



Redacted 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

Title: Redacted 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

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

160786

Name and address withheld

2009

Hi,

Post review of the documents made available the feed back below.

The findings of the Visual Impact Assessment do not take into account the change of view and its impact for residents in buildings [redacted]. The residential/ commercial developments will block the view of the bay altogether.

Furthermore, the findings captured from ViewPoint 15 do not take the above into consideration. The convenient location of this viewpoint is taken from the lowest place. Residents in the buildings nearer or at this view point will not be largely impacted.

IMPORTANT: There needs to be another view point added for the residents [redacted] as this study completely disregards the needs of residents of about 200+ apartments or over 400 people.

There also needs to be another study for this location that caters for the increased sound deflected from the facades of these structures on Bank street requiring NSW GOV to put in provisions to assist with noise management.

Lastly, the study fails to assess the shadows casted by larger buildings onto the Saunders Street and Quarry Master Drive which will have a greater impact on quality of living.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

160796

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2008

I understand the need to get sufficient funds from the repurposing of the existing fish market to fund the new one.

However, it is completely inappropriate to have 45 storey buildings so close to the water in an area where all other buildings are 20 floors or less (especially close to the water) so that the bay can fully be appreciated by all.

This is also touching Pymont which is already the most dense suburb in Sydney and designed to have a community feeling not being like the CBD with very tall buildings everywhere overshadowing the streets and lower properties.

The original community consultation with the 3 choice submission did not allow the community to object to the fundamental height and density as all 3 options contained the same profile buildings. This is not really a consultation.

There needs to be an option to object to the height of buildings and have it reduced to what is reasonable for the area being 20 floors or less for ALL buildings being considered.

Can this fundamental objection be registered for consideration?

160831

Name and address withheld

Sydney

I object to the height and number of dwellings proposed for this area. Many dwellings in the area are vacant and do not agree that additional supply is required.

I support the area's development if it were to focus on community space (greenspace, shared community facilities), affordable housing and foreshore access for the community (that connects to Jacksons Landing and the southern shores of blackwattle bay).

Again I OBJECT to high rise residential and mixed use.

160891

Name and address withheld

Sydney/pyrmont

The residential towers need to be lowered to match the surroundings. The size will cause shadowing over the markets, current apartments and the park. I think they need to be lowered significantly to ensure they fit in to the sorrounds and do not devalue people's current property's but ruining line of site. This is a real opportunity for nsw and it doesn't need to be another controversial design. Low to medium size apartment buildings hold more value and will have community support. Speeding up this process for you and us. Just listen to the community.

160926

Name and address withheld

2173

This project is a wasted opportunity.

In a time of environmental emergency and general financial struggle this project should be designed with the future in mind that is profitable, environmentally safe and community building.

As it is, this project is another crooked Gladys cash grab.

What is the point of building in an iconic part of Sydney with no regard to inspiration, and no thoughts to the future legacy? Shame on you all, fix it!

160941

Name and address withheld

Stanmore

The NSW government should be engaging professional urban planners to design sustainable green future-proof developments, not corruptly taking money from developers to build inappropriate high-density housing that's single benefit is profit for the developer. This development is equal to hugely offensive Crown Casino which should never have been approved as it's a massive eyesore on stolen public land.

The bulk and scale of this proposal will recast the whole area as an imposing shadowland, and overshadow the future Fish Market's solar panel roof.

Stop the corruption and make our city green, sustainable and beautiful for visitors!

161021

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

Having 45 floor towers on the edge of the water would create overshadowing of any solar features with the new fish market as well as of the very views that make Sydney Sydney. Furthermore, having such towers on the edge would not be of sound construction. I am against the size and think it should be staggered and spaced out.

161026

Name and address withheld

2037

I would like to voice my concern for the proposal to approve buildings up to 45 stories within the Blackwattle Bay Area. A chief part of the appeal of the area is the low rise construction. I fear these towers would impose huge amounts of shade on recreational space as well as on residents living in lower buildings. They will form an eyesore in an area which otherwise contains free visibility.

It seems to have little reference to the needs and wishes of local residents.

I have concerns over the approvals process of these buildings following a recent Four Corners episode on the approval of Barangaroo.

161066

Name and address withheld

2009

Hi, there

I live [redacted] facing the black wattle bay.

I am really concerned that the planned BLD 05, BLD 06 maximum building limit (37.5m) will block the water view that we originally paid for with a high property price and overshadowing all the residential buildings in that area. The Parkview towers on the other side of [redacted] is 35m. If BLD 05 and BLD 06 is set as 37.5m high, it will cause substantial inconvenience to our life, as we will be overshadowed from both sides.

We do support and welcome the redevelopment plan to create more job opportunities (not more residential apartments) and public entertainment area for this suburb.

Can you please do limit BLD 05 and BLD06 and BLD07 building height to existed fish market building height, so as to minimize the impact on local community who are just one street away from these future planned construction sites and would have to bear the construction noises that could last for years before completion?

Thank you

161196

Name and address withheld

2038

I understand the Blackwattle Bay precinct needs redevelopment, and any such change will need to balance an array of competing interests and priorities.

In my view the draft has given far too much weighing to the commercial and property interests, and far too little to both the current and future community of the immediate and surrounding areas.

Prime foreshore open space is greatly valued by the community. Witness the heavy use and crowding of the Glebe foreshore or the Drummoyne Bay Run.

Adding additional dwellings and residents in this area without making very significant contributions to additional open space (generous, usable open spaces for cycling, walking, playgrounds etc) is not in the interests of the community. It serves to benefit a few commercial interests at the expense of many.

The incredibly high rise proposals are way out of proportion, and have no precedent in this area. It's not the CBD. The domination of the skyline and sightlines, theft of sunlight and dumping of a great number of residents and workers into a congested part of Ultimo is not in the public interest.

Please reconsider the scale of the development, and the scale of genuinely useful publicly accessible areas delivered. A small library and community "space" are poor offerings given the detrimental impact this scale will have on the physical environment and the drain on already at-capacity local services. The team during peak-hour is at capacity 6 days/week. It's impossible to get a decent learn-to-swim spot at local pools for more than a single child at a time. Foreshore parks are packed on weekends.

I am not anti-development by any means, but the public/private balance seems way off in these draft proposals. I think the people of NSW would be short changed.

161211

Name and address withheld

Pymont

I believe the future development of the towers in Blackwattle Bay will be too high by overshadowing existing homes, alienating Pymont's existing character, turn the streets into dark canyons, exacerbate existing traffic congestion and reduce Pymont's open space provision.

They need to be reduced to current building heights.

161441

Name and address withheld

Mosman 2088

Why is this government obsessed with high rise developments which are so ugly and have no style!

These towers will destroy the ambience of the area and they are not environmentally friendly.

161461

Name and address withheld

2009

I object to the buildings on the Fish Market site being above medium density in height. The area is densely populated already and so many more units will not provide a quality of Life for those already living here and those who are going to.

The new building on top of the Metro Station + the high density buildings on top of the Darling Harbour Shopping Centre will bring 1000s of people into an area that is slowly starting to loose the fantastic combination of inner city and village that it now enjoys. The past weekend of lockdown showed just how densely populated the area is when all those unit dwellers were restricted to walking in the available park spaces in the suburb.

Peak hour on the Lite Rail is packed, as are the buses heading into the city.

161471

Name and address withheld

Ultimo

There should be plenty of affordable social housing. The height limit for buildings should be no more than 10 stories.

The public must have access to the foreshore.

161476

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

There should be plenty of affordable social housing. The height limit for buildings should be no more than 10 stories.

The public must have access to the foreshore.

161601

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

This is a wall of towers along the harbour with heights reaching 45 storeys, overshadowing the public foreshore and blocking the water from the rest of Pyrmont – exactly what the community has long opposed. Only five percent of the 1,550 proposed dwellings are earmarked as affordable despite the government owning this land and its obligation to address the growing housing affordability crisis. Money talks!

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

161831

Name and address withheld

2009

where are the schools, medical facilities and amenities that will be essential to service the needs of nearly 3000 new residents on the foreshore?

161926

Name and address withheld

2038

Please donâ€™t make the buildings so high. It blocks out light and causes wind tunnels. Also please prioritise public housing and public space. Please donâ€™t make it look like Barangaroo which is really ugly, expensive, and not at all suited to the foreshore area. Our cities define who we are. Donâ€™t mess it up. Thank you.

162051

Name and address withheld

2010

Hi

Regarding Blackwattle Bay.

Just like what happened for Barangaroo, all driven by development and profit, no proper planning, ignoring the community needs, selling this city to developers.

[redacted]

162201

Name and address withheld

ERSKINEVILLE

I have two major concerns with the current Plans:

1. not enough affordable housing
2. there needs to be forward planning to look after and support the current cat colonies that are living at the Fish Market.

1. You have written:

At present, the City of Sydney has an inclusionary zoning in place for Ultimo Pyrmont via the Sydney LEP which enables an affordable housing contribution as follows:

ï,§ 0.8 per cent of the total floor area of the development that is intended to be used for residential purposes; and

ï,§ 1.1 per cent of the total floor area that is not intended to be used for residential purposes.

A new provision is proposed in Sydney LEP that would enable the consent authority to impose a condition on residential development at Blackwattle Bay requiring a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing. The contribution would be equivalent to 5 percent of the total floor area of the development² that is intended to be used for residential purposes³ for the purpose of affordable housing. The contribution would be made by way of a dedication of affordable dwellings within the precinct and/or paid as a monetary contribution. The appropriate monetary contribution rate that should apply in Blackwattle Bay is yet to be determined but will need to be balanced with the overall contribution being made towards the provision of

public amenities and services that will be delivered as part of the development.

This is abhorrent. 5% isn't nearly enough AND you have written in a clause that says developers can just buy their way out of including any affordable housing. NOT GOOD ENOUGH. I think that the developers and Council should provide at least 10% of all residential housing to be low income/affordable housing.

2. The different cat colonies have been living there for a very long time. Through the efforts of the regular cat feeders (who I know, I also help feed them sometimes) and the Council's catch, desex & release program, ALL of the cats are desexed. Some of them we have managed to find permanent forever homes. Some of them are bonded and really need to stay together (ie. the three tabbies near the wharf). It doesn't need to be a publicly shared strategy but the council needs to work with those of us who look after the cats to make sure they can be supported to live out the rest of their lives down there or to also be quietly accommodated within the new plans. As the new plans have

extended walking pathways and large green areas, this would encourage an even larger amount of people who would walk their dogs down there (we see lots going through the car park currently). So an increase in water bowls and taps of water and small covered areas suitable for cats to sleep and shelter in bad weather could totally be incorporated into the current plans. Please include the cat feeders into all consultations so that we can discreetly and safely look after the well being of these colonies, while continuing to find forever homes for them.

162501

Name and address withheld

2009

Already heavily congested local traffic around peak hour times, how can adding another 1500 dwellings not add to this?

Height and density of proposed buildings not inline with current buildings, will cast shadows restrict natural light and create worsening wind tunnels which already exist.

Pymont is a wonderful area that is already densely populated and the community needs more open space not a token foreshore pathway. Proper consideration and consultation of the community needs to happen rather than another state Gov. short sighted money grab.

162611

Name and address withheld

ANNANDALE

I believe this proposal is grossly out of scale with the area. I am not averse to a mix of resi/commercial/retail buildings in this location but the buildings need to be reduced in height significantly. The studies included with your report indicate that there will be unacceptable overshadowing and wind tunnel effects as a result of these towers. The height will also negatively affect the character of this area. This is a large parcel of waterfront land and a rare opportunity to show that Sydney is at the forefront of best design practice. The current scheme does not respect environmental, place and community needs.

Please reconsider!!

Thanks,

[redacted]

162926

Name and address withheld

Pymont, 2009

I'm pleased that there are plans to update the fish markets and the waterfront for public use but I strongly object to the tall 5 adjacent residential towers (100-150m high) that will be out of place with the village nature of the Pymont Peninsular.

It was originally stated in previous plans that towers like the Sofitel and Harbourside would be limited to the Eastern side around the Cockle Bay but now the Pymont village area will be walled-in with high towers on the western side forming an enclave of the area totally out of character with the mixed heritage of the area. Previous developments have taken this into account and have minimised their intrusion on the character of the area.

â€œâ€¸ utilising lower built form elements such as lower podiums and lower tower heights immediately adjacent to the waterâ€™s edge and utilising lower overall building heights closer to the state-listed heritage Anzac Bridgeâ€¸ is not evident in the plans. The narrow strip of (60-140m) land between Banks St and the waterâ€™s edge does not provide enough space to achieve this leaving towers as an overbearing barricade. The waterfront pathway will not be in green space but narrow and wedged between the wall of tall buildings and the waterâ€™s edge.

I strongly object to public land being used for the profit of developers at the expense of local residents.

I also object to the changes in bay use by expansion of marinas and other development will reduce the size of the bay and its views.

162991

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge 2037

This area had a significant oversupply of both apartments and offices well before covid, let alone today. As such, the proposal can only become acceptable after all such development is scrapped and replaced by green space, which is sorely lacking in both the current and the proposed situation.

163176

Name and address withheld

Mona Vale

I think this proposal will be too high density and will spoil the area. Too many big office buildings.
Doesn't Sydney have too many of these already?

It will also block natural light to the fish market.

163181

Name and address withheld

2037

please leave our foreshores alone. we need lots of green space in what is already a congested area..
We don't want high rise developments like Barangaroo. We have a wonderful city and there are
already high rise right next to the Anzac Bridge entrance.

thank you

163201

Name and address withheld

Glebe, 2037

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

To whom it may concern,

I object to the proposed planning for Blackwattle Bay.

These developments will drastically reduce the quality of living for residents of Pyrmont and the surrounding areas. You are proposing high density towers in an already population dense area - which will only lead to uncomfortable - and, in the time of COVID and beyond, unsafe living conditions.

I also find the proposals regarding the inclusion of culture and place laughable - the proposal suggests that - aesthetic choice - can help communicate the notion of culture. This appears superficial and laughable.

I worry about having many 35 - 40 story buildings in Blackwattle Bay. It will ruin the environment and overpopulate the place.

In short, this appears like you, Planning NSW, are giving into the will of developers. Please reconsider this proposal and think about how it will affect us, the residence of this area.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

163226

Name and address withheld

2010

We need a lot more useful outdoor spaces and public buildings without the grey shadows. To have another barangaroo monstrosity would be criminal and lacking the wisdom to learn from mistakes if the past. A real outdoor public attraction. Is what is needed more than ever. Creating outdoor spaces for exercise and leisure with entertainment, food and culture hubs would improve this side of the city and make it a quality attraction

163236

Name and address withheld

2009

Please think about green spaces before more high rise buildings. The foreshore will be invisible by the time the large development is complete including the fish market upgrade. Please think about the residents. [redacted] the whole foreshore is becoming a concrete jungle. Pyrmont is already heavily developed with high rise buildings.. don't allow these buildings as well. Can you imagine the shadows from these buildings.. residents will go from sunshine to grey coming through their windows. This development is really unnecessary and green space and/or some other form of space that gives something to its local residents would be a much better choice and likely well received and supported. Please listen to the community rather than stakeholders who support it for the monetary gain. Consideration and respect must be shown to the local residents and community by not allowing this oversized development. The development will be detrimental to the foreshore and local and broader community. The new fish market and other concrete structures are enough.

