to ensure the space is best utilized and not just lining the pockets of the property developers who have already made much of Sydney into an eyesore

182556

Ivimey

2037

Ruining one of the most beautiful views & feeling in the country for the sake of more corporate expansion is shameful.

This government is going to struggle to get re-elected with the current public sentiments around handlings of COVID etc. This will be another stain, but one that will last in perpetuity.

Shame. Shame. Shame.

182726

Jalal

2041

I believe we should focus on making Sydney the most appealing city in the world. The current proposal seems to be going the opposite way: less green, less sunlight, more towers, and shade, with no benefits for citizens.

The area under consideration has a lot of potential and I would like to see green and recreational areas prioritised.

163361

James

Engadine

I am totally against the development of the site we are not Hong Kong why would we even want to end up like it ... we need to have more green spaces and this is a wonderful area to enable this to happen ... WAKE UP AND STOP OVER DEVELOPMENT

175911

James

Pymont

I have lived in Pymont since 2006 and feel I am one of the locals. There are three main reasons I am stridently opposed to these plans.

1. Open space is a fundamental part of life and this is desperately needed in Pymont. I know because I live here. The space where these buildings are planned would represent ideal spaces for outdoor sport and relaxation not only by local residents but also for visitors. You just have to go to the park at the bottom of Harris Street or even Centennial Park any weekend day to realise that our current open spaces are vastly overrun already and this will get massively worse if you bring a lot more residents to this area. This is a critical problem that must not be swept under the carpet. I should also add that one would have hoped that this COVID epidemic would have changed the views of people and governments about creating crowded spaces and providing inadequate open spaces. Maybe this is part of the reason we are in the mess. Human living is too crowded and people need to spread out more. We need to learn by our mistakes not continue to keep making the same mistakes over and over again.

2. The construction of these monster buildings along the Blackwattle Bay foreshore will completely disrupt the current architectural flavour of Pymont and provide a very constraining view of the area. Pymont is not part of the CBD! It is a residential neighbourhood where people love to come and browse. These buildings will irreversibly damage the historic feel of this beautiful suburb.

3. Justification. One has to ask the question why do we need buildings this high in Pymont? Is it to raise more revenue for the government? If so this should be rejected as this is narrow minded. Is it to bring more people into Pymont? But Pymont already has a very high density of living and this argument cannot be justified. The traffic in Pymont (out of lockdown) is completely untenable and these buildings will exacerbate an already critical situation. The argument that those new residents will not drive is ridiculous. Show me a suburb in Sydney where this is the case? This is simply problem shifting. Is it to bring more commercial space into Pymont? But Pymont already has a very substantial commercial presence and at lunch times many of the local businesses struggle to maintain this. Also as described above Pymont is principally a residential neighbourhood and so the commercial activity should be capped. So to me one is left with the answer - the reason that the government wants to build these buildings is to line the pockets of certain individuals and because they can! I personally think that unless a very compelling rationale can be provided this plan should be instantly rejected.

In summary, you need to put aside your desire to make profits and build things just because you can and rather look at the long game. That is all about human beings, their health and happiness. This project will only serve to erode away at all of this so it should not be done.

Yours sincerely

David James



182311

Jardine

Pymont

I am a qualified City planner. I will keep this brief. We need urban infill of apartments to provide housing growth and keep rents down. There is no better place for high rise apartments than the inner city, specifically high amenity areas near the harbour where infrastructure is currently underutilised - Wentworth Park is always dead - plenty of capacity. A new metro station at The Bays and Pymont is adequate transport infrastructure.

Do not compromise on height limits or # of apartments. If anything we need more apartments here. This is where the youth like me WANT TO LIVE. And we are currently priced out in rents and values. We need more supply.

Taller, slender towers offer better outcomes to sun access and overshadowing than the short, fat bulky unit blocks you see under City of Sydney planning controls around the CoS LGA.

Go tall, go slender. Do it for the youth of Sydney that is currently shunned out of the inner city by selfish interests of older established residents.

182271

Javadi

2064

From an architect's point of view, I can understand the desire for high density development in this area however I believe that conditions of building consent should be focused on the overall harbour views and street scape as large blocks of high rises with no contextual shape or character are detrimental to the future attraction of the city. It's like taking a suburb in the west such as Olympic park, or Homebush, or Mascot and placing it in the heart of the city, contributing to a concrete jungle with lack of urban spaces. Cramming people in large towers that all look the same is like taking the ghost towns of China and locating them on the Sydney harbour foreshore. Completely out of context.

182186

Jeremiassen

2105

The Blackwattle bay development is an obscene development that degrades the visibility of Sydney's beautiful skyline, creating an eyesore as a backdrop to our stunning harbour. Not to mention the casting shadows that it will be cause, particularly on the solar panelled rooftop of the new Sydney seafood market. It is a ridiculous development that only priorities the profits of the developers and state government. Public space for greenery must be included in the new development, while residential development must be refined to low density. For the sake of the people of Sydney and NSW, please do not go ahead with the proposed development and greatly revise it with proper consideration for the people instead of the special interests of developers.

182221

JEWELL

GLEBE 2037

I am concerned about the following aspects of the proposed redevelopment of Black Wattle Bay

The twelve towers to be built on the old fish market site are an over development of the site.

The proposed 45, 32 and 30 storey towers are in particular an excessive development which will create overshadowing of the surrounding area.

The towers will create a disconnect between Pyrmont and Blackwattle Bay.

The towers represent substandard housing that will be exposed to noise and pollution from the Western Distributor.

There will be a lack of green space in the area that is not in shadow.

The towers will contain insufficient affordable housing.

The foreshore promenade is too narrow in places and so is not suitable for a mixed use by cyclists and walkers as is proposed.

The overshadowing from the towers and the wind tunnel effect they will greatly detract from the amenity of the foreshore walk.

There needs to be a dedicated bus route servicing the new fish markets to alleviate the increased traffic congestion in the area.

Murray Jewell



167991

Johnson

Pymont 2009

Briefly, I understand that there are developmental priorities for great cities, and Sydney should aspire to be one of the world's great cities, and upward development is preferable (even essential) to prevent urban sprawl and overloaded transport systems. However the plans as they stand emphasise business and residential development but, with the honourable exception of social/affordable housing, has little or nothing to say about social infrastructure to support these further massive increases in worker and resident population. Could we have please equal emphasis on the development of Cultural, Educational, creative arts, community, sports and leisure facilities that provide quality of life rather than just quantity.

164541

Jones

Forest Lodge 2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

182906

Jones

2026

Please keep the character of the original fish markets. Don't allow tall buildings to block the light and create a high density building area. Keep the views of the city and let us feel like we're in nature, being by water and parkland, not dwarfed by highrise.



168731

Jongkind

Pymont 2009

I have lived in Pymont since 2000 and I am very upset about the proposed over development plans for the Sydney Fish market. Those proposing 45 storey and many others for another 1500 dwellings and nearly 3000 residents is a joke.

Those that suggest this type of over development have never lived here or seen the current traffic congestion at peak hours. Even if you propose a 45 storey tower to end up with a number of 30 storey towers you must be joking. Where will we see the sun shining in that area or anything that looks like some open space or a park for children to play. Even the new public school just built in Wattle Street will not cope with the new 3000 residents. We need local residents to be heard and properly consulted in this project, not just ignored

172786

Jongkind

Pymont 2009

To whom it may concern

I am appalled at the revised plans for Blackwater Bay.

If this monstrosity goes ahead it will cast shadows and create a cold "CBD" area in Pymont while creating a future slum.

To me it looks like a few brainless geniuses gathered with a heap of Lego bricks and had a competition to see how high they could go before their structure fell down!!

45 storeys - you must be kidding! Is the proposal that they are high enough to have a view of the Heads!

Pymont is NOT the CBD - It is NOT Liverpool or Parramatta. Pymont is a village where the community get together and are together and we would like to stay that way.

Have any of the "so called" planners even walked around Pymont? Have they talked to anyone? Probably not. They just saw 10.4 hectares and thought it was a good "idea" to fill it up with 12 high rise apartment blocks on the existing Fish Market site.

We already have high rise apartments on the foreshore.

The traffic congestion is chaos at vital times. Don't forget the bicycles that tear through Pymont breaking all the road rules - most of which do not live in Pymont nor do they contribute to the area.

So, there are plans to house 3,000 people in 1,500 apartments, obviously that calculation does not include children. How many cars have been included in these plans? 1,500???

1,500 apartments x 2 adults x 2 children = 6,000 bodies give or take a few.

Just where are the children going to school? The newly built Ultimo primary school will not cater for more than a couple of hundred - if that. OR, are you planning to keep the "temporary" school still sitting on Wentworth Park. I notice it has not been removed yet!!

The new school has been opened for over a year now and that "temporary" school should have been removed from Wentworth Park by now.

It seems to me that "the powers that be" are planning to make Pymont part of the CBD. Look what has happened to Darling Harbour. High rise apartments and buildings where there once was open space. Nothing to attract anyone anymore. We came to live in Pymont 21 years ago and walked around Darling Harbour every week - we have not been there for over 10 years. That is a pity.

The planners seem set on creating future slums not creating places to attract people who will be happy.

Please think about what you are doing to Pymont.

Margaret Jongkind

176031

Jongkind

Pymont

I have lived in Pymont for 21 years and I totally support the submission sent to you from CUPA on Blackwattle Bay.

When you look at the scale of the proposed development for Blackwattle bay it becomes clear that no one involved in this proposal lives in Pymont.

The overdeveloped monstrosity proposed is immense in its size and scale with enormous consequences in relation to shadows, traffic, school requirements etc.

We are a village not an extension of the CBD. That is what needs to be kept in mind at all times.

170841

Kaiote

Ultimo

I strongly oppose the proposed Blackwattle development.

Since I moved to Ultimo in May 2013, the increase in population has made the Ultimo, Pyrmont and Glebe areas very unpleasant to live in and or visit. The increase in population growth with all the many new apartment complexes and the increase in different types of vehicles on the streets and lack of parking spaces has already made these areas congested with traffic, noisy, underserved and overcrowded.

As outlined in the following examples I think the Blackwattle Development would stretch available resources in these areas to breaking point and make these areas even more unliveable.

#### Broadway Shopping Centre

It is overcrowded and unpleasant and in my opinion could not service the new development. Especially before lockdowns, one can't get a park in the shopping Centre on Saturdays and during the week, all the bank branches in the complex usually have customers queuing and not enough seats. Coles and Aldi are also very busy with not enough seats and queues. Coles, K Mart and Target are always busy with long queues at the checkout.

It is impossible to find a safe legal place for ride share vehicles or taxis to pick up or drop off in front of the shopping Centre. Before lockdown, most coffee shops were at capacity and there are not enough toilet facilities in the complex with long queues for the toilet.

In the apartment building where I reside - Dalgety Square 99 Jones Street ;

Parking is very hard to find because here are so many "Go Get" cars and vans taking spaces and they aren't used as much as private vehicles. Also when taxis or Ola Cabs or Ubers picking up people with disabilities or the elderly have to double park and block traffic in front of the building on Jones Street. Turning off Wattle Street into the loading dock into the building and backing out again is dangerous.

#### The International Grammar School

When the COVID lockdowns are not in place, the traffic is backed up on Kelly and Bay and Mountain Streets during the school drop off morning and night. It is the same situation with the Glebe Public school and the Ultimo Public School.

Often there is traffic backed up on Mountain Street for 1 or 2 blocks waiting to turn into Parramatta Road to travel to other suburbs or Bay Street to turn into Parramatta Road to Newtown.

When the Sydney Lockdowns are not in place, with the Glebe Markets on Saturdays, there is a queue for the length of Glebe Point Road back to St Johns Road and often, Bridge Road, as well as turning off Wentworth Park Road into Bay Street to go to Broadway Shopping Centre. All available parking spots are taken in Glebe, Ultimo and Pyrmont.

There are few, if any disability access facilities in these areas and the elderly or those with disabilities who have care workers taking them to appointments, must double park or park a long way from where the services are provided. There is little public seating and no public toilets which prevents me from walking from my home in Ultimo to any of the services in Glebe or Pyrmont.

My apartment is on the Wattle Street wing of Dalgety Square and though it faces inwards toward the courtyard, I still have to use ear plugs at night as there is considerable traffic noise. The proposed Blackwattle Bay development would increase traffic from Parramatta Road and Abercrombie Street into Wattle Street.

In conclusion I ask that the Blackwattle development not go ahead so that the existing amenities and resources are saved for the people who are already living in these suburbs.

Thank you

Kym Kaiote

165606

Kam

2037

I support the redevelopment of the area, but oppose the high rises. 45 storeys is too high; it will dwarf the Anzac Bridge.

165611

Kam

2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.



181296

Kam

2037

Itâ€™s obscenely bulky. I support a smaller scale development, but not the current proposal.

181401

Kam

2037

ŒŸ— Development in this area should be sensitive to existing character and promote job growth, not just squeeze as many people as possible between the Fish Market and free-flowing highway traffic.

ŸŸ± The excessive bulk and scale proposed will lead to more traffic, overshadowing and wind tunnels, with residents in massive apartment towers exposed to the damaging health effects of noise and air pollution.

Ÿ’ Adverse wind impacts make uncomfortable and unsafe public spaces, and losing access to sunlight makes is hard to grow trees and grass.

ŸŸ The requirement for 5% affordable housing is inadequate “ it should be at least 25%.

ŸŸfâ™Ÿ, Development should include Wentworth Park and Glebe Island Bridge being returned to public use “ developers should make contributions to upgrade local community and recreational facilities.

ŸŸ... Development here should secure a world class foreshore walk, public parks and places and cultural facilities “ not a sliver of a path between apartment lobbies and the water.

183431

Kamolz

Pymont 2009

I am against the current height limits of these proposed buildings. It is not at all appropriate for the area to have buildings 45 storeys tall.

- It does not match the neighbourhood and would be a severe detractor of value for many others in the area by blocking views and introducing an eyesore.

- The height of any new buildings should not compete with the ANZAC bridge or overshadow the foreshore.

- There should be more public open space. The designs submitted allocate one area under ANZAC bridge and then the rest is a small fountain area? This is an absurd waste of an opportunity to provide actual public benefit.

- 5% dedicated to affordable housing is insultingly low, especially in a time where the state is eliminating so many other public housing options in the area.

I support the area being made into something new and fresh but this seems like the fastest way to sell off thousands of apartments to some private contractor. We already have vibrant local businesses, what we need are more local amenities for recreation.

163506

Kated

Earlwood 2206

This is overdevelopment & loss of public green space. Foreshore will be overshadowed.

172341

Katz

Glebe 2037

The Hon. Rob Stokes MP

Minister for Planning and Public Places

Dear Minister,

The Sydney Fish Market definitely needs to be renovated. It's a terrible eyesore and right now is a great opportunity to fix this and make the area pleasant and vibrant. However, I am very disappointed that the current plans drawn up are lacking in imagination and character.

The most jarring thing when I first viewed the plans was the incredibly high building blocks (up to 45 stories) that completely overshadowed the plans. These buildings would completely eclipse the natural beauty of the area. The charm of a water front is that it has so much potential but that potential has been ignored in this proposal. These buildings completely wipe out the natural beauty of the area and turn it into another boring steel and glass development. Sydney is blest with the most amazing natural beauty and waterfronts. We should be capitalising on nature's gift and try to blend in with it.

I am also disappointed that not enough focus has been placed on creating an outdoor area that is large enough to be enjoyed by all residents and lots of visitors. People will not be drawn to a recreational site that is cramped and hasn't a pleasant atmosphere. This area is special and should be enjoyed by many people.

Finally, I think that only 5% of the residences being allocated to social housing is way too low. I understand that developers must plan for market buyers too, but with the housing crises that we are living with now, plans for affordable and social housing must be taken into account.

I hope that your department takes these suggestions regarding this development on board and rethinks this development. I look forward to seeing a new plan that reflects the all the potential of this special site.

Sincerely,

Lois Katz



167571

Kee

2037

With regards to the plan:

- 1) The comment time should be extended, for the considerable detail of the document.
- 2) If not extension, as a resident I am concerned that there has been insufficient community consultation regarding a proposal which significantly effects the area in terms of increased population and traffic, without adequate plans regarding management and genuine concern about the impact to the area.
- 3) I would request a plan which has undergone community consultation that ensures that community infrastructure and all other services, matches the level of development.
- 4) I would also request a plan regarding the safe management of the growth in street traffic and maritime traffic
- 5) I do not feel that the significant level of the proposed apartments is consistent with other buildings in the area and will have a negative impact on surrounding dwellings.
- 6) The proposal needs a plan to protect and expand access to public spaces that are usable and will be adequate for the substantial increase in traffic that will accompany the proposed buildings and also the traffic from the new fish markets.

I believe that inadequate planning and consultation has taken place and that the proposal significantly changes the area.

171281

Kendall

Rozelle

1. It would be nice to see some of the residential streets as walking streets without car access to prioritise walking and cycling and through design encourage people to consider public transport and active modes as their first choice for getting around Sydney.
2. An additional ferry wharf closer to the residential area may result in greater use (as opposed to walking around to the fish market)



168656

Kennedy

FOREST LODGE

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

It is the responsibility of government to improve conditions for the majority of citizens, build for the future of the many and benefit the environment for all. That is the complete opposite of what this proposal will do. It is a travesty for the community, present and future though it is clear it will benefit a few developers, presumably cronies of the governing party in NSW. It will also benefit the government's coffers for the next election but that is effectively a theft from the citizens of this local area and the electorate generally.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I am concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

#### Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

#### Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

171086

Kennedy

Pymont 2009

Permitting 12 buildings up to 45 floors is a massive and unwanted over development of the site. These buildings are 2.5 times the height of the tallest buildings in Pymont and are completely out of character with the suburb. They will be a visual blight on our suburb. There is also the issue of the impact on infrastructure of an additional 2800 people to the residential population of the suburb. How will increased demand for schools, hospitals and on-street parking to access local services be addressed? I don't disagree with the need to replace the fish market and improve residential amenity but not at the price of grotesque overdevelopment. Pymont is not and should not be turned into another CBD.

169451

Kerin

Glebe 2037

Dear Department

As a resident of Glebe I am very disappointed in the plan to over develop the current (soon to be former) fish market site. Allowing up to 45 stories is completely out of character with the surrounding area and will cause additional demand on already crowded public facilities (such as the already well worn ovals in Wentworth Park).

Ahoy

Conrad

179261

Khoury-Dagher

Pymont

To Whom it may concern,

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission

As the owner of Bayview apartment 94/ 120 Saunders St, Pymont NSW 2009 we had received notification of the development plans submitted for Blackwattle Bay redevelopment along with the technical documents as plans on display. The current plans call for significant mixed-use development along Bank street with towers close to 18 stories and adjacent buildings even higher.

As the resident of this building, we strongly believe that this development creates the following concerns and negatively impact us:

a) Character: While it is mentioned the current plans have been developed in consideration of the character of the neighbourhood the following attributes of the development negate that:

- Setbacks and building height: The proposed buildings reaching higher than 18 stories it does not consider the current building heights along Bank Street which is a major setback.

- Location and size of private open space: Consultations in the past advised the Department of Planning to increase the number of open spaces considering Pymont to be one of the highest density suburbs. The current plans overlook the recommendation. The large mixed-use towers will occupy what was intended to be allocated open space with only small land allocated for open space, thus compounding the current issue of the suburb density.

b) Overshadowing: The developments along the intersection of Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street will significantly overshadow the Bayview Towers, 120 Saunders Street. The positioning of new towers in the current plans does not provide an accurate assessment. This will lead to a loss of re-sale value for all the apartments.

c) Overlooking/loss of privacy: The residential & commercial use of the tower along Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street will create overlooking and loss of privacy and have a negative impact on us and the residents. Bayview towers were created with many apartments with balcony doors and windows facing the bay and Bank Street. The loss of privacy will negatively impact the living often resulting in residents having to down their blinds or installing other mechanisms.

d) Visual bulk of building: The development of the intersection of Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street will result in large, bulky buildings impacting the outlook of neighbours and dominate private open space areas such as apartment balconies facing the bay. The proposed developments would discourage many residents to enjoy the outdoors and prevent them from enjoying access to sunlight as they do as a result of overshadowing.

e) Overdevelopment: The plans suggest the Department's view is to go for a balanced outlook; however, this is not accurate. The addition of hundreds of apartments and office space will be considered as overdevelopment of an already congested area. As highlighted above the current fish market and private land should have been opened for the residents to have better access to open land.

f) Residential noise and vibration: The current assessments advise the buildings will be planned in accordance with the codes to ensure the occupants of new towers, are not impacted by noise with correct distance & height. However, the current plan fails to advise how the new construction will have an adverse impact on residents of Bayview Towers, 120 Saunders Street along Bank Street. With the increased development the noise pollution & vibration must be understood by doing the following:

- o a) assessment done for 120 Saunders Street now to ensure the current noise pollution as per the standards incorporated into the development

- o b) ensure take the above assessment into account when factoring the building heights of the proposed construction

- o c) provide noise & vibration reduction for current & future residents by putting large glass panels along the Anzac bridge to deflect the noise

- o d) provide appropriate noise reduction for 120 Saunders Street through Noise Abatement Programs such as Double-Glazing Door & Windows and Noise reduction curtains

In consideration of the above concerns, I and residents of <apartment no.>/ 120 Saunders Street, Pyrmont believe the heights of the buildings must be reduced significantly to not have an adverse impact. Furthermore, great effort needs to be put into understanding how the proposed plans negatively impact an already noisy and densely populated Pyrmont and in the particular intersection of Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street.

Looking forward to a favourable and considerate response.

Yours faithfully,

Fouad Khouri-Dagher

Home address: 4 Lloyd Wright Way

Beecroft

NSW. 2119



167371

Kiera

Balmain

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century, the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of the Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

167376

Kiera

Balmain

I also wholeheartedly support the:

PLAN TO ELEVATE THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE BAYS AND RESTORE ITS POSTCOLONIAL HERITAGE  
AS DRIVERS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF THE  
COMMUNITY WELLBEING.

164526

King

Pymont 2009

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic and support the working harbour, for maintenance of recreational and commercial boating

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

175556

King

Forest lodge

Further high rise development in the Blackwattle Bay area is inappropriate culturally, socially, environmentally and historically. It is site of early European settlement that has already been severely compromised by current high density residential architecture.

To add the proposed huge tower blocks is also a travesty from a visual or aesthetic aspect, not only for the area but for look of the entire harbour.

The current population of Sydney and locals need more open space for well being and health benefits. To deliberately ignore the needs of the area's residential population is a callous, short-sighted and profit-driven move taken by developers and their government supporters.

During these uncertain times of the Covid pandemic unprecedented queries are being currently raised over the usability of high rise already in place. Changes to work practices regarding the CBD area including suburbs immediately West are rendering high rise development obsolete.

Given the above considerations, it is clear that the only beneficiaries to the building of residential high rise in this area are the developers, the current government and potential residents, none of whom hold decent and socially aware values in regard to a sustainable and healthy lifestyle for people of this area, or values which hold aesthetics, culture and history important.

Short term building industry employment figures may be seen to be a positive, but are not sustainable.

Likewise local infrastructure and retail job increases in the area. This is misguided, these jobs would be created to serve a development which will not benefit the area and indeed on a larger scale, Sydney as a beautiful harbour city.

Employment boosts would be a deceptive inflation based on errors of judgement which cannot be seen to positives which do not balance all the social, cultural, aesthetic and environmental negatives of the project.

183416

Kinning

Glebe 2037

My family strongly object to the height of the proposed buildings as they are completely out of touch with our local area. We also strongly object to a shared pedestrian and bike space that is so narrow. Please make it visually appealing, functional and respect the general vibe of the space. Haven't you seen The Castle? The vibe means everything.

163191

Kirkwood

SUMMER HILL

This is a bad idea - public space is precious, and slowly being whittled away to benefit rich developers. This is yet another example of overdevelopment which will benefit only a few, look ugly, and overshadow smaller buildings and public spaces.

164531

Kirkwood

Pymont 2009

I have lived as an owner occupier in Pymont for 43 years and seen many changes to our landscape both in apartments and business. Our foreshores are our heritage and must be kept available to all and certainly not dominated by 45 storey high-rise apartments. It has been possible to erect 10 storey apartments on the foreshores of Pymont and not shadow or dominate the urban landscape.

What is proposed here on Blackwattle Bay is appalling in design and structure and will completely destroy the beauty of our city. Where is the accommodation for social housing in these plans to ensure that Pymont retains a social mix which we have all enjoyed. This is an opportunity for Sydney to build a world class mix of apartments for the rich and the poor and a market place for the world to visit with advanced eco architectural structures. A prize to Sydney to be proud of. Not this mess that is proposed. The only winners are the developers and the loss to people living here now and in the future is huge.

176821

Knight

2049

We need more than 30% public space!!!! More than ever, the need for shared, non-commercial space has been proved to be essential by these lockdowns. Once we lose it it's incredibly hard to regain. The city is its people, not just an opportunity for profit.



