

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Star Development Proposal - Objection  
**Date:** Monday, 2 September 2019 5:21:13 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

(If the following is to be made public, please remove my name and contact details prior to publication.)

I am writing to urge the Independent Planning Commission to uphold the Department of Planning's recommendation of rejecting the Star Casino's development proposal. Before proceeding onto describing the potential impacts which are being introduced by the development to Pymont as a community as well as a suburb, I ask of you to please consider the effect of the message being conveyed if the development was to be approved in its current form.

Comparison between the proposed development and the old power station chimney stacks has been made on more than one occasion by various development supporters, leading to the supporters' own conclusion that the development is a like for like reuse of the site based on the heights and similarity of the two structures alone.

The height of the proposed development, being over 200m, is neither mathematically nor functionally comparable to the old power station chimney stacks. Whereas every individual is entitled to their own beliefs, to force upon baseless opinions onto the others serves to emphasise the developers' and supporters' interest in their own agenda and little else.

Moreover, there were reasons why the old power station and its chimney stacks were demolished, along with the removal of the power station the necessity of tall structures has also been eliminated. reintroducing a tall structure to the site based on the reason that a tall structure used to stand does not appear to be a forward thinking development by any measures, in other words this reasoning is akin to redeveloping Pymont so that it will be aesthetically appalling, similar to how it was in the early 1900's where the power station chimney stacks overshadowed a relatively low rise surrounding.

Argument can be made that the height of the old power station chimney stacks were never in keeping with the surrounding and yet they were built, however this serves to emphasise that any development should take into account of not repeating past mistake with the aid of rules and regulations. Structures that were not in keeping with the surrounding were built out of necessity, when they were no longer required they were removed. Rules and regulations were put in place to ensure there is minimal "out-of-character" development, and we should do well to observe them or otherwise instead of moving forward the society would be regressing.

Additionally the original planning approval for the development was also based on the

proposal of additional hotel accommodation, not luxury accommodation – a clear indication that the developer, as well as the supporters, have little regards to the rules and regulations in addition to the abovementioned lack of interest in the wider community beyond themselves.

The development if approved, would by association mean the approval of unsubstantiated claims, allowable intentional disregard of rules and regulations, and bias on gains for selected parties as opposed to the community as a whole.

The above does not take into account some of the reasonings from the supporters, such as much money as been spent and therefore the development should be approved, and that there has not been any feedbacks on material impacts brought about by the development proposal (which was conscious negligence from the developer and supporters alike when the Department of Planning has already commented on the need to address environmental and community impacts brought about by the development). There is also the lack of proposed rectification treatments to issues identified in the engineering report. When all of these are taken into account, it is all the more evident that the development has been proposed and supported for the gains of certain parties, not the community and the environment.

Beyond the concern of wrong message being conveyed, the following is a selection of key elements I am able to observe as a resident in Pymont for over 8 years within walking distance of the Star, all lead to my being convinced that the development is likely to bring negative impact to Pymont as a community.

### **Road Traffic concern – intersection of Pymont Street and Jones Bay Road**

This particular road intersection is currently unconventional in the sense that the priority of entering the junction is to be negotiated by the road users akin to navigating round a roundabout, but without clear indication on the road and roadside it is a roundabout. The “roundabout” treatment is arguably sensible based on the fact that there would be more road traffic coming from south of Jones Bay Road, travelling along Pymont Street and turning right onto Jones Bay Road due to vehicle access to the Star and to the Metcalfe Park further on.

Having to navigate through this intersection on a weekly basis highlights the fact that the lack of clear indication of how the junction should be negotiated has led to frequent “near-misses”, where a mixture of road users who are familiar with the road layouts and those who are not, trying to navigate through this intersection in different manners causing confusion and occasionally chaotic situation, sometimes resulting in real hazardous road conditions leading to potentially fatal consequences.

This unconventional road configuration has been in place for years partly for the Star’s benefit, yet despite near misses occurring at noticeable frequency, nothing has been proposed by the Star to improve the safety for the road users.

### **Road Traffic Concern – pedestrian crossing on Jones Bay Road**

Currently there is a crossing on Jones Bay Road near Pirrama Road end, giving much

needed priority to pedestrian crossing from one side of Jones Bay Road to the other. The sighting of this crossing has not been ideal from a road vehicle user's point of view, especially when delivery and construction vehicles servicing the Star are outside of the designated loading zones along Jones Bay Road, this often leads to lack of sighting distances for drivers on approach to the crossing, resulting in near-misses when there are pedestrians utilising crossing. Whereas this is not the sole responsibility of the Star's when it comes to addressing concerns related to road layouts, nonetheless the Star has not been enforcing management of the delivery and construction vehicles to help minimising the safety concerns, despite reports made to the Star by those who have experienced near misses.