163251

Name and address withheld

Annandale 2038

I intensely object to the proposed high density apartment blocks, on the former fish market site.

This development has zero benefit for the local community, in fact it will further exhaust space and resources in an already densely populated area.

The planned proposal takes no consideration for Pymont, large towers will be an eyesore and prevent sunlight from reaching the bay and parklands.

This is despicable action from the government.

163266

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

The proposed development prioritises developer profits above community needs. The new buildings on and near the former fish markets are far too large and will overshadow Blackwater Bay and ruin a much loved public park. As a local resident and regular user of Blackwattle I implore you to NOT proceed with this development. It is completely excessive, insensitive and out of scale with this precious waterfront site. Do better.

163291

Name and address withheld

Pymont

I am in full support of the proposal

163311

Name and address withheld

Enmore 2042

We need more time to review this proposal.

163356

Name and address withheld

Pymont

[redacted] we are planning our future in this suburb, for us and for our children. We feel very excited and enthusiastic with the redevelopment of the current Fish market area and are very hopeful that it will enhance the pleasure of living in this area, in line with our community's active lifestyle and our love for our suburb. HOWEVER, we are extremely concerned about the current proposal of building massive towers in a suburb which is already overpopulated with Jackson's landing. These towers will also immensely shadow Wentworth park (which is our only large green space in the area) as well as the future rooftop of the new fishmarket on which solar panels may be set in an eco-friendly approach. This is absolutely nonsense and we feel the project wouldn't be beneficial for the community. It would be for the SOLE (financial) benefit of real estate developers. We respectfully request the review of the proposal to limit the number of storeys / the height of the future towers, and allow more walking areas and green spaces. Thank your for your consideration.

163416

Name and address withheld

2038

Dear Officer,

It is nice to see Infrastructure NSW has published the plans to redevelop the site of the old Sydney Fish Market in June 2021. However, the 45-storey high-rise building proposed in the plan will cause issues to local residents living in and around Blackwattle Bay area, especially having great impact on local area with post code 2037,2038,2040. It will indeed do harm to the interest of local residents, with respect to blocking nice city view, breaking this current quiet, relaxing and enjoyable living condition, and increasing the risk of economic loss for local residents. The enclosed is a full analysis of these issues mentioned.

Thank you for your review.

163431

Name and address withheld

Pymont & 2009

I have uploaded my submission and would be grateful if you reviewed and took it into consideration
.

If my upload has not been successful please reach out as I am keen for my submission to be considered.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

163466

Name and address withheld

2009

While I look forward to the revitalisation of the fish markets currently underway, I am have serious concerns about the proposed Blackwattle Bay development.

Specifically, I'm opposed to the ultra tall high density residential towers. Based on trends observed in similar waterside ultra-high density suburbs such as the Docklands Melbourne, The Peak Apartments in neighbouring Haymarket and more recently the over saturation of apartments in Waterloo and green square; I believe that these buildings won't hold parity with the market (they are costly to build and maintain, and are unlikely to hold parity due to oversupply).

Additionally, these building will block out the natural light and alter the lines of site for properties in Glebe and Pyrmont, thus devaluing property in these areas.

Rather than erecting a 40-story building, it would make sense to erect medium-density residential in combination with commercial spaces (5-10 stories). These properties will hold parity with the market, will be easier to maintain, and will add value by turning Blackwater Bay into a destination; rather than an overpopulated poorly maintained city fringe

163471

Name and address withheld

Surry Hills

I am an architect and urban design professional.

I support the Blackwattle Bay SSP Study.

The integration of brick/masonry podiums as a reference to the Wattle St heritage warehouses is particularly supported.

I also encourage future towers to be narrow and tall, and vertically articulated where possible. Large, wide floor plates should be avoided as they dominate the skyline and detract from a refined and sophisticated urban form.

163561

Name and address withheld

2037

My submission is simple. I am appalled that the towers you are planning are so very tall and intrusive to the cityscape and general urban environment.

City of Sydney Council has always prided itself on being a City of Villages and this proposed development is all about developers and their profits and forgets about the people.

Glebe has fought hard - and continues to fight - over the decades to maintain its heritage and it is beloved because of it.

I would have been happy to keep the fish markets on the same site but, given that that decision was taken out of the people's hands, at least let us have a proportionate development on the site where the fish markets once stood. Don't destroy everything for the sake of greed.

163736

Name and address withheld

2009

It's so dispoint for this proposed. It's so little of the benefits for public. But it's huge affect our local community.

Building a high rise towers wall along the blackwattle bay foreshore next to western distributor. Blocked all water views from rest the pyrmont residential.

Reduce our sunlights time. Overshadowing the the public foreshore and neighbor buildings.

More traffic. More noise. More air pollution to that location.

strong objection to this proposed.

163886

Name and address withheld

2011

These renders look like you want to turn the Bay into a soulless asian city on the water, like a new Hong Kong.

I don't want any more high riserson the water, that are being built just to maximise floor space and rental yields with no consideration of their environmental, visual and social impacts.

The whole foreshore area should be turned into a vibrant park or open air museum, with as little buildings as possible. the relationship between land and water should be celebrated by providing general public with an opportunity to enjoy a space that is left as untouched as possible. this is what makes Sydney's unique character and sets our beautiful city apart.

This development is not consistent with Sydney's character and will detract from all the lifestyle features we are blessed with.

163936

Name and address withheld

2000

I anticipate that the new dwellings will somewhat resemble a precinct found within the city of Beijing, skyscraper apartment blocks with many of the occupants of the same origin. Is this part of the NSW Housing Strategy to cram more residents into Sydney from China and increase property prices for Australians? While the government and developers capitalise on it?

Furthermore, In light of the current climate crisis and the planet's deteriorating oceans, how can a world class fish market of that scale be justified?

This development subscribes to luxury lifestyles, consumerism and excessive consumption, and no doubt developer greed and input from China, as they are the worlds biggest consumers of fish, not the Australians.

Australians don't really need a facility of this scale, we had a quaint fish market that everyone liked, maybe they could have just replaced the tables and the umbrellas instead?

Does every newly developed community hub in Sydney have to resemble Chatswood?

This an appalling waste of resources and funds in light of the current geopolitical situation with China and of climate change, an endorsement of consumerism, luxury and Chinese money. Not exactly progress. Disgusting.

164361

Name and address withheld

2072

Dear Department of Planning, Industry and Environment,

I write to you regarding the Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission.

I have grave concerns about this proposal. I lived in Newtown during university and was a frequent walker along the blackwattle bay walk to the fishmarket- this area means a lot to me.

The area which has been rezoned for nine massive high-rise buildings 7-45 storeys- imagine a world where we put a park there instead of a building?

Federal and jubilee parks are great. But we can make this area even greater with more parkland, instead of putting up these dirty great buildings which will just make everyone sadder.

Please consider this submission. Please, please don't do this to our city.

164386

Name and address withheld

GLEBE

Hi,

Your plan is impressive. Just a small suggestion, can you consider improvement of the traffic around Wentworth Park, considering the future more move-in residents & visitors? for example, widen Bay Street?

Thanks

[redacted]

164421

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

I object to the proposed control which would allow a maximum building height up to RL 156 metres (or 45 storeys), as this is not in keeping with the local neighborhood area. The local Pymont community do not want high rise development in excess of what is currently imposed by The City of Sydney Council.

Solutions for traffic congestion near the Pymont Bridge Road intersection should also be considered given the high density and current population of the local area.

164501

Name and address withheld

2037

I believe it is unconscionable to allow private construction on this public foreshore land. The towers do not reflect the wider plan for Sydney, which is higher towers in the middle of the city tapering down to the foreshore. The height of the towers are completely inappropriate.

We saw the incredibly dodgy backroom deals that went on to get the Crown Casino building through. It is a complete blight on the city skyline, sitting out there alone and oversized. These buildings would have the same effect.

Please can you actually consider the people who LIVE in glebe and surrounds already, instead of just trying to cram more and more people in? We already live here and we will have to look at this horrible outcome everyday when we walk along our beautiful foreshore.

We want more parkland and public facility. If you want to include residential towers they should be low rise and fit into existing city planning.

I've grown up in this area and I'm sick of the unthoughtful and garish plans that keep rolling around. You don't listen to us and you are ruining our city.

164576

Name and address withheld

Pymont

I do not support the huge height of the tower's proposed at the site as it will cast permanent shadows and increase noise pollution in the area due to sound reflection. Tower and building height should be restricted to under 15 stories. I also oppose the number of apartments as there should be more garden and open space along the foreshore with a dog park. There is also no consideration given to huge increase expected in vehicular traffic along existing narrow roads and increase in pollution. Pymont local community needs more open spaces, parks and easy access to foreshore. We don't need massive tower's and 1000s of apartments.

164651

Name and address withheld

Pymont

I think the residential building planned are excessive and do not benefit the occupants but more offer a large profit to developers. The public space dedicated will be dwarfed by the overpass and in constant shade. The increase in water traffic will be detrimental to local recreational water sports and wildlife.

Out of the ridiculous occupancy capabilities of the new buildings, not enough is being dedicated to affordable housing.

164801

Name and address withheld

WATERLOO;NSW

This is just gross over development. What is Sydney's infatuation with high rise? This will completely overshadow (figuratively and literally) the beautiful new fish markets. All the consultant reports do nothing to address the impact they simply just present what it is . More than half of the new "public" streets get less than a couple of hours sunlight a day. It's laughable. Go back to the drawing board.

164836

Name and address withheld

Glebe

Dear Department of Planning,

I am writing to you to oppose the current plans for the new fish markets.

I am all for updating and improving the Bay and the city for that manner.

But I do not agree with the high rise buildings be planned.

I would like to see the space used for public areas with the community in mind. Areas that can be shared and nature to the space.

I do not want to see high rise buildings shadowing the Bay. Our Bay. This is a public space and I do not agree with private use of the area.

165021

Name and address withheld

Glebe

Hello,

I find this proposal unacceptable for a couple of reasons.

1. Hight - Pyrmont, Ultimo, Glebe are still mostly 2 storeys high townhouses. Buildings that are 10-15 storeys high are acceptable. There is no need to for this height. Study after study shows that building smaller communities is better for humans, for the society and for the environment.

<https://www.smartcitiesdive.com/ex/sustainablecitiescollective/7-reasons-why-high-rises-kill-livability/561536/>

2. Low affordable housing rate and other community aspects

Where all the nurseries, kindies, schools, recreational places, community places to support such a huge community?

I find the 5% affordable housing rate is low, should be at least double.

3. Lack of infrastructure.

All these apartments come with parking, with parking comes more cars. The roads around Pyrmont are already choked by traffic every day. It comes with noise pollution, air pollution. There are no valid public or active transport options. No cycle paths for commuters. A light rail that runs every 15 minutes and so overcrowded you don't fit on as is, is not enough. There are no buses either.

165026

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

The proposed development of Blackwattle Bay looks like a product of developer greed and government corruption. It is entirely unfeasible, unsuitable, and unsustainable. The inclusion of a "sustainable development" clause is laughable.

There is no way local public infrastructure could accommodate the creation of thousands of apartments in this area, not to mention the eyesore of having buildings towering over the Anzac bridge, totally obscuring a city landmark. And where are the public green spaces?

A development half of the proposed size would be more appropriate. But as it stands, the development benefits no one except the developers and the politicians who are paid by them.

165211

Name and address withheld

2037

Please redevelop the entire Blackwattle Bay as community open space. A small amount of small scale commercial enterprises should be developed which compliment the New Fish Market Site.

There should be NO apartment towers. There are currently not sufficient services and amenities to support the current population living in the Glebe Ultimo Pyrmont areas.

Having huge apartment towers would only exacerbate that problem.

Open space for the entire population of Sydney is a much more sustainable idea.

165326

Name and address withheld

2009

(1) Proposed high rise buildings are too high and too many.

All the surrounding buildings in the Pymont area are not over 20 floors.

The proposed height of the up to 45 floors buildings in the plan are too high and not in sync with the surrounding area. This will also disadvantage and block the sunlight to the existing surrounding lower buildings.

(2) Increase traffics congestion.

The increase population density of the area will also cause traffic congestion at the area which is already congested.

165596

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

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 Pyrmont
- 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 Pyrmont.
- 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 has been some local consultation, the majority of it seems to have been for demonstration purposes rather than actually taking into account the issues that existing residents have.

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.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

165601

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

Dear Sir/Mdm,

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

[redacted], we have seen increasing pressure on the public school system. I am also concerned that my child will not be able to attend school locally if spots in the schools are not increased in line with any population increase from this complex.

Some of the issues as I see it are :

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 Pyrmont
- 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 Pyrmont.
- 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 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 :

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.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

165636

Name and address withheld

2203

I request an extension until December 2022 for submissions of this project. The timeframe is already too small for such a massive project, and do not full take into consideration the environmental, social, and political implications involved with such a huge undertaking.

165711

Name and address withheld

2000

The Sydney Fish Market is key for tourism but also for the local Sydneysiders also. Outdoor seating and dining is critical to its success. Tourists (which I entertain regularly) love the market as it is known to have a relaxed open air atmosphere without the concrete jungle of a big city. Easy to sit and eat purchased from the markets. The design is horrid, where is the relaxed outdoor seating? Where are the beautiful late afternoon bars/restaurants to enjoy the sunset from? Where is the "nautical" theme that the old markets was LOVED for? Steel and glass is what your design has, it looks like a library or council building, NOT a place to relax and enjoy the unique city life and market. The design is just another Darling Harbour Convention Centre look. VERY BAD DESIGN. The design will spoil all the great reasons the tourists flock there for.

The 45 floor buildings are too high and not in keeping with the peaceful surrounds currently enjoyed by visitors to the fish market. Circular Quay was spoiled by buildings of a smaller height (from corrupt politicians and developers). The planners need to learn from that. Barrangaroo look alike... built up concrete steel and glass. DO A BIG RETHINK on this one. 20 floors would allow a much less "enclosed" feeling and keep an openness needed for the very heavily built area.

The planners have an opportunity to make this GREAT, not another ugly development creating shadows and keeping developers happy to sell yet another high rise with water views.

THIS DESIGN IS A HUGE DISAPPOINTMENT. Do the work thinking of the USERS not the developers or how much council rates can be charged.

165721

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

There should be no residential properties, especially the proposed 45 storey towers - it will completely ruin the character of the suburb. This proposal is a classic overdevelopment with only property developer's interests at heart, not the local community or the wider CoS and state.

165736

Name and address withheld

2009

The traffic management plan does not address existing LOS for intersections surrounding the project. Concerned the project during construction and operation would severely impact access to and from Pyrmont.

Figure 4-5 is incorrect and shows western harbour tunnel with beaches link and beaches link is not an approved project.

It's too difficult to find out what the proposal would look like in relation to building height. Many figures are plans rather than 3D images.