181566

Krajewski

2037

Dear ladies and gentlemen, I go for walks and also runs along Blackwattle Bay and Pyrmont or Forest Lodge up to three times every single days especially during lockdown but even before and after COVID. I am excited about the new Fishmarket and would imagine that it would introduce one or two new pedestrian crossings / traffic lights which I think are much needed even today and should not be delayed until the fish market is ready. Speaking of wish, if it does indeed have a sustainable solar panel roof then please do not make that part of Sydney a laughingstock by allowing highrise developments to cast shade on those solar panels. More housing is always needed but the height needs to make sense and access to the water and sunlight for the public needs to be a number one priority to improve or at least keep the quality of life. Thanks for your consideration. Best regards,  
Paul Krajewski

160871

Krezic

Ultimo 2007

To whom it may concern,

This is a brilliant, well balanced plan. As a local, I support it wholeheartedly. It also generates long term benefits for the wider community and state economy.

Blackwattle Bay and Bays West are the last great opportunity for a major development on Sydney Harbour. This is a golden opportunity to turn the most unpleasant waterfront in Sydney to a world-class mixed use precinct.

I find proposed building envelopes and heights optimal and encourage an international design competition. The residential/commercial balance is quite good. I suggest no social housing in the vicinity, this is destined to be a high end luxury precinct.

Public spaces, parkland, cultural precinct, restaurants and retail should be carefully designed and executed.

Public transport improvements are critical including light rail extension to Bays West, Pyrmont Metro station and a regular ferry line to Barangaroo and Circular Quay.

Last but not least - I believe the construction at the northern end of the precinct should start well before Fish Market relocation with the rest to follow immediately after the opening of new Fish Markets.

163386

Kristensen

Glebe

This is crazy, we do not need or want this type excessive high density living absorbing a space that could be used far more efficiently with out such enormous impact. This is extreme and can only have enormous negative side effects for our existing local community. I can only see this as a capital raising exercise that is being pushed through far too quickly without proper foresight or planning, or consideration for the existing population. We can't have this beautiful, already heavily populated, area threatened by excessive development and overpopulation damaging. We risk losing it's character and beauty well beyond the boundaries of black-wattle bay. I can only see irreversible damage to what makes this wonderful place to live. We need more time to review and consider is this what we really need as a community.

I am all for some form of development but this is excessive.

165986

Lander

Annandale 2038

The 45 storey towers will overshadow the Bay Area and will create a cold and unwelcoming walkway for locals and visitors. The Bay will suffer from a claustrophobic feeling as it will be built up to such an extent that there will be few open sky and air vistas - so important for people to enjoy the sun and be able to look into the distance.

Residents who already live around the Bay will have their views destroyed and will be forced to live in an over developed area. The building height should be up to 4 storeys only to allow for sun and sky to be seen in the Bay and for existing residents and visitors.

178771

Lane

balmain east 2041

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

Although this site definitely needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

High-density housing development will totally dominate and swamp the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure. The height of the 45 storey apartments which would include 1,550 apartments will reduce any light in the area. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons blocking the foreshore.

This scale of residential development will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing is appalling.

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Trish Lane

Balmain East, 2041

178776

Larner

Forest Lodge 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

It is a complete over-development.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Ruth Larner

Forest Lodge, 2037



163051

laurence

sydney

The current design is completely out of step with current thinking for livable cities which are going green (eg Singapore Berlin Copenhagen Paris London )

This Scheme offers no quality public space for community development no biophilic environment (now proven to be of vital importance for mental health and well being) It is instead overbuilt , designed for developers profit

The Barangaroo development is already despised It creates dark windy shadow around the harbours edge instead of beautiful public space of nature and sunlight To emulate this model is a disaster and will destroy the surrounding livable communities of Pyrmont and Ultimo and Glebe

175131

Lawrence

2037

I oppose the proposed planning controls.

My reason for opposition is that I regard the height of the towers to be excessive. I consider this because:

At that height the towers will be a visual blot on this part of Sydney.

Many studies have shown the negative social and mental health effects on humans of living in a very tall tower.

167206

lee

2009

this SSP study and proposed violation of convention. only little benefit to the public. but huge impact to the local community and residents.

Built up a tower wall along the harbour. blocking all water from the rest pyrmont residents. reduce sunlights. overshadowing public domain and neighbours. more traffic, more noise, more pollution in the area. its unacceptable.

water, sunlights and air quality are invaluable environmental assets for the local community and residents. nothing can exchange these. we do not want these invaluable assets to be affected.

Blackwattle Bay harbour foreshore is low rise building permit land. high rise building shouldn't built there. we strongly opposed this proposal.

180751

Lee

2136

Blackwattle bay needs to remain open to the public so we can all enjoy it's amenity.

As an ex dragon boat racer who represented NSW and Australia, I will always be grateful that the area was open and able to be used by the public to embrace water sports especially as not everyone is lucky enough to live on or near the water.

Please increase the accessibility and availability of the bay for the public and refrain from selling it all the private interests.

173991

Leeson

2047

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

A link to our updated submission can be found here:

<https://tinyurl.com/4edwj2mj>

181886

Leprovaux

Redfern

Hi there,

Just writing to complain about the Blackwattle Bay proposed development.

This sore to the eyes is another Barangaroo of big businesses:

- creating wind corridors
- completely unsuitable for the area
- destroying the neighbourhood: creating a fake living zone

In a nutshell it is destroying the local community and destroying the soul of Sydney.

168556

Leung

2009

Don't support high-rise residential developments and re-zoning to B4

Would support a lower GFA

Concern about overcrowding and shadow issues

Support for more investments in commercial, retail, and community facilities.

Thank you



161936

Liebenberg

2016

There should definitely be more public consultation. Over development will ruin this important piece of Sydney heritage to high density towers. It will also greatly impact on the sustainability of area to support such a large population.

Please reconsider the height of towers to be more respectful to the bay and natural open air space.

168481

Lighton

Glebe

Having reviewed the State's plans for the Blackwattle Bay precinct I would like to lodge a formal objection to the proposal as a resident and property owner in the adjacent suburb of Glebe. It is clear that the proposal that includes 45 story buildings is totally out of keeping with current usage and surrounding buildings. This area should not be confused with the CBD. The Blackwattle Bay area is separated from the CBD (where tall multistorey buildings are permitted) by the Darling Harbour precinct and Pyrmont residential areas where building heights are considerably under 45 stories.

Sydney has a reputation for repeatedly creating over-developed, unlivable sites. It is proposed that approximately 2500 people will occupy the residential buildings. How does the state imagine that this number of people, including families with children will manage with the equivalent of one-and-a-half football fields and a foreshore walkway? Lack of outdoor space for leisure and exercise contributes to poor physical developmental outcomes for children and poor mental health in adults. No amount of 'sustainable development' or 'affordable housing contribution' can obviate the social consequences of this vastly over-crowded over-development orientated proposal.

181511

Lim

Glebe

I am strongly against this proposal. I don't believe the current proposal puts public space and public benefit first - it treats the foreshore as a cash cow, not a public asset - and the government needs to do better.

Pymont is already a densely-populated area and the proposed rezoning rules would allow the building of towers up to 45 storeys tall at the western gateway to the CBD, which will overshadow parks and homes in the precinct.

The re-design of this proposal must respond to the needs of the community and prioritise public space and benefit, not developer profit.

172061

Limmer

Pymont

I would like to place my name to the submission by Pymont Action being a member.

I would also like to add that Sydney had wonderful and simple planning policy in the 60's. Where one could virtually do what one liked, heightwise, between George and Pitt Streets tapering down to the water on the Barangaroo side and Hyde Park on the other giving everyone a fair go at some sort of view. This was thrown out when the Planning minister gave Barangaroo open slather to do what developers wanted. Now that should be a learning curve for Sydney Fish Market (SFM). From what I read there have been no lessons learnt, SFM will be another over developed, dark, cold place in winter, which nobody wishes to visit. PLEASE HAVE ANOTHER LOOK AT WHAT YOU ARE DOING for the sake of the almighty dollar.

182111

Lipson

Haymarket 2000

I am making a personal submission as a nearby resident, a registered architect and a practising scientist specialising in the effects of urban development on local climate.

The proposed Blackwattle Bay SSP study proposal shows gross overdevelopment for the precinct.

The bulk of a dozen towers up to 156 m high (Figure 35) directly adjacent to the harbour foreshore destroys local character, sightlines and public access, and will negatively impact the local environmental conditions. A proposed height of up to 156 m exceeds the current maximum heights of 15-18 m from SLEP 2012 (Figure 24). New development must maintain SLEP 2012 heights to remain sensitive to local character and maintain a comfortable local environment.

The case studies (Table 12) are totally inappropriate. They show either

- dense development away from foreshores (Central Park, Green Square)
- dense development on foreshores, but that have much greater public space distance between towers and water (Barangaroo, Brooklyn, Battersea)
- dense development within the CBD (Elizabeth Quay, Barangaroo)
- or moderately sized (6 - 8 storey) development completely at odds with the 30+ storeys proposed (Hamburg).

None of these case studies are appropriate for a residential mixed-use foreshore area surrounded by 4-8 storey buildings. The controversial Barangaroo development case study has a greater distance from building to foreshore and has its public path axis facing North, allowing solar access for more than half the day. This development public access will be on the South West, so will be in shadow most of the day.

Figure 10 shows a 10 m "typical" promenade width between buildings and foreshore. This is half the width of the promenade at Barangaroo, which is criticised as pushing too close to the foreshore. 10m is thinner than the street (bitumen) part of a quiet residential street. For Blackwattle Bay to reduce this to 10 m is grossly undersized for a public access overshadowed foreshore and will destroy local character.

Neighbouring apartments are typically 4-8 storeys in height (Figure 39). New development closer to the foreshore must be lower than buildings behind it to maintain the character and amenity of the

area. The development should be lower than the adjacent Western Distributor to maintain sightlines. At the least, new development must comply with maximum heights set out in SLEP 2012 (Figure 24) if negative impacts are to be avoided, and positive impacts flow from development.

Wind will be concentrated by these towers to dangerous levels. Overall wind speeds in cities are lower than open water because buildings provide "surface roughness" which slow wind, and building heights step up slowly. This proposal is inappropriate because it faces South West (the most common and strongest wind sector - Figure 67), but steps up suddenly in height up to 156 m without lower buildings slowing wind before it. The strongest wind coming from the South West is unimpeded because it comes over the harbour. This already high predominant wind speed will be concentrated by the towers. Even with "treatments", wind speed still exceed critical criteria in public locations (Figure 69).

A simple rule is that development should step up slowly from the foreshore to taller buildings at the back, like an auditorium. This helps solar access, wind management, sightlines, public access and creates a sensible bulk and scale. This development is very far from sensible, and grossly over height.

The proposed development is of very poor quality compared with the case studies considered, which are not appropriate for this residential/ mixed-use precinct with building heights 4-8 storeys. Development in the area must comply with maximum heights set out in SLEP 2012 (Figure 24). If not this development will exemplify developer demands over local resident and public rights, and lock environmentally insensitive development.

Sincerely,

Dr Mathew Lipson

167101

Liu

Ultimo

This proposal with heights of residential buildings is shocking and has predominantly developer profits in mind. Please reduce height limits of the skyscrapers in the area.

173081

Livery

2038

There is way to much bulk and density in the proposal. There needs to be a minimum of 50% open space accessible to all. Any development should have a maximum height of 4 stories above ground level.



170701

Lloyd

Ultimo, 2007

Glebe is one of the few inner city suburbs where the public have unfettered access to the foreshore. We have a unique opportunity to link up the existing Glebe foreshore walk with the foreshore walk around Pyrmont, at Bank Street, under the Anzac Bridge.

Why not make the foreshore on the old fish market site similar to the Glebe foreshore and not turn a fantastic space into a narrow path through cafes and shops.

I urge you to consider increased public green space. Unless I've got my maths wrong, according to the plans, 30,000 sqm (3 hectares) is to be public land. Two hectares are slated for the new fish markets, which by definition will be public land. So that means only one hectare out of the total land area of 8.4 hectares will be accessible by the public.

The Blackwattle Bay area is almost at bursting point. This was evident during the COVID-19 lockdowns. My daily walk around the foreshore was akin to Pitt Street at rush hour (not to mention the numbers using Wentworth Park). I realise the NSW Government wants to make as much money out of the deal as it can, but please think about the livability of the area.

Please re-think the approach. I'm not against re-development and private apartments, but this is public land. We need more space, not less, and these current plans take public land away forever.

Fewer apartments and more public foreshore !!

160981

Long

2037

Thanks for the opportunity to provide comments.

My comments are;

- Waterfront promenade; 10m minimum width is insufficient. Should be increased to >15m to allow for sufficient space for 4m pedestrian, 3m cyclist, 8m landscaping.
- The scale of the towers is too imposing. These should be reconsidered and shortened to provide for the future built form transition from the innovation corridor to Glebe.
- The proposed residential component should be reduced and replaced with additional commercial real estate to help support the innovation corridor.
- the proposed 'future marina' #16 on plans should be removed from the plans and not proceed.
- #13 on the precinct plan should be relocated away from the historic Glebe Point island bridge.
- #20 on the Precinct Plan should not be a 'future connection' but should be delivered as part of this project to accelerate delivery as a shared user path.
- the residential amenity of the towers along the express way would be horrible.
- #12 on the Precinct Plan should be removed and this land integrated into the park as it would receive the greatest solar exposure and the park could then provide an interpretation of the heritage bridge.
- the park beneath the expressway should contain significant amount active recreational infrastructure rather than passive due to the proposed amount of residential dwellings proposed. This could include; multi-use courts for tennis, futsal, basketball, netball etc, skate park/s,

Thanks

Michael

177511

Long

2037

To whom it may concern.

I am opposed to the increased height limited proposed in the Blackwattle Bay redevelopment.

I am opposed to the proposed towers of up to 45 storeys.

Sydney does not need another ugly Darling Harbour, dominated by commercial needs. This unique harbour area requires more public space. Towers shadow and presence over the harbour must not be permitted.

Any residential development must include more than 5% social and public housing.

Regards

Rob Long

183266

Low

Elizabeth Bay 2011

I have posted about two pages of my submission as well.

Pymont Peninsula was originally part of the City Centre of Sydney Planning Scheme 1951.

In summary my points were:

- housing supply leads to affordability (without mentioning negative gearing, capital gain tax).

- comparison to similar size city Melbourne which provides additional dwelling supply that leads to a cheaper and more affordable housing stocks.

- encourage more active transport and close to work which is in line with CoS goals to be zero emission by 2030.

- additional future commercial / retail / hotel accommodation to support hospitality, tourism and jobs for ever expanding Sydney.

- to avoid further suburban sprawl.

- density in Pymont peninsula is still below global cities benchmark with surrounding parks, public space and abundant harbour to the north.

- Central Park and Darling Square set a world standard to be followed.

- This is the last foreshore harbour land remaining in Sydney within 3 kms from the CBD. It needs to be fully utilised and to cement Sydney as a competitive global city.

181586

Low

Elizabeth Bay 2011

My take on this development:

1. 1,500 residential apartments with an estimated residential population of 2,850 within an area of 8.4 hectares equates to a density of 339 residents per hectare. This is significantly lower than the residential density at Darling Square (1,500 residential apartments and 1,000 student rooms with an estimated residential population of 5,500 within an area of 4.4 hectares equates to a density of 1,222 residents per hectare. It is also considerably lower than the residential density at Central Park (2,100 residential apartments and 1,000 student rooms with an estimated residential population of 5,200 within an area of 5.8 hectares equates to a density of 897 residents per hectare). In fact, it is most comparable to the adjacent Jacksons Landing renewal site (1,000 residential apartments with an estimated residential population of 2,500 within an area of 11 hectares equates to a density of 227 residents per hectare).

Conclusion: This seems pretty on the money.

2. The projected lower household occupancy and absence of student housing indicates this will not be some cheap residential development, even in comparison with Darling Square and Central Park.

Conclusion: A target of 10% affordable housing equates to about 160 residential apartments. It would be nice to see a commitment to social housing as well.

3. 5,910 jobs within an area of 8.4 hectares equates to a density of 704 jobs per hectare. This is slightly higher than the employment density at Darling Square (at least 3,000 jobs within an area of 4.4 hectares equates to a density of 682 jobs per hectare. It is also significantly higher than the employment density at Central Park (at least 1,200 workers within an area of 5.8 hectares equates to a density of 207 jobs per hectare). Jacksons Landing had no significant employment.

Conclusion: The number of jobs planned appears quite ambitious, but may not be as much of a problem for traffic and transport as COVID-19 has permanently changed the frequency with which we go to the office.

4. The shortest distance between Blackwattle Bay and the new Pymont Station is 300 metres. In contrast, the shortest distance between Darling Square and the closest railway station platform (Town Hall) is about 700 metres. The shortest distance between Central Park and the closest railway station platform (Central) is about 600 metres. As we all know, it is a significant walk between Jacksons Landing and the closest railway station. The commitment to a new Pymont Station is critical to the redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay, and to shifting mode share to public transport in Pymont-Ultimo.

Conclusion: Despite being located further from the Sydney CBD than Darling Square and Central Park, Blackwattle Bay will actually be better located in relation to a railway station

5. The development proposes the construction of a 400m<sup>2</sup> community centre space, a childcare centre, medical services, a 1,200m<sup>2</sup> arts and creative uses space, a children's playground, an outdoor fitness area, two outdoor multipurpose courts and three hectares (or 36%) of public open space (including the missing link in the harbour foreshore walk). There's also a suggestion that a more significant cultural facility could be housed adjacent to the new Sydney Fish Market. This is considerably more public and social infrastructure than Darling Square (library, childcare centre, medical services, green central park, public artwork and 25% public open space). It is also considerably more public and social infrastructure than Central Park (childcare centre, medical services, green central park, public artwork and 33% public open space).

Conclusion: Significantly more public and social infrastructure is planned than Darling Square and Central Park. This is a good outcome.

6. The press and the council have incorrectly inferred that this is all public land. Whilst the majority of it is public land, there are private landholdings north of Miller Street that comprise approximately 20% of the whole redevelopment site.

Conclusion: The height and density of buildings north of Miller Street is reflective of its location within the site. The southern end of the development site will offer much better connectivity to metro, light rail and bus services and therefore it justifiably has a taller and denser built form.

160911

Luciano

2009

I am a resident in Pymont with views over to the new fish markets site. Right now there is a concrete facility only 200 meters or so from my apartment with two children under 4. I am happy for that to go as such an industrial facility should not be so close to residential apartments, but to be replaced by oversized apartments is not a good solution. The area needs more public space, and trees especially as a connection from the Fish Markets light rail station. If you want to appeal to the local residents and tourists there should be more consideration for the openness as you approach Blackwattle Bay. In summer the city gets very hot and the breeze off the water can help cool off the existing apartment blocks a few streets in from the Bay, planting trees will help cool the area down. Building new and big apartments will make the heat worse. Also Pymont doesn't have the infrastructure for that many new people. I hope the developments are not too tall and shutting off an area that should be for the many preexisting residents and office workers.

181891

Lum

PYRMONT

19 August 2021

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission

I am writing to object to the proposed redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay.

The following are the reasons for my objection:

The project is inconsistent with the Government's own Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy

3000 new residents will overload existing infrastructure and amenities, including schools and health facilities.

The roads to and through Pyrmont are already overloaded from too much traffic, much of it is heading onto the Anzac Bridge which makes it impossible for Pyrmont locals to get home through cars blocking the lanes heading into Pyrmont.

The towers along the foreshore exceed current allowable building heights and floor area. They will block sunlight to Wentworth Park, Pyrmont and Ultimo.

The scale of these towers is inappropriate for this location which is mostly residential.

The narrow foreshore boulevard, overshadowed and dominated by the towers, will not be an inviting, public space.

The park proposed at the northern end of the site under the Anzac Bridge is an unpleasant leftover space with the least amount of real estate value, which is why it's proposed for the park.

The incorporation of Hansen's concrete plant into the lower levels of one of the residential towers seems appropriate. How does a concrete plant co-exist with a residential building and green public space, especially when concrete trucks are required to enter and exit the site to transport the concrete?

There has been a lack of genuine community consultation; the previous round of feedback seems to have been largely ignored the aspirations and objections of the Pyrmont and Ultimo community objects.

Your Sincerely,



Martin Lum

181906

Lum

PYRMONT

19 August 2021

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission

I am writing to object to the proposed redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay.

The following are the reasons for my objection:

The project is inconsistent with the Government's own Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy

3000 new residents will overload existing infrastructure and amenities, including schools and health facilities.

The roads to and through Pyrmont are already overloaded from too much traffic, much of it is heading onto the Anzac Bridge which makes it impossible for Pyrmont locals to get home through cars blocking the lanes heading into Pyrmont.

The towers along the foreshore exceed current allowable building heights and floor area. They will block sunlight to Wentworth Park, Pyrmont and Ultimo.

The scale of these towers is inappropriate for this location which is mostly residential.

The narrow foreshore boulevard, overshadowed and dominated by the towers, will not be an inviting, public space.

The park proposed at the northern end of the site under the Anzac Bridge is an unpleasant leftover space with the least amount of real estate value, which is why it's proposed for the park.

The incorporation of Hansen's concrete plant into the lower levels of one of the residential towers seems appropriate. How does a concrete plant co-exist with a residential building and green public space, especially when concrete trucks are required to enter and exit the site to transport the concrete?

There has been a lack of genuine community consultation; the previous round of feedback seems to have been largely ignored the aspirations and objections of the Pyrmont and Ultimo community objects.

Your Sincerely,

Martin Lum

165261

Lynch

2010

I object to State Government's proposed development at Blackwattle Bay. I have lived in the inner-city my entire life and went to school in Ultimo, just up the road. I know the area very well.

Your proposal will ruin the area and result in thousands of people literally living on top of a huge freeway. In what universe is this a good idea?

The area must be developed using small scale, people focused design methods, not by techniques that simply maximise developer profit. There must be more parks, cycling facilities, walking routes, and plants and animals.

The proposal is just too big, far too big. In your Precinct Study, you cite Hamburg as an example. I suggest that you seriously study how countries like Germany, Holland the Scandinavian countries do development. I can tell you it's not by creating enormous concrete towers, that cast shadow over people and occupy public land, right next to a huge freeway.

The NSW Liberal Government has ruined Barangaroo. That place should be one of Sydney's most lovely public spaces, instead it contains an enormous casino which casts a shadow over the city and is cold and soulless. Blackwattle Bay is a chance not to repeat the disaster that is Barangaroo. Unfortunately, the current proposal repeats the disaster that is Barangaroo. The disaster can be avoided by using small scale development, not huge towers, in tandem with the creation of public, not commercial, facilities such as parks, trees, cycling facilities, and green spaces.

The current proposal for Blackwattle Bay must be rejected.

181466

M

2037

No ugly highrise luxury apartments.

170121

MacDiarmid

Glebe 2037

I object to the height of buildings planned for the Black Wattle Bay eastern shore.

All should be less than 45 meters High.

178706

Macdonald

Glebe 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

It is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, as I have written to tell you before the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public are unacceptable and historically illiterate.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. Instead we have:

High-density housing development which will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The current low, blue building and unobtrusive building that houses the current Sydney Fish Market with its gaggle of fishing boats will instead become 45 storey towers. These will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will dominate the foreshore.

As well as being an aesthetically unpleasant development the scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

It may ,in a pandemic future, be that you are facilitating Petrie dishes for future lock downs close to heart of the city you are seeking to improve.This will be particularly true if such development is predominantly taken up by local investors and a poor economic climate favours the greedy thus becoming a largely rental area for high worth individuals.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development which is itself an overdevelopment with too few controls. This project canâ€™t even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces.

It is indefensible that the approach of Infrastructure NSW not focused on providing best practice in design and planning.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. I understand other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments and this would help mitigate the effects of the pooling of wealth. This proposal offers 5% public housing. It is particularly important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) and with minimal opportunity for expansion and the proposed Sydney Metro stop a significant distance from the site. Pedestrian access too is poor.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

Instead the waterfront will be transformed into a shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning to compete with public access. Moreover if the three private landholders in the precinct do not develop their properties to allow public access it raises serious doubts about the ability to ever deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with thoughtful space to accommodate passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver extraordinary windfalls in property value to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

The largest proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Kyrsty Macdonald

Glebe, 2037



183051

Mackey

Dulwich Hill 2203

Those of us who walk ourselves and our dogs around foreshores are acutely aware that pedestrians and bicycles don't mix.. Cyclists travel quickly; pedestrians don't and putting both on the same path leads to spills, injuries and lots of antagonism - surely not what is intended. You have a fine opportunity at Blackwattle Bay to provide safe, separate pathways for these two groups over a divided 30 metre area: with two-way spaces for both groups. The Surry Hills bike paths are a fine example of how to do it.

182326

Maher

2009

The government CANNOT do this to our beloved blackwattle bay!! This is an absolutely disgraceful plan and thoroughly lessens the beautiful of such a magical area! that's putting it very diplomatically! let me rephrase! ITS ABSOLUTELY HIDEOUS AND CANNOT HAPPEN. I honestly wonder what goes in the brains of some politicians. This city is beautiful!. We may have a hollow culture compared to some other cities but we have a stunning aesthetic and I will be gutted to see these heinous looking buildings go up ruining the iconic sydney skyline. SHAME ON THE GOVERNMENT. SHAME SHAME SHAME.

