

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074608

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEES: ELIZABETH ELENIUS  
BILL D'ANTHES**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**Introduction and disclaimers spoken by Danielle Smalley at the beginning of each meeting:**

*Thank you very much, first of all, for coming today. I just want to let you know that, as you were advised when you registered, that we will be recording the session and then we're going to make the transcripts publicly available. So first of all I just want to check that you're comfortable with that.*

*[All attendees agreed]*

*My name's Danielle Smalley and I'm the chief operating officer at the Greater Sydney Commission. This is Stephanie Barker and she's acting Executive Director City Strategy and she's leading the review for the Commission, and Dan Bright is our senior project officer with the Commission. Renee Attard is taking some notes for us today. Lara Irwin is recording it for us. And we also have behind us Chris Leeds, who is from Procure Group and he's our probity officer, so he's here today just in case there's any probity issues that arise. If you leave this session and feel that there are probity issues that you'd like addressed, Meredith outside has Chris' card and you can contact him directly.*

*All Greater Sydney Commission staff complete a conflict of interest and make an annual declaration and anyone working on this project has also declared any conflicts of interest in relation to Pymont and they have recused themselves from being involved. We've got a probity plan in relation to it that Procure Group has reviewed for us. We're unaware of any conflicts in relation to staff participating in this review, and you can find additional information about the way we manage conflicts on our website along with our code of ethics and conduct policy. Now, I do need to ask you, are you a registered lobbyist?*

*[No attendees participated in meetings in a lobbyist capacity]*

*Just to remind you of the purpose of the review, we are looking to determine the effectiveness of the planning frameworks to deliver the New South Wales government for the Western Harbour Precinct and Pymont Peninsula. It's been requested that we do that by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces under the Greater Sydney Commission Act. I understand that you have read the terms of reference and that you have a map of the area, but we have maps here today if you want to point anything out.*

*Today's focus is about us listening to you. We really want to understand your concerns and issues. We're not here to comment on the review or on your views. Therefore, we might ask you for questions around clarification, but usually that's not necessary. And everyone who's meeting with us has ten minutes, which will start once I finish, so you'll get the full ten minutes. We will give you a warning bell at nine minutes and then we'll finish it up at ten. We do have quite a few people to get through so we do need to limit it to that time.*

MS ELENIUS: Yes. I'm Elizabeth Elenius and I'm convener of Pymont Action Incorporated.

MS SMALLEY: Hi, Elizabeth.

MR d'ANTHES: And I'm her deputy, William d'Anthes.

MS SMALLEY: Did you have any questions before we begin listening to you?

MS ELENIUS: Well, I did ask whether the report that you finally come up with will be made public.

MS SMALLEY: So we will provide it to the Minister for Planning and that will be their decision about whether the report is made public.

MS ELENIUS: Well, up front I would like to state that we would like that to happen.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Well, we will note that and we'll note that in our - - -

MS ELENIUS: Thank you.

MS SMALLEY: - - - report on the engagement. Okay. Well, thank you very much and over to you. We'll start the timing now.

MS ELENIUS: Thank you. I represent the member of Pymont Action Incorporated and also speak for many concerned members of the Pymont community. Pymont Action's aims are to work with all levels of government, community members, including business, and with developers to improve the physical and social amenity of our suburb. We have worked successfully on a number of projects, including a new plan for Waterfront Park involving withdrawal of an already approved DA, redesign of 1 Distillery Drive apartments after community rejection of a previous plan, collaboration on the establishment of urban bushland on the western escarpment, providing input on public domain contributions by Harbour Mill developers. The list goes on. We are not anti-development but pro-good development.

We are represented on the Bays Precinct community Reference Group and the White Bay/Glebe Island Community Liaison Group. We have deep knowledge of our suburb, having watched its transition from an abandoned industrial area to a 'vibrant, mixed-use precinct' over the past 30 years, and we are familiar with the rules which mostly have governed this transformation, Darling Harbour and sites of state significance excepted. The GSC has been handed an impossible task by the Premier to come up with recommendations for yet another transition to what, in five weeks, is ridiculous. Even as I speak, the last available sites in Pymont are either being built upon or are at some stage of the planning and/or assessment process. Those remaining are in the Blackwattle Bay area of the Bays Precinct, and another government body, Infrastructure New South Wales, is charged with developing those plans as proposed.

The new Sydney Fish Markets plans will go on public exhibition within the next two months, but we are none the wiser as to how visitors will get there, given that more than double the number are expected, whilst the number of car spaces will remain as at present. With only the light rail within a reasonable walking distance, I don't see people from Palm Beach or Pennant Hills carrying their eskies full of seafood home by public transport. How the GSC expects to unravel in five weeks the regular traffic jams inflicted on our narrow local roads by destinations such as Darling Harbour and The Star Casino is unfathomable, and road projects like WestConnex will only exacerbate the already choked road system. A Pymont metro station will be welcome but it won't change the fact that Pymont is a peninsula and the poor design of the Pymont interchange means that traffic comes to a standstill every evening in peak hours, delaying bus services by up to an hour in Harris Street from Fig Street to Bowman Street.