Objects to the proposed interface with the western distributor as it appears this has not been considered in the proposed building height.

Appears the public domain for the project would be shadowed for the majority of the day due to the proposed building 45 heights. Cannot see how the 4-8 storey buildings proposed would receive adequate lighting.

Concerned about the bulk and mass of the 45 storey buildings and lack of visual interest proposed

Appendix 15, visual impact assessment needs to use A3 pages to show the plans rather than splitting two A4 pages in half as it disrupts the visuals... can't believe a visual consultant would think this looks good now everything is electronic.

The project blocks too many views of the Australian tower, a distinct city skyline feature.

The photomontages in Appendix 15, visual impact assessment are so faint and shown on a cloudy day gives the impression they want to subdue the overall project as its so imposing.

As Pyrmont is effectively cut off from the rest of the city, there needs to be a construction management plan submitted so the impacts can be assessed.

The interface of Wattle St/Harris St is really nice , its a good design choice to have shorted buildings at that intersection so it is not tooo imposing.

Queries how the overall impact rating for Foreshore path / open space

near Blackwattle Bay Wharf (no4) can be mod-high, it should be high. The displace of that overall data is terrible - honestly how can a visual impact assessment display data like that.

165756

Name and address withheld

2108

I have just had the privilege of reading about the innovative master plan for Msheireb Downtown Doha - a city based on a dream. It would be worth having the planners of the Blackwattle Bay site see the scale and beauty of this design before signing off on their lacklustre (and sub-par offering). It saddens me to see that the proposal is not seeking design excellence or a seamless and clever integration of what already exists in the Sydney City built environment. It is going for the barnacle approach of sticking very ordinary apartment blocks in front of and hence shadowing what is behind. Not blending and working with the extant built environment of Sydney but rather imposing its height and mediocrity on an important "gateway" to Sydney.

Design excellence for a particular site takes years of research and development and a clear vision of what makes cities beautiful and liveable. It must be site specific, which in this case would take into account the historical context of the fish markets and the incorporating of this history into the new plans. It cannot be developer driven as this means a maximising of profit over civic amenity.

The scale and height of the residential towers is bloated to maximise quantity of apartments over quality of design. Where is the overarching idea or dream for this site?

For any new development for Sydney we need to consider first the well-being, quality of life and security of future generations, employing design for climate and for future-proofing with regard to changes in climate and also a clear focus on civic use over private ownership. We can of course have this, as evidenced by the example in Doha but it is challenging and it needs a clear overarching plan. It must be driven by excellence in design as the sine qua non.

165781

Name and address withheld

GLEBE 2037

To Whom It May Concern,

Whilst I welcome the long overdue upgrade to the Sydney Fish Markets the planned redevelopment of the old fish market site is disappointing and offers little public benefit. The towers loom over the water, creating dark shadows at the times of day most popular with walkers along the Glebe foreshore path. The tower heights detract from the Anzac Bridge, competing for attention in the skyline. The wall of towers cuts Blackwattle Bay off from the Pyrmont peninsula. There is no 'stepping down' to the foreshore, or variation in building envelopes. The building envelope heights should be halved, to provide solar access, prevent wind tunnels, and respect the character of the residential suburbs and green space surrounding Blackwattle Bay.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

165801

Name and address withheld

Camperdown 2050

I STRONGLY OBJECT TO EVERY FACET OF THIS PROPOSAL FOR BLACKWATTLE BAY.

This does not align with any of the communities requests or wishes. And it most certainly is not based on our previous feedback.

This development is facing a residential area and is our local Backyard - literally, as many of us live in units. We depend on this space for sun, rest, activity, exercise and leisure. As does our local wildlife.

No member of this community voted for high rise! This proposed development will dwarf the Anzac bridge and all surrounding structures. It will overshadow and destroy the natural bay environment, will be an eyesore for residents and does not contribute to public access or amenity in any way.

We were promised more green space and more improved public access to the foreshore. This proposal does not deliver!

It has been wonderful to see many more birds, fish and wildlife in general return to BLACKWATTLE Bay Over the past year. Please do not destroy their habitat and drive them away.

THE INNER WEST is NOT your dumping ground for over development, high rise casinos, cruise ships and making a quick buck. The state government has already destroyed Pymont. Leave something of value for the residents and the wildlife of the inner west. You don't do this in the Eastern or Northern Suburbs - leave the inner west alone.

165966

Name and address withheld

Albury 2640

The proposal to allow 12 buildings up to 45 storeys high is a massive overdevelopment of a foreshore area that would be better utilised as primarily public space. The redevelopment of this area provides a unique opportunity to reclaim a significant site for public use. The current usage of the site, while not attractive, is limited to very low profile buildings. I believe that this aspect of the site should be retained and any development be limited such that it doesn't extend above the height of the elevated road at its border. The current proposal will mean the site will become an impediment to the view of existing structures behind it and there has not been adequate consideration of the shared amenities of both outlook and sunlight when developing the current proposal. The shade and wind tunnel effects of 12 tall buildings in close proximity will also make the proposed open spaces between them unpleasant to frequent.

In addition, the increased volume of traffic in an already congested traffic zone needs further consideration.

After the disaster of Barangaroo, Sydney does not need another eyesore on the foreshore. The foreshore is for the people of greater Sydney, NSW and indeed beyond. It should not be overwhelmed by towering monstrosities and certainly not 12 in such a tight space!

166076

Name and address withheld

2137

Public space should remain in public hands.

166086

Name and address withheld

pyrmont

il would like to vehemently oppose the construction of 45 storeyed towers on the land vacated by the present fish market on the grounds of following reasons;

1. This would create forceful wind tunnels in the location . Black It Itwattle bay is a very windy part of the harbour precinct. Hence this would be a problem for the residents . And also how many huge shadow shafts this would cause impacting on the solar panels on top of the new fish market.

2. The traffic density is currently pretty high in this area and the proposed apartments when fully occupied would aggravate the traffic congestion substantially.

3. It would be worthwhile going back to the drawing board and reduce the size of apartments to 15 to 20 storey level.

166191

Name and address withheld

2009

The proposal to allow buildings heights of up to 45 storeys (156 metres) will create massive shadows across most of Pymont in the afternoon and distorts the overall skyline.

166426

Name and address withheld

2009

Reading this SSP study and proposed. It's so shocking. 12 buildings up 156m height = 45 storeys tower. Built on the Blackwattle Bay foreshore. Along western distributors. It seems that a high rise towers wall along the harbour. Blocking all water from the rest of pyrmont residents. Bring more traffic, more noise and more pollution to the area. Overshadowing the public domain and neighbours. It's unacceptable.

When PPPS on exhibition. We already objected to the consideration height of 156m on this site. Because it directly impacts us.

[redacted] If this tower wall was built up. It will block all these wonderful views from us. Also block our sunlights for at least 3 hours.

Sunlights and views are very important to our residents. It offset western distributor noise and pollution. Give our residents peace and happiness. Keeping building value. We really need this to remain.

Always talk, listen to the local community and give more benefit to the public. But this proposal seems to be of very little benefit to the public. But a huge impact to pyrmont residents and community. Only see more benefit to the private developers and business.

From PPPS to this SSP study and proposed. We see clearly what infrastructure NSW is trying to do. Compared the CBD 300m high tower to this proposed site 156m high tower. This doesn't make any sense. Around Blackwattle Bay foreshore buildings only 2 storeys - 6 storeys high. Why not compare them????

In order to transform, pyrmont becomes a CBD extension. Proposal high rise towers up 45 storeys on the lower storeys building permit land. It breaks the rules. Hard to accept.

Pyrmont is a special residential suburb. Have beautiful character. Different from CBD. As 20+ years pyrmont residents. We really don't want to see pyrmont become a CBD extension. All over high rise commercial and residential towers into pyrmont. Can imagine how terrible it will be. Overshadowing. Reduce sunlights. More crowded. More noise. More traffic. Ruin pyrmont character. Damage pyrmont residents' living environment.

Transformation Blackwattle Bay foreshore from old to new upgrade is a good idea. We support more open space parks and community centres on harbour foreshore for the public to enjoy. Plant more trees along the western distributor. It's good for the environment. But transformation Blackwattle Bay foreshore surrounded by high rise buildings . That's unreasonable. The impact is huge. We are strongly against this proposal.

All waterfront foreshore public domain should remain more open space parks and low rise buildings. Can't break these rules by any excuse. Special leader of infrastructure NSW. It's the wrong example.

We strongly object to this bleaching rule high rise tower proposal.

Hopefully the proponents hear our pyrmont residents and community wishes. Complying with the rules.

[redacted]

167251

Name and address withheld

2050

I think the plan for black wattle Bay should support and grow community infrastructure ;
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

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

167311

Name and address withheld

2037

I would like to request a greater proportion of the proposed development be given to the improvement of public facilities such as public parks and spaces.

Black wattle Bay area has become increasingly popular with the public, providing an essential place for walking, relaxation, off-leash dog zones, family bike rides etc.

On the weekends this area is congested and therefore more parkland is needed. It is also vital that consideration is made regarding shadows from buildings and how this will affect public parks and spaces.

Thank you

167326

Name and address withheld

2040

The details of the new fish market development deliver public waterfront land to property developers at the expense of our local community.

This area is one of the most densely populated in Sydney, and already suffers from a massive under-provision of community recreation facilities, public green space and a light rail that is at capacity.

We don't want more development, we don't want more apartments, we want more public open space.

167331

Name and address withheld

2040

The details of the new fish market development deliver public waterfront land to property developers at the expense of our local community.

This area is one of the most densely populated in Sydney, and already suffers from a massive under-provision of community recreation facilities, public green space and a light rail that is at capacity.

We don't want more development, we don't want more apartments, we want more public open space.

167341

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

Dear Sir or Madam

I object to the Blackwattle Bay proposal on the basis that the maximum building height exceeds my expectations for this location.

This Blackwattle Bay Precinct sits outside of the CBD and I believe any future developments should not exceed a height equivalent to four storeys. High rise developments detract from the enjoyment of the area.

Kind regards

[redacted]

167361

Name and address withheld

2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

I support the development of the fish market, retail shops and SOME residential unit.

However I strongly oppose the development of towers up to 45 stories due to the following reasons:

- Pyrmont is already densely populated and it is very stressful to live with so many skyscrapers. These skyscrapers may also block sunlight and deprive residents of lower building of sunlight reaching their units;
- Insufficient facilities built (schools, playground, parks, supermarkets etc) for so many additional residents;
- Traffic congestion during construction and once completed, there will be too many cars using the same roads;
- Movement in soil structure during construction may damage our units (eg cracks and weakened structure); and
- Depressed rental market and unit prices due to over supply of residential units.

I understand the need to create jobs and to boost tourism but over development of residential units adversely affects the current residents which is not very fair.

Thank you for your consideration.

167466

Name and address withheld

2040

Buildings are way too high and there are too many of them. It's just a wall of very tall buildings which is unattractive and too condensed. It dominates skyline and blocks views. not enough public parking, not enough public green space.

167526

Name and address withheld

2009

[redacted] Currently we only get a few hours of sunlight each day in the afternoon as the sun sets in the west. The placement of buildings 45 levels tall at the proposed site would result in our home getting no direct sunlight at any point during the day. Hundreds of other residents on [redacted] with west facing homes would be affected in the same manner. I recommend the building heights be adjusted so they don't create shadows over the many of the existing residents' homes, particular those already living in fairly dark units.

In the attached photo you can see the small bit of sky we have access to, and how important it is for us to have this sunlight.

A second matter is the pedestrian access in this part of Pyrmont. The southern end Pyrmont is already dominated by cars and lacks the numerous pedestrian crossings available in more affluent parts of north Pyrmont or suburbs like Surry Hills. Currently pedestrian foot traffic to Sydney is funneled down two very narrow footpaths on Pyrmont Bridge Road or under the Western Distributor.

The footpaths on Pyrmont Bridge Road are particular bad, being only 1m wide, and lack safe crossings from the traffic coming off Pyrmont Bridge Road (where Edward St meets Pyrmont Bridge Road is a good example where traffic and pedestrians are already facing difficulties).

Any new development at Blackwattle should be accompanied by a large expansion of pedestrian access across Pyrmont to stop the new development being hemmed in by large roads for cars and little else.

I have attached an image of showing the routes pedestrian access through Pyrmont from the new site is restricted.

167616

Name and address withheld

2089

This plan does not consider future generation and use of this space. Additional traffic to roads, pollution of 8 lane traffic to residence in towers, negative environmental impact (including shadowing solar panels), lack of green space.

167736

Name and address withheld

Elizabeth Bay

I write in support of the proposal.

As a Sydney fish market customer and previous resident of Glebe I have always lamented the poor quality urban environment around the fish market, Pyrmont bridge road and the south and eastern sides of Blackwattle Bay.

I believe the master plan proposal, as it stands is entirely appropriate for the area and consistent with established urban form of the Pyrmont peninsula. The scale of buildings sited to the south east of the bay ensures overshadowing at the critical period (midday to sunset) is contained to areas over the freeway. Furthermore the bulk of buildings provides an excellent sound buffer between the adjacent freeway and the water's edge and new fish market. As an active cyclist I am also excited about the completion of a continuous foreshore access from Woolloomooloo to Rozelle.

My only feedback is that the proposal ensures sufficient building set back along Pyrmont bridge road, between the Wattle Street intersection and the Western Distributor, to ensure a generous pedestrian footpath width, perhaps to allow a separated cycle path and parking bays and even an extra lane of traffic with generous areas for landscaping and street trees.

Otherwise I look forward to experiencing this exciting development for Sydney and the Pyrmont peninsula.

Thank you

167771

Name and address withheld

2037

The development of the area of the Fish Market needs to consider :

1. Drainage to resolve the flooding of the corner outside the Kauri Hotel in heavy rain.
2. Heavy traffic congestion on Pyrmont Bridge Road from the Anzac Bridge off-ramp up to the Glebe Point Road traffic lights after 3.pm which also impacts on Parramatta Road.
3. The reduction of daylight in streets surrounding the areas of the twelve, forty-five story towers.
4. The wind tunneling created by the towers especially in heat waves, and resulting unaesthetic appeal of Blackwattle Bay.
5. The loss of significant historical sites such as "Hell, Purgatory and Heaven" quarries from which the Sydney sandstone was built.
6. This area needs new builds to include 12% affordable housing for the increasing number of unemployed in the Inner West.

167841

Name and address withheld

Erskineville

I am so disappointed that prime waterfront land like this is to become dominated by high rise buildings creating shaded wind tunnels ! When can the council ever plan to genuinely build spaces for the community instead of pandering to the developers - this is an outrageous proposal and lacks vision , imagination & genuine community partnerships . We have an opportunity to create a world class water front space - donâ€™t waste this opportunity!

167956

Name and address withheld

2042

I believe the proposed towers will cast shadow over the area and cause an unmanageable level of traffic in an area that is already congested. I have waited for 40 minutes to get from Jackson's Landing on Bowman St onto the Anzac bridge due to traffic under the overpass and expect that adding thousands of residents to the area would worsen the traffic.