183316

Maher

2037

SIDNEY MAHER

52 Talfourd Street

Glebe NSW 2037

20 th August 2021

Re: Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective and the Glebe Society to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

The redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

I support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and believe that it can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values.

I also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

I want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

The proposed buildings are too high, will overshadow the harbour and cast shadows on the water. They will cast shadows on the solar panels of the Fish Market.

The buildings must be scaled back, there needs to be more green space and there needs to be more public housing.

The width of the current proposed foreshore is a wholly inadequate 10m wide in places and the area is already busy with cyclists, joggers and walkers let alone with the planned residences.

I support calls for the following:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Public space is a premium in Sydney and I'd like to see the amount of public space in line with the 50 per cent applied at Barangaroo.

The current plans amount to a massive over development of the site.

It will see Pyrmont further disconnected from Blackwattle Bay by a massive wall of buildings.

Public transport is already struggling to keep up during normal times, with the light rail packed during peak times. It cannot withstand further capacity.

The planned development will create wind tunnels and ruin the amenity of the area.

It will also change the iconic skyline from the Glebe side of Blackwattle Bay, for the worse.

I lend my support to all the recommendations in The Glebe Society's submission:

<https://www.glebesociety.org.au/wp-content/uploads/Blackwattle-Bay-SSP-submission.pdf>

And I also wholeheartedly support the Bays Water Collective submission:

<https://onedrive.live.com/?authkey=%21AH5iQjceDXesHLM&cid=F3F4762C18C8021C&id=F3F4762C18C8021C%21121&parId=F3F4762C18C8021C%21104&o=OneUp>

Please let common sense prevail and reduce the height of the towers and create a truly useable public space.

Yours truly,

Sidney Maher

166071

Major

Annandale

Such potential and possibility, but again foresight and imagination are missing with this development plan by the state government. Again this city is being used as a cash cow to fill the pockets of developers. And again another exclusion zone is being built around what is possibly the last bit of Sydney's harbour. An exclusion zone based on and filled with concrete monoliths in order that a property developer can make more money. All to the detriment of the community. This development will cast giant shadows over Pyrmont, adding more hard surfaces, more traffic and less access to the harbour. This is not a development plan to improve the city, it is a development plan that is short sighted, insular and lazy. Go back and start again, build something that will benefit everyone, now and into the future, build something that is accessible for all and something that the city can be proud of. Stop making the harbour a shadowed exclusion zone that only lets in the well heeled, creates traffic congestion and pollution. As the planning stands now this is not a win for the city of Sydney and the people who live here.

179341

Major

Annandale

To whom it may concern

Please leave Blackwattle Bay alone. It is about the only part of the harbour that hasn't been sold off to the highest bidder, overdeveloped and has scope to be open, accessible space for residents. On the water everyday there is something to see, working boats, rowers, fishing boats and general craft. It is last part of Sydney's waterfront that is not dominated by high rise apartments, blocked access and concrete, all of which we don't need. What we need is more open space and a green environment where nature is the winner and local community access , not over development.

Jane Sullivan

180791

Mantelli

Ultimo

The proposed development has a number of issues including:

1. Excessive height of the development that will overshadow local properties
2. The size and development is excessive and will total size / bulk dwarf the local area
3. The amenities and green spaces for the public are very limited and insignificant compared to the total development
4. The development is located close to fumes and exhaust of a major arterial road
5. The consultation process with the public has been limited and manipulated so to pose this design as being approved by the public (it is not evident how this label was achieved)
6. The developmet is massive and will introduce excessive traffic and vehicles to the area but with no increase in parking, public transport or road safety for children and pedestrians.



172146

Manton

Glebe, Sydney, 2037

From: Marion Manton <action@campaignnow.co>

Sent: Sunday, 8 August 2021 6:26 PM

To: DPE EHC Mailbox <eastern.harbourcity@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Blackwattle Bay Overdevelopment; an insult to our Sydney Waterfront

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

While I agree with everything written by the pre-filled message, I want to emphasise the tragic outcome if this plan should go ahead. It will require our Government to change the city's planning controls. Perhaps this might be appropriate to build, say on a garbage dump that is full up, but to consider changing planning controls to approve a series of ugly tall apartment blocks, plus shops, restaurants and offices, on a precious area of our foreshore is an insult to the people of Sydney. We deserve a plan that maximises access to the waterfront for both passive and active pleasure. Walking, picnicing, relaxing. People need to visit peaceful places for their mental health; and places that can be accessed easily. This wonderful opportunity for our extremely limited waterfront space will be lost by this crowded overdevelopment. Developers are clearly being favoured over the genuine need for public open space. Our Govt. obviously prefers money, short term, over the long term need for maintaining the availability and beauty of the harbour foreshore. Over-building, overshadowing, over-crowding from the extra population in those unaesthetic towers, requiring parking spaces, more schools, more public transport, more medical and other services. It is ridiculous to contemplate this new plan for an invasion along our already overcrowded foreshore. I know from my experience of the heavy use of the Glebe foreshore walk; by people, bikes and dogs, and they are there without a single shop or restaurant beside the park. They come to escape from noisy, busy areas and just to enjoy the view. We need more places like the Glebe foreshore not like the plan for the adjoining Black Wattle Bay. Will you be planting Black Wattles along a wide waterfront path, with easy access for the surrounding people, without all the extra crowding of the plan that is unfortunately proposed? Please don't go ahead with this inappropriate overcrowded submission.

Yours sincerely,

Marion Manton

Glebe, 2037

-----

This email was sent by Marion Manton via [campaignnow.co](https://campaignnow.co) and [www.jamieparker.org](https://www.jamieparker.org)

Image removed by sender.

181816

Marais

2026

This is vulgar. Surely weâ€™ve all learnt this Comrade Alan Jones style back room deals donâ€™t benefit the city long term.

The area needs respectful, sustainable development that honours history and the cityscape.

Sydney is fast becoming a joke with all this carry on.

The state government will be accountable for these mistakes when itâ€™s too late. Shame on those in charge of this sham. Look forward to finding out who benefited what in years to come for this project.

Be on the right side of history.

164001

Marks

2040

In the interest of public health and wellbeing I wholeheartedly disagree with the proposed development plan for Blackwattle Bay waterfront. The proposal does not protect or promote quality of life in communities by prioritising developer profits and high rise buildings above access to physical activity, open green and blue spaces and other shared public spaces which are demonstrated to improve wellbeing and reduce risk factors for chronic disease, as well as reducing the environmental impacts of our cities. I would request you consider the wealth of evidence of co-benefits of increased access to active transport for population health and the environment in new planning proposals for the area. Minimising high rise buildings and the associated shade they cause on public spaces as well as traffic from multiple lanes of cars is recommended. Thank you

180516

Martich

2037

Please consider that a tapered line of buildings, rather than the tower blocks proposed would vastly increase the beauty of the Fish Markets. Aesthetics is a very important consideration. We should be planning for the enjoyment of generations to come, not lining the pockets of a greedy few with no sense of the natural beauty of this site, and its vibrant community.

173151

Martin

Annandale 2038

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Your sincerely

Jennifer Martin

165871

Martinez

Pymont, NSW 2009

hi there,

I live in Pymont and with this overdevelopment you are killing Pymont. The traffic coming off the Anzac bridge is already a nightmare, so by adding thousands of more dwellings, you are increasing the problem. I know you will come back with the garbage that people needs to be re-educated to not drive cars and use more the public transport. This is exactly the same lame excuse I heard about the overdelopments in Zetland and Green Square when they happened. I can tell you, because I moved from there to Pymont a few years ago.

I'm not opposed to developments, but these high rise buildings with deteriorate our quality of living - which I guess you couldn't care about it because you don't live here. The height of the buildings will put some streets in complete shade and I already talked about the traffic.

I heard that in the online sessions, you just ramble about nothing for 45 minutes and don't address enough questions in the last 15. Your traffic solutions are very vague.

I wanted to submit this, even though I know the developments are going ahead regardless the concerns of the residents. I think this "feedback" channel is just for you to "tick a box" pretending that you care. It is in your procedures, but your pockets already have the money of the deals you struck with the developers, so I think I'm just wasting my time.

Regards

Milo



172546

Matthews

Glebe, 2037

I am displeased with the height of the proposed buildings, as well as the lack of shared space proposed by the development. 45 story buildings will be higher than the ANZAC bridge. They do not suit the surrounding area which is low and medium rise. The lack sun will impact the shared space on both sides of blackwattle bay and ruin the natural surroundings of the area. As this land is publicly owned, the local residents should have the final say in whether this developmet goes ahead. The shared space amount should mirror that of previous developments at barangaroo (50%) shared community space. The current plan and 30% shared space does not reflect the communities needs and expectations.

161016

Mayer

Glebe 2037

Please please please don't continue with those enormous apartment towers, its going to be absolutely awful and ruin glebes unique character.

168276

Mazziotti

2009

These plans are a travesty. The beautiful foreshore has become a money grab for developers and, if these plans are fulfilled, Pyrmont will become a shadowland and residents will face severe consequences, such as increased traffic, lack of infrastructure and transport and more.

These plans need to be reviewed and the population density adjusted. Buildings in the foreshore need to be 5-7 stories max so that the rest of the suburb is not as impacted. It's the Star casino all over again.

164606

McCann

Glebe

As a local resident and regular user of this space. I strongly disagree with this proposal. I believe it will impact the the environment in a largely negative way.

A few concerns:

- casting large shade over the area and making it unappealing
- casting large shade over fish markets solar panels
- imposing large eye saw over whelming presents in a the space

Thanks

160976

McDonald

2041

I disagree with high density housing in Blackwattle Bay as there are already too many people in the area for the amount of open space and not enough amenities

172781

McGuinness

Glebe NSW 2037

The height of these proposed building is absurd. I have no objection to developing this site yet to have buildings of this height will change the skyline detrimentally I feel.

Please reconsider the heights.

Thank you

182391

McIlroy

Sydney

I am opposed to the Berejiklian government's project - The Blackwattle Bay Revitalisation Plan.

The 10.4 hectare complex is proposed to be built on the old Sydney Fish Market site. It wants to develop 12 sites along Blackwattle Bay, with an apartment tower of up to 45 storeys. The towers include a shopping and business district. I think this is going to seriously overdevelop a tiny block of public land.

The development will cast deep shadows over the foreshore, cast shadows on the solar panels of the new Fish Market development proposal, and limit public access to Blackwattle Bay forever.

The development proposal comes on the back of the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the cost of which is blowing out to more than \$750 million.

Moreover, I am opposed to this plan because Infrastructure NSW is seeking the approval of the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces to change the city's planning controls to allow towers up to 45 storeys to be built on the former Fish Markets site.

Many locals are opposed to the plan, as are local community organisations, such as the Glebe Society, Pyrmont Action, Bays Community Coalition and Ultimo Village Voice.

The state government needs to stop this project, abide by planning and heritage laws and properly consult with the local community.

160971

McIntyre

2583

The overall massing of the buildings (heights, locations and orientations) encourages overshadowing. Passive solar design principles are ignored. The waterfront promenade will be in shade for most of the day and as such not as inviting as it could be. Tall buildings to the north overshadow smaller buildings to the south. By reversing this - taller buildings to the north shadows go over the roads instead.

Buildings on the waterside park have direct west to south westerly orientation and sun which is bad. Orientate then 30d to north to get the northerly aspect and much better sun and view potential. With this plus spacing them wider apart ensures a massive increase in sun penetration to the promenade and public spaces and makes the public spaces a lot more inviting and enjoyable.



183211

McLeay

2050

As someone who frequently uses the path between Glebe foreshore and Bicentennial Park, I find the area narrow and lacks open space for joggers, dog walkers, and parents with children and prams.

I am concerned that this development will not give needed open space next to Blackwattle Bay and instead create a white elephant similar to the Cahill Expressway in Circular Quay. We need to maintain Sydney's iconic beautiful foreshores that make our city liveable and enjoyable for tourists. I suggest amending the height of these towers so that they do not overshadow Blackwattle Bay or block the view of the city and that they allow large open spaces for people to enjoy the surrounding foreshore.

167601

McClelland

2037

The ability to be able to use and share the foreshore for all residents is what the government should not let this opportunity pass. We've moved to forest lodge from five dock where we enjoyed the bay run. To be able to replicate this walk to enable everyone to share this beautiful bay and harbour. More trees, not more concrete. More access to walk around the harbour, not less.

177871

McPhee

Glebe 2037

Margaret McPhee

36 Lombard Street

Glebe 2037

Blackwattle Bay Redevelopment

I object to the proposal.

I am very concerned about the proposed redevelopment of the old Sydney Fish Market site. While there are many grounds for objecting to this massive over-development, my objections relate mainly to the impact on the quality of life of existing " and future " residents and visitors.

1. I despair about the loss of priceless public foreshore. We have a unique opportunity to safeguard public access to a stretch of inner harbour waterfront and redevelop the bay in a form that future generations can enjoy, rather than create a concrete jungle along the water's edge. But, if the proposed redevelopment of the old Sydney Fish Market site is allowed to proceed, we, and future generations, will be denied use of the bordering area. What should be public open space will instead be occupied by a wall of apartment blocks, built for developers' profit.

2. Just a sliver of what should be public waterfront will be retained for public use as a foreshore promenade dominated by a wall of apartment blocks. The majority of the proposed public space is underneath the highway overpass, permanently in shade.

3. The height of the three main towers is out of scale with the bay itself, and completely out of scale and character with the immediate surrounding suburbs, which have many low-rise, heritage buildings. These proposed towers will dwarf the pylons of Anzac Bridge and shade the bay and the new Fish Market. Why not have low-rise nearer to the waterfront, and taller buildings higher up on the ridge line?

4. The proposed redevelopment will have a significant negative impact on recreational use of the bay " a public resource " at the moment used by the local rowing club, and also by kayakers.

5. Development at this site should include a mix of moderate-sized dwellings and businesses that create broader opportunities for employment and leisure for locals and visitors alike.

6. There will be an unacceptable increase in traffic density. The proposed density of residents/workers is clearly excessive and beyond the capacity of transport facilities, even with the proposed improvement. Where is the parking?

7. What is the public benefit? Where are the proposals for the schools, hospitals, and community services that would be needed for such a massive overdevelopment?

I have not made any political donations in the previous two years.

Yours sincerely

Margaret McPhee

167396

McPherson

2010

To whom it may concern,

For the love of god please stop prioritising property developer profits over the heritage and integrity of Sydney.

Instead, create a leafy and tasteful public park that the entire city can enjoy. The importance of public parks have become profoundly clear throughout this pandemic and greatly improve the livelihoods of Sydney-siders.

If you must build residential or commercial properties, please for goodness sake, ensure that the buildings are in keeping with the industrial heritage of the area. Build something Art Deco, with a little flare, that we will be proud of in 100 years time. Not an overshadowed, soulless blight on Sydney's foreshore like so many of the commercial buildings in the area.

The White Bay power station was always my favourite building coming into the city as a child. Please, do not destroy it and instead revitalise it to its former glory. Why not use part of it as a large scale music venue and hub for restaurants and bars? Sydney is in desperate need of a cultural lift and this would be a perfect use of space.

I doubt anyone will read this but please, for once, don't prioritise corporate interests over that of the entire population.

Regards,

Hugh

165251

Meehan

Glebe 2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

A reduction in the height and number of new high-rise dwellings

Access to the whole foreshore right around the new development from the existing forshore walk right around into Darling Harbour

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

182426

Meijbaum

2007

To whom it may concern.

I have reviewed the SSP Study concerning Black Wattle Bay, and feel it is a completely inappropriate development for the area, and therefore would like to provide a submission.

It appears that almost no provision has been made to support the traffic needs of the increased commercial and residential usage. The roads around the existing fish market are already frequently at a stand-still. Adding mixed use towers will make the current poor situation much worse.

The towers themselves at their proposed height will completely dominate the skyline. Pyrmont already supports buildings of a significant height, but some of the new towers appear to be twice their size. Even worse, they are very close to the water's edge, making for a very claustrophobic feel. The shadow these buildings will cast will have a detrimental impact over a large area, including the new fish market I believe.

The SSP Study discusses the new public domain, but it appears to be minor, wedged in between the towers and the foreshore, and some of it even under the Western Distributor overpass. As the majority of this is public land now, this is a sad loss to private ownership.

Pyrmont and Ultimo already support more than their fair share of housing density and commercial facilities. The community is not against more of the same, but it must be developed in-line with existing infrastructure.

All points, and more, could be addressed by reducing the size of the towers (to at least half of that proposed), reducing the number of towers, and retaining that land as the suggested public domain, but with a much bigger footprint.

Thank you for your consideration.

183021

Menzies-Miha

2038

The scale of these buildings is obscene.

The Barangaroo Crown tower looks ridiculous, poking out at the end of the skyline.

From where I live in Annandale, these new Blackwattle Bay towers would completely obscure our view of the city (from the park/harbour front) and look similarly out of place.

Cramming as many apartments as possible into an area is not the answer. We are already low on space, particularly for parking to people ratio. These types of apartment buildings do not help.

Projects like this only make me feel like all politicians see is dollar signs. And with property developers being amongst the biggest political donors in Australia, itâ€™s no surprise.

When plans like this are so clearly to maximise profit and not for the publicâ€™s well being, all they do is decrease my faith in our system, our government and our people in charge. Leaders isnâ€™t the appropriate term for the vast majority of public â€œservantsâ€ in this country, Iâ€™m sorry to say.

I might support apartments here if they werenâ€™t at such an obscene scale - they would need to be half the size or less.

There must be plenty of green space, parking, public access / walk ways and affordable housing included.

Thank you.



162536

merry

Pymont, 2009

As a resident of Pymont for 21 years I can only say that I am completely disgusted that millions of dollars have been wasted by the NSW Govt to come up with a plan that provides for 65 Metre high towers jammed together that will provide huge shadows, wind tunnels and little or no natural light on the surrounding precinct, even having adverse impact on the neighboring area of Glebe.

No consideration whatsoever has been given to the neighborhood character, heights of adjacent buildings or adequate public space.

The increase in traffic in Pymont will simply clog the surrounding roads with gridlock.

The proximity of these towers to the motorway will make them almost unlivable due to the noise and pollution.

Masses of reports written to appease planners and bureaucrats who have absolutely no clue about the requirements of the existing and future communities.

If the Govt cannot arrive at a sensible plan to rejuvenate the area then it should do nothing rather than squander this once in a lifetime opportunity.

There is also a degree of secrecy surrounding the sequestering of existing parkland for the re routing of the road behind the new fishmarket.

Send the planners out into the community to really find out what I wanted and, finally, get the City of Sydney involved in arriving at an acceptable plan.

What has been proposed now is completely and utterly unacceptable!!!!

167161

Metcalf

Pymont 2009

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

177006

Michie

Glebe, 2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed development at old Fish market site at Blackwattle Bay.

I walk along the Blackwattle Bay foreshore walk several times a week, both alone and with my young family. It is a beautiful site, one of my favourite in Sydney and a big part of why I want to live in Glebe. I fear that the proposed development will negatively impact the utility of the site for me, my family and thousands of others like me.

While I am not opposed to development in general, and understand the need to ensure a sustainable supply of housing in the area, the proposed towers are much too high. They are completely out of character with the rest of the region and I fear that the shading associated with high towers over the water will negatively impact the biodiversity in the foreshore waters.

During lockdown, my young daughters have taken to counting the number of puffer fish we can spot. We have observed that right next to the new fish markets site is a "hot spot" where more puffer fish can be seen. This space is likely to be shaded for a significant portion of the day if such tall buildings are allowed to proceed. We have also observed several other species of fish breeding in the area and are concerned that the shading could affect their breeding.

As well as significantly lower height limits for the apartment buildings, I would also like to call for more public green space to be integrated into the development.

Yours sincerely

Kathryn

161941

Mifsud

2009

I feel the height of some of the proposed buildings are too high for an area so close to the bay. Buildings should be tapered down as they get closer to the water line. The Pymont area is already highly densely populated and more open areas are required to relieve the claustrophobic feel.

164611

Millar

Glebe

Dear Mr McDonald,

thank you for the opportunity to make a submission regarding the Blackwattle Bay development.

My name is Andrew Millar and I live at 10 Forsyth Street, Glebe

I object to this proposal on the following grounds;

Building height/visual impact. Whilst I applaud the initiative overall, what makes living where we do so pleasant is the visual connection to the city and beyond. By building such tall towers right on the foreshore it blocks that connection and the impact on the waterfront detracts from the intent of the department, which is to provide design excellence. Design excellence is sympathetic to the site and its surrounds, it does not impose itself upon them.

Open space, not just for locals but for the residents of the development. I don't see how living in this development, at current heights, would provide a pleasant amenity for the residents, witness the residential blocks in Pyrmont where there is insufficient green space, just waterfront walkways, this does not lend itself to the local environment unless Wentworth Park is improved upon significantly.

Environmental impact on new fish market - now I admit that I am responding here to the newspaper reports but I cannot understand how this design is 'excellent' if it blocks sunlight to solar panels which are a part of the same overall development plan!

A more appropriate height for this development would be similar to the Nova FM building, maybe a bit higher, which is located on the other side of the elevated roadway.

I wish you all the best in developing an appropriate design which benefits all of the community and responds to the locale environment.

Sincerely

Andrew Millar

162586

Miller

2009

I have reviewed the State Significant Precinct Study and disagree with the findings and recommendations in relation to the proposed maximum building heights.

The proposed planning has little regard for the surrounding developments and existing urban context, and positions overly bulky and tall building forms in close proximity to the harbour's edge.

This approach provides little equity for the suburb, minimising access to water views and light at the waters edge, seemingly in favour of maximising profits for developers. Development elsewhere in the city such as the eastern side of Darling Harbour has, in my view, been successful where buildings are relatively low immediately adjacent to the water and then gradually increase in height away from the water's edge. Conversely, other areas of the city where large buildings are immediately adjacent to the water, such as Barangaroo, are heavily over shadowed and windy, and much less successful as public spaces.

I would be supportive of the development of the building heights stepped down to the water's edge, similar to the heights nominated in the original SLEP 2012, which included buildings of an appropriate height and scale which are sympathetic and consistent with the surrounding suburb, site context, and provides a fairer share of access to water views and light to all residents and visitors.

The city only gets to have one go at developing this site, and it's my view that the proposed heights of the developments, particularly in Areas 2 & 3, are excessive, and will be detrimental to the character and success of this area and the wider suburb.

181686

Mitchell

2037

I feel that what is being proposed is not the best use of the space and won't enhance what could be a beautiful precinct. The buildings will be too high and are not in keeping with the surrounding suburb and there is not enough green space. The foreshore should be a priority and should be beautiful and a much larger space.



168366

Mizzi

2009

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of Pymont, I believe that what makes this suburb so special is it's community feel and wide open spaces.

This development is in direct opposition to what makes Pymont an amazing suburb. Let alone the monstrous height of the buildings, they are also not designed with any community needs in mind. They will encourage more traffic congestion, less open spaces, and block the views we currently enjoy.

There is widespread condemnation for these buildings by residents, who agree that they add no value to community whatsoever.

Please reconsider allowing this development to move forward.

Best,

Monica Mizzi

181046

Moffat

2050

I would like to thank the Infrastructure NSW team for their communication and inclusion in the development of this Precinct Plan. I have been fortunate to be a member of the Blackwattle Bay Community Reference Group and can appreciate the hard work that went into the document. I am a member of Pacific Dragons Dragon Boat and Outrigger Canoe Club. Pacific Dragons is an affiliate founding member club of Dragon Boats NSW (DBNSW) and is also an affiliate member of Australian Outrigger Canoe Racing Association (AOCRA) and Paddle NSW.

Like Pacific Dragons, I support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and I am strongly advocating for a permanent home for the sport and recreational activity of Dragon Boating within the Bank Street Open Space and bay area.

I envisage this space to be critical to the recreational water sport community. My club also facilitates outrigger canoeing and other water sports for our local community. There is little to no space in inner Sydney or on Sydney Harbour for clubs such as ours to safely store all of our canoes and easily launch into the water. Opportunities for storage of single watercrafts both club owned and private are hard to come by.

The NSW Government now has the opportunity to have a world class water sports hub on the famous and iconic Sydney Harbour that is available for the whole community.

#### Importance of Bank Street:

The site of 1-3 Bank Street has been the home of some of DBNSW's Premier Clubs along with the State and National Teams for nearly 20-years. Pacific Dragons have over 100 members who use the Bank St site for Dragon Boating three times a week at club sessions. Our members also represent Dragon Boating at a State and National level, training at the site for those purposes regularly. Pacific Dragons also have outrigger canoes that utilise the Bays precinct from Glebe Foreshore three to four times a week. Currently Pacific Dragons have many six man canoes that do not have a permanent, safe and secure home.

I would support this opportunity for DBNSW and other water sport clubs to have a permanent home, where boats can be stored safely and close to easy, accessible launching facilities. Additionally, simple amenities such as change rooms, showers and toilets that can be used by the community.

#### Positive Outcomes from the SSP:

â€¢ I see the proposed safe and secure undercover storage location for Dragon Boats and other paddling sports as outlined in the study as a positive result for the redesign of the Bank Street Open Space. I am a strong supporter of this initiative and believe the proposed location and design scope is fitting to for the needs for DBNSW and their members, and the whole community.

