From:
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Cc:

Subject: Star Casino Redevelopment MOD 13

Date: Friday, 23 August 2019 4:28:04 PM

We are writing to you, the Independent Planning Commission NSW, to accept your invitation to have a say about the proposed tower associated with the Star Casino.

We agree with the findings of the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment that the proposed modification is not in the public interest.

Most of the buildings in the precinct of Pyrmont near the casino (ie excluding Jacksons Landing) are terrace houses or apartments with a maximum of seven levels. The proposed tower is completely out of keeping with the current character of Pyrmont. It is not even close! The proposed tower would absolutely dominate the skyline and hugely detract from the charm and feel of Pyrmont.

The rejuvenation of Pyrmont occurred from 1990 under the auspices of the City West Development Corporation, a division of the then NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. A strategy for Pyrmont was formulated to ensure certainty for developers and potential new residents. The strategy incorporated the maintenance of view corridors through-out the peninsular and the harbour; and the continuation of Pyrmont's heritage, seen in its building form, topography and street pattern. The proposed tower is completely contrary to the strategy that has guided Pyrmont's development for thirty years.

Pyrmont already has a very high density of residents. It certainly does not need the addition of 30 levels of apartments. At present traffic volume in and around Pyrmont is already at stretching point. Most roads are narrow, and constrained by parking being permitted on both sides of the road. Both Light Rail and bus service during the extended rush hours are usually overloaded. Any further demand from additional residents will put pressure on an already stressed system. Parking as well is at a premium and a bad situation will be made worse by overflow parking from the proposed apartments. In summary, transport infrastructure will not cope with the proposed additional apartments.

There has been considerable comments in the media about the proposed tower. The main argument for the tower seems to be that Sydney requires more facilities for tourists. There are two counter arguments to this point of view. Firstly, the apartments are not tourist attractions. Secondly, tourists flock to many cities around the world simply because those cities have retained their original character and are not despoiled by intrusive towers. Hence the "tourist objective" could be achieved by a high quality hotel on the site, built to a height consistent to the present architecture of Pyrmont.

We urge the Commission to uphold the decision of the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.

Yours respectfully

Martin and Katharine Stevenson



Virus-free. www.avast.com