Additionally, the geography of Pyrmont means that it is a noticeably windy area. The residential towers at Jackson's Landing create wind tunnels, and there is an unbelievable amount of wind isolated in this area some days, particularly on Distillery Drive. I'm concerned about wind levels around the new towers.

168026

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

Views on Proposal:

â€¢ Concerns that the redevelopment of site doesnâ€™t capitalise on increasing access to Public Land and foreshore.

â€¢ Concerns about increased density

â€¢ Concerns involving increased traffic movement due to the increase in residential accommodation

â€¢ Very concerned by the visual impact and potential overshadowing of the Prymont abd Glebe foreshore by allowing building heights above 12 Floors and up to 156 metres.

â€¢ Concerns that the current plans have not taken into consideration the provision for the public to social distance in common areas such as in the Public Recreation Zone and during Major events.

Reasons for View

â€¢ There is an opportunity to provide the community with improved access to the site. Given it is a congested site consideration to public amenity is paramount. There has been significant public concern given the impact of construction in the Barangaroo precinct.

168111

Name and address withheld

2041

Dear Department of Planning,

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

The current plan for The Bays needs to be revised for:

- Better support to grow community infrastructure
- less allocation to private moorings and apartments
- More open space (not just under the Anzac Bridge) for the community, existing and those moving to the apartments and for visitors

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

168126

Name and address withheld

2060

Overall I think this a great outcome for a rather neglected and under used area of the Sydney foreshore, bringing some much needed height and life.

168181

Name and address withheld

2050

I STRONGLY OBJECT TO EVERY FACET OF THIS PROPOSAL FOR BLACKWATTLE BAY.

This does not align with any of the communities requests or wishes. And it most certainly is not based on our previous feedback.

This development is facing a residential area and is our local Backyard - literally, as many of us live in units. We depend on this space for sun, rest, activity, exercise and leisure. As does our local wildlife.

No member of this community voted for high rise! This proposed development will dwarf the Anzac bridge and all surrounding structures. It will overshadow and destroy the natural bay environment, will be an eyesore for residents and does not contribute to public access or amenity in any way.

We were promised more green space and more improved public access to the foreshore. This proposal does not deliver!

It has been wonderful to see many more birds, fish and wildlife in general return to BLACKWATTLE Bay Over the past year. Please do not destroy their habitat and drive them away.

THE INNER WEST is NOT your dumping ground for over development, high rise casinos, cruise ships and making a quick buck. The state government has already destroyed Pymont. Leave something of value for the residents and the wildlife of the inner west. You don't do this in the Eastern or Northern Suburbs - leave the inner west alone.

168191

Name and address withheld

Glebe

Dear PI&E- Blackwattle Bay,

I am [redacted] directly impacted by proposed Blackwattle Bay project. I note the environmental Plan 2012 requested changes (and other plan /policy changes noted in letter sent by PI&E 6 July 2021) which concern me (and also would impact other residents and broader inner west community members who share this Blackwattle space). The proposal has not demonstrated clear and stakeholder approved criteria to: 1) minimise greenery/light reduction due to height limitations and changes, in consideration of surrounding residencies/schools and public areas 2) minimise traffic/noise impacts with the changes in consideration of traffic/population density and existing residents in the area.

I particularly believe building heights need to be kept to a minimum (existing policy at a minimum) due to all of the concerns above.

168236

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

The heights of the proposed buildings is unprecedented in this area and in the rare in the city of Sydney, at 45 storeys. This is far too tall, and i am concerned about the following:

1. heights of buildings are too tall - should be limited to 20 storeys max
2. the creation of wind tunnels - pg 210 clearly demonstrates wind tunnels which are horrible and make areas extremely unpleasant, thus no-go zones
3. no extra public transport routes or definite ferry wharfs. The light rail is already crowded, and the bus routes in this area are limited
4. shadowing from the buildings, making the area cold, windy, and uninviting

168376

Name and address withheld

2047

Please don't build high rise apartments here. Please prioritise the community and not developers!
There's too too many high rises and it's ruining our city :(

168416

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

Is it appropriate to have 45 storey towers on the harbour foreshore?

Will the foreshore promenade be wide enough for the anticipated amount of pedestrian and bicycle traffic?

How much extra traffic will be generated around an already highly congested road system?

Will there be medical and educational facilities to cater for the increase in residential population?

Is affordable housing guaranteed, or will the alternative monetary contribution disappear into consolidated revenue?

Will there be sufficient housing for key workers – teachers, nurses, community support workers, police, ambulance and emergency officers, delivery personnel and cleaners?

Will any indigenous people be able to live there? If not, how will an authentic indigenous presence be achieved?

How are the proposed changes to the planning regulations consistent with the government's promise to return planning powers to the people?

Should developer contributions raised in Blackwattle Bay go into state consolidated revenue, or be used to support infrastructure with the Pymont/Ultimo/Glebe/White Bay precinct?

I don't understand why this is a state government and not a City of Sydney Council decision

168426

Name and address withheld

2007

I don't agree with the government selling more publicly owned foreshore land to private property developers. This will reduce our access to the foreshore. There will be too much overdevelopment. Too many high rise buildings. 45 story buildings is outrageous. Even 20 story high buildings is too much. Where is the infrastructure and public transport to support this outrageous overdevelopment? I vote no to this Blackwattle Bay proposal. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

168671

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

I strongly disapprove of the proposed development of Blackwattle Bay.

As has happened with the ugly, over-sized monstrosities on Barangaroo (particularly Packer's Prick), greedy developers have been allowed to break all longstanding building height restrictions and heaven knows what else.

Our glorious harbour foreshores should not have to bear buildings of more than 12-15 stories at the very most. [redacted] and walk along the harbour front almost every day, often shedding tears of joy at the serene beauty of the area. If this development goes ahead I'll sob with anger and frustration at such foolish and unfeeling destruction.

Also there is scant attention given to traffic flow, schools and a hospital to service the area.

I absolutely object to this destruction of Blackwattle Bay.

Thank you for the opportunity to have my say.

Kind regards

[redacted]

168761

Name and address withheld

Pyrmont 2009

See attached submission

168831

Name and address withheld

2037

I wish to lodge my objection to the development proposal. As a long term resident and owner in Glebe. The local roads and transport infrastructure is already at breaking point in the Glebe/Pymont area, and the development proposal will add additional strain. Additionally, the visual impact of the up to 45 story towers will negatively impact and sense of space and light for the existing community. I strenuously object to the existing proposal as it stands.

168841

Name and address withheld

2040

I am writing in support of SCENARIO 2 “BALANCED.”

In addition to the proposed Dragonboat storage facilities, additional separate storage should be added to allow for 6 Man Outrigger canoes and single passive crafts.

With the increase in popularity of water based recreational activities, the proposed development should have facilities/ storage to cater for the growth of water sports, and not just provide for the numbers currently in use.

168846

Name and address withheld

2040

I am writing in support of SCENARIO 2 “BALANCED.”

In addition to the proposed Dragonboat storage facilities, additional separate storage should be added to allow for 6 Man Outrigger canoes and single passive crafts.

With the increase popularity of water based recreational activities, the proposed development should have facilities/ storage to cater for the growth of water sports, and not just provide for the numbers currently in use.

168856

Name and address withheld

2000

I prefer SCENARIO 2

Connection to the water and having recreational facilities for youth development is paramount to the success of our growing community.

Recreational water activities such as kayaking, paddling and fishing is what makes our area unique. We not only need to allow for safe access to water, but also have enough facilities and storage areas to facilitate these activities.

169066

Name and address withheld

Pymont

To Whom It May Concern,

I object to the maximum height of proposed buildings as it is inappropriate for the area.

In addition, winds from South and West will create a wind tunnel.

Regards

[redacted]

169916

Name and address withheld

Pymont

Hi,

Following the discussion with the project team of Blackwattle Bay regarding the Visual Impact and Noise & Vibration Assessments below are some concerns raised:

- With significant mixed-use development along Bank street with development close to the intersection of Bank Street and Quarry Master Drive will have a considerable impact on the Viewer Activity, Number of Views and Quantum of View. The current assessment has been classified as Low. With the current plans, this would place a large structure blocking all the views to the bay of some 750-1000 people currently residing [redacted] and apartment blocks on [redacted], in excess of 250+ apartments. Homeowners had made property investment decisions at the basis of the current view with no concrete plans in the past to suggest buildings at this height.

- The new buildings designed have factored the noise and vibration from the Anzac bridge however, these new buildings will considerably increase noise and vibration for current residential buildings with both noises being bounced off the new buildings. There are no considerations currently to account for existing buildings and how to remedy this.

Certainly, the new development is welcomed and there is support for new development in Pymont but not at significant detriment and loss to current residents.

Make a concerted effort to engage the residents of [redacted] and [redacted] whose day to day life and investments are impacted. Further assessments must be done to understand what can be done to prevent loss of view to bay/ water with the findings addressing this issue.

Assess the current Noise and Vibration level for residents close to Anzac Bridge and the anticipated increase in levels should the current plans go ahead. The remediation plan should not only factor in the changes to the building form & design but also provisions for apartments & buildings along Bank Street such as Noise Abatement Program.

170591

Name and address withheld

Ultimo, 2007

Hi,

I am very positive about the building of the new fish market, this will be a great investment and asset for Sydney.

My concern is the apartment developments along Blackwattle bay where the fish market is currently located. I have to say that I am against this part of the proposed development.

The reason I am against the building of apartments along there is centred on the roads and traffic issues. Already, driving through the fishmarket area in any direction, Anzac bridge etc is a congested and painful experience. Adding 100s of apartments to the area will just make it far worse. I can foresee traffic backing up in multiple directions causing add on issues with through traffic, resident traffic, fishmarket traffic.

Reviewing the proposal documents there was no mention of improvements for traffic/roads except public transport and footpaths. Unfortunately, no matter how much Sydney wants people to walk and use the trains etc it is not going to happen. There needs to be roads that can handle the volume of private vehicles and that area is already struggling.

Given this, plus Pyrmont already being Australia's most densely populated suburb I am very much against the building of apartments along the fishmarket shore and feel the land should be set aside as parkland for the community which I understand was the original intention.

Regards,

[redacted]

171176

Name and address withheld

alexandria

I am totally against high rise of up to 45 storeys. My reasons include but are not limited to: 1) it is not in keeping with the current outlook 2) it will crowd the foreshore.

171276

Name and address withheld

2009

Hi,

I would like to express my concerns and rejection of the Blackwattle Bay project. It will cause significant overshadowing, environmental impacts and increased congestion and traffic in the Pyrmont suburb. Increased density in this area will change the locale, and will not be beneficial to the suburb. Increased noise, air, water, and other pollution will come as a result of this project. Hence, I vote against it.

171966

Name and address withheld

Pymont

I submit that:

1. The proposal has too much bulk and height close to the water which will overshadow the foreshore especially during the morning. An example is Crown at Barangaroo: if you walk along the foreshore in the morning, Crown blocks the sunlight and spoils the foreshore in ways that the lower rise buildings do not. Public land should be used for the benefit of the public.
2. The general development principal of buildings becoming lower in height as the waterfront is widely accepted. The case for not following this approach is not clear.
3. This looks like a substantial profit opportunity for developers. Consideration could be given to the government doing the development itself and applying the profit from public land for public benefit.
4. Public housing is needed, but funds are limited. But every public housing residence in Pymont could fund several residences in some other suburbs. The policy case for depriving several families of a residence so that one family might live in Pymont is not clear, and should be clarified. I submit that the proposed Pymont public housing apartments (or value of those apartments) could be given to government for the purpose of provision of public housing in those areas where the policy case is strongest (which might include Pymont).

172021

Name and address withheld

Rozelle 2039

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

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

This proposal is crazy. 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.

This is a perfect opportunity to create a n entirely new, lasting and positive precinct. 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.

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,

[redacted]

172026

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

The proposed plan for Blackwattle Bay is insufficient in supporting the needs of social and affordable housing. At a minimum 20% of all residential development should be for social and affordable housing. Covid restrictions bring to light the city and Pymont's dependence on essential workers living long distances away in the west and south west of Sydney. Ensuring at least 40% of all residences in the proposed development are assigned to those unable to afford private rentals in the area would allow young families to live near their parents' place of work.

172056

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

Nope. Just no. Back to drawing board. This proposal is oversized, overcapitalised and overweening. Like all cities and buildings on shorelines it will be drowned long before the expiry of its expected lifespan. Remember Champlain Towers. To expend energy of all types on a foreshore soon to disappear by building a pricey ghetto is the quintessence of hubris and shortsightedness as well as cynicism. Stop the charade and return to Sydney one of its best features: a semblance of a working harbour.

172081

Name and address withheld

Balmain

[redacted] I regularly visit Blackwattle Bay and the fish market. I support the proposed plans to redevelop Blackwattle Bay for a mixture of commercial, residential and open space uses.

172106

Name and address withheld

Balmain 2041

I object to the current proposed redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay and the suggested heights and density of the proposed site.

Continued overdevelopment on overly crowded and congested space is an abuse of tax payers and rate payers rights.

The proposed heights and density of the dwellings are not in line with the skyline of the inner west and will only add to the congestion caused by traffic.

This proposal needs to be re-assessed.

172151

Name and address withheld

Ultimo

State Significant Precinct Study – Existing Sydney Fish Market Site

The existing Sydney Fish Market site provides significant opportunity to connect Pyrmont with the harbour, grow employment capacity in the region and greater Sydney, and build on Pyrmont's social vibrancy and diversity. But the proposed rezoning of the site fails on all fronts and should be rejected.

Bulk and Scale

The proposal to allow towers of up to 45 storeys high along the waterfront will create a wall of development, blocking the harbour from the rest of Pyrmont. The towers will cast shadows along the proposed public domain including the public waterfront promenade, making it unpleasant particularly in winter. This is a poor approach to place-based planning and is not what our iconic harbour and Pyrmont deserve.

The massive proposed development footprint constrains the public domain along the waterfront to a token 10-metre band. This is a missed opportunity to create a destination promenade that attracts investment in adjacent commercial space and visitors from across the globe.

Proposed heights and development footprint are too large and must be scaled back.

Public open space, particularly around the harbour must be expanded to create a worldclass public waterfront park.

Commercial Residential Mix

The proposed massive boost in residential development is inappropriate for the site. Pyrmont is already one of Australia's most densely populated neighbourhoods with much of its social infrastructure at capacity. Furthermore, the close proximity to the Western Distributor and the Anzac Bridge will compromise residential amenity from significant air, noise and light pollution.

The focus of development on this site should be jobs growth, which will help rebuild the economy after the pandemic.

The proposed proportion of residential development must be reduced.

Housing

Only five percent of the 1,550 proposed residential dwellings are earmarked as affordable. This is appalling at a time when the state is in a housing crisis. New South Wales does not have enough social and affordable homes to house those waiting for housing assistance, particularly in the inner city where there are jobs and services. The latest lockdown could see that list grow even further as large numbers of people become unemployed and lose businesses.