â€¢ I am extremely encouraged by the potential opportunities to utilise the existing buildings at 1-3 Bank Street as a potential home for Dragon Boating and other community water-based activities or organisations. Given the close proximity to the water, we believe the redesign of 1-3 Bank Street should be a multi-use space and include storage for equipment as well as toilets, change rooms and showers. I would welcome the opportunity for this location to be a club house and permanent home for DBNSW.

â€¢ The topography of the entire site and location on the harbour provides a fantastic opportunity to ensure water sports on Sydney Harbour are accessible to those of all mobilities in the community. Of note, access to the launch ramp from the proposed boat storage facilities ensures safe and easy access to the water which is a critical win from the study.

#### SSP Omissions:

â€¢ While I understand the position the study has taken regarding parking, we ask the NSW Government to re-look at the needs for the area and allow for suitable parking to the area for vehicles, especially with regard to accessing the Bank Street Open Space. I would also welcome the inclusion of secure bicycle, scooter and motorcycle parking.

â€¢ Loading/unloading areas must be incorporated into the design of the Bank Street Open Space to allow for large and long vehicles to access the storage area for Dragon Boats to ensure safe loading and unloading of boats and equipment.

â€¢ The study does not appropriately address the need for adequate lighting or security to the area for users who use the area outside of daylight hours. This is particularly important as paddling, Dragon Boating or other, is predominately outside of daylight hours in winter.

â€¢ The relocation of the 15 DBNSW clubs during construction has not been addressed or discussed.

I believe the housing of Dragon Boating and other water sports is complimentary to the vision of the development as it is a sport and recreational activity that has the ability to offer an extraordinary opportunity to reconnect the harbour, its surrounding neighbourhoods, and the city.

It is important to ensure that the end product is user friendly and meets the needs of all of the community. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity for the NSW Government to make a significant contribution to the Blackwattle Bay and Inner Sydney community.

Thank you for your time.

182701

Moffat

Ersleville 2043

I have lived in Sydney for most of my life, which includes primary school, high school, further education & training & employment, marriage, & volunteering. My children were all born in Sydney, attended primary schools, high school & further education, all in Sydney. Lets just say we have a strong connection to this city we call home.

I oppose the plans our state government has presented for the redevelopment of the fishmarket site on Blackwattle Bay. The is truly a proposal to overdevelop a site that to me looks like there is focus on apartment towers for maximum developer profits? And so ugly. Surely in an area already densely populated we could shift focus from huge towers (like those built in place of our Enterertainment Centre, like those built at Barangaroo...please, they do not enhance our harbour foreshores), and yet government is proposing to continue with intense development on our beautiful harbour foreshores here at the fishmarket site. I would love to see a harbour foreshore enhancement here at Blackwatter Bay. The proposed development here is not compatible with the existing character of the area. The bulk and scale is excessive, and will create overshadowing plus wind tunnels. Loss of sunlight and wind tunnels are not a comfortable environment, and lets say the create a depressing environment. The development proposal should includelandscaping, trees and grasses native to the Sydney Basin area, to attract wildlife providing habitat and resources for many varieties of our native wildlife. 5% requirement for affordable housing is mean and inadequate, this percentage should be raised to at least 33%. The development proposal should include Wentworth Park and Glebe Island bridge being returned to the public, for public use. This development should secure for us all an adequate and majestic foreshore area, continuous, with public facilities and cultural acknowledgement. The slivers of pathways that are being proposed along the water foreshore are embarassingly inadequate. Please stop embarassing us Sydneysiders with these awful intense developments that are taking away from us everything we should be included in, to enjoy, for the future.

This submission is from myself and on behalf of my family.

170411

Mok

2009

We have this once in a lifetime opportunity to give our public precious waterfront foreshore available to everyone. Why can't pyrmont have the same facility as Hyde park where the public land is spacious for many people to enjoy centuries to come. Can the plans in all honesty say there is enough open space land for picnics trees people etc. the fish market plan is just amazing and will provide shops for everything to enjoy. I understand government needs to finance the fish markets but that comes at a huge cost to the public by filling it up with high rise buildings.

If money is needed why not use the space that will be created in the middle of Wentworth park when the greyhound racetrack will be removed. What an inheritance for the future of sydney to have a huge public space walking distance from the city for all our visitors. The population for our visitors can only increase.

The area under the Anzac bridge overpass can be windy and lack sun and as lovely as the park area looks in your plans it is not enticing to visit during our colder months

Please give serious consideration to not having apartments on this precious foreshore. When I walk to Barangaroo it is filled with buildings and restaurants and concrete pathways and so little space for adults and children to play kick a ball and cycle their bikes. The backstreets of Barangaroo are shaded with unattractive high rise and considering this land and the land in pyrmont was owned by the Gadigal people where there was plenty of room to enjoy the open space away from cars.

165746

Monk

Pymont 2009

I object to the development planned for Blackwattle Bay.

My objection is based on the bulk and density of the proposal.

High rise building, up to 45 floors high, are completely out of character for the area and with some 1550 apartments bringing in approximately 2,800 additional residents to the area will create traffic chaos and over population of the village of Pymont.

I overlook the Blackwattle Bay Marina, which I objected to when it was relocated from the new Fish Market site. We were advised then that with the provision of limited parking (4 spots) Marina staff would use alternative forms of transport (walk, cycle, public transport etc) and parking would not be an issue - just as DPIE are advocating for this development. The Marina, now completed, has proven to be the opposite. The Marina site is nearly always full of vehicles parking anywhere they can fit and overflowing onto Bank Street. There is little evidence of staff using alternative forms of transport.

To advocate the same philosophy for this huge development, which will likely bring an additional 2,000 cars into the area is a complete disaster. Parking all around the area will be highly sought after, bringing further congestion and traffic chaos. To brush this aspect of the affects of the provision of limited parking for the residents is a travesty.

The sheer bulk of high rise buildings of up to 45 floors built right up against the Western Distributor Freeway will present an Architectural nightmare which Pymont can do without. The buildings are out of character for the area and will be a blight on the landscape for years to come.

174616

Mookhey

2037

No one living here wants the high rise towers blocking the view and creating shade! Itâ€™s a terrible plan

181956

Mookhey

2037

The excessive bulk and scale proposed will lead to more traffic, overshadowing and wind tunnels, with residents in massive apartment towers exposed to the damaging health effects of noise and air pollution.



165051

Moore

2009

I'm a local resident at Wattle Cres and will keep it brief.

- no permanent ferry wharf is an oversight
- the transport strategy does not seem to take into account the detailed traffic movements associated with changes in car movements with the new Fish Market and inter-connections with Western Distributor (which it notes is already congested at the Pymont on- / off-ramps)
- the scale of the buildings in Area 3 are clearly disproportionate with respect to buildings in the immediate area. And almost anywhere else on the peninsula
- it surprises me that, for whatever level of public consultation there has been, that this has been deemed by the study team and Planning to be an appropriate development (specifically Area 3)
- it concerns me that, as a practitioner in the built environment, that this is the level of information that has been provided to the public for comment with a total of less than 3 weeks to respond. The vast majority of stakeholders (i.e. the public) have no understanding of the majority of this information and do not have access to the resources to be able to make sense of it all. The cynic in me says that this volume of information has been provided to overwhelm people and / or stifle argument by being able to say 'we've done our due diligence'
- overall I am supportive of the proposals but seriously think that Area 3 needs to be significantly reduced in height

160906

Moreno

2010

Every decision is for the developers rather than the citizens.

Open space and proportionate housing for the many displaced by the sales of Waterloo and Millerâ€™s Point.

No more large towers for millionaires.

As a resident of City of Sydney, I strongly object to more of our foreshore given to developers.

182131

Morgan-Clarke

2060

I spend much of my youth around black wattle bay and I am horrified by this proposal.

Why build high rise right up to the waters edge.

Sydney harbors public access to it is critical for this city.

Please do not build these hideous building and ruin a peaceful beautiful part of our city.

168596

Moult

2009

Hi

I live in Jacksons Landing, where there are quite a few towers of 19 floors or so. Let me tell you what happens when there is a fire drill or real fire. Most people do not come out. These are only 19 floors high.

I understand that you are proposing 45 floors. In my book, one day there will be a fire and you are condemning a few people to death. I am not trying to be funny, come and stand round the corner when a fire alarm rings and count how many come out.

Secondly, lots do break and often. Most of our towers have two lifts, you would need four or more. These get hot, the world is getting warmer, they break and people get stuck up there.

There are many more things like the already congested area around the Fish Market that this will make worse, how such huge towers will detract from the area, but for now I am only talking about the size of them.

So, please stop, think less about your back pocket, and more about safety and the environment and the people who will live in it.

Regards

Patrick

182076

Moxey

2484

These plans are obscene, a complete block out of the foreshore!

Again for the rich in towers

168086

Muirhead

Balmain 2041

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

167481

Muntoni

PYRMONT (NSW - 2009)

As a resident of Pyrmont, Miller Street, I strongly oppose the plans as currently laid out in Attachment 10: Explanation of Intended Effect.

A) I do not oppose the redevelopment of the fish market (Area 4) and the preservation of Area 3 as a government owned waterside park.

B) I strongly oppose limiting the open/public space to what is labeled as "area 1" while designing "area 2" as privately owned land. This is a clear move to privatize the best area of the harbor foreshore for very little public benefit, as area 1 is far less desirable for public amenity and recreation and is partly overshadowed by the ANZAC bridge.

C) I strongly oppose the proposal to include Blackwattle Bay as a "major event site" to facilitate the holding of events in the public domain.

This would create substantial noise and pollution in a residential area, as we have recently experienced with ruthless entertainment on party boats during the night. This would be in addition to the noise and pollution already created by the White Bay docking terminal and by the designation of Glebe Island to a cement manufacturing and ship docking facility to unload construction materials. It would permanently ruin a once very appealing and tranquil suburb.

D) I strongly oppose the proposal to amend the maximum height and floor space control.

1) Allowing towers along the harbour to reach heights equivalent to 45 storeys would create a substantial problem of overshadowing in the foreshore, an area that should be utilized by the public for leisure and recreation activities.

2) Creating over 1500 dwellings would cause enormous congestion in a suburb that has already one of the highest population densities in Australia.

Thank you for considering my submission

173616

Murphy

MALABAR

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

Lack of wholistic town planning

In any waterfront city it makes sense to have the tall buildings in the centre and low-rise buildings on the foreshore. Otherwise, a high-rise wall is created along the foreshore, disconnecting the city and the majority of people from the waterfront.

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.



The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

#### Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

#### Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Nicholas Murphy

MALABAR, 2036

183191

Mussi

Ultimo

I would like to object the current project. The planned towers up to 45 storeys will monster the foreshore, cast shadows on the solar panels of the new Fish Market and limit public access to Blackwattle Bay.

161446

Neal

2007

I think that the apartments shouldn't be higher than 20 stories and there should be more parkland for all of the people in the apartments to use. Also, what about the increase in traffic? The infrastructure needs to be in place to support this many people. Additionally, with all of the recent problems with new apartments, how will the government make sure people aren't buying apartments that soon fall apart? This certainly doesn't resemble the plan I voted for. Most importantly, how will you ensure that it doesn't become a giant short term accommodation complex and how much is affordable housing.

181191

Neill

CAMPERDOWN 2050

I believe the ENTIRE foreshore should be FULLY accessible to the public 24/7 & that most particularly, it should have dedicated cycleways.

I believe the residential towers are too high (dreadful shadowing inevitable )& the overall density too great -- the scheme seems to hugely favour private enterprise over public access/usage ..& lets not forget it is largely PUBLIC LANDS were talking about here..

I dont believe there has been enough (any?) serious consideration given to the WATERWAY TRAFFIC traffic likely to be generated following the planned changes.

eg what about the existing Rowing Club's basic needs being enshrined? >> & simple individual passive boating recreation also being mentioned & even encouraged to be developed?!

# PUBLIC TRANSPORT: Its clear that there's NO consideration to extend/improve public transport to the re-located Fish Market....it isnt really convenient to get to the existing fish market right now ..it will be manifestly MORE INCONVENIENT in its new position..how can a major infrastructure move like this be seriously promoted BY THE STATE GOVT ..& that same body pretend it doesn't have the planning responsibility to INSIST that public transport be essential to the planning process.. as is almost always the case ..its most often an AFTERTHOUGHT ..if truly addressed at all!

181361

nevell

kensington

Densely populated towers shadowing the whole of blackwattle bay are going to mark pyrmont and the fishmarkets as a place to avoid. With the right plan Pyrmont could become a new foreshore hub that adds to Sydney's public spaces.

The current plan looks terrible and blatantly sets to benefit property developers and nobody else.

160881

Newey

Surry Hills 2010

I am writing to show my support for the plans for the Blackwattle Bay precinct. Though I am not a technical planner and many of the reports go above my head, I am someone that is trying to buy my first property and I am excited by the opportunity that Blackwattle offers. I believe these submissions need to consider a balanced view from a range of people in the community and those that will benefit from projects like this - like the future residence.

I do get dismayed at the strong opposition that this precinct is receiving, by people who are purely campaigning for their own personal advantage. Groups like "Hands off Glebe" who are only interested in maintaining their city views, not diluting the local housing supply to maintain their investments or are people who just don't like change.

For me this site is a no-brainer - A primarily industrial site on prime land, already in a high-density zone of Pyrmont, next to a future metro site and a much improved access to public space. I can not think of a better site for higher density towers than this. These sites are becoming rarer in the inner city and we need to maximise the benefit for the whole community - not to maintain the benefit of those who already live there or have attachment to nostalgia.

I would highly annoyed if these campaigners got their way and we put single story housing on this site - even these people would think thats too much.

182486

Nissen

south yarra

I am in support this development.

I do not understand the overly emotive anti-development agenda.

This terribly underutilized urban renewal precinct, right on the edge of the CBD and surrounded by infrastructure, is ideal for major development, in fact I believe the buildings should be taller given there are no real sun access plane issues.

Take a look at what is being developed in Southbank and Fishermans Bend, in Melbourne for urban renewal inspiration.



168306

Norman

2000

This is not what Pyrmont is about. Architecture is full and dated. Obliterates our skyline views. Will create more traffic. We say no.

182816

North

2010

This is an appalling attempt at responsible, sustainable and intelligent development!

Development in this area should be sensitive to existing character and promote job growth, not just squeeze as many people as possible between the Fish Market and free-flowing highway traffic. Whatâ€™s proposed is a disgusting eyesore.

The excessive bulk and scale proposed will lead to more traffic, overshadowing and wind tunnels, with too many residents in massive apartment towers. Iâ€™ve seen whatâ€™s happened in and around Green Square / Alexandria and itâ€™s abominable.

Whatâ€™s proposed will mean less natural light and adverse wind impacts that will make uncomfortable and unsafe public spaces, and losing access to sunlight makes it hard to grow trees and grass.

Development should include Wentworth Park and Glebe Island Bridge being returned to public use â€” developers should make contributions to upgrade local community and recreational facilities.

Development here should secure a world class foreshore walk, public parks and places and cultural facilities â€” not a sliver of a path between apartment lobbies and the water.

Rethink this appalling proposal!!

174116

Oâ€™Malley

2016

This proposal will increase maritime traffic on the Bays such as ferries, private and public pleasure boats, and trawlers. The Government’s own report recommends the creation of a maritime traffic management plan to manage this growth “ but there is no plan for that in this proposal.

The Government must put safety first and commit to a comprehensive and enduring maritime traffic management plan for The Bays.

— HAVE YOU HAD YOUR SAY ON THE BLACKWATTLE BAY PLAN? —

You can help by making a submission at the link below:

<https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/blackwattlebay>

Making a submission is easy, it only take two minutes and it's one of the only opportunities we will have to have our say. If you haven't written a submission before, we have drafted one you can use and copied it below.

DRAFT SUBMISSION TO THE DEPARTMENT

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support

Thank you

161081

ODonnell

2038

This is such a despicable plan by nsw government of overwhelming magnitude

The height of the proposed buildings are totally unacceptable

Blackwattle foreshore belongs to the people of nsw not the greedy, capitalist developers, state government planners or a wealthy few

165646

O'Donnell

2038

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

Decrease the height & number of apartments been proposed

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

178846

O'Malley

Sydney 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

For goodness' sake, change the plan to something humane and environmentally sound! You are destroying an amazing opportunity to have more green space and public access to the foreshore. Nobody who lives anywhere near this area is in favour of it. It will be disastrous for local communities and turn Blackwattle Bay into a ghastly replica of Darling Harbour. This is such a foolish political move, as well as absolutely damaging to the local area.

Do something for the future, not just for a money-grubbing present. Show some integrity and vision!

Yours sincerely,

Maureen O'Malley

Sydney, 2037

174926

Ong

2010

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.



182611

Orr

2009

The heights of the proposed towers on Blackwater Bay are too high and intrusive. There would need to be different heights in the 8 buildings to achieve any degree of harmony in the precinct. It is evident that the view from Glebe over the Bay will be to another CBD and the link to the city will be destroyed.

The tower heights are neither in harmony to the new Fish Market nor to the existing buildings on Bank Street.

The development is clearly overkill in providing many more Apartments and offices than can be accommodated on such a site.

181516

Parkin

Hornsby 2077

Sydney needs more green public open space foreshore NOT LESS. It's what gives Sydney its tourist appeal. It's what enables Sydneysiders to engage with its history and understand and appreciate the geography of our drowned river valley. No Government has the right to hand over, sell or lease these lands to commercial interests. Blackwattle Bay is and will forever be indigenous lands! Blackwattle Bay should not be a political football. Please return it to the community.

168526

Parkins

2038

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

181976

Parkins

Annandale

Please don't consider this proposed development. The height proposed will wall off the city from the water & create a narrow canyon of public access, which will serve no one except the views of the apartment owners.

168951

Paton

PYRMONT (NSW)

I object to the skyscrapers being built in an already densely populated area. Something more in keeping with the vibrancy and lifestyle of Pyrmont village is ideal.

170586

Patten

Lilyfield

I have the following serious concerns about the planned redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay -

1. The extremely tall 45 storey heights to be allowed on the former Fishmarket site will overshadow neighbouring suburbs and the solar panels at the new Fishmarket site. They will make the skyline visually ugly and dominate over the glorious view we have now of the Anzac Bridge.

2. The provision proposed to make monetary contribution instead of providing affordable housing space according the Sydney LEP should not be allowed. one of the effects in the Intended Effects document is to provide homes near jobs and housing. If this effect is to be put into action, it should not be limited to homes for only those who can afford higher priced housing. To effectively price lower income persons out of the area is unethical, undemocratic and severely limits the growth of community spirit in the area.

3. Special provisions should be made to protect and allow the existing cat colonies in the redevelopment area to live out their lives without fear and cruelty. All the colonies in the area are now desexed and healthy due to the work of dedicated charities and volunteers. Since the cats were initially neglected and abandoned there by people we should make good that neglect by providing shelter, access to fresh water and safe areas.

4. From the planned diagrams the waterfront promenade is limited in width and needs to be increased. This is extremely important as it will be shared access with pedestrians and cyclists and increased number of residents. In the future we will be living with Covid and we need to be thinking pro actively about social distancing provisions for the area.

Yours sincerely

Joelle Patten

165011

Pearce

Pymont

In my opinion the redevelopment on the fish market has completely missed the point. What the local community needs is more open spaces not more high density apartments. I think the maximum height of any development should not exceed 4 stories high.

183196

Pelizzari

Ultimo

I would like to object the current project. The planned towers up to 45 storeys will monster the foreshore, cast shadows on the solar panels of the new Fish Market and limit public access to Blackwattle Bay.



178831

Peterson

Rozelle, 2039

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

Dear Sirs,

I've never voted for the Greens but in this case, Jamie Parker's comments represent the voice of the reasonable resident including me.

It appears the prime motivation of the development is not to build a new Fish Market (though this is to be welcomed as the current one has been unimpressive and the outdoor tables matted in bird droppings for many years) but to build as many new units as possible.

Sadly, we know what most of the units will be too - mainly complete rubbish, probably riddled with defects and of much lower value than the sale price in about 8 years time.

The green space under the existing Anzac Bridge / Highway is very unenticing - I often walk the bridge now and even if it was landscaped, it's not a great place to hangout.

So really I have two things to say:

- I endorse Jamie's comments below.

- PLEASE TRY and have some ambition beyond profit for this area - same as with the Bays precinct, you have a chance to build something spectacular. Let's not review this in 10 years time and say "you did such an average / averagely-bad job". Good luck.

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market

development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

#### Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

#### Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Julian Peterson

Rozelle, 2039

164366

Pippen

Pymont 2009

I wish to make a submission against the proposed Blackwattle Bay development.

Below in point form are the reasons for my objection:

â€¢ There is insufficient infrastructure to support the existing population of Jacksonâ€™s Landing, never mind the proposed development. Bank street already has traffic congestion problems. To turn from Pymont bridge Rd onto Bank Street and continue to Bowman St one must get through three sets of traffic lights in the space of 200 metres which are not sequenced. Even late at night when the fish markets are closed it takes up to 8mins to get through these three sets of lights. This is not due to the automation of the pedestrian lights for covid safety, rather this has been an issue for the 12 years that I have lived in this area.

â€¢ The proposal suggests that 5600 jobs will be created. Considering the demographics and age of the population in this area most of these jobs will be for people living outside of this area. In this case these people will require public transport into the area as there is no public parking. The public transport (pre-Covid) was already full in peak times. Bus Route 389: By the fourth stop after departure from the Maritime Museum, buses were regularly driving past unable to pick up more passengers due to congestion on the bus. The bus timetable was unreliable with buses not arriving when scheduled on a regular basis and post Easter 2021 the new schedule is untimed, presumably because the exiting timetable was unable to be met.

â€¢ The light rail is regularly congested as it also services The Star casino which has a large number of visitors in addition to commuters.

â€¢ Cadi Park and Pirrama Park which have BBQ facilities are already at full capacity on weekends from both locals and visitors to the area.

â€¢ Playground areas for children are already extremely busy and at capacity on the weekends. With up to the proposed extra 2800 residents the facilities will be overrun.

â€¢ I would like to know on what demographics are you making estimates of 2800 residents living in 1550 dwellings. This estimation is less than two people per residence which seems extremely unlikely given the cost of rents and housing in Sydney. A one-bedroom apartment is likely to have at least 2 people living in it. I think the number of â€œproposedâ€ residents is grossly underestimated.

â€¢ Whilst the proposal allows for 30,000 square metres of public space by the time you count existing residents, new residents, workers to the area and the visitors that the Fish markets and new retail will attract, this is insufficient public space. Has the proposal considered shading of said â€œpublic spaceâ€ from 45 storey buildings? In winter there is nothing nicer than sitting in the sun, but unless the public space and all playgrounds and green space are unshaded in winter, the space will be wasted and planners and public officials unforgiven.

â€¢ The Fish Markets attracts a lot of visitors now (especially pre-covid with international visitors). On weekends it is extremely busy and during periods such as Christmas and Easter the crowds become so large that the police force is required to put on extra resources in order to deal with the congestion of both people and traffic. Any local resident knows to avoid Bank Street and Pyrmont Bridge Rd as much as possible on weekends or public holiday events. This will become an even bigger problem with such a large development.

â€¢ Public planners seem convinced that inner city residents embrace public transport, so shovelling thousands of additional people vertically into a few hundred square metres of land space generates no additional traffic as those residents either walk, ride bicycles, or use public transport. As a resident of a multiple storey apartment building, I can assure you that people still drive cars, and most 2 adult households both drive. Public transport to the city is accessible, but getting anywhere else is problematic, and reliance on motor vehicles is significantly higher than planners seem to account for. No planner that lives in Jackson's Landing and deals with existing levels of congestion could support this proposal. On a weekend it can take an hour to drive from Jackson's Landing to Broadway Shopping Centre, less than 2km away. It is totally naïve to suggest that creating an attraction of the new fish market will not increase the existing congestion.

â€¢ With the advent of Covid it has become evident that public space is extremely important for people living in apartments. The only place they can "escape" is outside into open green space. This green space has become a requirement for people's mental and physical health. Especially with the closure of gyms and indoor sporting centres.

â€¢ How can we have confidence that a 45-storey building in Pyrmont will not have the same or more problems than those with building defects in Concord and Mascot? Frankly, the public has lost confidence in the building regulation ability of successive NSW Governments and its authorities and there is zero accountability of regulators or builders for failures.

â€¢ How can we as residents have confidence in the development approval process after the scandal exposed in the Barangaroo project? Waterfront public space was stolen from the public and handed to the developer and building heights which were increased after the proposal was approved at lower heights. As a member of the public and rate payer to the Council of the City of Sydney I hold little confidence that my voice holds any sway against the vested interests of both Council and a cashed-up developer.

â€¢ As a resident I chose to live in Pyrmont because it was a quiet community with outdoor green space, I do not wish to live in a high-rise ghetto style location.

â€¢ This Blackwattle Bay development proposal is in addition to other proposed future developments to The Star, consisting of a 65-storey building. Pyrmont is a community and not the CBD. However, the elected members of council continue to ignore residents' voices.

