

From: [REDACTED]
To: [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Objection to The Star Casino's Redevelopment (MOD13)
Date: Sunday, 1 September 2019 3:48:41 PM

To Whom It May concern,

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

As a local Pymont resident, I am writing to strongly object to the current Star Casino's development proposal and hope that you will agree with the Department of Planning's recommendation to reject the proposal as it currently stands. As I'm sure you will be inundated with information prior to making your final decision, I will strive to keep my reasons succinct:

1. The proposal submission attempts to utilise the now defunct Part 3A of the Planning Act that our current NSW Government repealed way back in 2011. The ICAC Commissioner has already stated that the clause "creates a corruption risk and a community perception of a lack of appropriate boundaries." The fact that The Star is still pursuing this channel is a clear indication that it knows it would not be approved in its current form through the proper planning process as it exceeds current development standards in the Pymont suburb (i.e. 8 times the existing height controls). To allow this development to proceed would set a dangerous precedent that other developers can also bypass planning laws and override the integrity of the planning system.
2. The Star advertises this as a new luxury hotel development but this is a huge misrepresentation as there are more floors of private residential apartments than there are hotel floors. It is simply a prohibited residential development in a commercial zone masquerading as a hotel to justify selling luxury private apartments on prime waterfront land with limited benefit to the broader Pymont community. If Sydney so desperately needed extra hotel rooms then why not submit a proposal without the apartments and for a hotel of a more reasonable scale only?
3. The height and design of the twin towers is grossly out of proportion with the surrounding area. It is too big and too tall, completely inappropriate for the dense residential surroundings that it sits in. It would not only dominate views from Pymont but also from other inner west suburbs. Many residents will lose views they have had for years with no compensation or benefit. It also looks isolated and separate from the surrounding neighbourhood rather than part of it.
4. The development's engineering reports and environmental submissions do not demonstrate that the proposal has limited environmental consequences. In fact it served to highlight impact on traffic, public transport, noise and crime, visual pollution

and overshadowing. None of the reports had mitigation measures against these negative impacts. In fact, most of them implied it was simply inevitable that traffic jams worsen, buses filled up faster and most local nearby residences will suffer from overshadowing.

a. The reports deemed it acceptable that people who already have little sunlight in their homes would lose all sunlight altogether especially in the winter. The massive twin towers would act as a giant sundial, casting shadows on multiple homes and open public spaces and footpaths over many blocks throughout the day. I would think this is unacceptable for the health and wellbeing of all Pymont residents. It would certainly make it uncomfortable to pedestrians who currently enjoy walking around Pymont.

b. Commercial lighting will fill up the night sky around Pymont meaning we will not only live in shadows during the day but may suffer disturbed sleep at night.

c. The reports claim there is reserve capacity in the existing road network but I have to disagree. One needs only observe Harris Street and Pymont Bridge Road at peak times to note that traffic congestion is a serious problem.

d. I note there was no wind assessment included in the reports despite the increase in tower height. I believe there would be significant wind tunnel impacts if an assessment was correctly conducted.

e. Given that these reports were prepared and funded by The Star, they do not have appropriate independence to truly reflect the significant impact on our community.

5. Despite what some might like to believe, Pymont is a suburb in its own right, not merely an extension of the CBD. Our suburb has a character, charm and feel all of its own and I believe that is what attracts tourists to visit the area. To say it is inevitable that Pymont will become a high rise mecca to match the CBD across the water is not justification for bypassing good planning and community views. The past regeneration of Pymont as a community-minded neighbourhood and a great place to live is substantial evidence that the current planning rules compliant with the Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP) are suitable, successful and comprehensive.

6. Pymont is not the quietest of suburbs but over the years, I have noticed an increase in level of noise, especially at night as a result of increased patronage of The Star with the introduction of lock out laws elsewhere. The noise stems from increase in people wandering around shouting and also loud cars racing around late at night and in the early hours of the morning. Majority of these can be traced back to The Star's patrons. Yet The Star wants to expand the size of its nightclub, potentially leading to more noise and higher crime rates. None of this, including the larger nightclub, benefits us as Pymont residents at all. Whatever measures The Star might impose would not apply once the extra people leave their premises and enter places where we reside.

7. The Star claims this development would benefit local residents yet I fail to see how. Providing a single local Neighbourhood Centre is insufficient to counter the negative effects of this development on residents and the surrounding public areas. I note that growth of any plantings in the Centre's terrace would be limited to avoid blocking the new luxury apartments' views. Rather ironic since The Star plans on decimating views of existing local residents. The development also proposes to replace existing mature trees with the minimum required of variable species thereby reducing the local green cover around our suburb at a time when the City of Sydney is trying to increase green cover to counter rising temperatures and heat sink effects.

8. When The Star was granted permission to develop the site of the old power station, it was with the promise that no development would exceed the height of the stacks. Recent comments equating the new towers with the old stacks clearly fail to comprehend the difference between just over 100m and 237m. The slimline nature of the stacks would not have impacted the views or surrounding environment as greatly as the proposed massive towers.

9. The fact that The Star has spent a considerable sum has no bearing on whether the development should be rejected or accepted. All development proposals should be assessed equally on its merits and compliance with current planning laws.

10. I see no reason why more luxury private apartments are required in Pymont, particularly since there are already two luxury developments, Paragon and NewLife, currently being constructed in the area. Surely we are not intending to change the local demographic by only allowing the wealthy to live in our community.

11. Lastly the tower is rather ugly in my opinion. I hope no one will take offence if I say it looks like a giant hand with a rude sign towards its competitor at Barangaroo. The high shine of the exterior finish could cause unwanted reflections creating unpleasant living areas in existing homes and well as those spending time outside in the many parks that surround the area.

I urge you all again to protect the integrity of our current planning system and uphold the Department of Planning's recommendation to reject this development as it currently stands. Thank you.

Regards,