All experts agree that government redevelopment projects should dedicate at least 20 percent of units to social and affordable housing. This is particularly important when the government owns the land.

The claims of engagement with First Nations people seem only symbolic when more practical measures like providing Aboriginal housing have been ignored.

At least 20 percent of residential dwellings should be social and affordable housing.

Planning Process

A number of disturbing proposals have been made that will reduce scrutiny and public involvement in the future planning and management of the site.

There is a proposal to declare Blackwattle Bay a public authority precinct like Barangaroo and Darling Harbour which would enable the state government to design and deliver public domain areas and manage future use of the site outside normal transparent and accountable planning processes. This will be the case regardless of building ownership. This approach undermines the purpose of determining areas of state significance, risking social licence for major development.

Affected residents and businesses face challenges when their neighbourhood is not managed by their elected council, including communities that came under the former Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority. The future residents and businesses should have their neighbourhood democratically managed and planned.

Furthermore, proposed changes to state environment planning policies and Sydney regional environment plans would exempt open space and public domain design and delivery from a public consultation and approval process, and any development application above \$10 million would be state significant development and subject to reduced scrutiny.

The best planning outcomes come when the public can provide input and when decisions are made by those who represent affected communities.

Blackwattle Bay must be subject to local government planning and management to ensure all decisions are open, transparent and accountable, and reflect community input.

There is no consideration of how the massive number of new residents and workers to the region would increase demand for facilities, services, and social infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is not part of the precinct plan but will be delayed until after approval. This provides little comfort to

local communities that existing infrastructure will not be overburdened or that new infrastructure will meet the new demand created by the redevelopment.

The State Significant Precinct Study must identify what local infrastructure will be required to support the redevelopment prior to any determination.

The proposed development is too big, too dense, too close to the harbour. It has the wrong commercial and housing mix, with not enough social and affordable housing as part of the residential component. I ask you to reject the proposal and recommence work to ensure the former Sydney Fish Market site can be an outstanding redevelopment that creates jobs and social cohesion..

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

172456

Name and address withheld

2037

My objection is regarding the height of the building and lack of public space. Please address these. I am not against development but the shadows caused by this tall building will have a negative impact on the environment and public.

172466

Name and address withheld

2037

I would like to see this plan go ahead as Glebe is in a such great location to the bay, to the water, to the park, to universities as well as to the city. However thereâ€™s not much development in the areas that is away from the Glebe point road, you can hardly find a good cafe.

With the renovation getting going with the black waffle bay, we wish to bring more opportunities for job, retails and bring more investment to the areas.

172501

Name and address withheld

2037

Due to the excessive bulk and build of the proposed design, I cannot support it in its current form.

I fully support the redevelopment of this site however this should be scaled down in terms of the building height and density.

Specific concerns being :

- Height to be reduced in proportion to site / setting. This is not a large parcel of land and to size with building similar to Barangaroo is excessive.
- Green space represented in the artistic diagrams does not truly reflect the potential of the site. It is under a highway and will likely be starved of adequate sun light.
- The scale and prominence of the 12x buildings will dwarf the fish markets and Anzac bridge which both should remain centre stage of the bays design.

We only get one go at this. So please consider form and design for future generations over maximising revenue potential.

172566

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

I object to a few things of the current proposal.

1. The over the top height of these buildings. 45 stories is ridiculous, but they are all just too high for the area.
2. There are barely any open spaces despite what the politicians keep saying, this submission shows there is little open space.
3. There is already a lack of transport, infrastructure, ammenities in the area, and there doesnâ€™t seem to be a concrete plan in rectifying this.

172976

Name and address withheld

Stanmore NSW 2048

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

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

This represents a horrifying over-development of a sensitive site right on the foreshore. I have many happy memories of visits to the Sydney Fish Market and would hate the area to lose its amenity.

While it is clear that the site needs to be renewed following the relocation of the Fish Market, the proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls are unacceptable.

We need a plan for the site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and greenspace, not over-development. I come from Newcastle and have seen the large-scale alienation of public foreshore land there. It has also happened elsewhere in Sydney, with Barangaroo being an obvious example. I don't wish to see it happen again. The high-density housing development permitted under the plan - up to 1,550 apartments in 45-storey towers - would monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure.

The wall of towers on the site would 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 appears Infrastructure NSW is focused on realising a business case rather than providing best practice in design and planning.

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

Further, the transport modelling fails to adequately address the significant impact of both the new Fish Market development and the proposed residential development.

The proposal makes little provision for quality open greenspace, with 70 per cent of the site dedicated to the private use of residents, offices and shops and 30 per cent allocated to public use such as walkways and roads. Only small portion is greenspace - much of which is actually under the Western Distributor, in shade. 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.

Nor does the plan make any provision for the windfall profits that will inevitably flow from rezoning Blackwattle Bay to be shared with the community. These gains will be completely unearned, delivered by virtue of a change in planning controls that will allow more intense use of the land, making it exponentially more valuable for sale to prospective developers.

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,
[redacted]

173411

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

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

We already have so many apartments in Glebe, it is being taken over by greed and totally losing the village atmosphere. So many of these apartments are already empty so why build more. With Covid-19 so many people have moved out of inner city to the west and south so they have their own homes and garden.

[redacted] for there to be built a 45 story apartments would totally block out my view of the city. I have already lost sight of the harbour bridge due to the high rise in Pyrmont.

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.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

173556

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

This is a terrible plan to overdevelop an already cramped, small site by the side of the freeway with ridiculously tall residential apartments out of character for the area.

No improvement of roads, traffic congestion or any amenities (increased transport, food and services, schools, etc) in already next to one of the most densely populated suburbs (Pymont-Ultimo) - and all this supposedly only to be considered after the fact.

Grave concerns for overshadowing the proposed fish markets and surrounding areas in Pymont.

Existing concrete plants also supposedly to stay - in the midst of residential apartments.

Free public parkland only a fraction of what Barangaroo was provided and in these COVID times, it has shown how incredibly important greenery and parkland is for all residents.

This reeks of a developer's wet dream and a land and cash grab to the detriment of locals and demise of yet another opportunity to truly re-envision the site for the future.

Please do not consider these overheight residential towers not fit for purpose on the current site.

173636

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

[redacted] I strongly oppose the proposed development for Blackwattle Bay. While I support medium density, the proposed development is entirely out of proportion for the area and does not adequately provide for the needs and interests of local residents. The high-storey towers will dwarf the surrounding areas and stand like elevated fortresses over Blackwattle Bay. More appropriate and sensitive plans must be developed to provide good housing and public amenities for the area.

173641

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

[redacted] and wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed development for Blackwattle Bay. I am a supporter of medium density housing. The submission in question is not in proportion with the surrounding area. It does not meet the needs of local residents and will have a significant negative impact. Social housing and public amenities are urgently needed in our city and this plan does not provide that.

174396

Name and address withheld

2007

"I welcome this opportunity to comment on the NSW Government's plans for the redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay.

As a person who loves the water, can I ask that the plans include a public harbourside pool, possibly positioned near the old Iron Cove bridge, under the Anzac Bridge,

There seem to be pockets of calm water, away from boats and where the sun will warm both swimmers and those enjoying the few remaining public spaces we have,

Also I am concerned, as a lot of people are about the high of the buildings along the foreshore, particularly the one that is earmarked as 45 storeys high.

Many thanks.

174596

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

Ultimo/Pymont is already too crowded. We do not need more high-rise towers with thousands of more residents. Where will their kids go to school? Childcare? Our community cannot sustain so much more development. Furthermore, the foreshore is for everyone and we need more natural/green spaces. This is just far too much development and the height will overshadow many other buildings and obstruct views. Please reduce the height of these buildings (not to mention other planned buildings in Pymont for that matter!!)

174921

Name and address withheld

2009

Please put in a harbour side pool

175031

Name and address withheld

2008

* 50 m shoreline pool

* a rooftop sandpit area for beach volleyball to at least replace what used to be Pyrmont's sandy beach shorelines destroyed by gentrification.

Afterall one of the best features of Pyrmont are the high rise heritage and modern buildings and stunning penthouses ðŸ™,

175736

Name and address withheld

2009

I strongly oppose to Blackwattle Bay Project because the development will not contribute to the community surrounding it and also the planned buildings are too high and they will destroy the beauty of the area.

176446

Name and address withheld

2000

We need a harbourside pool!

176666

Name and address withheld

2037

We run kayaking and surf ski paddles on Rozelle Bay and out to the main harbour and coast. Our group paddles are growing and paddling is a fantastic way to get more people actively enjoying Sydney Harbour.

We need more access points for kayaks and most importantly some kind of storage for our surf ski's and kayaks. There are great opportunities here for the community, government and stakeholders and I would like to offer to be involved not only from the perspective of a local paddler and kayaking business but also as a fully qualified kayaking professional and advocate of paddling generally. Please let me know how I can get this on the radar and make paddling something more than just token drawings on a concept plan.

177336

Name and address withheld

2040

In summary, in addition to the proposed Dragonboat storage, the facilities should also cater for additional passive crafts storage.

We would like Outrigger Canoe storages (similar to the ones on the Glebe foreshore). Six 6-man outrigger canoes storage racks in addition to kayak storages would be recommended.

177371

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

All proposed buildings are too tall & will cast long shadows on park below. 3 to 4 stories should be maximum allowed.

178006

Name and address withheld

PYRMONT 2009

As the resident and owner of [redacted] I have 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 a resident of this building, I 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 [redacted]. 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. [redacted] was created with many apartments with balcony doors and windows facing the bay and Bank Street. The loss of privacy will have a negative impact for residents in these apartments.

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 currently do due to 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.

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 [redacted] along Bank Street. With the increased development the noise pollution & vibration must be understood. The following should take place first:

- o a) assessment done for [redacted] 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 eg. by putting large glass panels along the Anzac bridge to deflect the noise

- o d) provide appropriate noise reduction for [redacted] through Noise Abatement Programs such as double-glazing door & windows and noise reduction curtains.

In consideration of the above concerns, I and other residents of [redacted] 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.

178286

Name and address withheld

Glebe

I believe the development of Blackwattle Bay to be a good thing, however, the height of the new towers at 45 stories (or higher as reported in the Sydney Morning Herald) is too high and would greatly impact the amenity and views of Glebe residents between Blackwattle Bay and Glebe Point Road.

178551

Name and address withheld

Pymont

To Whom it may concern,

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission

As the owner of [redacted] 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 [redacted] will significantly overshadow the [redacted]. 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 [redacted] will create overlooking and loss of privacy and have a negative impact on us and the residents. [redacted] 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 [redacted] 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 [redacted] along Bank Street. With the increased development the noise pollution & vibration must be understood by doing the following:

- o a) assessment done for [redacted] 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 [redacted] through Noise Abatement Programs such as Double-Glazing Door & Windows and Noise reduction curtains

In consideration of the above concerns, I and residents of [redacted], 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 [redacted].

Looking forward to a favourable and considerate response.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

178756

Name and address withheld

Killcare Heights 2257

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

My family objects to the current State Significant Precinct Study.

The proposed rezoning and changes to planning controls that have been put to the public are unacceptable.

45 story apartment blocks in this area is obscene. But you know this.

The locals, residents of Sydney, visitors need a plan for this site that prioritises public access to the waterfront and passive parklands.

Planning can do better. We don't need token walking paths, which experience tells me results in unnecessary conflict between walkers, families with prams, the disabled, bike riders and senior citizens.

Sydney deserves much better than this tragic and greedy proposal.

I encourage you to work in partnership with City of Sydney which will allow for sensitive and respectful planning. We need decent controls in place which would be monitored thoroughly by City of Sydney.

Shame on the Minister for Planning and the "resume building" staff involved for coming up with this rubbish.

Housing stock, close to the city is important. 10 storey residential blocks (not 45 storeys) would compliment the existing built environment, as well as compliment the bridge, the heights of the nearby trees in Wentworth Park and the National Estate registered viaduct.

Existing vista and sight lines must be protected from all aspects of the western side and northern side of the harbour.

The creation of new vistas and sight lines would benefit the highly populated neighbourhoods in this precinct.

St Vincent de Paul Society recommends that 12% of new building apartments be allocated as affordable housing in perpetuity. This must be incorporated to allow for essential workers to live near their work.

I encourage the management and staff of Infrastructure NSW to think of the environment, the areas history, the need for families to live and work peacefully with updated facilities and an improved living amenity.

This can be achieved. Give us something we can be proud of. Sydney deserves no less. You can do this by dumping this shameful proposal. Put the greed aside.

Plan and build something that works for the people, visitors, residents and future generations for the decades ahead.

I do not support this proposal or the rezoning. Minister Stokes can do better than this.

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission. I welcome your acknowledgemnt and comments on it.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

178806

Name and address withheld

Leichhardt 2040

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 am concerned that:

High-density housing development will monster the foreshore and overwhelm local infrastructure. This also ignores the history of this location and aligning areas.

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,

[redacted]

[redacted]

178841

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

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

The proposed 45-storey apartment blocks to replace the old Fish Markets are totally out of proportion. Blackwattle Bay is a narrow band of water; development on this scale would overwhelm and overshadow the bay and foreshore.

The proposed 1,550 new apartments will bring at least that number of new residents into an area already infrastructure stretched. Added to these will be the expected visitor numbers to the new Fish Markets, estimated at 6 million annually. Residential development on this scale would put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and already limited public transport.

I urge the Department of Planning to reject Infrastructure NSW's application and ensure that the City of Sydney becomes the consent authority.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

178891

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

To Planning, Infrastructure and Environment,

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

Each winter I wait for the sun to rise over the city CBD buildings to fall on [redacted]. With planned highrises much closer to Black Wattle Bay the shadows will be much longer in the morning. 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. Please don't put the community open space under the bridge like the failure in Darling Harbour. In winter it will be very cold without any sun. In particular, I'm concerned that:

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

For many years I have praised the city council for what they have done for Glebe but this has changed my mind and you must fight this for us. It seems like money is the big driver for this project.

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. These are way too high!

Residential development at this scale will put overwhelming pressure on local schools, parks and basic infrastructure which are already at capacity. The traffic will be even more of a nightmare at peak hour.

Please don't sell us out just to make more money. Make this area liveable with a sense of natural beauty, not over developed.

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. Why can't this project comply with the absolute minimum standard for solar access on public spaces?

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

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

This walk won't look anything like the existing naturalised Glebe Foreshore which is characterised by parks – Jubilee, Federal, Blackwattle Bay and Bicentennial. Please make it more natural.

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.

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,

[redacted]

[redacted]

179431

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

This proposal is disappointing and does not take into account the area in which it is proposed. A 45 storey building where no buildings around it are more than 5, makes no sense. What amenities will be provided for the extra 3000 min people that will reside in these units. Where will they park, go to school etc? What about increased use of already constrained public transport at peak times? What about the eenvironmental impact of this huge and out of place building.

I oppose the building of something so large and high in this area. It does not make sense and will have a negative impact on the environment and the local community.