161111

Plant

Glebe 2037

Too much concrete, not enough green space, it will bake in the summer like Darling Harbour.

The towers are far too high and should be low rise.

If any social housing is going to be affected it must be protected within the suburb.

179081

Poczynek

2037

It is common knowledge in the building trade that the overdevelopment of the Blackwattle Bay area has already resulted in sewer being let into the stormwater which flows into Blackwattle Bay. The planned over development of the area will only exacerbate the already danerous problems which much of the public is ignorate of .

163636

Poetschka

Newtown

An appalling misuse of public land.



167346

Poulos

Glebe 2037

I'm appalled by the lack of public infrastructure planning to make such a development feasible. The light rail is already fully packed out, and there are no extra bus services or so on planned to make this work.

Not only that, the shadows these buildings would cast would reduce quality of life in Glebe and Pyrmont areas. I really enjoy this part of Sydney and seeing these extremely poor obvious developer-lead projects (they're clearly not made with the public in mind) makes my blood boil.

Stop catering to the developers, start making intelligent planning choices that will allow people to easily move in and out of the city without increasing congestion on our already over-taxed roads.

Start catering to the constituents rather than your donors. It's disgusting and a huge waste of taxpayer land and money.

163396

Prasad

2038

The development proposed at this site is unsustainable. The surrounding area does not have sufficient infrastructure to support apartment towers of this size. Already the area has been placed under strain by the Harold Park development. At the very least, in the interest of transparency, the NSW government should extend the Public Exhibition Period for this project so that the public has time to respond to this proposal.

174146

Prelipcean

2009

It would be awesome if we can include a Harbourside pool

181751

Prendergast

2050

To the planners.

I have several concerns around the over development at this site.

The excessive bulk and scale proposed will lead to more traffic, overshadowing and wind tunnels, with residents in massive apartment towers exposed to the damaging health effects of noise and air pollution.

The requirement for 5% affordable housing is inadequate “ it should be at least 25%.

Development should include Wentworth Park and Glebe Island Bridge being returned to public use “ developers should make contributions to upgrade local community and recreational facilities.

Development here should secure a world class foreshore walk, public parks and places and cultural facilities “ not a sliver of a path between apartment lobbies and the water.

Thank you

Gavin Prendergast

172681

Preston

redfern 2016

Hi,

I broadly approve of the plan to provide a great new urban domain in the location, and agree the Balanced option marries a variety of interests and probably will make for a more interesting location overall.

I raise a strong objection however the height of the three towers - identified in Att 10: Explanation of Intended Effect as buildings 2, 3 and 4. In other studies I note these towers are requirement to occupy at most 50% of the available footprint area. Where that figure comes from I do not know - but it does mean the creation of 50% of shadowing across the entire public domain that so much time and resources are going in to create. This is a profoundly poor outcome.

The documentation does not spell out why there is a need for towers of this scale. The proposal simply seems to assume ....because it can? If it is an economic consideration then say so - and give community stakeholders the option for less development and lesser massing. Or an option for lesser height, higher premium.

As it stands I find the inclusion of the three towers, positioned as they are at the north east of the overall site will have a profoundly negative effect due to their imposing scale and overshadowing.

Yours Sincerely,

Lynette Preston

163246

Purcell

Camperdown

Hi there,

I don't believe this development includes enough public space, or services the public needs, and instead puts property development and big buildings in an area that could well be renewed for greater public benefit.

With the new Fish Market, this area could have wonderful public use like Darling Harbours new precinct around ICC.

Please consider additional public use one and amenity to enjoy for families, rather than big tall towers.

On account of the COVID lockdown also, and attention just surviving everyday life, this submission window should be extended into October and not rushed through.

Thankyou, James

178826

Pythagoras

Glebe, 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

Obviously the site needs renewal following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets however the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Xanthi Pythagoras

Glebe, 2037



165336

Quek

2009

The buildings planned for the Blackwattle Bay are too high. The buildings are too close to the water's edge & their heights are incongruous to the surrounds. It will block natural light & current buildings will constantly be in their shadow. This is not only unhealthy & unfair for current residents in surrounding buildings but it will create an eyesore. In addition wind tunnels will result between the high buildings making it hazardous & most unpleasant to stroll through. The precinct is meant to be a work/play environment but having so many tall buildings in such a small area by the waterfront will defeat the entire purpose of making this a liveable area that maximises the potential of the wonderful location. I am totally against the current proposed heights of the buildings.

181721

Randerson

Forest Lodge

I object to this proposal for the following reasons:

As Sydney is in Lockdown and we lurch through a health and climate crisis, it is very disappointing that these pre- Covid designs for Blackwattle Bay are being seriously considered for a future build.

As I write there are 1,049 properties for rent in Pyrmont (SMH Domain) and the city has undergone significant change since these plans were drawn up.

Immigration and tourism levels along with overseas student numbers have plummeted and are unlikely to reach pre-Covid levels in the foreseeable future. Funding for nearby universities has been reduced.

What Blackwattle Bay needs is a plan for the future, not this plan from the past.

Harbour Precincts should not be considered in this ad hoc manner but as part of an overall plan that takes into account changed conditions, These include the clearly demonstrated need for more recreational space in the city, where ventilation and air-flow are paramount requirements for any new buildings.

The proposed apartment blocks are a massive overdevelopment for this small piece of public harbourside land.

The buildings are too tall, will create unpleasant wind tunnels and will overshadow and detract from the new FishMarket building on the adjacent site.

There is inadequate provision for public housing.

There is no vision to this proposal. It lacks Indigenous perspectives that consider how the project would impact the land and harbour

The proposed harbourside walk is too narrow for different users of the site and does not separate pedestrians from cyclists.

The proposal prioritises apartment building construction jobs over other employment opportunities which should be considered for the site eg imaginative landscaping, public recreation, outdoor dining, children's play areas and the arts.

Environmental considerations have not been forefront in the design. The ratio of concrete to new vegetation on the site is woeful

To achieve a better outcome, the City of Sydney Council's "Green Factor Score", as outlined in their Greening Sydney Strategy, should be adopted by the NSW Government planning authorities in the assessment of this project.

Yours sincerely

Helen Randerson



167886

Rapisarda

Saratoga 2251

Hello all, I own an apartment in The Mews, Cadigal Av, Pymont. I really enjoy Pymont as we often stay there. It is relatively quiet, considering the amount of people living there. However, crossing Bowman st at all times is difficult, the speed cars come from Bank st is excessive, while children and people with dogs try to get to the parks. Just imagine hundreds more cars using Bowman to get to Harris or Pirrama Road. I believe these new high story apartments are too high. Many people walk and enjoy the view over to Glebe from the cliff top walk near the Mews. Often residents are there in the evenings enjoying the breeze. That area has historical value and groups walk to explore. It's high elevation with views is contemplative. Will this view be lost? Is there a model on display? Could one be put in the community centre?

163306

Rayner

2037

Extend the deadline

We are not being given enough time to respond

The size of this development and lack of infrastructure is concerning

Also the height of these buildings and the overcrowding of current facilities is unknown

Shadowing across this total area is not in the interest of the community

180031

Re

Petersham

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

These towers are too high, bloated, and will have a very negative impact on the area. We need gentle density, and a maximum of 5 stories to keep the area warm alive and beautiful.

I would like to see a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace.

We should be planning bike paths and good pedestrian paths to encourage green transport. It is a short walk to the city CBD.

There should be a rule for parking maximums to discourage car use. There is a tram stop near.

There needs to be a maximum of green space here as well for people's well-being. The foreshore must be designed similar to the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore.

An allocation of 20% affordable housing must be included.

I urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

163271

Redman

Glebe 2037

Hi

As a local resident I am disappointed to see the development proposal that will put much of the surrounding area in shadow. The development proposal is far too large for the area. The proposal prioritises developer profit rather than being sensitive to the area and public space.

Warm regards

Anne

181726

Reed

Pymont 2009

I am very concerned about the scope and size of this project and the steps that will be used to limit the planning controls on projects such as this. My chief concerns are:

1. Excessive height of buildings, blocking out essential winter sunshine from existing residences. The wall of tall buildings also blocks out the view from the Glebe area foreshore.
2. Lack of open space. Covid has shown us the need for wider promenades. The current promenade near Glebe is already too narrow. Large open spaces are essential even for a development catering to half as many residents as this project.
3. Needs for new residents. These are residential towers. Where will the people go? Where will kids play? How do people push prams or wheelchairs on narrow promenades.?There is not enough open space for all these residents to enjoy the open air. Pirrama Park playground is already Sydney's busiest. Pymont is already a very densely populated area with limited park space.
4. Fish market plan is good, but why do the people of Pymont have to pay/ suffer the consequences for a development that benefits the whole state?
5. Parking/ traffic. Anzac Bridge is already terribly overloaded for many hours of the day. Where do fish market visitors park? Where are the facilities so many more public buses can pick up customers?
6. The "laneways". The back streets of Barangaroo do not function well because they are windy, dark, bleak. The ones in this development are possibly worse. Who would want to walk down these dark wind tunnels? Who would want to shop in them? Quite a Dickensian aspect of this plan.
7. Who benefits? How are these very significant financial benefits to be returned to the people of Pymont and Ultimo? New schools? New sportsfields? facilities for seniors? New library? Local gathering areas? Local cultural centres?
8. Lack of transparency and therefore loss of trust in government agencies can be a big detrimental effect of changes in the planning laws on projects such as this.

Pymont and Ultimo are residential areas and should still be treated as such.

The potential is there to make this a great project, a world class project, for the Blackwattle Bay area. A project that integrates well with the neighbourhood. We should not give up this opportunity so easily by creating such an isolating oversized development.



167821

Reeve

2042

I believe there is too much high density, and not enough public space

168286

Reyn

2039

The proposed height for the residential towers (45 storeys) is outrageous. It will completely dominate the whole area and is totally out of context. They will spoil the suburb, and also create overcrowding and unsustainable demands on local infrastructure including parks etc.

It would be much better to keep the concrete plant and the existing fish markets than to create this amount of hideous overdevelopment.

They should be reduced to a maximum height consistent with the other existing towers in the Pyrmont / Ultimo area (which are already pretty high).

161326

Ribbon

2037

I strongly oppose the development of high rise residential buildings that close to the Glebe foreshore which will dwarf the Anzac bridge, block the view of the city skyline and cast a shadow over Blackwattle bay which is currently enjoyed by many.

176246

Rice

2009

As a local residents we are pleased to see the new Fish Market Development which has been long needed.

This will leave an ideal space to do something equally exciting to beautify this important part of Sydney Harbour. What is suggested in this precinct study will certainly not provide this.

This is not an area to squeeze in a version of the CBD.

Of course there should be development but not of the enormous size proposed.

It is difficult to see how so many buildings and people in this small area could be seen to provide an attractive development or life style for residents.

In summary our main objections are:

1. Over -sized - 45 storey buildings will just create a huge wall on one side of this lovely Bay. A low level, stepped development would be more attractive , especially in comparison to the new Fish Market. Buildings should be no higher than the Anzac Bridge roadway & not dwarf this beautiful structure.
2. Density - 2800 residents in such a small area is unsustainable for the bay and environment and likely become a ghetto of the future.
3. Traffic - there are no constructive plans in the study on how traffic congestion will be controlled. A future metro will not be sufficient. We all know that most residents will have at least one car. This junction at the Fish Market/ Anzac Bridge is already one of the worst in Sydney. At present, traffic is backed up from early afternoon.
4. Public Recreational access - this area is already highly populated with a need for more open space and recreational facilities. This is an opportunity to provide community & sporting facilities such as a rowing course or swimming pool. A smaller building footprint would allow this.

To the local population and much of Sydney this looks like a ' developers dream plan' with little real consideration for life quality. Where is the planning imagination for an attractive & practical solution without the same old ' we must build tall towers' philosophy ?

It is imperative that this proposal is re-visited with serious social rather than monetary considerations and concern for maintaining our beautiful harbour foreshores, while providing a quality lifestyle for a sustainable population.

Sincerely

Susan Rice

182546

Rinaldi

Ultimo

lâ€™m concerned about overshadowing and how this area is already densely populated with limited public space

171191

Riordan

Ultimo

The current plans for the Blackwattle Bay site fail to take into account the needs of the current population and the imperative to keep this land for the public to enjoy, not building giant towers to cast shadows on and create windtunnels out of the foreshore. Additionally such a large development is out of character for the area and will put strain on existing transport, school, recreation etc facilities. Needs a rethink.

165991

Rissel

GLEBE

i don't mind increased density but 45 stories will create wind tunnels and shade all day in the area and look wildly out of place considering the surrounding buildings are 20 something stories.

very much behind the idea of fully connected public waterfront, just makes sense to preserve this (especially considering how well used it's been during covid). not sure the cycling connections have been fully thought out though and would appreciate more effort in this area, as a cyclist who finds the current connections dangerous and unsafe.



164656

Roberts

Pymont 2009

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

164636

Robotham

Avalon Beach

I have looked at the plans for Blackwattle Bay and believe the apartment height of the buildings on the bay are too high. They will block the sun and should be lower and set further back from the bay. I feel this has been developed to maximise profits for developers as there is very little social or affordable housing in the mix when the area is in dire need of facilities for low income people.

182191

Roden

2017

As someone who uses the Blackwattle Bay walk frequently, it would be a shame to have this portion of the city and it's communal spaces and sites dwarfed by a huge construction site.

Sydney's growth is continual and seemingly exponential, yet there is so much City of Sydney real estate under or un-used. It would be great to see the State Gov focus on better usage of current developments rather than thinking more and more construction is always the answer. We know exactly who profits from these developments.

167686

Rodger

Ultimo

Hello,

I have read the proposed submission from NSW government. So far I have read documentation on the visual impact, but I could not see anything on the solar plans. From the sketches of the visual diagrams provided, It seems that the buildings are oversized and bulky. They would cast a sizeable shadow across the Blackwattle bay in the morning and over shadow all the way down to Ultimo in the afternoon. This is quite alarming for local residents that live in the area.

My second concern is that the local traffic in a heavily used intersection is not discussed and by adding 1400 houses, that is a large population increase, housed right at an intersection that is already choked with traffic. The second impact is just across the Anzac bridge on the Rozelle side. If you live in the area, you cannot cross Anzac bridge from the city and exit toward Annandale (left two lanes on exit from Anzac bridge) without the said left two lanes choked with traffic. Already the queue of traffic just about any time of day of the left two lanes are always bumper to bumper and you are planning to house more people in the direct vicinity is negligent.

I am not against investment and development, but it should be the right mix, not over sized and driven by greed.

Regards,

Duncan

161071

Rodoreda

Ultimo, 2007

Submission re Blackwattle Bay redevelopment.

To those individually and so collectively concerned,

I believe the current plans are designed to make a small amount of people a large amount of money.

Please examine your conscience, step up to the plate and reconsider this development for the sake of our future and of the people who will live and work in this area.

If what we do is about financial gain and exploitation, what is the point of living?

I have faith that you can employ decency and integrity in your choices.

Thank you

Andy Rodoreda

0421970709

170016

Rodriguez

2009

Reduce the amount of residential units being proposed and ensure foreshore walking track connectivity across the entire foreshore.. i.e. no private buildings should take the foreshore area. leave space for public walkways.

181311

Ryan

Leichhardt 2040

I generally support the overall proposal, especially in light of the need for urban renewal to unlock the potential and improve the amenity of the Blackwattle Bay area. I am also supportive of improvements to active transport and public transport proposed as part of the SSP and more should be done if possible.

However, it is necessary to improve the amount of green space and trees provided as part of the project, and it is essential that the working commercial nature of the fish market remains a key focus of the project, rather than a mere tourist or retail base.

164721

Sabeha

Glebe

As a local Glebe resident I object to buildings sizes of 45 storeys being built at the Blackwattle Site.

The public plans placed on the website and described within your notification letter (dated 6th July 2021 and described as a public 'exhibition') do not show where you plan to build such towers nor do the plans talk about how you are going to ensure that the water is preserved and pollution is managed from thousands of new residents suddenly being housed in apartment style living.

The Blackwattle Site was named after beautiful Australian plants. Where are the public plans to plant thousands of new trees and invest in new parks? We only have a small amount of foreshore!



161406

Sammons

2009

While I welcome the redevelopment of the Bays Precinct I am concerned over the height being permitted for the residential towers on the government owned land. 45 floors is too high and out of proportion for the western side of the western distributor. There is also already highly congested roads around the access to the ANZAC Bridge. If the housing density is increased above the already high level as suggested without making adjustment to traffic flow into and out of the peninsula we will be living with permanent gridlock.

166441

Sanderson

Chippendale

There is way too much development of this area. It shouldnt have MORE apartments. This will destroy the area and its feel. The area already has lots of nice psrks. The waterfront area should be turned into public space to enjoy only

168081

Saunders

Potts Point 2011

I oppose the proposed sky rise development in place of the fish market as it will cause excessive shadowing of the area and will add nothing to the existing community. This is a reckless use of public space

182251

Schepers

Glebe

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

While I welcome the renewal of the site following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises equitable public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I am concerned that:

High-density housing development will overwhelm the public space and local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will substantially overshadow the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning, as well as balanced outcomes for the wider community.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal fails to address the need for affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserly 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

#### Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the noisy and polluting Western Distributor, in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority

181796

Schlesinger

2009

Could you create part of the submission as videos with industry experts that can actually explain what is going on as it is hurting my eyes to see everything on the page. Is there like a layman's guide to what is going on?

In reference to the affordable housing part of the submission, will this bring down home prices/gentrification of the area? Also, can there be more public toilets/facilities to be used for the planning site so that members of the public can actually use it.

How much is the parking going to cost, sorry in advance as I wasn't sure how to word it or if I need to use the complex language within the submission report. If you could put a guide of how the submissions should be sent, that would be good.

Is there going to be a lot of noise in the precinct during the construction of the event, and how many roads will be blocked off and when in the construction phase of the project?

163481

Schroeder

Surry Hills

I want to voice my horror at the prospect of yet another wall of high rise looming over the harbour at Blackwattle Bay. Have you not learned anything about the value of liveable open space, human scale and environmental sensitivity. About the dangers of over-crowding and the short-sightedness of 'cram as many people into as small a space as possible to maximise yield' as a viable strategy that delivers long term quality to the city?

Because just about every sophisticated city elsewhere in the world and their inhabitants have.

Catch up, NSW planning. You're about to impose a disaster on us. You'll look back on this in shame. Just don't do it.



162721

Scully

Glebe

The plans for Blackwattle Bay represent a gross overdevelopment. Such an outcome will be a huge win for private interests (the developers) at the expense of the public.

The fact that the high rise buildings will overshadow solar panels on the new fish markets show how little thought has gone into the proposals. What about the traffic implications? Bridge Road is already congested in peak hour; it will be in complete gridlock with the extra traffic from the high rise & the fish markets.. What about catering for all the extra school students? The local schools are already stretched to capacity.

Please think about scaling down the size of the apartment blocks. Done sensitively, the Black Wattle Bay could be huge plus for the area. Think of how well the Harold Park redevelopment was done; let this be a blueprint for Blackwattle Bay.

169051

Sergeant

GLEBE POINT 2037

I am a local resident. Generally (and unlike many others who live in the area), I am supportive of increased residential densities and of creating a destination that attracts people from other parts of the City and indeed the world.

I wish to address one small part of the proposal. Best practice is to have vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians on three separate paths. However, this is not always possible. Sometimes, it is necessary to have "shared pathways" in which cyclists and pedestrians mingle.

My plea is that such shared pathways are marked with a centre line and directional arrows ... because so many fish market patrons and inner city apartment residents come from RH drive countries and do not instinctively move to the left to avoid collisions.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this exciting development. I am looking forward to seeing it take shape, and to walking and cycling safely!

167356

Shah

2041

My partner and I think there should be at least 50% public access land rather than 30%, similar to Barangaroo.

169401

Sharkey

2000

The site must be at least 50 percent public space with the foreshore restored in the manner of Barangaroo. The benefits to the city of such a move cannot be understated. Anything less shows a blatant disregard for the community and the city.

170561

Shaver and Beckett

Pymont 2009

We believe the proposed plan for the redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay is misconceived and not in the interests of Pymont now or in the future. The proposed built-form development is too intense: too many buildings, too large and too high, with insufficient provision for open space, sunlight, and movement. The congested body of high buildings will wall off the waterfront. The supposed public space along the waterfront is too narrow, merely a corridor which the buildings will deprive of morning sunlight, while the laneways risk being wind tunnels rather than enjoyable public spaces. As we look forward to living with the contagious covid-19 virus, the dense high-rise buildings will be unhealthy and unattractive to potential allowance of alternate provision in money rather than housing risks undermining the social mix that marks Pymont's development to date.

179116

Shilling

PETERSHAM 2049

Submission to the Blackwattle Bay Redevelopment

(NB: I do NOT want my street address published/shared, only my suburb)

To the Director, Planning, Infrastructure and Environment:

I OBJECT to the State Significant Precinct Study in its current form.

While it is clear this site requires renewal following the planned relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have recently been released to the public are unacceptable.

Our non-developer community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and green space, not yet more overdevelopment and high rise towers, particularly on public land!

My major objections and concerns are:

1. High-density housing development would overwhelm the foreshore and be too daunting for local infrastructure to handle

As currently proposed, up to 1,550 apartments would be allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. At FORTY FIVE storeys, the residential towers would be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and would totally dominate and ruin the foreshore area.

Furthermore, residential development at this scale would put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase floor space ratios, building heights and footprints are highly likely to follow.

The proposed development would also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which would overshadow public space and cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development.

How can this be even contemplated when society must increasingly turn to solar electricity and solar hot water on private and public building to address current and worsening global warming effects?

It is infuriating and distressing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning which incorporates the ever-increasing effects of “climate change” (in reality, global heating).

2. Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

At a time of critical public/social housing need across Sydney, and in particular with the sale of the Sirius Building (that was purpose-built for people on low incomes) to private buyers, this current proposal is an insult. It completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

3. Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double “ to six million a year. Together with the proposed addition of 1,550 new apartments being proposed, the transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (ie pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion. The on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site. Pedestrian access would be severely inhibited if this proposal proceeds as indicated. Surely pedestrian access should be encouraged and be made a major feature, not reduced to a lesser option!

4. Lack of quality open green space

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% would be used for walkways, roads and a small portion of green space “ much of which is actually under the Western Distributor - in shade.

COVID-19 impacts have made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key element of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is insulting and unacceptable. I reject it.

5. Reduced public access to the foreshore

Under this current proposal, residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path. If realised per the plan, this would be yet another soulless, suburban, forlorn and boring walk. In the 21st century with all that we know about city dwellers™ (and visitors/tourists™) wishes to explore and enjoy naturalised paths and parks along the foreshore, is this really the best design the planners and landscape architects can envisage?

I do not want to see yet another waterfront shopping precinct with private restaurants (like the alienating Darling Harbour) with businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of PUBLIC ACCESS.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the Government is not ensuring that private landholders along the proposed walkway redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants - needs - naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

## 6. Summary

Considering all these factors and concerns, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application. Instead, ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

To reiterate: I am appalled at this proposal. It is clearly over scale for the area, would be a theft of publicly-owned land and a developer's dream "yet again". The time is long overdue for land grabs and gratuitous pleasing of private developers to take priority over the common weal and needs of ordinary people, both local dwellers and visitors.

## 7. RECOMMENDATION:

I urge the Department to re-design this space at a much smaller, human and environmentally sensitive scale, then re-submit the plans and seek broad public support for the new design.

Adrienne Shilling

23 Albert Street

PETERSHAM 2049

17 August 2021



168316

Simon

Summer Hill

I support the proposed development on this site. Sydney needs more housing, especially close to the city, and this is ideally placed to build high density. It will be good to see the fish markets refreshed.

164681

Simpson

2009

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

171116

Simpson

GLEBE

I think the new Sydney fish markets is a wonderful design and will become a great tourist attraction.

However, I do wish to lodge my objection to the proposed development for the old fish market site. Towers of up to 45 stories is extremely excessive and I cannot see how infrastructure can be developed to adequately support the increase in vehicular and pedestrian movement.

Pyrmont Bridge Road, Wentworth Park Road and Anzac Bridge already look like parking stations during the peak hours.

With the increase in traffic this development will obviously generate, I think the quality of living in the area will certainly be dramatically downgraded by such an unreasonable increase in population in such a tight area.

I strongly object to such large towers being constructed.

Regards

Narelle Simpson

178746

Singleton

Glebe 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

Objection re Blackwattle Bay 'theft' of public land and over development.

I and my family have lived in Glebe for more than 35 years. We have used the area around Blackwattle Bay and enjoyed the amenity of the Fish market and its charming fishing fleet. Yes there needs to be more and better public access and Parkland but no, there does not need to be forty story or more high rise bringing thousands more people and vehicles into an already over developed apartment ghetto stretching through Pyrmont.

I used the Bay for rowing, the shores for walking and playing. Lockdowns have proven how very valuable this space is and its now overcrowded with exercisers, dogs, bikes, and people. The 'fishmarket' site needs to become an extended parkland to accomodate us all, now, let alone in a couple of years time with even more residents.