### **Road Traffic Concern – increasing number of tour buses, often parked illegally, in residential areas**

Currently, there are tour buses parked in Pymont during day time, often parked illegally due to their sizes and lack of available street parking.

These tour buses parking illegally often obstruct the sighting of the other road users, leading to potential road accidents, and with the Star's development it will inevitably mean more tour buses in the area, increasing the risk level.

### **Increase in noise disturbance**

Over the past years the noise level in Pymont has been on the increase. Whereas it is understandable that as Pymont becomes more populated, increase in noise level is inevitable. However the noise becomes serious disturbance when it is random shouting and screaming from drunken patrons, leaving the bars, restaurants and pubs including the Star late at night, awaking residents who are in the midst of sleep. The noise disturbance is also made worse by the loud engine and exhaust sound emitting from high powered vehicles, often driven around Pymont treating the roads as race tracks, by visitors to the Star and its accommodation.

With the expansion of the Star, the level of noise disturbance will inevitably increase, heading towards a level where the liveability of the suburb will be seriously compromised.

### **Increase in crime rate**

Expansion of the Star, especially the nightclub, will mean a highly probable increase in drunken patrons in the area, and in line with this a highly probable increase in crime rate compromising the safety and therefore, again, the liveability of the suburb.

### **Worsening Public Transport**

Proposed addition of accommodation would mean Increase in the number of residents using public transport getting to and from Pymont. Currently the public transport, especially the only bus route (389) that passes through the city, is already saturated with passengers during peak hours with sporadic running in both direction.

With the imminent opening of city light rail, it is often seen as an alternative mode of transport taking Pymont residents into the heart of the city – however taking the light rail

into the heart of the city will require changeover from one light rail line to another meaning journey time will be necessarily long for the distance travelled making it an inefficient way to commute, one that some if not most residents cannot sustain. With the proposed development, the already less than optimal public transport will only worsen.

### **Road congestion**

I have had experience of sitting in traffic jam on Harris Street for over an hour before being able to get on ANZAC bridge continuing west. Reports from some of the residents state they seldom experience road congestion in Pyrmont and that there is no sign of traffic condition worsening over the years – this is true and I can concur if all road commutes can be done when there is a distinct lack of other road users (i.e. off-peak hours), unfortunately not everyone has the luxury to avoid other road users on a daily basis. There is a lack of mention of solution to the above concerns as part of the development proposal, and in worse case lack of acknowledgement of the issues. Lack of proposed improvements/resolution from the Star for some of the ongoing issues adds to my lack of faith in that the development, being proposed and supported by a party that has not exhibited care, is going to be one that is beneficial to the environment and community. Lastly, I would like to express my opinion that there does not seem to be any urgent need for Pyrmont (and the Greater Sydney for that matter) to site yet another building of prominent dimension with no lasting appeal that has no functional features that help to maintain/improve the quality of environment in Pyrmont. Moreover, the development proposal includes an expansion to the Star's night club, perhaps developments that will increase the availability of art and culture, instead of those that will inevitably serve to increase the occurrence of negatively impactful behaviour brought about by alcohol consumption and substance abuse, are more in line with what Sydney needs going forward?

Nightlife is not just about night clubs and casinos, evening and late night art and culture, family entertainments, meals-out and shopping when they can be enjoyed in safety are equally important. The availability of non-alcohol/gambling related entertainments are perhaps what will put Sydney back onto the world map for having a reputation of fantastic and balanced nightlife, substantiated by examples of other world class cities (such as Paris and London) in other parts of the world that have reputations for excellent nightlife, where there are equal importance paid to all varieties of night time entertainment.

Does flanking the city from both sides by gigantic casino related structures help Sydney springboard back onto being one of the top-rated cities? When all it shows is a lack of variety.

International celebrity Nigella Lawson once said, "I'd been told such good things about the food there, I was ready for disappointment. Instead, I was transported! And that after ... wading through one of the *circles of hell that is the Star casino mall-thing*, which is where Momofuku Seiobo is situated." Arguably it is one person's opinion, unfortunately she is not alone in having this opinion and the approval of the expansion of this circle of hell should

not be given lightly, unless there are plausible plans to make it less of a hell circle inside, out and vicinity.

Thank you.

Regards,