179736

Name and address withheld

2037

Like many, many others I am dismayed by this proposed development. Not that there should be no development of this site but the one that is proposed is simply inappropriate, out of scale and not in the interests of the wider public – but in the interests only of greedy developers that appear to have the government’s ear. The wider public will not accept this shallow proposal. If carried out as currently proposed it will be yet another Sydney development that will be regretted by many for years to come – another opportunity missed.

1. I am deeply concerned by the proposed redevelopment of the old Sydney Fish Market site. 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 majority of the area. A wall of apartment blocks, built mainly for developers’ profit will be built on much of what should be public open space. It is yet another example of how this government is willing to alienate public assets in favour of private interests. Voters will not be kind if this proposal is not radically modified before construction is allowed to proceed.

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 beneath the approach to the Anzac Bridge 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 the ridgeline?

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? There seems to be inadequate provision for traffic management to the site both during construction and once the building is complete. Access to the proposed building (opposite Wentworth Park Rd) appears inadequate and the impact on traffic along Bridge Rd not dealt with to my satisfaction in the proposal. The existing Fish Market accesses the major road network (Western distributor, Anzac bridge), whereas Bridge Rd is already severely congested both morning and afternoon, particularly at the "choke point" where the road goes under the light rail bridge as a single lane in each direction near Taylor Street. To suggest that the increased traffic generated by the proposed Fish Market in this location can be managed effectively, with a doubling of visitors within the space of a few years, is preposterous.

7. What is the public benefit? Where are the proposals for the schools, hospitals, and community services, as well as restaurants and bars that would be needed for such a massive overdevelopment?

180146

Name and address withheld

Pymont

Dear Minister

We would welcome a plan which develops this site into an attractive area for both people and local social infrastructure as well as commercial and innovative opportunities with planning input from the local community. But the State Significant Precinct Study does not allow for this. Furthermore, it does take into account what is apparent from the Covid pandemic that shows the need for more space for people with far greater distance between buildings to mitigate against pandemics in future.

The proposed development is too dense and too big with 12 towers up to 45 storeys or 156 metres. This will cause major overshadowing of the proposed narrow harbour foreshore walk and the new fish market, particularly in winter when the sun would be welcomed. It will also have a wind tunnel effect with narrow alleys. It creates a massive wall of buildings too close to the harbour. This is contrary to good planning.

Has any thought be given to rising sea levels and the possibility of more extreme weather events and localised flooding in this area?

Furthermore so many buildings are too close to the western distributor and bridge with its significant air, noise, dirt, and light pollution. This lacks any respect towards the occupants of these buildings who need and want fresh clean air and no traffic noise into their homes, balconies and workplaces. The building mix with only 5% affordable residential housing is inadequate and too low, where it is recommended to be at 20%. The site does not have enough foreshore park for facilities for families and children, as well as a promenade for the increase in population and visitors attracted to complete the 14km foreshore walk or visit the new fish market. The narrow 10 metre walk is totally inadequate especially with possible social distancing requirements for pandemic situations now and in future.

The proposed significant increase in population for this area is not reflected in the plan for any significant services infrastructure. Where are the services? Furthermore, lip service only is provided with claims for engagement with First Nations people. Where is their input? What is provided for them, or by them?

More importantly the proposal significantly reduces local government scrutiny, planning and development, as well as public scrutiny, input, approval, and proposals for this part of Pymont.

Seeking feedback on this proposal is really only tokenism on the part of State Government where they want to reward the developers with overdevelopment of the site, rather than permit the local government to carry out planning in a more democratic way with the community of Pymont. I ask you to reject this proposal and allow local government to plan and manage, as well as reflect the community input to ensure all decisions are open, transparent and accountable.

It would be good to see an international design competition for this site and to have at least one building of significant design merit as a public building with a suitable purpose (performance venues, or galleries etc) to attract both domestic and international visitors.

Please reject this proposal.

180361

Name and address withheld

PYRMONT

I wrote to blackwattle.bay@infrastructure.nsw.gov.au with the following submission & they advised I should send it to this address. So:

Dear Sir/Madam,

As long term residents of Pyrmont, my husband & I are concerned with some aspects of the proposed redevelopment of Blackwattle Bay and surroundings as well as being positive about many of the proposals.

ON a Positive Note: Redeveloping the Fish Markets, extending & developing the Foreshore Walk, planning for open space, degree of affordable housing, acknowledgement of First Nation's people & their history in this area, also the Wentworth Park improvements.

Negative Note: 32 to 45 story buildings far too high for this area - obstructing views with subsequent population growth impacting on traffic. schools etc. as well as creating wind tunnels & blocking the sun & light. A height limit of no more than 20 stories at the most is far more people & environment friendly. With the Hanson & Hymix cement trucks coming & going as well as other traffic involved in privately owned business developments involved in the proposals will impact on the village feel to the area where many of us walk about enjoying life so close to a major city. Please consider this when reviewing many of the business proposals.

With regards,

[redacted]

[redacted]

180526

Name and address withheld

2008

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing in regards to the Blakwattle Bay proposal to say that if this development goes ahead it would be a huge loss to the community who benefits from the public space.

Due to this government's relentless privatisation of land and assets we have already lost so much valuable community space and this should not continue with the Blackwattle Bay proposal as it is a well loved fixture in the area.

The plan also fails to take into account the already congested roads in the area and the strain this will place on public transport.

Please reconsider this proposal.

Regards

[redacted]

180581

Name and address withheld

Pymont

Thank you for your hard work in putting this plan together.

I [redacted] and love living in this vibrant part of the City. The Blackwattle Bay remains a key recreation area for Pymont residents and it is great to see it finally being rejuvenated. It has been long overdue.

I fully support your plan and in particular I endorse the following:

- a continuous promenade and addition of parkland and greenery
- adding cycleways

I have no issues with the proposed heights off new buildings and thing that ensuring a mix of tenancies between residential and office use is very welcome. In particular there should be focus on new economy and technology tenants in the precinct.

My only worry is the motorway leading up to the Anzac Bridge which has always been very problematic in that part of Pymont as it separates the suburb from the waterside, it is unsightly, dirty and noise. I think it is vital that this is addressed and adding as much greenery as possible as well as enhancing the landscape by colours, perhaps adding New York style high pedestrianised high line, should be explored.

It is a lively and vibrant part of the City with prized waterside location and we need to ensure it is connected to the rest of Pymont and City as well as possible. Improving the area around the motorway is key to a successful outcome as poor accessibility as in the current state would detract from any revitalisations you do.

180636

Name and address withheld

2922

Donâ€™t destroy the suburb

180896

Name and address withheld

2042

Provide over 50% of public space to the Blackwattle Bay development.

No high-rises like Barangaroo.

No overdevelopment

More greenery

180986

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

To Whom it may concern,

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Blackwattle Bay Redevelopment Submission

As an Owner [redacted] we have received notification of the development plans submitted for Blackwattle Bay redevelopment.

We strongly believe that the proposed new Bank Street buildings / towers will negatively impact us as per below:

1) View:

The development of the new buildings (especially the new building which shall be located at Bank Street + Quarry Master Drive intersection) shall negatively impact our views. In some cases, Owners'™ water views shall be completely blocked by the new development.

This shall result in reduced property values; please note that many of the residents had based their investment decisions on the bay views.

2) Residential noise:

The current assessments advise the new buildings will be planned in accordance with the codes to ensure that the occupants of the new buildings are not impacted by noise. However, the current plan fails to advise how the new construction will have an adverse impact on residents of [redacted] along Bank Street. The increased noise will result in downgraded living.

3) Overdevelopment:

The addition of hundreds of apartments and office space will be considered as overdevelopment of an already congested area.

Please do not proceed with the development of the proposed new Bank Street buildings / towers.

Thanks,

[redacted]

181086

Name and address withheld

2000

The main thing is that there needs to be public access for people, bikes, prams, walkers, runners across the zone and public spaces and public access to the water front.

The public areas need to remain accessible to the public so was all share this space.

181256

Name and address withheld

2009

[redacted] I am very pleased to see the proposal to revitalise Blackwattle Bay. This is an area of great potential and this proposal is well overdue.

Parkland and continued waterfront access need to be given key priority. There is a challenge of the existing motorway separating waterfront from the rest of Pyrmont and more thought needs to be given on how to best integrate this cement monstrosity. Can thought be given to landscaping this with vertical gardens?

I support the mixed use and proposed heights but would like to see further work/proposals on dealing with the motorway.

181291

Name and address withheld

Sydney 2000

I am opposed to the Blackwattle Bay SSP and the proposed planning controls.

As a resident, I ride and walk around this area often and I am opposed to the height and bulk of the proposed development.

I am concerned also about overshadowing.

181326

Name and address withheld

2010

Dear Minister Stokes

As a registered architect, I am appalled by the blatant disregard of the public interest, public benefit and the public amenity of DPIE's proposal of this important public waterfront site.

The proposal is completely out of scale to the local context. It blatantly exploits excessive bulk and height producing expanses of shadowland. This is gross overdevelopment.

We don't need a privatised, bulked-up Barangaroo 2.0. This is a scheme that overwhelmingly prioritises private profits for private developers. Given the lack of public and open spaces, the NSW Government must focus on developing a liveable precinct that celebrates public life and the public asset of Blackwattle Bay for the community's benefit and not the wealthy few in the property development industry.

I implore you to reconsider this proposal, especially given the need for more socially sustainable and liveable communities in Sydney.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

181346

Name and address withheld

Forest lodge 2037

I completely reject & protest the development for more residential high rise apartments in an already over populated suburb.

181386

Name and address withheld

Chippendale

I am against the new plans for Blackwater bay

181406

Name and address withheld

2037

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.

181416

Name and address withheld

newtown 2042

This proposal is not in the interest of the community and public surrounding this area. A huge high rise placed in a densely populated area will completely change the community spaces we are all so heavily reliant on at the moment. As urbanisation continues to expand public places need to be considered a high priority when looking at redevelopments.

45 storeys will throw surrounding houses and community spaces into immense shadow for the majority of the day. It is unnecessary and selfish.

The NSW government needs to do better than this profit increasing design that will harm the community that surrounds.

181431

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge 2037

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.

181451

Name and address withheld

2011

[redacted] i and my family object to the high rise development of the fish market site.

Pymont is already a densely populated area with existing services already straining to service the current population of pymont.

Any addition would be counterintuitive to a congruous landscape of the area.

181486

Name and address withheld

Glebe

The proposed development is far too large and not in keeping with the area. I'm fully in support of revamping the fish markets but not to the scale proposed in the development.

181501

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

To whom it may concern,

I am making this submission requesting that you rethink your current plans for Blackwattle Bay.

I understand the desire to make as much money as possible from the site, and this is certainly what the new plans seem to aim for with their excessively tall towers and limited public space, but this is a once in a lifetime opportunity.

Governments in Australia seem so eager to just sell off all of our amazing assets in exchange for some quick dollars, but I beg you to think larger. Think what we could achieve with such an amazing space, because once we sell off our harbour, we can't get it back.

I'm not against development, and I would wholeheartedly support lower towers with retail underneath, (at an appropriate height, and spaced out, similar to those apartment buildings already existing in Pyrmont), but your current plans place buildings which are extremely out of place with the surrounding area.

They will be an eyesore, reducing visibility of the lovely ANZAC bridge, they will create excessive shadows and wind tunnels, and they do not take into account the parking and traffic chaos this amount of new residents will cause. They will also set a precedent, allowing more and more high towers as people behind them try to regain their water views.

Covid has shown us the vital importance of sunshine and open green spaces. So many of us here in the city live in tiny little apartments, often without balconies, gardens or views. One has only to look at how busy the Glebe and Pyrmont foreshores are during the current lockdown to realise how much we cherish open spaces, and our beautiful land and harbour. This is an amazing opportunity to add more community features such as open parks, walkways, playgrounds and open space.

Instead the current plans seem to privatise almost all of the land except for a narrow concrete walkway, through which pedestrians will have to battle with speeding cyclists to try to gain access from Glebe to Pyrmont. The small areas of open space are all mostly shaded and uninspiring.

I watched the community seminars and was also completely surprised at the unrealistic approach to the parking and traffic situation. I live in [redacted] from the current site. Almost ALL of the residents in my large apartment block own cars, sometimes multiple cars.

I understand that we can walk to the city, and yes, we do walk a lot. But we also do large grocery shops which require a vehicle. We drive to jobs outside of the city. We have elderly and disabled people who cannot walk far. When not in lockdown we drive on holidays and to visit friends and relatives. We need street parking for tradespeople, guests and deliveries.

Yet the new plans assume that only ZERO to 15% of residents will own cars??? And to try to force this overly optimistic view, youâ€™re going to provide LESS parking in the buildings and REDUCE the amount of street parking in the surrounding areas, intentionally causing more traffic, parking and public transport chaos. Glebe, Ultimo and Pyrmont already have traffic jams in peak hour now, yet the suggested solution to the issue of adding thousands more people to an already crowded area is to pretend that these new people will suddenly stop wanting or needing to own cars??? That seems crazy.

To be honest I genuinely doubt that anyone there actually cares what the community thinks, and Iâ€™m sure that developer money will win out as it always does until all of our assets are sold off, but if anyone there is actually listening, please donâ€™t do this.

Make something wonderful instead. Plan sustainable buildings which are lower towards the harbour, protecting our beautiful foreshore, then build upwards further inland.

Make our foreshore a green space open to ALL the people of Sydney, not just those who can afford waterfront views in a premium high-rise building.

This is your chance to say no. To create something beautiful that we can all share in.

And once itâ€™s gone, itâ€™s gone forever.

181506

Name and address withheld

Glebe

I strongly object to the proposal. I object particularly to the proposed buildings that range from 10-45 storey in height and the apparent lack of thought and planning of the impact of increased people, vehicles, transport, green spaces etc. on the existing communities. This is a once in a generation chance to retain open spaces and plan something that would be sympathetic and beneficial to the community.

181521

Name and address withheld

2011

I am very supportive of the renewal plans for Blackwattle Bay.

The extended harbour foreshore is a game changer and will deliver incredible benefits for the people of Sydney.

The plans will deliver much needed homes and jobs close to the Sydney CBD.

181556

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge, 2037

Hi, I am an immigrant to Sydney from another state and have lived in [redacted].

Thank you for this opportunity to make a submission. I am writing to suggest that that waterfront promenade as proposed is drastically inadequate for purpose.

My current use of the affected area includes:

- walking along the existing foreshore path (Glebe)
- dragonboating
- riding my bicycle to work along the existing paths and roads
- kayaking in blackwattle bay
- ferry user (when it's running)
- occasional visitor to the old fish markets

So I do believe I have some domain knowledge of what makes the area work and what would enhance and what would detract from the making it a really desirable, enjoyable place to be.

The current foreshore walkway on the Glebe side of Blackwattle Bay is extremely crowded. Pre-covid it is an uneasy mix of walkers, joggers, dogs and cyclists. During covid it has no commuter traffic but is even more crowded as locals seek out their nearest green areas.

It is clear the extended foreshore walkway on the Pyrmont side needs to be substantially wider than proposed and much wider than the Glebe foreshore or else it will be a disaster of urban planning.