The planned increased population, parking, and need to be able to access the development will make getting around the area all the more difficult: traffic soaked, polluted, noisy and unattractive.

The residential towers will cast shadow right over to the opposite side of Blackwattle Bay and the site of the High School.

Glebe was an industrial as well as residential suburb. People lived and worked here. Consequently there has been a tradition of and need for low cost housing and housing commission accomodation. The community needs this.

The low cost housing promised for the Harold Park development has been far less than our community needed and expected, and very much slower to be constructed than the high cost accommodation already occupied.

The scoping for the site estimates visitor numbers to double to 6 million a year, and those numbers are in addition to the 1,550 new apartments proposed.

Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site, which at present is owned by us, the public, for private use is unacceptable and provides only minimal facilities for the other 30%. Much of which will be shadowed both from sun and light by the overpasses. It is neither in the interests of existing nor new residents.

A naturalised public space around the shores of Blackwattle Bay would be an urban delight and a development entirely in tune with the needs of the next generation.

I absolutely reject this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Singleton

Glebe, 2037

163196

Skellett

2251

This proposed project is a disaster that future govts and generations will have to retrospectively deal with - you ought to be ashamed of your pitch for pure developer profit over public good .

165406

Skelton

2040

The buildings are way to high. Iâ€™m happy for the Redevelopment but no buildings around the area are that high. No to any buildings over 15 storyâ€™s

161006

Slattery

2037

The city of Sydney is already over populated with high rise apartments. We do not need anymore. Not to mention this would destroy the Glebe foreshore and many of the residents view and property values in Glebe Annandale and Pyrmont. Utilise the building's you have sit empty already instead of building more ugly apartments that will stay empty. Better yet make it green space instead of selling it off to make up your profits.



183356

Smark

2037

I will keep this brief. We need urban infill of apartments to provide housing growth and keep rents down. There is no better place for high rise apartments than the inner city, specifically high amenity areas near the harbour where infrastructure is currently underutilised - Wentworth Park is always dead - plenty of capacity. A new metro station at The Bays and Pyrmont is adequate transport infrastructure.

Do not compromise on height limits or # of apartments. If anything we need more apartments here. This is where the youth like me WANT TO LIVE. And we are currently priced out in rents and values. We need more supply.

Taller, slender towers offer better outcomes to sun access and overshadowing than the short, fat bulky unit blocks you see under City of Sydney planning controls around the CoS LGA.

Go tall, go slender. ðŸ˜ƒ

183236

Smith

2007

Planning around parking and waste management seems inadequate considering proposed density.

There is an opportunity to be very innovative around waste management for this project however the current proposal is lacking in putting forward any direction that would form the basis of a concept design.

It would be a significant landscape and visual impact to have buildings as high as proposed and it would not be consistent with the existing amenities and landscape.

164511

Smithson

2041

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

As a local resident in Balmain, I use this precinct regularly and can see the potential for the site. Local residents really need more green space not less. We also need a plan for the area that is based on our needs now and in the future, not the greed of property developers.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government:

- Work harder to strike a better balance for the community
- Expand access to the harbour and our urban blue spaces
- Improve water quality and the health of the environment
- Capture the public benefit in development
- Use the planning system to elevate the views of the community
- Support healthy and active urban communities
- Ensure the safety of all maritime traffic

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Kind regards,

Catherine Smithson

167566

snelgrove

Glebe

I would like to express my dismay at the plan to allow the building of towers up to 40 storeys high on the current fish markets site. This would have a serious impact on the surrounding areas, blocking light on the Glebe side and creating yet another ugly tower block.

I would like to department of planning to reconsider this proposal and to not go ahead with the current proposal to build towers.

I would also like to express my disgust at the Sydney Fish Markets and what a dirty unpleasant place it has been for many years. Why is it necessary to 'relocate' them into a lovely stretch of prime harbour land on Blackwattle Bay? The former coal-loader site was an opportunity to extend the walkway along the bay, that is, give it back to the residents, but no, we have that disgusting fish market and all the crowds that will bring.

167976

Spallek

Pymont 2009

Will any indigenous people be able to live there? If not, how will an authentic indigenous presence be achieved?

167981

Spallek

2009

Will there be sufficient housing for key workers – teachers, nurses, community support workers, police, ambulance and emergency officers, delivery personnel and cleaners?

168056

Spallek

Pymont

Will the foreshore promenade be wide enough for the anticipated amount of pedestrian and bicycle traffic?



176251

Spallek

Pymont

Private landowners will benefit disproportionately

Once the land along Bank Street is rezoned, Poulos Bros Seafoods Pty Limited, Celestino/Baiada Poultry Pty Ltd. and Hanson Australia Holdings Proprietary Limited will benefit hugely from the sale of their land. The higher the new buildings on this stretch of land, the more disadvantaged the current residents. How does this fit the approach advocated in the plan: 'development potential to be distributed fairly & impartially'?

176356

Spallek

2007

Foreshore promenade must be 30m wide

Completion of the foreshore promenade around the harbour - one of the most important tourist facilities in Sydney. It must be 30m wide all the way. Given the anticipated number of visitors and the need for residents in surrounding suburbs for more open space - pedestrians, cyclists, dog-walkers, families with prams, kids on bikes and scooters - squeezing the walkway back to 10m at some stages will create serious congestion and not allow for physical distancing at times like the present pandemic. The lack of separated cycleways and walkways is already a problem along the Glebe foreshore. Some Glebe residents are currently avoiding the Jubilee Park foreshore walk out of concern for overcrowding.

Consider and respect our history:

In 1831 under Governor Darling, the Surveyor-General of the colony of NSW Thomas Mitchell introduced Clause 14 to the NSW Land Regulations [Syd Gaz 4 Aug 1831]: "No land within one hundred feet of the high water mark on the sea coast, harbours, bays, or inlets, is to be considered open to purchase, unless for the purposes of commerce or navigation."

167986

Spallek

2007

Is it appropriate to have 45 storey towers on the harbour foreshore?

164381

Spencer

2009

Please don't do this! It's a horrible idea! I live right next to the fish market and I have a TBI disability and I won't be able to take the noise! Are you going to compensate me and find me a new place to live and moving, setting up my new place! I can't handle any noise and I'm housebound and bed bound!

This has really upset me! I thought you were just doing up the fish market not destroying the area with residential area you will sell off to foreign investors. This is just pure greed and you have not taken into consideration your people! No one in the local area wants this!

Please get back to regarding this.

178906

Spencer

Rozelle, 2039

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

Please take this opportunity to be a leader in capital city planning in the world...offering a sustainable low rise unique accessible development, integrated community access, showcasing the jewel in our crown our harbour without overshadowing and with superior walk and cycle ways and community spaces that benefit our entire community.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to

adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Jan Spencer

Rozelle, 2039

171936

Spring

2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

We want a plan that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

High-density housing development will be overbearing on the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be 30m taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will be overwhelming and not what the public wants for this public land.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development.

This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case for the private developers rather than providing best practice in design and planning for the best public outcome

Poor quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Drew Spring

17 Leichhardt St GLEBE.



182836

Spring

Chiswick, 2046

To Dept of Planning

The plan for the Blackwattle Bay area fails on many areas. It does not protect maritime safety in the Bay. It does not offer security for passive recreation- rowers, paddle boarders, kayakers, dragon boaters.

The land area for public use is a mere 30%. Paths and park ares are too shaded, narrow and crowded by the proposed housing towers. Bringing more peopleinto the area requires more open space, and buildings more compatible with the Glebe low rise neighbourhood.

Continuing the line of buildings which wall off the water from the land is a long term disaster.

Nowhere in the plan is there reference to capturing public money from the commercial development.

The opportunity cost of this development is far reaching.

Short sighted squeezing of blocks of selfish housing into unfortunate sitesimplies that more of this style of development is approved, and can only threaten the close neighbourhood of Glebe.

In other countries a treasure such as the Bay area would be protected and enhanced, with more generous access for all.

I hope the plan can be redrafted to a style more compatible with its wider neighbourhood.

Pat Spring

181356

Sputnik

2037

Recently I drove into Sydney from the North and was amazed to see the beautiful skyline on the right hand side of my vision. The left was clouded by high-rise, blackened and tarnished by black shadows of large buildings. To the right, was the view of beautiful hilled precincts with HOMES nestled between trees.

The proposed high-rise development begs the question "WHY DOES SYDNEY GOVERNANCE FETISHISE HIGH RISE DEVELOPMENT IN SYDNEY HARBOUR?"

Australia has, an extraordinarily large amount of coastline. There is nothing to gain from developing the Fish market area - but there is sunlight, history, culture, and peace at risk of being lost from Sydney forever. The world has New York, it has Hong Kong, why are we inviting the cultural collapses - cold weather - violence - poverty that comes from increased population density?

181746

Steele

2043

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct Study

I write to object in the strongest possible terms to virtually every detail of this study; to the assumptions, to the "vision", to the proposed legislative and planning changes, and to the plan itself.

The development should not be classified as State Significant because it constitutes extremely poor planning. The primary consideration has been density at the expense of other requirements, including important community-supported criteria.

The land in question is public land, but the study and plan not only does not deliver any public good, the plans, if delivered, would be detrimental to the site, to the precinct, to Blackwattle Bay and to Glebe.

I believe the proposal is a massive overdevelopment of the site, and would bring more residents and workers to the area than could be sustained.

As a frequent runner and cyclist in the area, I believe the foreshore walk is far too narrow. It would be overshadowed by the buildings and windy. Paths shared between pedestrians and cyclists do not work - especially with the increased numbers of people in the area (Blackwattle Bay during COVID lockdown is a good example of the gridlock that would occur).

There is inadequate provision of affordable housing.

The needs of passive water users of Blackwattle Bay, the so called "blue space" have been overlooked. The plan preferences private marinas over community users and access.

The plan states that 30 per cent of the area is public open space, but much of it is in overshadowed windy areas between tall buildings.

In September 2017, the NSW Government invited community members to engage in the visioning for a future Blackwattle Bay and to contribute to the writing of a set of Design Principles to guide the preparation of the Precinct Plan. The result was 16 guiding principles.

However, the plan fails to fulfill 11 of its guiding principles, and there is no clear path to fulfilling another two.

The plan also fails to meet six of the the nine objectives that apply to consultation with the community and stakeholders.

This development, and the construction of the new Sydney Fish Market, are based on pre-Covid 19 pandemic thinking. Tourism from China has collapsed and workers and residents are leaving the CBD. The State Government faces having a ring of new, underutilised buildings around Blackwattle Bay, a Bay that belongs to the people of NSW.

I refer to the Glebe Society's submission for further details.

Kind regards

Justin Steele

174951

Steininger

2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

164706

Stevenson

Pymont 2009Th

The proposed building heights are far too high. The Pymont area currently has a height limit of approximately eight storeys. This restriction, plus the historic terraces give Pymont its distinctive character. The proposals will devastate the ambience and character of Pymont as can clearly be seen in the Visual Impact Analysis prepared by Clouston Associates.

Pymont already has the highest residential density of any suburb in Australia. Why should it be increased?

There have been two recent apartment developments in Pymont: one in Miller Street opposite Woolworths and the magnificent Grande in Harris Street (near the Terminus hotel). Both these developments are consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood, and presumably have returned a reasonable profit to the developers. These two developments should provide a template for Blackwattle Bay.

Please moderate the height of any buildings to about eight storeys.

Martin Stevenson

176376

Stoeckli

Pymont 2009

Let's not make Pymont the 2nd most densely populated suburb in all of Sydney " STOP the Blackwattle Bay Precinct now!

#### Solar impact:

The application states that "no additional solar impact will occur between 9 am and 3 pm at 21 June on the Glebe Foreshore or Wentworth Park". However, the Glebe Foreshore is extremely busy outside these times and particularly between 7-9 am and from 3-6 pm. In view of the popularity of this Foreshore in my view it is essential to lower the building heights so that there is no "additional solar impact" from at least 7 am if not earlier.

#### Visual Impact:

One must question the moral and ethical impact of this development proposal. The view particularly from the Glebe Foreshore will be dramatically impacted which is unacceptable. The Glebe Foreshore is extremely popular for all sorts of recreation likely due to its appealing views across the bay and the CBD skyline and due to its unobstructed sunshine from early morning. All four viewpoints from the Glebe Foreshore have had High (2) or Moderate/High (2) visual impact rating (the 2 highest of 5 ratings), indicating that this proposed development would severely downgrade this important recreational space and it would also considerably impact all the residents in proximity of the foreshore. In view of the massive impact this proposal has it is essential that the maximal building height is lowered to the extent that no visual impact rating is higher than Low/Moderate.

#### Traffic and Transport:

The proposal is based on a shift to "stretch mode share". This is a very unrealistic model based on the current situation. The proposal aims to encourage this model by "prioritising pedestrian and cyclists over private vehicles with road space reallocation". Basically, the new development will reallocate road space to cyclists and pedestrians. Knowing the congestion driving in and out of Pymont this plan is a road to ruin. The fact that currently only two of the 7 investigated intersections in Pymont are below capacity according to table 3-9 (attachment 4) is another indication that this proposed plan is not realistic and if anything, dangerous once all new residents have moved in. Another issue is that the "stretch mode share" plan is based on a 5-year old census that only takes into account travel to work for one specific day " hardly a thorough study. A more thorough study over a longer period and not during lockdown is necessary as a basis for such a development.

#### Parking:

The planned provision of parking spaces is an absolute shock with only 0.3 spaces per 1-bedroom and 0.7 spaces per 2-bedroom dwelling. One wonders what kind of residents will be attracted to these apartments with no available on-street parking at any given time in Pyrmont. I watch people waiting in cars for more than half an hour to get a parking spot in my street. 59% of City of Sydney residents had one or more cars in 2016 (table 3, attachment 5) but the modelling predicts that more than 70% of the Blackwattle Bay residents will not have a car. Again one wonders where these very unrealistic numbers are based on. I would appreciate an assurance that no City of Sydney parking permits will be allowed for any of these residents or workers when the developers fail to provide adequate parking.

Overall:

The motivation for building these many far too high apartment/office buildings in the already very if not most densely populated suburb in the City of Sydney is highly questionable. Pyrmont is the 4<sup>th</sup> most densely populated suburb in all of Sydney (microburbs.com.au), so the rationale for further increasing its density is staggering. An additional 2,795 residents will push Pyrmont into the “proud” position of the 2<sup>nd</sup> most densely populated suburb in Sydney. This is not an accolade that any of us should be aspiring to achieve.

The plan promises >30% of open space but when questioned what will happen to the “Blackwattle Marina” that currently occupies some of this open space it seemed as if the Marina was going to stay, suggesting that some of the promised open space will not be open space. The plans for 1-3 Bank Street are also extremely nebulous and I wonder how it can be allowed to not include such details in the plan. The statement in one of the Webinars that the traffic around the existing fish market will only marginally increase and hence needs no further improvement is just unbelievable.



168886

Stuart-Smith

Pymont 2009

I wish to make the following points in relation to the Blackwattle Bay proposal:

1. The 45 story tower blocks are much too high for the limited space of the development area. They are out of scale with nearby high rise developments.

2. The public spaces are inadequate. The foreshore walk in some places is no more than a path. A much wider foreshore area would enhance the lovability of the area. Also, the public space beneath and close to the Anzac Bridge will have limited utility, given the shadowing and dominance of the bridge. Perhaps this area would be best served for purposes similar to its current use, i.e. as a space for launching kayaks, canoes, dragon boats etc.

3. The traffic studies do not seriously look at vehicle movements along Bank Street. This path is at present very poorly serviced. 3 sets of lights, each with multiple phases, are present between Pymont Bridge Road and Miller Street. Long waits are normal, even in off peak times. New developments within the designated area will be expected to exacerbate this problem.

An additional eastbound lane between Miller Street and the freeway entry U shaped intersection would ease the problem. Also, the 3 intersections need to be redesigned to reduce the required numbers of phases, allowing longer green times for each phase.

Thank you for considering these factors

Kind regards

Roger Stuart-Smith (Retired Traffic Engineer)

162146

Su

Sydney 2000

I am a frequent user of the Blackwattle Bay area, with its open waterfront views, parkland and ample sunshine.

Already living in a highly built up city, nature is hard to come by - trees, shrubs, even grass - filled with native birdsong, calming breezes and being able to just 'breathe'.

To put up such dense development so close to a scenic area, would just snuff out any sense of spaciousness and specialness about Blackwattle Bay. Hence I strongly OPPOSE the proposed development - please just STOP it! Thank you.

167786

Su

2000

Please, just leave Blackwattle Bay alone:

- NO High-Rise Apartment Blocks
- Increase and widen Cycleways
- More Park Land

Thank you.

165676

Sue san

2007

I have extremely concerned about the over population of this area with high rise residential buildings. Please reconsider this to be medium density and mixed purpose buildings, in line with current building heights in the area. There should be even more green space. This was supposed to be for the community NOT the benefit of developers.

167446

Summerfield

2009

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

181651

Tan

2037

I object to dense high apartment blocks along the foreshore. It reduces public enjoyment of the view towards the city and will irrevocably change the community spirit.

182381

Tayama

2009

To Whom it may concern,

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission

As the owner of Bayview apartment 49/120 Saunders St, Pyrmont NSW 2009 we had received notification of the development plans submitted for Blackwattle Bay redevelopment along with the technical documents as plans on display. The current plans call for significant mixed-use development along Bank street with towers close to 18 stories and adjacent buildings even higher.

As the resident of this building, we strongly believe that this development creates the following concerns and negatively impact us:

a) Character: While it is mentioned the current plans have been developed in consideration of the character of the neighbourhood the following attributes of the development negate that:

- Setbacks and building height: The proposed buildings reaching higher than 18 stories it does not consider the current building heights along Bank Street which is a major setback.

- Location and size of private open space: Consultations in the past advised the Department of Planning to increase the number of open spaces considering Pyrmont to be one of the highest density suburbs. The current plans overlook the recommendation. The large mixed-use towers will occupy what was intended to be allocated open space with only small land allocated for open space, thus compounding the current issue of the suburb density.

b) Overshadowing: The developments along the intersection of Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street will significantly overshadow the Bayview Towers, 120 Saunders Street. The positioning of new towers in the current plans does not provide an accurate assessment.

c) Overlooking/loss of privacy: The residential & commercial use of the tower along Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street will create overlooking and loss of privacy and have a negative impact on us and the residents. Bayview towers were created with many apartments with balcony doors and windows facing the bay and Bank Street. The loss of privacy will negatively impact the living often resulting in residents having to down their blinds or installing other mechanisms.



d) Visual bulk of building: The development of the intersection of Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street will result in large, bulky buildings impacting the outlook of neighbours and dominate private open space areas such as apartment balconies facing the bay. The proposed developments would discourage many residents to enjoy the outdoors and prevent them from enjoying access to sunlight as they do as a result of overshadowing.

e) Overdevelopment: The plans suggest the Department's view is to go for a balanced outlook; however, this is not accurate. The addition of hundreds of apartments and office space will be considered as overdevelopment of an already congested area. As highlighted above the current fish market and private land should have been opened for the residents to have better access to open land.

f) Residential noise and vibration: The current assessments advise the buildings will be planned in accordance with the codes to ensure the occupants of new towers, are not impacted by noise with correct distance & height. However, the current plan fails to advise how the new construction will have an adverse impact on residents of Bayview Towers, 120 Saunders Street along Bank Street. With the increased development the noise pollution & vibration must be understood by doing the following:

- o a) assessment done for 120 Saunders Street now to ensure the current noise pollution as per the standards incorporated into the development

- o b) ensure take the above assessment into account when factoring the building heights of the proposed construction

- o c) provide noise & vibration reduction for current & future residents by putting large glass panels along the Anzac bridge to deflect the noise

- o d) provide appropriate noise reduction for 120 Saunders Street through Noise Abatement Programs such as Double-Glazing Door & Windows and Noise reduction curtains

In consideration of the above concerns, I and residents of <apartment no.>/ 120 Saunders Street, Pyrmont believe the heights of the buildings must be reduced significantly to not have an adverse impact. Furthermore, great effort needs to be put into understanding how the proposed plans negatively impact an already noisy and densely populated Pyrmont and in the particular intersection of Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street.

Looking forward to a favourable and considerate response.

Yours faithfully,

Kazuko Tayama & Steve Gannon

49/120 Saunders Street

## GLOBAL COMMENTS

### 1. Greater Sydney Commission and Planning Excellence

In one of the documents that I read when reviewing the Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct Study, I noted the concerns that the Greater Sydney Commission's concerns about the complexity of planning in the Blackwattle Bay area.

No-one can deny the amount of planning studies that the Pyrmont Peninsula has been subjected to. Unfortunately, I cannot believe that this most recent study would assuage the Commission's concerns. This study is perhaps the most repetitious, poorly structured/written, and hard to read document that I have had the displeasure of reading. Rather than a true planning study it is more of list of acronyms, tables and references to other studies and planning documents and what they require rather than advancing planning for the site and Pyrmont Peninsula and garnering support.

It also occurs to me that the report was developed to accord with the principles of the Yes Minister/Prime Minister TV series:

#### 1. Get Rid of the Problem in the Title

- this Study is not about Blackwattle Bay but less than 50% of it
- : only the portion you WANT to include in the Study

#### 2. Is it the right weight? The report is

- poorly structured, the report hides important comment deep in the document.
- unbelievably repetitive and more a list of requirements from other documents and statements about "that" it responds rather than actually responding.
- filled with numerous figures missing codes and which should have been amalgamated
- missing all the documents frequently referred to as attachments, the contents of which should have been discussed properly in the report.

Having struggled through the report I am left with the impression that the report is intended to bore and confuse the reader to limit legitimate and reasoned response.

The number of times that the document refers to the need for future studies and decisions clearly makes it an inadequate report on which to move forward.

The report also repeatedly refers to the need for planning excellence. I have difficulty in accepting that this report represents "excellence" in any form. Just saying the words does not make it so.

## 2. The Precinct and Place-Based Planning

All sites or precincts exist within something of a higher order. As I commented in my submission on the new Sydney Fish market, that study sought to avoid significant issues by limiting the extent of the geographic space under consideration and sidelining the impact of that area on the surrounding. While this study report refers to the surrounding areas its treatment of them is inadequate and seems to adopt a "not our responsibility" and "somebody will look at that later" approach. How can that be planning excellence if a site is planned before its impacts on the surrounding area is known. For example, it takes 148 pages to acknowledge that further study of utilities such as water, sewerage, electricity and gas in the Pyrmont Peninsula is required and 154 pages to acknowledge that a Pyrmont Infrastructure Study is required yet seeks to develop the Blackwattle Bay Precinct as narrowly defined in advance. It is unsurprising that the Pyrmont community is not supportive and lacks confidence.

Rather, the Blackwattle Bay study, is myopic and essentially deals with the old Fish market site and the Bank Street foreshore - although that part of the site is primarily dependant on "future" decisions. Is this really good enough for a site of such significance and reflective of planning excellence?

My other general comments on the site are that it:

" Fails to address the gateway to the Bay - Glebe Island Bridge. This heritage item is too important to be largely ignored in a plan for Blackwattle Bay. Surely it cannot be planning excellence to deliberately ignore/defer this important but decaying heritage item to future decisions. Then, suddenly at p 134 there is an alarming statement slipped in that talks about "construction of a "new crossing" between Glebe Island and Pyrmont that "could support walking cycling and public transport". What does this mean for the existing and much-loved Glebe Island Bridge and, if this structure or a new one is recommended it would totally change the need to funnel cycling and public transport through Pyrmont as the harbour foreshore would be a far more logical and acceptable route. This needs to be decided before the Blackwattle Bay infrastructure is constructed.

" Fails to properly deal with the roads and traffic issues that border the site. Decisions on major roads bounding the site need to be agreed before planning for the site is finalised.

" Fails to adequately deal with utilities infrastructure (water, sewerage, gas and electricity capacities) are properly assessed and, where necessary upgraded. Having only recently recovered from the disruption caused by the Darling Harbour redevelopment, residents of Pyrmont are rightfully concerned about future severe disruption while not only building works at Blackwattle Bay are undertaken but also a major upgrade of water and sewerage from the southern end of the Peninsula are upgraded/replaced.

" Treats surrounding areas of Pyrmont, Ultimo and Glebe differently with Pyrmont being the big loser when it comes to issues such as noise and solar impacts and the impacts being hidden and only fleetingly discussed in the latter parts of Study.

" Conflicts with previous studies such as the Pyrmont Peninsula and transport studies (the latter talking about closing and narrowing roads in Pyrmont and this study speaking about opening and widening them.

" Defines out the western foreshore of the Bay just as it does the bordering roads. I note the consultation with the Sydney College (owned and controlled by the State Government but if I was a resident of Glebe, I would fear that "Glebe is next".

" Caves-in the commercial interests to the north of the current Fish market site including, but especially the Hymix site which is simply not congruent with the aims of the Study. Anyone who currently lives in the Miller Street area would be aware just how much concrete dust this facility spreads over the neighbouring areas. Its 24-hour operation also creates a lot of noise from trucks at night as well as its trucks being one of the major transport problems in the locality. Just because Hymix say its facility is essential does not mean it is so - it probably isn't. It must go before the old Fish market site is redeveloped. Even the study indicates the problems it will create for the site let alone the surrounding areas.

All "private land-used, if advised now should have plenty of time to relocate before the mid 2020s and the sites then compulsorily resumed as they are inconsistent with not only the site but surrounding residential areas.

### 3. The World has Changed Irrevocably - Catch Up!

While I note the numerous planning studies that have been conducted in the past and their predictions of housing, commercial space, and employment needs, are used, COVID has rendered these studies out of date.

Working from home is now a fact of life and it is highly unlikely former "office-based" will return. Work will return to anything like previous levels. Health Directions also inhibit the number of workers who can occupy any space and the demand for apartment living weakened. We will not be going back to previous models and your demands should be revised to reflect this and recognise the excess of space that now exists in the CBD. There are already predictions of a glut of office space in the CBD and retail shops there are in desperate need of additional city workers. Building office space in Blackwattle Bay will only exacerbate that problem and should be reconsidered. It is highly likely that a lot of the "Innovation Corridor" requirements can be satisfied without Blackwattle Bay.

Similarly, apartment and inner-city living has lost a lot of its attraction as working from both home and moving to regional areas has been both feasible and desirable. Your arguments about "affordable housing are also badly diminished by your acknowledgement that only 1.7% of the residential floorspace on the site will be for that purpose (as opposed to 5-10% across Greater Sydney), your failure to identify where that will be and your arguments that it should not be mixed with medium and high-end housing. Essentially, therefore you are proposing a waterfront development for the rich.

#### 4. Impact on Pyrmont

Throughout your report you downplay the impact of your proposals on the existing community of Pyrmont. Glebe and Ultimo feature far more prominently in your report than does Pyrmont and your proposals frequently conflict with previous studies. Ultimately, buried deep in the document, you admit that further work is required to properly understand the impact of the proposals on Pyrmont - a clear indication that the site area is considered more important than the remainder of the suburb.

Pyrmont residents are not opposed to development, but it needs to be appropriate development. We know that the Star tower proposal is not dead, and fear being squeezed into a sunless valley with the Star blocking our morning sun and Blackwattle Bay our afternoon sun. Leaving development approvals in the control of a Minister or a Departmental Secretary simply adds to that concern and mistrust.

#### 5. Attachments

The Study refers to 41 Attachments stating that information can be found in them - it isn't provided in the document under review.

However, the Attachments are not provided nor are there links to them? Why is that?

## DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE STUDY/REPORT's CONTENTS

Page    Issue    Comment

xi - xiii    Increase international visitor length of stay and expenditure    Wording reveals the truth about the proposed development as an adjunct to The Star and an as a "cash-cow for the NSW Government

xiv    Precinct Plan -comprehensive urban design visions and strategy    This is highly debatable. A comprehensive Plan would properly cover all of Blackwattle Bay not just select parts and even the Study show much planning is yet to be undertaken.

xv    Extension of Miller Street    The Study exhorts the through site roads and lanes but ignores the reality of the problems that the current Fish market creates for Miller and adjacent street. The plans for the street and laneways will add problems for surrounding areas Pyrmont does not improve the problems there.

You even admit that the transport modal mix that you are espousing is aspirational and will be difficult to achieve.

Referring to extending Miller Street Saunders Street as providing vistas is also grandiose.

xiv    Glebe Island Bridge    Based on the report the old Glebe Island Bridge is THE MOST SIGNIFICANT heritage item (European or First Nations) in the vicinity.

I cannot believe that a planning body claiming "planning excellence" in place-based planning could leave the gateway to Blackwattle Bay out of the Study. The Study is monotonous about the much trumpeted "world class Fish market that will be erected at the head of the Bay. Yest the Study cannot even bring itself to admit that the Glebe Island Bridge, the most important and much-loved heritage feature in the Pyrmont landscape actually exists. and lies rotting. It is not only "planned out" of the Blackwattle Study, it is referred to in Figure ES2 as "Future Connection to Glebe Island". WHAT! How can a planning authority that touts itself as delivering planning excellence leave a small sliver between 1-3 Bank Street and Evolve as unresolved in this Study? Sham eon you!

Then, buried incredibly deep in the Study at Page 135 the Study states

The construction of a new crossing between Glebe Island and Pyrmont could support new walking, cycling and public transport links.

This is extremely worrying to Pyrmont residents concerned about our heritage and would lead us to believe that the existing bridge is going to be left to rot until cannot be salvaged and is replaced by a new structure. This cannot be allowed to happen.

Further, as hinted at in the report a Glebe Island connection could allow a huge volume of pedestrian and cycle movements (but perhaps not public transport) to be diverted out of residential Pyrmont and onto the harbour foreshore.

This matter should be resolved before development of Blackwattle Bay is commenced and cannot wait for planning of Glebe Island to be undertaken and agreed.

Xvi 138,000 sqm of space for employment. For the reasons mentioned above, I believe this is now excessive and should be downsized significantly.

Xvii 16 Principles I would contend that the Study fails against Principles 5,6,11, 13 and 16 and, as such fails the test of design excellence.

9 Precinct Plan The Study states The current planning framework applying to Blackwattle Bay is complex, with controls contained within several different planning instruments. This is inconsistent with planning best practice and will

not facilitate the realisation of the vision for a renewed Blackwattle Bay.

The Blackwattle Bay SSP Study outcomes will establish a new planning framework to guide the future

land uses, design and development of buildings and public domain in the Precinct.

That may be the authors' view. Put simply I do not accept it. For reasons I have explained above and below I believe that the Plan is inadequate and not a sufficient basis on which to proceed.

9 9 Project Objectives To my mind the Study fails Objectives 4, 5 and 6.

9 A2.4 Project Governance I am opposed to the proposed Governance model which completely lacks local representation. It needs to be broadened to obtain community input because State Government agencies clearly do not understand/accept Pyrmont community views.

10 Study Key Principles This is the clearest example (as if one was needed) that there is no interest in the existing residents and businesses (except perhaps The Star) of Pyrmont. Please remember that the future of casinos in Australia and Sydney and Melbourne in particular is now under a serious cloud.

21 Privately Owned Lands Does Hymix ACTUALLY own their site??? I recall being horrified some years ago at seeing media that their "lease" had been extended by 50 years.

Either way:

1. I would question that any site that relies all raw materials to be trucked in is essential (maybe the output is but it could be delivered from elsewhere just as when the Hanson's facility on the new fish market site has been

2. The report clearly indicates that the facility is inconsistent with the proposed development but fails to acknowledge both the adverse noise and cement dust problems that the site creates for surrounding areas of Pyrmont.

3. Of course Hymix will argue that the site is essential but that does not make it true. If Hymix were given its marching orders now they would be able to relocate before the new Fish market is opened.

For similar reasons, I cannot see why other privately-owned lands facilities could not be successfully relocated with three years notice.

23      B3.6 Other Uses      This discussion is not consistent with latter information which describes 1-3 Bank Street as a local heritage item.

There is also no clear indication of what is proposed for the "new temporary 5-year maritime facility" and the Dragon Boats storage. Relocation of the dragon Boats is never discussed.

27      Gradients      The gradients along some footpaths on routes towards public transport stops and major transport hubs (Town Hall and Central stations) are steep. Are you serious? Have you even walked them?

28      Light Rail      Figure 11 - are you not aware of the John Street Light Rail stop or do you just not want to admit to its existence?

29      Parking      This is a clear example of the authors' myopic approach to planning. The statements are ignorant in that they deal only with "on-site" parking and ignore the "off-site" parking volumes and issues created by the infestation of small buses from The Star and the Western Suburbs that are not catered for in either the old or new Fish markets. Drivers have, in the past told us that the Council allows them to park contrary to street signs. We have observed Council Rangers walk past/ignore illegally parked vehicles in the past and have no confidence that this will not occur in the future.

30      Heritage      "There are no heritage items of local significance in the Blackwattle Bay Study Area".

Clearly defining out the Glebe Island Bridge and the assists this argument as does the Kauri Foreshores Hotel that support my arguments about the site definition. However, the Study a lot later mentions the local heritage importance of the buildings on 1-3 Bank Street - so much for planning excellence. Also excluded seem to be the two on-site parcels of Aboriginal peoples' heritage and the in-cliff cave shelter at Jacksons Landing.

37      5 Big Moves      It could be reasonably argued that Pyrmont residents are not interested/in favour of Big Moves 2 and 3. Neither of which have benefit to us.



It is also of interest that none of the 5 Big Moves mention housing or work - two of the big principles allegedly underpinning the study.

54 Minister may waive requirement for a master plan If the Blackwattle Bay site is as significant as claimed, how can it be argued that development of a Master Plan is unwarranted. Doing this is tantamount to stifling legitimate and important debate and should be strongly criticised.

55 SLEP Heights Figure 24 is intentionally confusing in that the heights indicated do not indicate whether they are metres or floors.

62-64 Reconnecting The Bay To Its Surrounds The naming of the street and lanes (e.g. Gipps) is not explained as to its connection with Pyrmont.

Further, the extension of streets such as Miller and Saunders seem to have far more to with movement through the site than connecting the neighbouring areas of Pyrmont. In fact, connecting Miller and Saunders Streets to the foreshore are likely to increase difficulties for the residents of those streets.

The recently installed cycleway in Miller Street is a failure (most cyclists use the newly narrowed roadway instead of the cycleway) and hated by many residents because of the problems it has created.

64 Community Consultation As evidence by the statements in the Study, the community consultation has not been with residents but with bodies that might be expected to support development proposals - it is "fake" consultation

71 Hymix I view the comments here as an ambit defensive position by Hymix that could not be reasonably sustained. The Hanson's plant was removed for the new Fish market and despite pressure by Hanson's it was not relocated to Glebe Island. Pressure by Hymix to remain should be similarly refuted.

73 Building Heights While a majority of people may have opted for Scenario 2 that does not mean that we like it. It is akin to being asked how you want to be executed - being electrocuted, being hot or having your head removed.

None of the three scenarios are acceptable to most Pyrmont residents that I have spoken to who all believe that the heights of the buildings are excessive and that they will result in significant afternoon shadowing for significant parts of Pyrmont village.

The study deals with avoiding morning shadowing of Glebe and Wentworth Park but remains silent when it comes to Pyrmont.

If ever The Star Tower is built, we could be in shadow in both the morning and afternoon especially in winter.

75 First Nations Culture Is this it? Is this all you could come up with despite First Nations supposedly being a significant component of your philosophy?

81 Roads The current Gipps Street Pymont terminates on the Eastern side of Harris Street Pymont and there appears no intention to extend it to the current Fish market site. Why then are streets in project area being called Gipps Street and Gipps Street and Gipps Lane - just as the bisected Jones Street does. Also why is the nomenclature European and not based on Aboriginal words?

I also strongly oppose any road system on the site than promotes vehicles from the site moving through or seeking parking in the residential streets of the remainder of Pymont.

85 Proposed Road Hierarchy Figure 33 shows Miller Street as a 'Major Road'. This is both unreasonable and unacceptable to Miller Street residents. Our street has always been a busy and heavily used road and is often a bottleneck in the weekday afternoon. The recent addition of the cycleway has reduced its carrying capacity and increased the danger for accidents between bicycle and vehicular traffic. It does not have the capacity to carry additional traffic generated by the proposed Blackwattle Bay development. Through traffic should instead be funnelled onto the largely not residential Pymont Bridge Road.

86 Development sensitive to adjacent development. This is not correct. Your report concentrates on open space and sun planes for Glebe Foreshore, Sydney Secondary College and Wentworth Park. It totally ignores afternoon sun planes for Pymont Village which will be completely overshadowed in the afternoon. This is unacceptable.

For the study to justify building heights on mirroring those on Distillery Hill is also laughable. Those building are constructed on a far higher elevation, and far less floor and create far less afternoon shadowing than will those proposed for Blackwattle Bay.

As well as shadowing the existing residential areas of Pymont Village the proposed building will also cause a loss of both views and privacy for existing dwellings.

Yet again I must object to the myopic views expressed in the report about the need for appropriate sun-planes on site but total disregard for the sun-planes of Pymont Village.

88 138,000sqm employment floor space As stated elsewhere, I do not accept that this minimum can be justified in the posit COVID environment especially when there is so much concern for excess floor space in the nearby CBD.

93      Maximum Building Heights      The proposed maximum heights will ensure that appropriate solar access protection is afforded to existing and new open spaces.

This is another clear example of how myopic the authors are. Your concern is for the site and totally ignore the impact of your proposals on Pymont Village.

How can this possibly be "planning excellence"?

94      Affordable Housing      Your admission that only 1.7% of residential space in the development will be for affordable housing compared with 5-10% across Greater Sydney makes a mockery of the other statements in the Study proudly espousing a mix of housing types. This is further evidenced by the fact that you argue for sperate buildings for affordable housing but do not indicate where that will be. No doubt you are intending that they be in the area of the Western Distributor that you have already stated will suffer noise issues.

110-112                      DCP 2012 requirements and the shadowing overlay map on p 111 clearly demonstrate the callous disregard that this Study shows for Pymont and its residents. The study constantly looks West and never East unless it is to solve an on-site problem.

119-120                      Indicative Staging Plan      This Plan is extremely disappointing and will compromise the success of any development on the Fish market site for many years. It is a sell-out to commercial interests and clearly indicates that the Study is all about getting maximum economic benefit out of the current Fish market site and that anything else is peripheral and of little, no interest.

122      Promenade Width      Again, choice of Option 3 promenade width demonstrates:

1.the desire to squeeze as much money as possible out of the site and forsaking public open space for extra building space.

2. Caving into the commercial interests in Development Zone 8

125      Figure 55              Ignores the Light Rail Stop at John Street Square which would be an important access link for the northern p[at of the site.

126      Glebe Island Bridge      The statements at p126 are cursory and do not satisfy the requirement of SR3.6 to identify "how" the plan connects to the former Glebe Island Bridge as a possible future active transport connection to the Bays. Planning access to and through the site and ignore the significant opportunities offered by a future transport link that could significantly alter the situation cannot be "planning excellence".

133      SR4.13 Noise & Acoustic Compatibility      Your Study shows that the Hymix facility is not compatible with the proposed land uses - even ignoring the dust that Hymix creates yet the building planning studies show that proposed buildings are intended to be constructed so as to minimise the problem. Surely this is not acceptable. The Hymix site is a problem already for existing local residents from noise, dust and transport perspectives and will become even more of an issue when the current Fish market site is redeveloped.

Hymix's assertions that the facility is essential need to be seriously tested. I do not believe them. Hanson's relocated to allow the new Fish market and construction in Sydney survived. The same would happen if the Hymix facility was forced elsewhere.



162631

Taylor

2050

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government:

- Work harder to strike a better balance for the community
- Expand access to the harbour and our urban blue spaces
- Improve water quality and the health of the environment
- Capture the public benefit in development
- Use the planning system to elevate the views of the community
- Support healthy and active urban communities
- Ensure the safety of all maritime traffic

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Kind regards,

Martina Taylor

162271

Tbessi

Tempe 2044

I dont agree with this plan, it doesnt seem to take in consideration the impact on the traffic, the parking capacity and the increase in the population density in an area that is already saturated. Traffic is already very bad, not sure how the planning was done to justify the additional 1500 dwellings? I feel this is pure greed to make more money from development without considering the community needs first. Please reconsider or reduce the dwellings planned and create more business and employment opportunities instead. Thanks

172436

Teoh

2037

I am very much against to the height of the proposed buildings.

165006

Thistleton

2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Regards,



Camellia Thistleton

164561

Thornton

2039

More trees, shade and grass and areas for off leash dogs.

178901

Tilley

Artarmon , 2064

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

My objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

Redevelopment of the Sydney Fish Market site

The community want a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that: The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

The proposed High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure with no warranty for potential owners that this would never be another Opal Tower, Mascot, Parramatta or Castle Hill fiasco that costs billions to the State and the individual apartment owners with no prospect of resolutions or restitution.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity. Would the developers have the gall to propose donating an additional tower block to house a conglomerate public school/TAFE/community college.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does. Any development should be community building. High rise apartment blocks tend to isolate and fragment especially if there is not sufficient green and recreational space provided for all the public.

Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in permanent shade. While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Tilley

Artarmon , 2064

173511

TIMMINS

Pymont NSW 2009

The submission made by Alex Greenwich reflects the my view and that of my wife, Anna Timmins.

Planners need to be realistic about the re-development without crushing the beauty of the area where the Fish Market is to be.

Traffic would be horrendous if the existing proposed large scale development went ahead.

Doug and Anna Timmins

173536

Tizzard

2037

I think the upgrade to the area and increased access will be great, I exercise daily along the Bay. We have been in Glebe for 8 years having moved here from St Kilda, we like the eclectic working class feel of these areas. My concern rests with the height limits of the possible developments in the region of the present fish market/cement preparation area. I think 45 stories changes the feel of the area to a CBD/Gold Coast feel resulting in a loss of some of the historical character of Blackwattle bay. Rather than offering a different location to the CBD it will become an area where the CBD has encroached on. Lower height limits enabling 15 to 20 stories would limit the feeling of the CBD overwhelming the area. I will use Swadlings timber and hardware over Bunnings whenever I can. The history of the area of the industries too toxic for the CBD moving here and the associated workers. I still remember my 75 year old mother's comment at the time we bought into Glebe "when I was a young woman we would never go to Glebe, it was too rough."

I enjoy the view over Blackwattle to the working shipyards/marina. The industries that enable modern life don't need to be hidden from view. Breeding a generation of children who don't understand the realities of this means they may believe for example that a lamb chop comes from a supermarket and not a white fluffy animal. A 45 story building will change the character of the Bay and bring greater pressure to remove all industry that is not pleasant to look at. There are very few working Bays in Sydney and they should be allowed to continue to exist particularly one this close to the CBD.

182531

Tolhurst

2016

The scale, size and intrusion of this plan is unacceptable.

Green and public spaces will be left cold, windy and uninviting beneath those large scale tower.

The department should look to City of Sydney approved developments like East village with a mix of high and low rise buildings that allow space for views, light and warmth.

162821

Torrealba

Glebe 2037

My partner and I are two new Australian citizens who have been living in the Inner West since our arrival in Australia 8 years ago (Erskineville 2 & Glebe 6). We bought our house in Glebe to make our home in the area because we found it had so much to offer, being so close to the CBD, yet full of natural beauty and plenty of potential to still develop. We were extremely excited to hear about the plans to build the new fish market and have been supporting that effort, despite having to face some resistance from some neighbours regarding that change.

We're all for change. Positive change. Valuable change. Beneficial change. Respectful change. Mindful change. And the list goes on... What the State Government is proposing with the Blackwattle Bay towers is none of the above. Yes, there might be (very) few who will profit from this endeavour, but certainly not the community and its inhabitants. We don't need, nor want another Darling Harbour. Many of us also know how deceptive the construction of the Crown Casino came to be. Let us learn and reflect from our past mistakes. This part of town should be treated with care and regard for its heritage, nature and architectural dimension. I agree with you: Creating, rebuilding, developing a beautiful, healthy, accessible, and liveable city is about wealth. But it's not just about a few making some bucks, it's about the enrichment of its inhabitants, natural environment and legacy.

Having expressed all this, I commend you all at the State Government and all this involved in this project to please meet, as many times as it might be necessary, to discuss your development proposal within a more human context of the area and communities that share that space. We will all not only immensely appreciate it, but we'll support your efforts and will be forever thankful.

Yours truly,

José M. Torrealba



181831

Towers

2042

By going ahead with these abhorrent structures, you are not only ruining the skyline, but you are taking away from the traditional working class-ness of the area. If you were really trying to reinvigorate the area, money would be best spent in the revitalisation of the fish markets, which would encourage a healthy revenue stream, as well as paying homage to the areas industrial roots. Sydney certainly does not need more of these soulless apartment blocks, with their soul purpose of housing the rich. It needs more social housing, and tax payers money should be used to help fellow citizens, not to line the pockets of multi-billion dollar corporations. Please consider the future of Sydney and it's foreshore. Kirralee Towers of Newtown, age 26

164831

Tran

Ultimo

I am a long time resident of the Pyrmont/Ultimo area of the City of Sydney. I have serious concerns about the proposed heights of the towers for this new development.

These buildings will be over 15 storeys taller than the tallest buildings in the Jackson's Landing development and have significantly less consideration of community living space. The height of the towers will literally overshadow many residential areas of Pyrmont. Which are already, by no means low density. It also has the potential to have micro climate effects like wind tunnels which will reduce the quality of life for residents.

Furthermore, I am concerned that only 5 percent of residential space will be reserved for affordable housing. The Government is giving public land over to private entities without a good enough return for citizens who are in need to housing in proximity to good jobs. Non one has a right to profit off public land if citizens are not receiving anything in return.

181496

Tribe

Lilyfield

Keep the area in public hands dont let developers have the space for private use It needs to be assessable and opens spaces for all people to use

167666

triefus

Forest Lodge

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

171296

Trott

2037

It is objectionable that the proposed size of residential development of 12 building envelopes is to include 45 story towers for 1550 dwellings for 2800 residents. It is a closed bay and with such massively increased heights the changes to wind patterns, litter movement, reduced sun light, but increased street and building lights, water run off from sealed paths, radiant heat from massive building surfaces just to mention the most obvious results from complete over development of the site. It will result in a wall of uninteresting and uninterrupted building exteriors where the reduction of natural light into the rear of the buildings will negatively impact on rubbish and amenity areas.

Only a small part of the proposed redevelopment includes public space (approximately 11%), and of that, much is concrete. The many concrete steps will result in both human and bird debris - this is an area being developed alongside the fish market where there are a multitude of birds such as seagulls, pelicans, ibis, mynas and magpies. Any vegetation depicted in the sketches does not appear to be indigenous to the area, does not provide shade, does not absorb rainfall and does not in any way showcase the distinctive landscape of this bay area.

Too many people, too much concrete, too many huge apartment buildings, too much radiant heat and not nearly enough emphasis on the calm and serene water.

Please do not allow such ugly residential over development to proceed.

174681

Tunncliffe

Pymont NSW 2009

We have uploaded our submission as a .pdf file.

176496

twist

Pymont 2009

I am appalled at the height of these buildings , your gov shows no respect for the residents who choose to live here your guidelines you change without seeking residents input . the only winners here are the developers certainly not the residents where is the infrastructure we have a school that is nearly full to capacity what about a high school not a campus that caters for year 11 and 12 , facilities for kids to play as most live in units , this land should go back to the people ie open space on the foreshore , you all should hang your heads in shame .the forefathers of Pymont would not walk the walk with your decision .

182231

Tyler

2015

This is not necessary and has no benefits to the community.

Do not approve this.



178606

Van Der Heide

2040

Hi there, I'd like to see the development go ahead as the area needs it but I'd also like to have a minimum 50% allocation of public space like Barangaroo.

Many thanks

Daniel van der Heide

175146

Vargas

2037

Hello, my husband and I moved to Forest Lodge only earlier this year and were completely surprised by the beautiful bays that line the Glebe foreshore. We support development for community but not for big business. The current plan only allowed 30% public land - that doesn't not scream community! We would be so devastated if the large high rise buildings go up and shrink the Bay Area. At the moment it is a unique, beautiful space that can be enjoyed rather than feeling like another piece of water in the middle of the city. We truly hope developers will work with the community and, in many ways, give back to the community, rather than just coming in, claiming land, building business and ruining the vibrant nature of the Bay Area.

Many thanks,

Nicole Vargas

168331

Vella

Pymont

Reading through the redevelopment plans for the Fish markets, I am excited that one of Sydney's premier spots is being developed for the modern day.

However, I believe the opportunity to develop into a unique community and tourist-friendly site is being lost with buildings of a height and size that will ruin the gains.

Apartment buildings of this height and size will completely dominate the area. They will cast shadows over the water and surrounding areas, block views of numerous apartment blocks of the water and not fit in with the area.

I sincerely hope that plans are amended and a more sustainable and community-friendly project is built. Taking a longer-term approach over short-term profits will be to the benefit of all.

173716

Voyage

PYRMONT

Overall, the Blackwattle Bay proposal is too high, too big, too dense and far too close to the harbour.

The proposed excessive building heights will cast shadows over nearby homes and public spaces and the public walkway.

The proposed excessive building heights will create wind tunnels and reduce the area's amenity.

The proposed excessive building heights are out of proportion with the existing buildings that are adjoining and adjacent.

Much of the public space on this huge site is located underneath the overpass and will be permanently in the shade.

Most of the public space will also have its amenity diminished by excessive noise.

Community, sporting and recreational facilities are being ignored especially due to the expansion of private marinas and yacht moorings. Natural ecosystems, quality of the harbour water and marine life are being put at risk by this proposal.

Pyrmont is already the densest suburb in Sydney. Excessive and overheight apartment blocks, charter boats and commercial activities will cause even more ongoing issues with traffic management and flow as well as impacts from noise and pollution.

183036

Walder

CHERRYBROOK

I just want to comment on the scale. This will block out views of the city from surrounding areas. One of the best things about sydney is how scenic it is. Too densely packed, too tall towers will ruin this.

Keep Sydney a nice place to be.

161036

Walker

2037

These proposed apartments are completely out of step and scale with the character and needs of the area.