Traffic sources for the new walkway:

- existing residents (already over capacity on existing walkways)
- new residents

- influx of day walkers making use of the extended bay walks
- commuter cyclists (increasing year on year)

I am from another state and so I can't really say I understand a lot of the planning decisions made by Sydney (eg the Barangaroo Crown tower which obviously has been built in the wrong spot) but please don't go to all the effort of redeveloping that area but fall short of making it actually liveable.

Thank you.

181576

Name and address withheld

2000

I am in agreement with Mayor Clover Moore that the impact to population density, shadowing of the locale and impact to sustainable developments in this area makes this project damaging for the local community. It was bad enough seeing the IMAX theatre demolished for a hotel that has cast shadows over part of the CBD around Darling Harbour and Bathurst St and this Blackwattle Bay proposal will have a similar impact in Pyrmont. Please do not allow this development to go ahead.

181596

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

I object the proposal because:

For Glebe residents, the proposed development would literally overshadow the suburb in the early morning. The buildings would tower over the Bay, destroying the natural amenity of the Bay, and bring increased traffic pressure to our roads that will also have to cope with unacceptable increases in traffic and parking from the new SFM.

The proposed development, touted as an extension of the CBD, would place further pressure on Glebe to yield to intrusive, inappropriate and unacceptable developments.

On the Pyrmont side, the Western Distributor is a shadowy chasm separating Pyrmont from Blackwattle Bay. It destroys the legibility of Pyrmont as a peninsula and is a gloomy wasteland redolent of danger which makes the pedestrian experience of walking across Pyrmont to the bay unpleasant.

The views to the west with the harbour in the foreground and beyond Glebe Point, with its interesting topography landscape and architecture, are beautiful and interesting. Great potential exists to open up these vistas. It is a distinguished, indeed, a painterly vista which allows the Distributor with its vertical stanchions and horizontal roadway to be read as a frame enclosing a great and beautiful landscape.

The proposal does not take advantage of these opportunities. Apart from a narrow slot of open space to the bay on the Miller Street axis, the proposal will make the Distributor's undercroft even gloomier by enclosing it with a wall of buildings.

This is not the hallmark of distinguished place making. Blackwattle Bay provides the opportunity to show the world how clever design can ameliorate the impact of the impact of traffic engineering on a beautiful place. The scheme fails dismally in this regard.

181601

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

To whom it may concern,

I write to you as a [redacted] and frequently use the foreshore walk and bike paths in the planned precinct study area. So I hope I can provide views from a number of perspectives.

Firstly thank you for the amount of detail and planning that has gone into this proposal. Having attended previous online seminars, I also understand some effort and advice indirect or otherwise to the existing and approved new Fish Market design as well as Light Rail station are really appreciated - I'm looking forward to their completion.

If there is any lasting impression or request out of my community feedback submission, it is that the proposed maximum building height is simply much too tall. Having attended the original design online seminar with the community in mid-August 2020, many of us provided strong feedback that we don't want the skyline of Pymont and Blackwattle Bay drastically altered, however it's disappointing to see that our feedback has not been considered when creating this proposal.

Of the major landmarks in Sydney, the ANZAC bridge is one of the most iconic Australia wide. Having a nearby residential building taller than bridge towers of 120 meters would dwarf it's beauty, a change that couldn't be undone with deconstruction in future years. I have taken note that the proposal calls out "sensitive design response to the Anzac Bridge pylons and adjacent development in Pymont", however in my opinion I don't see this being respected in the proposed maximum building height. The existing residential buildings in Jacksons Landing get close to the height of the bridge while still preserving it as the standout in the skyline of Pymont. I urge the leaders of this project, and the NSW Department of Planning to reconsider proposed maximum height of these buildings. May I suggest 100m (or 28 stories) as the maximum height instead of the proposed 156 meters (or 45 stories). I believe this would provide a good compromise while still maintaining the intended aesthetic and functional goal of the design.

Other than this one strong point above, I am honestly really happy with the proposed changes that are detailed in the plan. To summarise quickly, the items that I specifically like are:

- The extended foreshore promenade to connect the existing broken links. Personally I would prefer 20 meters wide (option 2), but the 10 meter minimum should be fine in tight areas.
- Having mixed small business and residential use makes sense to me, as it means people can be using the space both during and outside business hours. It may even help boost foot traffic in the evening making it feel safer.

- I would gladly accept more park areas and public spaces. I also understand the City of Sydney is trying to improve it's parkspace percentage, so this would help.

- I also have to note that the existing Fish Market light rail stop will no longer be the closest to the new Fish Market; Wentworth Park or Glebe will hold that title; so it should likely be renamed to Miller Street to not confuse folks.

I hope you may find this feedback helpful. However I must reiterate as a resident, investor, employee, recreational tourist and general Australian; I appeal that the maximum building height in this proposal be no larger than 100 meters.

Thank you for your time,

[redacted]

181606

Name and address withheld

2008

Dear Department of Planning,

The current plan fails to meet community expectations on many fronts.

Instead I support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study. This includes a request for you to consider:

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

Please do better.

181656

Name and address withheld

2050

the scale of this development is crap. The end.

181676

Name and address withheld

2048

I have been using the bay area regularly for many years and [redacted] I am concerned about the development.

The scale of this development is alarming.

There needs to be the same level of open space and public access to it. This should not be used for private use such as marinas.

There needs to be consideration and continued access to the bay for existing water users be it for sport, exercise or transport.

This area offers greenspace and open area for many people in surrounding suburbs and access to the harbour and walking via foreshore should be maintained.

181691

Name and address withheld

2037

I object to the proposed development because the tall towers will overshadow Glebe, blocking light in the mornings, the space provided for pedestrians is too small to safely share with cyclists, and too windy/shadowed to use for recreation. Further, the development will bring too much extra traffic to the area when the roads are already too busy at peak hours.

181701

Name and address withheld

2037

I object to these plans. The buildings are too tall, and will cause too much over shadowing. Not enough parking either Please review!

181756

Name and address withheld

2010

The proposed buildings ruin the vista high rise of that scale is not appropriate for the area. Itâ€™s not sensitive to the local area and more sophisticated architecture should be considered

181836

Name and address withheld

Enmore, 2042

I fully support the Blackwattle Bay strategy as proposed. This area of the city is absolutely well suited to this form of development which will expand the scope of the CBD at the same time as not placing a burden on nearby heritage suburbs. Pyrmont is a consistently underdeveloped part of Sydney, which is shocking considering the proximity to the CBD as well as current and future transport links.

181841

Name and address withheld

2758

We need open space, green zones, urban wildlife and public access to be priorities for this site.

NO high-rise and NO development fir developers. This is public space.

Protect our harbour and its foreshores.

181846

Name and address withheld

2204

disappointed in the out of scale development proposition . We need smart density rather than large buildings and compromised public space that leave a legacy of greed.

181876

Name and address withheld

Leichhardt 2040

I am strongly opposed to plans to riddle the Blackwattle Bay Area with residential tall towers. Having spent the last 10 years paddling on those waters, enjoying the surroundings and even holding our wedding reception at the Fish Market restaurant, it would be great to see the area become a precinct to encourage local communities to be outdoors, exploring the local amenities and not take away from the iconic Sydney skyline.

181921

Name and address withheld

2016

I would like to raise my concern for this project

We should be protecting the current skyline Sydney has

Not building it up with more high risers that will take away from our iconic city views

I would stronger suggest other option are looked at for an upgrade of the current fish market

Less high rise

Possible location move to avoid the impact these current plans have

181986

Name and address withheld

2037

I am [redacted] and strongly object to the proposed plans for the Blackwattle bay development. The proposed plans significantly increases the people and traffic density without leaving enough green spaces for residents to enjoy. The increased traffic in an already busy area will also create more noise and air pollution which needs more green spaces to balance out.

182001

Name and address withheld

2040

I am opposed to the plan as it stands. I am in favour of development and the revitalisation of this area but not his proposal is way too high and dense. The shadows will be horrible and the potential for wind tunnels too. It needs more green space, fewer tall buildings etc.

182011

Name and address withheld

Glebe

20 August 2021

The Manager

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission

Locked Bag 5022,

Parramatta NSW 2124

Dear Sir/Madam,

For the following reasons, I wish to strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of the current fish market site on Blackwattle Bay:

â€¢ the development should not be classified as State Significant because it constitutes extremely poor planning.

â€¢ the land in question is public land, but we believe that not only does it not deliver any public good, the plans, if delivered, would be detrimental to the site, to the precinct, to Blackwattle Bay and to Glebe. Further, the determination of the Hymix concrete batching plant to remain at its Banks Street site, will mean the proposed residential, office and retail space will be immediately adjacent to a noise industrial site, with frequent truck movements, with the possibility of working 24/7.

â€¢ the proposal is a massive overdevelopment of the site and would bring more residents and workers to the area than could be sustained. The buildings are too dense, and the expectation of 1,550 dwellings, 2,800 residents and 5,600 people employed there, would put further, damaging, pressure on an already very densely populated suburb.

â€¢ 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.

â€¢ there is inadequate provision of affordable housing.

â€¢ 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.

â€¢ 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.

â€¢ this development, and the construction of the new Sydney Fish Markets, 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.

â€¢ the proposed development would overshadow Glebe in the early morning. The buildings would tower over the Bay, destroying the natural amenity of the Bay, and bring increased traffic pressure to our roads that will also have to cope with unacceptable increases in traffic and parking from the new Sydney Fish Markets.

â€¢ residents have fought for over 50 years, and continues to fight, to maintain Glebe’s wonderful built heritage. The proposed development, touted as an extension of the CBD, would place further pressure on Glebe to yield to intrusive, inappropriate and unacceptable developments.

â€¢ the proposal does not have the hallmark of distinguished place making. Blackwattle Bay provides the opportunity to show the world how clever design can ameliorate the design of buildings and the impact of traffic engineering on a beautiful place. The scheme fails dismally in this regard.

â€¢ the plan does not deliver a foreshore walk congruent with the walk along Johnstons Bay and around the Glebe foreshore. It is too narrow, too shadowed and too windy. At 10 metres wide it is too narrow to provide for the number of people who will use it, which would include pedestrians, shoppers and tourists milling about, cyclists, parents pushing strollers, wheelchair users and people walking dogs. If the Glebe foreshore is any indication, the proposed walk will come under heavy pressure.

In concluding, I request that the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment prepare a Master Plan as the basis for development. The terms of reference for the Master Plan should include:

â€¢ the height, bulk and configuration of the build form must reconnect Blackwattle Bay to Pyrmont.

â€¢ the foreshore walk must be at least 30 metres wide.

â€¢ the height controls of the existing LEP must be respected.

â€¢ the impact of the Western Distributor must be minimised through good design.

â€¢ and the long-standing use of Blackwattle Bay by rowers must be protected by controlling other users.

â€¢ the Master Plan should be prepared for public exhibition and the City of Sydney should be the consent authority for the development.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

182021

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge

The old Fish Market site should be renewed, but the scale as and bulk currently proposed by the State Government is obscene.

Any new development should be sensitive, enhances the character of the area and prioritise employment growth and be more green and people friendly.

182051

Name and address withheld

2095

As a [redacted] and now a frequent visitor, I am concerned by the size and scale of this project. I welcome the redevelopment but not at the cost of residents and visitors right to sun, clean air and space. Please scale back the development to something more manageable that will residents and those passing through to avoid traffic jams and yet more tall buildings that cast shade. More of the space should be devoted to parkland as well. Thank you.

182071

Name and address withheld

2016

The current Blackwater Bay Planning Submission should be rejected outright. The effect of the proposed development will diminish the natural beauty and accessibility of the important area.

182101

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge

As a resident and developer, I think the massing on the site is excessive in height, bulk and scale. The massing is out of context and needs to be halved.

The idea of urban renewal is supported but please significantly reduce the scale.

182126

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

To: Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Blackwattle Bay redevelopment submission

While there are many reasons I would like this proposal to be revised, one of my main concerns is the loss of light and view from our windows, as I live [redacted], and we face south so do not get direct sunlight. Our direct view is out to the Poulos Bros and the Dragon Boats, so I am very concerned about the things mentioned below in the 'Key Concerns'.

I am not against progress, and welcome a new fish market and walkways and more access for people to walk along the waterfront. When we moved here [redacted] it was with the signs on the fence across the road saying there will be a new promenade all the way around the bay. I was really looking forward to this development. So far this has not happened and the plans I saw originally have been changed numerous times.

One of my other main concerns is the height of the buildings being proposed, I think it will really spoil the area and I have included the 'Key concerns' below which I agree with.

Looking at the projected images of what it will look like, the height of the buildings along the Bank St side are totally unacceptable in my view. Crowding the Bay and totally ruining the beautiful view for the people in Glebe side of the Bay as well as for us.

I also think more parking needs to be provided as people will still be driving motor vehicles. As much as we would like to promote the use of the public transport system, even more so now with the Covid 19, people are not going to use it as much.

Key concerns as [redacted] Residents :

- New developments will lead to a much higher density of residents putting greater strain on already struggling infrastructure and facilities
- Upon closer inspection of the document Attachment 14: Draft Design Code Final (2) and Attachment 15: Visual Impact Assessment it is now understood that one of the mixed residential towers will be towards the right-hand side of the current Bank Street + Quarry Master Drive intersection. Currently, the proposal suggests this could be as high as 18 stories. And the adjacent tower to the left of the intersection is higher than 18 stories. This presents the following challenges for the residents & owners:

Â· Reduced property value & downgraded living: 18 story building along with the adjacent building (higher) will eliminate the view to the bay altogether and residents will stare into large towers. This will have a considerably high negative impact on the investment/ asset value of [redacted] residing in [redacted]. Many of the residents had based their investment decisions on the bay views. I have advised the project team that when new construction takes place of a house a due process is followed with DA submissions. Furthermore, it drastically downgrades the living experience of current/ future residents.

Â· Increase in Noise & Vibration: Attachment 18: Noise and Vibration Assessment advises that 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 current residential towers along Bank Street. I have proposed that in addition to ensuring the building height does not adversely impact the views of [redacted] plans to remedy the noise pollution & vibration are understood by doing the following:

- a) Assessment done for [redacted] now to ensure the current noise pollution is understood
- b) take the above assessment into account when factoring in the new construction
- c) provide noise & vibration reduction for current & future residents by putting large glass panels along the Anzac bridge to deflect the noise
- d) provide appropriate noise reduction for [redacted] through Noise Abatement Programs such as Double-Glazing Door & Windows and Noise reduction curtains.(NSW Gov has done this before)

I also wish to note that I support the submission made by the Bays Water Club Collective to the Blackwattle Bay Precinct Study.

So I implore you to reconsider the State Significant Precinct (SSP) Study and proposed planning controls, and include the local community in further planning and consultation so we can come to an agreeable plan.

Yours Sincerely,

[redacted]

182176

Name and address withheld

GLEBE

I wish to object to the Blackwattle Bay proposal because of.