Development should taper down to the harbour and not impose on it like an iron wall. Sydney Harbour is famous for its low rise appeal, all the best parts of it from the eastern suburbs to the north shore are defined by houses and small apartment buildings which do not dominate the area like the Hong Kong shoreline. Why should this area be any different? Massive towers should be built further back into Pyrmont or not at all. The character of Sydney depends on this decision as this will set future precedents ruining the character of our harbour foreshore.

This area is already choked with traffic and over 1000 extra apartments will make it daily gridlock.

Stop thinking about developer interests and think about the community and what makes Sydney the globally loved place that it is.

161981

Walkington

2037

Thank you for the opportunity to make submissions on this plan, I can only imagine it has been a long road with many competing pressures to reach this point.

But the use of this land must be in the public interest and held to a higher standard than what I'm seeing in this proposal.

This is a clear overdevelopment of a historic area that threatens to privatise large portions of our public harbour and allow the CBD to creep into the residential areas of Ultimo, Pyrmont and Glebe.

I can't disagree strongly enough with this planned development, the large towers must to be stuck out of this plan at the very minimum. Having these buildings near the waterfront does nothing to enhance the city.

I would argue the site should be largely turned over for use as parklands and community buildings/development with a focus on arts, trades and future manufacturing. A nod to the areas recent manufacturing history.

Allowance for retail and small business, that can flourish and benefit from some of the most beautiful foreshore. Something everyone in Sydney can come and enjoy. The harbour is not just for those who can afford it.

The relentless drive to squeeze the most out of every square inch of land will only result in an unattractive place to call home, unless you are wealthy.

Post colonisation, Sydney's history is as a working harbour, and I don't see this reflected in the design or use of this public space. This plan errs on the side of "developers" and not public benefit, which we are entitled to expect.

I would like to see a revised plan that aims higher, and forms part of the fabric of why Sydney is attractive to residents and tourists. (Hint - They don't come to see residential/office buildings)

Maybe an idea would be to propose an Eora Parkland - A strong and bold statement that recognises First Nations connection to this place. Better still turn it over to the First Nations Community to run it.

I wish you all the best with the revised plans and look forward to seeing what you come up with. We can and must aim higher. (Not with the towers)



178736

Wall

Pymont 2009

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

I am writing to make an objection to the State Significant Precinct Study.

While it is clear that this site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public at this time are in my view unacceptable.

Noise from traffic on bridge roadway will be deflected into Pymont this is not addressed in this proposal. Noise from Anzac Bridge increase with redesigned allowing noise and wind to escape now this wall of noise.

Geological subsidence the Anzac bridge weight has already effected sandstone stabilities around the Southern foot pad as exposed in the now defunct metro line now cancelled. What will happen with added weights of these towers? Is the fore shore sufficient to support the weigh I believe not.

Traffic is already Grid locked during peak hours and weekends and holidays the fish market blocks local streets as does events held in Darling harbour note it takes one hour to drive from Pymont to the Broadway now. With increased traffic from new fish market it will freeze traffic out of Pymont.

Our community wants a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace not over-development. In particular, I'm concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure

The proposal would see up to 1,550 apartments allowed on the current Sydney Fish Market site in 45 storey towers. The residential towers will be taller than the Anzac Bridge pylons and will monster the foreshore.

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity.

The proposed controls are designed to set out the maximum potential yield for the site and without specific mechanisms to prohibit modification applications, proposals to increase Floor Space Ratios, building heights and footprints are likely to follow.

The proposal will also create an imposing wall of towers on the site which will even overshadow public space and even cast shade over the solar panels on the new Sydney Fish Market development. This project can't even comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces. It is disappointing that the approach of Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

Lack of provision for social and affordable housing

This proposal completely fails to address the critical need for social and affordable housing. While other jurisdictions around the world are delivering a 50% mix of affordable housing in similar

developments, this proposal offers a miserable 5%. It is especially important to ensure there is a diverse housing mix when development occurs on public land, as this one does.

#### Cumulative impacts on traffic, public transport and local parking

Once the new Sydney Fish Market is built, visitor numbers are expected to double to 6 million a year, in addition to the 1,550 new apartments now being proposed. The transport modelling fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of both the Fish Market and the proposed residential development.

Transport access is inadequate with the light rail currently at capacity (pre-COVID) with minimal opportunity for expansion, the on-demand ferry to the Fish Market was a failure and the proposed Sydney Metro stop is a significant distance from the site, not to mention inhibited pedestrian access.

#### Lack of quality open greenspace

This proposal would see 70% of this site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops. The remaining 30% will be used for walk-ways, roads and a small portion of greenspace – much of which is actually under the Western Distributor in shade.

COVID-19 has made it abundantly clear that accessible public space is a key ingredient of healthy and liveable places. Proposing to lock-up 70% of this site for private use is unacceptable.

#### Reduced public access to the foreshore

While residents may be able to walk along the foreshore on a narrow 10m wide path under this proposal, this walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial.

The waterfront will be transformed into a glorified shopping precinct with private restaurants and businesses given prime foreshore positioning at the expense of public access. There is also the concern that private landholders in the precinct will not develop their property, raising serious doubts about the ability to deliver a connected walk along the foreshore.

The proposed public walkway could take decades to eventuate as the government is not ensuring that private landholders along the walk redevelop their sites to permit public access. Our community wants naturalised foreshore access right around Blackwattle Bay with ample space to accommodate active and passive recreation.

#### No mechanism for value sharing

Rezoning Blackwattle Bay will deliver once-in-a-lifetime windfalls in property value uplift to three private landholders within the precinct. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow higher and more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

A fair proportion of this windfall profit should be returned to the community through the inclusion of a value-sharing mechanism in the planning controls.

Considering all these factors, I cannot support this rezoning proposal and urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

Glenn Wall

Pyrmont, 2009

181461

Wall

2037

I would like to register my objection to the scale and lack of public open space proposed at the site of the current Sydney Fish Market. It is not in keeping with the scale and nature of the surrounding area nor is it fitting for a working harbour. The master plan doesn't reflect the options presented for community consultation.

The Bay redevelopment promised connection to the water along all sides and open space for the public. The proposed masterplan does not deliver on these promises and the heights proposed would overshadow and reduce the public amenity further, shadowing the bay, foreshore and Wentworth Park.

There are heritage precincts in Glebe and Pyrmont that will be irreversibly impacted if the scale is allowed. Buildings taller than the ANZAC Bridge will overpower the iconic bridge and waterway.

This area of inner city is already at public transport breaking point and is highly congested with traffic. A metro station at the casino will not provide enough relief. The area lacks schools and other community facilities to cater for another 3000 residents. Pyrmont is already the most densely populated suburb in Australia.

The scale appears to be attempting to set a precedent for the over development of the whole Pyrmont peninsula to make the most money. It is opposed by the City of Sydney and the state Member for Sydney. This is profit over public interest.

I am a local resident living in a heritage warehouse zone of Glebe.

161786

Wallace

Balmain 2041

The proposed residential accommodation next to the Western Distributor will 1. expose residents to traffic fumes and noise 2. Clog the existing often overcrowded light rail service which in normal times carries numerous visitors to the Fishmarkets 3. overshadow a large part of the neighbourhood. Images of the waterfront show extensive paved areas with no shade from the western sun. Tree planting is needed for cooling and air quality improvement.

The pandemic has shown the need for generous outdoor exercise space. To move more people into tower accommodation in this congested area will exacerbate existing overcrowding of these already heavily trafficked, densely populated areas.

171366

Ward

BALMAIN 2041

I am concerned that the submission gives no image of the height of these buildings until nearly the end. An image of these enormous buildings should introduce the submission.

I read this as your way of deceiving us about the look of this massive over development.

These heights would perhaps be ok in the main city area but this development seriously encroaches on this beautiful bay and an area where buildings are of much lower heights.

I OBJECT TO THE EXCESSIVE HEIGHT OF THESE BUILDINGS

182876

Warkentin

2038

This is an appalling proposal, it looks like a monstrosity. You have a duty not to ruin the iconic view with those hideous buildings

164546

Watson

2502

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow. We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

<https://www.smh.com.au/national/stinks-more-than-bins-anger-mounts-over-fish-markets-redevelopment-20210715-p58a33.htm>



171171

Webster

PYRMONT

I am concerned that the proposal is too big, too dense and far too close to the harbour.

The proposed building heights would cast shadows over nearby homes and public spaces, create wind tunnels and reduce the area's amenity.

Much of the public space on this huge site is located underneath the overpass and will be bombarded by traffic noise and be permanently in the shade.

The public walkway by the water would be overwhelmed by a wall of huge apartment towers right on the waterfront and dominated by retail outlets and these will dwarf the pylons of the Anzac Bridge and shade Blackwattle Bay.

The plan devotes significantly more on-water space to corporate and charter marinas than it does to community sporting and recreation facilities. The proposed expansion of private marinas and yacht moorings puts at risk water quality and degrading water quality poisoning natural ecosystems and harming marine life.

Pyrmont is already the densest suburb in Sydney and we endure ongoing issues with traffic management and flow. With this proposal the area will suffer even more traffic as well as serious noise and pollution impacts.

178026

Webster

Pymont

The proposed scale of the apartments is too dense for the area. The height of the proposed apartments are inconsistent with the surrounding area. The proposed building heights would cast significant shadows over nearby homes and public spaces, create wind tunnels and reduce enjoyment of the area's amenity.

Much of the proposed public space on this site is located underneath the ANZAC Bridge overpass and will be bombarded by constant traffic noise and be permanently in the shade.

The public walkway by the water would be overwhelmed by a wall of huge apartment towers right on the waterfront and dominated by retail outlets and these will overtake the attractive design of the pylons of the Anzac Bridge and shade Blackwattle Bay.

The plan devotes significantly more on-water space to corporate and charter marinas than it does to community sporting and recreation facilities. The proposed expansion of private marinas and yacht moorings puts at risk water quality and degrading water quality poisoning natural ecosystems and harming marine life.

Pymont is already the densest suburb in Sydney and we endure ongoing issues with traffic management and inherent traffic congestion. With the proposed scale of this development it will negatively impact traffic flow as well as serious noise and pollution impacts.

183106

WHEELER

PYRMONT

I have watched all the webinars and read all the studies and appreciate the considerable work that has gone into the planning for this precinct.

The plans for the new Fish Markets are commendable.

I am, unfortunately, disappointed by the nature and scope of the planning for the old fish markets site, extending up to and under the structure of the Anzac Bridge. My concerns are:

1) The number and size of the high-rise buildings which are primarily residential. I feel that they dwarf the Blackwattle Bay area and make it look like an enclosed pond. While it may be argued that improved transport options (metro) will help to accommodate this increase in the number of people living in a relatively small area I think the reality will just be increased congestion in an area that is already notoriously clogged, especially in peak hours. These buildings, in such a limited space, look very much like dormitories in function not living areas.

2) The multiple storey buildings alongside the Anzac bridge seriously detract from the (architectural ?) appearance of this bridge. I look at photographs of significant bridges around the world and see them standing out as celebrations of architecture and engineering. This will no longer be the case with the Anzac bridge, which will have high rise buildings cluttering up its edges. Can it not be allowed to stand apart from the urban clutter?

3) The amount of public space is actually very limited. One thing that the Covid pandemic has shown us is that our public spaces, our pedestrian spaces, need to be larger. If we end up having to "live with" Covid then we will also need to keep reasonable distances from each other. This requires future planning and the opportunity is here to create more space. Also, pedestrians and bikes can co-exist, but only if there is enough space for both. These plans do not realistically allow for that to happen. We have a beautiful harbour. Please create more space around its edges so that we can all enjoy it. The proportion of high-rise buildings to open space is restricted. People need to go outside and move around but this dominance of towers in the available space will preclude that. This design is not people-centred.

4) The use of the Bay is of concern. While the varied uses of the water look good on paper I fear the reality will be a congested, and perhaps dangerous, waterway. The movement of so many commercial vessels in and out of this area is of concern. I have watched the movement of watercraft in the Darling Harbour areas and it is often very busy and even congested, in what is a larger waterway than Blackwattle Bay. There is limited room for mistakes.

Please can you make this a beautiful area, structured to be an environment that enriches the lives of people.

181761

White

2040

Please do not block the beautiful views we now enjoy from Blackwattle Bay please be mindful and sensitive to the beauty of Sydney, when new structures are being considered.

Please keep Sydney fish markets a market for the people of Sydney and all others that enjoy our wonderful fish markets.

PLEASE DONâ€™T OVER BUILD

YOU'VE ALREADY MADE AN EYE SORE WITH THE MOTOR WAY. LET THE UGLINESS STOP THERE!!!

182566

White

Glebe

I'm writing to lodge my disappointment that a proposal like the towers at the old Sydney Fish Market site are even being considered.

Given the magnitude of the towering blocks that already exist around the Pyrmont foreshore, I'm stunned that NSW Gov would be prepared to take more potential public land away for the purposes of commercial gain while adding even more housing to an already over populated area.

That aside, theres the obvious issue of it being another concrete monstrosity on the Sydney harbour frontage that would cast deep shadows over Blackwattle Bay whilst eliminating whats left of the sense of open space and blue sky that the city of Sydney desperately needs and we all currently enjoy.

For what its worth, basically, its a NO from me!

181446

wilcox

Annandale 2038

I write in objection to the Blackwattle Bay proposed development.

My main objections are:

1. The sheer size of the development - residential towers taller than the Anzac bridge are far out of the range of buildings in the area and will dwarf everything around it.

This is adverse to current planning restrictions. Why is it being permitted?

They will also cast significant shadows across the area, including over the Fish Markets proposed solar roof.

They will totally change the skyline and likely permit similar huge scale buildings in the area. They will do the absolute opposite of "The Precinct Plan has been designed to protect the scenic and cultural landscape of Blackwattle Bay".

2. The lack of affordable or public housing proposed in this development.

3. The lack of consideration or proposed amenities for the 3000+ population of the apartments - many local public schools are struggling with overpopulation.

Regards

167606

Willan

2037

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

163296

Williams

2039

There is only one word for this planâ€, vile. But a few other words are appropriate: inappropriate for the site; a blight on the harbour; pandering to corrupt developers. How could you possibly think this is a positive addition to our harbour foreshore. You should be ashamed



181561

Wilson

Glebe 2037

Dear Planning NSW Team.

I would like to object to the proposed development on the existing fish markets site.

The proposed developments overly tall building will ruin the existing city skyline from blackwattle bay, completely overshadowing the new fish market site, Wentworth park and existing Prymont apartments. The tall buildings will create wind tunnels!!

There is not enough open space.

With the additional residents in proposed towers..... where will the extra school be built?

the existing site does need development..... not over development.

this project should not go ahead in any form, and a new plan should be submitted to the public.

173836

Winters

Surry Hills 2010

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

Over the course of the last century the local community have seen intense industrial use of The Bays come and go. We understand innately that redevelopment of The Bays represents a once in a generation opportunity for our community and for Sydney.

We support the revitalisation and the rehabilitation of The Bays and we believe that can take place in a manner that is consistent with community values. We also understand the significant impact that short-sighted planning decisions made today can have on future generations tomorrow.

We want to ensure this once in a generation opportunity to rehabilitate and revitalise our harbour is not wasted.

The current plan for Blackwattle Bay fails to achieve this.

For those reasons, our broad response to this precinct study is that we would like to see our government put forward:

A plan to support and grow community infrastructure

A plan to safely manage the growth in maritime traffic

A plan to protect and expand access to public open blue space

A plan to rehabilitate the natural harbour environment

A plan to elevate the ancient history of The Bays

We hope that the government takes this opportunity to set a standard for development on The Bays that the entire community is able to support.

Many thanks,

Theresa Winters

183226

Witt

VAUCLUSE 2030

I object to the Backwattle Bay State Significant Precinct Plan.

It's a huge overdevelopment of the site and will destroy the ambience of neighbouring Glebe and Pyrmont, which has also been earmarked for even more density.

The aesthetics of the remaining heritage areas will be detrimentally impacted by new highrises on the harbour foreshore.

The people of inner Sydney are owed a decent-sized harbourside park, as originally promised in the Barangaroo redevelopment but sacrificed to make way for ugly highrises.

If Sydney is going to cope with future pandemics and the impact of climate change, we need more green space trees, community services, local shops and local schools.

Don't miss the chance to get this important plan right!

I support all of the detailed criticisms of this plan made by the National Trust. I implore the Government to go back to the drawing board and deliver a project for the people not for the developers.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

183171

Wong

PYRMONT 2009

As a two decade resident of Pyrmont, I have seen the tall apartment buildings come up around me as the area developed, making Pyrmont one of the most densely populated suburbs in Sydney. I am not opposed to the idea of development, where appropriate, but am very much opposed to the visual eyesore of the proposed 45 story towers. I'm also concerned about the increase in population that the new proposal will bring. Traffic around the area, including access to the Anzac Bridge, is complicated and congested because it is an arterial to other parts of greater Sydney. The new Pyrmont Metro station is not going to change this. Create more green spaces that are also respectful of the indigenous heritage in the area. Develop a world class fish market that is a tourist magnet. Develop the community spaces proposed such as childcare and cultural facilities. Do NOT build tall, ugly residential towers in our community. Respect the character and culture of the interconnected areas of Pyrmont, Ultimo, Blackwattle Bay and neighbouring Glebe. Do NOT throw monstrosities on the shoreline.

160896

Wood

Balmain 2041

1. The bulk and height of the buildings proposed is much too great for the area and reduces the available public foreshore space to a great degree. Page 85 of the Visual Impact report (Attachment 15) highlights the out of scale nature of the buildings proposed. The public space would be severely shadowed.

2. Even with supposed restrictions on parking it is hard to see how the additional traffic generated by such a massive development can be handled in an already gridlocked area. Reliance on the light rail for public transport is unrealistic as the light rail is already at capacity. Will need to provide new bus routes and commit to new ferry stops to make public transport work.

3. New regulation needs to be introduced to tightly control the construction quality as well as the design aesthetic. Independent engineers need to sign off on all critical design and construction hold points and inspect not just "certify" the buildings are code compliant. Avoid Mascot/Opal towers. Regulate.

165521

Wood

2041

I believe the buildings proposed are grossly oversized for the site; more public space is required given the already high density of apartments in the area.

This area currently suffers from poor traffic management; any additional residences will only compound the problem.

181301

woodall

Russell Lea 2046

This looks like a proposal designed to deliver developer profits, not livable city spaces.

Huge overpowering towers, soulless apartment blocks. Where is the open space, the liveability, the mixed retail, the business opportunities?

Yes, we need more housing. But it needs to be integrated into a wider plan to create jobs, a vibrant cultural scene and a livable city that acts as a destination.

This is none of those things. This proposal should be rejected.

161546

Woodcock

2049

As a frequent user of the existing Sydney Harbour foreshore areas I would like to see that all future developments of the foreshore allow for a set back of approximately 30 - 40 metres from the harbour edge allowing for a mixed use pedestrian area. This would enable large and wide walkways, cycling paths and open grassed areas that can be used for Sydney resident play parks for children, picnic areas or simply areas for sitting in the sun. Urban streets don't work well in that way like the current developments surrounding Barangaroo and King St walk which is only used as a thoroughfare. With the new fish markets near by an area for people to take food even with the provision of electric BBQ's. The harbour edge should be retained for all Sydney siders not just for the wealthy few and foreign investors. This is a great shame on the development of the Sydney area in the way this has been developed in the past.



166176

Wright

Pymont 2009

We wish to object to housing proposal as it too large in height and floor area and will create more bottle necks then what is occurring now. The statement that that pubic transport will be the priority is unworkable as the Lightrail is over crowded now to the fish market . The open space areas are too small and in the shade under the Anzac Bridge where all the new housing is in the sun and shades the recreation areas. We do not object to the new Fish Market building.

182061

Wright

Redfern

Dear Sir or Madam

I'm am shocked by the inappropriateness of this proposal.

It will create large buildings at the foreshore that over-shadow the bay and new fish market, undermining their use as public spaces.

The plan itself does not create adequate green space for use by the public.

It is a plan worthy of 1970s Hong Kong, prioritising developers over people.

Kind regards

Caspar Wright

182691

Wright AM

Pymont 2009

My submission regarding the Blackwattle Bay planning proposal involves objection on the following grounds:

1. The high-rise is aiming to change a diverse scape in the area into a high-rise scape for all of Pymont/Ultimo and will significantly diminish the character of the suburb and area,
2. The traffic in the area is already causing major blockages at peak hours and the increased concentration of population is not being accompanied by adequate transport corridors, and
3. Why are we building for more concentrated populations on the water when it may be compromised by rising sea levels in the next twenty/thirty years - which means we will be moving everyone elsewhere.

For these reasons, this development is not sustainable and unsound,

Sincerely

Jeremy Wright AM

171306

Wyatt

Redfern

My submission objecting to this proposal is attached

171426

Wyatt

Redfern

My objection to this proposal is attached

182356

Wynter

CHIPPENDALE

I am opposed to the Berejiklian government's project - The Blackwattle Bay Revitalisation Plan.

This is horrific for the local community: A massive overdevelopment of public land, for pure profit. It is not a plan of revitalisation but a plan of amenity destruction.

The 10.4 hectare complex is proposed to be built on the old Sydney Fish Market site. It wants to develop 12 sites along Blackwattle Bay, with an apartment tower of up to 45 storeys. The towers include a shopping and business district. I think this is going to seriously overdevelop a tiny block of public land.

The development will cast deep shadows over the foreshore, cast shadows on the solar panels of the new Fish Market development proposal, and limit public access to Blackwattle Bay forever.

The development proposal comes on the back of the relocation of the Sydney Fish Markets, the cost of which is blowing out to more than \$750 million.

Moreover, I am opposed to this plan because Infrastructure NSW is seeking the approval of the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces to change the city's planning controls to allow towers up to 45 storeys to be built on the former Fish Markets site.

Many locals are opposed to the plan, as are local community organisations, such as the Glebe Society, Pyrmont Action, Bays Community Coalition and Ultimo Village Voice.

The state government needs to stop this project, abide by planning and heritage laws and properly consult with the local community. Remember I vote, and so do many other people in the local area.

Yours sincerely

Dr Coral Wynter

--

160996

Younes

Ashfield

This proposal will dramatically alter the landscape of the area for the worse. Looking beyond profits, this is a terrible, terrible idea. It's already an incredibly dense area and focus should be on creating areas for employment. Regardless, these plans will be a dramatic eyesore on the Sydney skyline and will negatively impact everyone not living in or profiting off this construction.

Please don't destroy this beautiful city with these awful designs.



160816

Young

ULTIMO NSW 2007

Thank you for an opportunity to comment.

1. As a local and long time resident in the City of Sydney, I'm strongly supportive of Blackwattle Bay State Significant endeavours.

2. The proposed revitalisation need not only be narrowly focus on Pyrmont and surrounds but, more widely, regionally.

3. A single Value ought not to be a dominant show-stopper; however the planning authorities need to have full discretions to consider all values and make their informed determination accordingly.

4. Connectivity, technology, lighting, infrastructure, traffic-transport; and lifestyle-cafes, walkway, open space, movements, aesthetics, natural-built interfaces - a reasonable balance.

Once again, I'm pleased with all your good work to date, well done!

Warm regards,

South Young

171206

Young

DARLINGHURST

The proposed development is too big for the area. Surely something low rise, with plenty of green space would be more sympathetic for the area.

Developers have had too much say in destroying the human scale of Sydney, & in particular Blackwattle Bay.

172426

Zabala

Glebe

I am against any encroachment or limiting of public access as a result of this overdevelopment that is clearly in favour of developers and not the community. Glebe is an eclectic area enjoyed by many and this development threatens to tower over most of the city skyline, obstructing views and sun for existing residents. More importantly, it is using public land for private use. I am vehemently opposed to it and will join any class action or legal undertaking to prevent it from eventuating.

183326

Zolfaghari

WEST PENNANT HILLS

It is totally understandable how demand of housing in Sydney is growing and government policy on urban design and planning is considered to supporting community in this matter.

However, from my architectural perspective, this proposal regardless of aesthetic assessment of the urban environment, would create a citadel on the overall harbor views. Lack of contextual character and urban space reminds me of an out of tune instrument in the orchestra.

176356

Spallek

2007

Foreshore promenade must be 30m wide

Completion of the foreshore promenade around the harbour - one of the most important tourist facilities in Sydney. It must be 30m wide all the way. Given the anticipated number of visitors and the need for residents in surrounding suburbs for more open space - pedestrians, cyclists, dog-walkers, families with prams, kids on bikes and scooters - squeezing the walkway back to 10m at some stages will create serious congestion and not allow for physical distancing at times like the present pandemic. The lack of separated cycleways and walkways is already a problem along the Glebe foreshore. Some Glebe residents are currently avoiding the Jubilee Park foreshore walk out of concern for overcrowding.

Consider and respect our history:

In 1831 under Governor Darling, the Surveyor-General of the colony of NSW Thomas Mitchell introduced Clause 14 to the NSW Land Regulations [Syd Gaz 4 Aug 1831]: "No land within one hundred feet of the high water mark on the sea coast, harbours, bays, or inlets, is to be considered open to purchase, unless for the purposes of commerce or navigation."