- Â· Massive over development of the site
 - Â· High skyscrapers not in keeping with area and taller than any surrounding buildings
 - Â· Blocking of view of city skyline from Blackwattle Bay, spoiling current pleasant outlook from Foreshore Walk
 - Â· Lack of useable green space not in shadow.
 - Â· The width of the foreshore promenade, it is only 10 metres wide in places - not adequate for the many cyclists , joggers and walkers using it as the link in the harbourside promenade.
 - Â· CBD high rise 'creep' to the heritage suburb of Glebe.
- Overshadowing the new state of the art Fish Market.

[redacted]

[redacted]

182201

Name and address withheld

Dulwich Hill 2203

I wish to object to the plans in its current form.

The bulk of the towers as well as the tower heights will negatively impact on views and vistas to the city/CBD.

The towers should also be set back away from the ANZAC Bridge.

I would also ask planners to review the amount of open space to be incorporated into the plan (I would advocate for increased open space)

Thank you

182206

Name and address withheld

Balgowlah

I am supportive of this project. [redacted] and believe the foreshore would benefit from development. Pymount would only be improved with more large scale development. It's only a 100 meters from the largest city in Australia and highly desirable area. Any high density development of high quality must be considered ahead of low rise that is already there.

182216

Name and address withheld

Glebe

There appears to a targeted campaign from facebook by our Lord Mayor to guide the responses. Please beware she has actually taken the steps of writing possible responses for people to add in here. Anything that echos a copy and paste from her page should not considered an actual view but a political sponsored attack on this project. (ok that's a little dramatic overstatement)

FOREST LODGE

ðŸŒŒ 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.

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

ðŸ”” The requirement for 5% affordable housing is inadequate â€” 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.”

182291

Name and address withheld

2037

Hi - would just like to say as [redacted] resident that this is a fantastic proposal that will rejuvenate the foreshore and bring new vitality to the area. It's fantastic! Please ignore those that oppose every development and would have us living in caves !

182331

Name and address withheld

Glebe, 2037.

We do not need such a dense concentration of housing, Covid is changing the way we work for good and access to those of us who continue to live in the inner city (versus those who will more further afield) will be at a premium, this development (all 3 scenarios) should be slashed by 50-90%.

182436

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

I support this development completely.

The area is a decrepit wasteland and requires some good development like what has rejuvenated Baranagaroo. Please ensure this is a good mix of commercial and residential developments of tall towers with plenty of public space for us locals to be able to walk and admire the water and built form.

Thank you.

182481

Name and address withheld

2037

The bulk and height of the proposed (over)development is entirely unsuitable for the location .

The development will create unacceptable overshadowing of the bay and surrounding areas and the buildings will look entirely out of place with the proposed height limits.

The project will also increase traffic on Bridge Street which acts as an arterial road into and out of the city but wasn't designed for it, and which is already well over capacity and dangerous, especially during peak traffic times.

Views of the ANZAC bridge and the city will be obstructed for many nearby residents. An important part of the bay will feel enclosed and cut off from Pyrmont and the east.

A more appropriate scale should be considered with a height limit of 8 storeys with a bulk and scale which reflects the site context. This will reduce the impacts on the neighbouring residents while providing an appropriate level of new housing supply for the area.

182606

Name and address withheld

2048

The proposed towers as way too big and don't match the rest of the area. They wil totally overshadow the bay and the surrounding area and should be dramatically reduced.

182716

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

Submission on Blackwattle Bay State Significant Precinct including Sydney Fishmarket.

Blackwattle Bay should not be an extension of the CBD. Pymont and Ultimo are predominantly residential, inhabited by people of all ages and diverse backgrounds.

The monstrous towers form a barrier between Pymont/Ultimo and the harbour, and between Oyrmont and Glebe. The towers should be no higher than the highest in Jacksons landing

Traffic is already at unmanageable levels particularly at the junction near the fish market, and on to Anzac Bridge, and to Pymont Bridge Road. Adding 2,800 more residents should not be added.

During this Covid pandemic it has become more evident than ever that sunlight, fresh air and space is extremely important to the welfare of residents and visitors. The present plans create windtunnels, limit sunny areas, will feel unsafe, limit tree growth and destroy what could be a pleasant and healthy environment for all to use. The area needs more open space and sports facilities.

The foreshore promenade needs to be at least 30m wide all the way along. This has been demonstrated during the present Covid pandemic when social distancing is required to prevent the spread of the disease. This is required for families with prams, cyclists, kids on bikes and scooters and people with wheelchairs or walkers.

Affordable and public housing should be increased to provide for essential workers such as nurses, teachers, cleaners, police, emergency officers and should be at least 25% of housing.

This plan needs to be reworked, taking into account the mistakes that have been made in Barangaroo and learning from the social impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic. More open space should be included. It is not too late to change. The plans as they stand today will ensure that this government is remembered as being greedy with no empathy for the community, and no ideas of the future.

Please reconsider before it is too late. Be innovative and human.

182746

Name and address withheld

Glebe

Please see the attached Pdf which details my objection to this proposal.

Many thanks – [redacted]

182791

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

I wish to object to the planned over-development of the current Sydney Fishmarket site for the following reasons:

1. The existing and long-established character of Blackwattle Bay in the vicinity of the fish market site is typified by older style, modest structures that transition away from the foreshore towards the higher scale development of the Sydney CBD. The proposed height of the residential towers would be inconsistent with this character and would visually dominate the eastern side of Blackwattle Bay;
2. The bulk and scale of the development would present as a dominating form almost immediately adjacent to the water's edge at the eastern side of the bay, with no transition to the form and height of existing structures to the east; and
3. This combination of height, bulk and scale would be grossly at odds with the existing waterside character and would set an undesirable precedent for the inevitable further development of land to the east of the existing fishmarket site, resulting in a perpetuation and flourishing of this excessive height, bulk and scale.

Comment: The process that has lead to the construction of the "new and exciting" Sydney Fishmarket at the head of Blackwattle Bay is a classic example of catering the the whim of the developer, with scant regard for the history of this waterfront precinct and with token "respect" only being shown to the real and legitimate concerns of the nearby residents.

The southern foreshore of Blackwattle Bay should rightfully have been given over to unencumbered public access, as an extension of the public-owned Wentworth Park. Instead, a "flashy" retail facility is now underway, blocking this access, wrapped in marketing spin to sell fish which overwhelmingly will be trucked to the site rather than offloaded by numerous, jaunty fishing boats.

To add insult to injury, the public is being told that the redevelopment of the existing fishmarket area, which has suffered from years of neglect and abuse ,is something that we must have.

I am not at all convinced that these dominating buildings will be anything other than a massive financial windfall for the developer(s)and that once built, they will stand as yet another ugly and unpleasant reminder of the long-term "corruption" of the planning process in New South Wales.

182866

Name and address withheld

Glebe 2037

This proposal is of great concern to me due to so many reasons, but mainly:

The height of the towers - overdevelopment (and ugly, total lack of design just rectangular blocks but that's just my opinion) the scale of the proposed buildings creates another concrete wind tunnel.

The lack of open space - currently the bay walk on the Glebe side of Blackwattle Bay is hugely popular all year around and particularly at the moment with the community. This proposal is completely insufficient for the communities needs now, and into the future.

There is limited public transport - one bus route and the light rail (which is already at capacity)

There is no high school nearby (nearest are in Balmain or Surry Hills)

Why can this not be a low density project?

Why can there not be more generous outdoor space for all people to enjoy?

Please listen to the community rather than the property developers who's only legacy is ugly overdevelopment in order to maximise profit and reconsider this proposed development.

It is a real shame that this once in a lifetime opportunity to do something really meaningful for the community is going to be wasted and not used to provide mid rise buildings along with large public spaces that are desperately needed in this area, especially with the amount of apartments that are already in the Pymont area.

182886

Name and address withheld

2011

Lack of affordable housing

Overshadowing

Lack of accessible public space

182896

Name and address withheld

2050

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.

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.

182941

Name and address withheld

Newtown 2042

The proposed development is too high, the airport OLS shouldn't be the target height for the development. Medium sized development is a better fit for the site as it then won't over shadow the new Fish Market site, won't throw as many shadows across this and adjacent areas, and will be more in keeping the the ridge line that is Glebe Point Road and its building.

The 85% public transport, walking or cycling target is very optimistic, and if it is substantially lower then it won't be the department, nor the consultants, nor the developers that will feel this impact, it will be local community, especially those residents that live along the access roads.

182946

Name and address withheld

Petersham 2049

The proposed height and bulk of development on the former fish market site is obscene. I believe that the site should be renewed in some way however I cannot support what is being proposed but the state government. The effect on the public land and view corridors to the city would be devastating and signals to me that private profits are more important to this government than public amenity. I believe the height of development should be limited to the height of the vehicular lanes on the bridge in order to minimize overshadowing and maintain view corridors from the west to the city.

182966

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

I am opposed to the nature of the proposed rezoning, particularly around the building height of 45 storeys.

I am supportive of the redevelopment and renewal of the site and appreciative of the need for residential and commercial uses to make the project viable.

However, I am concerned of the impacts on the public infrastructure in the area considering that it is already one of the most densely populated areas in Australia. The proposed density of the residences will only create additional strain on open spaces, roads, transport, schools and hospitals.

The maximum building height needs to be seriously rethought.

182981

Name and address withheld

mount druitt

There is no better place for high rise apartments than the inner city, Ideally Pyrmont would be an extension of the CBD travelling west & with a new metro station at The Bays and Pyrmont there is adequate transport infrastructure & would be a waste if this development was to be downscaled look at Central Park and Barangaroo are huge successes that Clover thought would be failures. I'd love to see a fantastic cultural venue built here to complement the new Sydney Fish market.

183086

Name and address withheld

2125

The new proposal for affordable housing affects the appearance of the city. I suggest the location to be reconsidered.

183126

Name and address withheld

2133

I support the redevelopment and this proposal. We need more housing available in the inner city and closer to jobs where people want to be. This location has outstanding public transport accessibility with the light rail and future metro station.

As it stands, this area is uninviting and run down and I am sure this development will make it attractive, liveable and connected. There is plenty of underutilised green space nearby.

We need greater supply and density in the City of Sydney LGA to mitigate urban sprawl on the outskirts of the city that increases climate change and destroys natural habitats.

183161

Name and address withheld

2035

Too big. I get the need for development, but over development that this project is an example of is not good. Please scale down as per suggestions of the community

183166

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge

Donâ€™t do it!

The old fish makers should be made into child friendly public foreshore space.

No more massive tall buildings.

It will block out all of the light and be an eye-sore.

Cheers

[redacted]

183186

Name and address withheld

Leichhardt

I support this plan for the Blackwattle Bay redevelopment.

There is a shortage of housing in the inner city.

This plan will produce a much needed supply of housing.

High rise residential buildings are ideal, as they will provide the supply required for the demand of this location.

There is and will be sufficient infrastructure to support this growth, consisting of the Sydney Metro West stations at Pyrmont and The Bays and multiple stations of the Sydney Light Rail L1 Inner West line, as well as the many cycle ways and pedestrian routes produced by the City of Sydney Council and NSW Government.

There is also significant public open space in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site, which will provide ample space for the growing community.

Do not cut these towers short, build them tall!

Do not do as the City of Sydney council does, build them tall!

183216

Name and address withheld

Glebe

I have attached my objection to this planning development

183231

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

I wish to make the following points regarding the proposed Blackwattle Bay redevelopment SSP study:

1 - That the foreshore walkway be allocated a minimum 30 metre width.

2 - That a row of trees be planted as close to the waters edge as possible to counter the sites western aspect. These need not be large trees, but a species with a broad shade canopy. My experience working as [redacted] the most successful walking corridors are those providing the most shade available. This is particularly important in our current state of increased and rising temperatures. To this end we have been working with local councils and The Green and Resilient Places Division of the Planning Department, to promote and support such plantings

3 - That consideration be given to the construction of a boardwalk from behind the current Blackwattle Bay Marina along the foreshore, either free standing, or cantilevered off the foreshore embankment. This would pass beneath the old Glebe Island Bridge abutment to connect with the current foreshore path at Waterfront Park. Although this is on the fringe of the SSP Concepts Precinct it would enhance the developments connectivity, and enrich the foreshore walking experience.

4 - That quality interpretive material be provided where appropriate, in line with the extensive interpretive signage available throughout the peninsular. A sense of place and history is an important component within the community.

5 - That the fig trees abutting the Western Distributor be retained and extra plantings be made to provide a continuous green corridor screening the motorway. If trees need replacing in the future, they could be done so on a case by case basis, and only when required. Such mature trees should be valued and not discarded.

6 - I support that the cycleway behind the Fishmarket between Pymont Bridge Road and Miller Street be retained and improved, to link with the new Miller Street Cycleway. This would provide an excellent Active Transport corridor, leaving the foreshore pathway for walkers and more leisurely cyclists.

7 - That a new ferry network be implemented with a wharf not only at the new Fishmarket, but to include wharves also at the end of Glebe Point, Elizabeth Macarthur Bay at the end of Harris Street, Barangaroo and Circular Quay. The Casino Wharf near Pyrmont Bay Park could also possibly be included. This could potentially assist in reducing the amount of traffic an increased population would create in an already highly populated area. This could also be of use to tourists in future happier times.

8 - That the extreme height of the buildings proposed be replaced by building heights in line with the Pyrmont Peninsular Place Strategy. Sydney is now permanently scarred by the Barangaroo developement. The same is about to happen to Cockle Bay. It is essential that the Pyrmont Peninsular remains a place where the built environment reflects the human scale we all desire, consistent with the local precinct.

183291

Name and address withheld

2009

Bulk, scale and size are appropriate for this side of Pymont when taking into account future plans to rezone Pymont.

This site needs to have good links up to Harris St and the new metro station site including wider footpaths with active transport separated, and quick/ better sequenced pedestrian traffic light crossings.

A pedestrian bridge over Pymont Bridge Rd to Wentworth Park for safe access between the two.

Cultural building something substantial with at least 20% devoted to the history of Pymont.

183311

Name and address withheld

Ultimo 2007

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.

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.

183341

Name and address withheld

2010

I am making a submission on behalf of the Mavericks dragon boat racing club while supporting the submission made by the DBNSW.

183386

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge 2037

The proposed towers are too high. They don't fit into the area and will create too much shade. Also this area is already too dense and this will make it a lot worse

183391

Name and address withheld

Pymont 2009

This proposal is not in keeping with the local area and itâ€™s current architecture.

We need to re use and re purpose our buildings and architecture and not just erase the last .

The light shadow cast by this proposal would be terrible .

Please re think this submission and do not let this go ahead .

Thanks for you time and consideration

Regards

[redacted]

183401

Name and address withheld

2037

I strongly believe that the proposal will have a negative impact on the surrounding area, affecting the landscape and importantly, the liveability of the local community. I do not believe that this approach is right for the area and I strongly urge the Government to reconsider. Any plans should conserve the shoreline, limit obtrusive buildings and enhance public space and greenery.

183406

Name and address withheld

Forest Lodge

Please don't do this to our foreshore it's just so sad. Way too high, way too dense. Shadows, traffic problems. Please build, but build something beautiful. It's not Manhattan island.