The 30 minute city is already a lost cause, especially for the less athletic of us, and we're only two kilometres from the centre of the CBD. In viewing Urban Taskforce's vision of Pymont and Ultimo, it is clear that the developer lobby has public housing in its sites, just like at Millers Point. How dare public tenants have a harbour view. It is also clear that heritage precincts will be sacrificed if they get their foot in the door. Local parks have not been spared either, even though we have one of the lowest ratios of public open space to population in Sydney.

To ensure that Pymont and Ultimo become even more vibrant than at present and to provide focus for creative industries as well as tourism, there can be no greater imperative than to retain the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo. It is the site of the Ultimo Power Station which powered the first trams which ran along Harris Street. It houses the huge Boulton and Watt steam engine, one of the oldest in the world still working regularly. Well, it worked when they put it on a truck and got it to Parramatta. Is it in its context, and alongside it is the Innovation Corridor, UTS, TAFE, the ABC and a myriad of large and small innovative businesses. The powerhouse and tram shed sites must not be sold off to private developers and Parramatta should have its own museum of relevance to its historical and cultural current context.

Over the 30 years of Pymont's and Ultimo's transition to a vibrant, mixed-use precinct, we have seen a progressive weakening of planning laws by the introduction of political powers which enable exceptions to be made to the rules-based LEPs and other official planning instruments, including spot rezoning, part 3A exceptionalism and sites of state significance declarations. They have corrupted the orderly planning process. Rather than ask the GSC, which really has no planning powers except advisory, to produce a rushed review of Pymont and Ultimo planning parameters with only three weeks for members of the community to respond, the Premier would be much better served in establishing a review of the planning legislation covering the whole state with a view to a wholesale rewrite. This should eliminate opportunities for political intervention such as this review and enshrine a planning process which includes genuine and early community engagement.

Setting planning parameters should be the responsibility of the Department of Planning in partnership with local governments, with equal opportunities for input

afforded to all stakeholders in the process. Assessments should be conducted by the Department and councils as determined in the revised legislation. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this rushed review was ordered by the Premier for only one purpose, to overturn the legal planning instruments governing development of the 61-storey Ritz-Carlton tower on the site of the Star Casino, thus enabling it to proceed and to become an exemplar of the transition of the already very successful redeveloped Pyrmont and Ultimo into an extension of the soulless Sydney CBD. We reject that modification proposal just as we reject the rationale for this review.

Our full written submission will be provided prior to 16 September. It contains facts about Pyrmont, opportunities currently being explored by Infrastructure New South Wales and draws attention to the constraints on further large-scale development in the precinct. We can see no value in this review but have aimed to be helpful nevertheless. Our hope is that the Premier will see the sense of our recommendation to engage in a whole-of-government review of the current planning legislation to eliminate forever the opportunities for the corruption of the planning process. Thank you.

MS SMALLEY: Great. Thank you. Would anyone want to clarify any comments?

MS BARKER: No, that's - - -

MS SMALLEY: No.

MS ELENIUS: A lot of detail is in the - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes. In the submission.

MS ELENIUS: Yes, the submission.

MS SMALLEY: Did you want to leave that with us or we'll wait till you put the submission in.

MS ELENIUS: We'll put the submission in in ..... in the fullness of time, but I believe this will be ..... .

MS SMALLEY: Thank you for much. And again, we greatly appreciate your time.

MS ELENIUS: Not at all.

MS SMALLEY: And, yes, we'll certainly advise when we've provided our advice.

MS ELENIUS: I would suggest that you get a hold of that. That's a Cabinet approved document.

MS SMALLEY: Yes. All right. Thank you very much.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074606

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEES: SAM STONE  
STEVE MANN**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR MANN: Yes, so it's the Urban Development Institute of Australia NSW.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

5 MR MANN: I'm the CEO and Sam's the manager at policy and research.

MR MANN: We've brought a presentation. Hopefully that's - - -

MS SMALLEY: Great.

10

MS BARKER: .....

MS BARKER: Fantastic.

15 MR MANN: - - - useful. So there's a few of those.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MS BARKER: Thank you.

20

MR MANN: Sam and I might – might bang it on this one. So a little bit of background on us first, but you – you probably don't need too much on that. You can look at that afterwards. So deeply involved with Greater Sydney Commission. Deeply involved with the – the Greater Sydney plan – the regional plan and really  
25 pleased about advocating for that – the importance of the three settings. So focus here on, obviously, the CBD and – and we very much see this precinct as needing to be an important feature in the next stage of evolution of our main CBD – crucially important. We've had a big focus on housing and its importance and we've been doing a lot of what we call future city – so the – using technology to understand our  
30 city and the planning of our city better.

So I think particularly with a – a region like this, which is a regeneration region, it's really important to understand how the city's changing demographically – how the younger generations are wanting to live and work and how that can come together. I  
35 think the thing we're – sort of, as a banner sitting over it would be mixed use. This is the real opportunity to do mixed use well. What could – very much jobs focus, but a living focus as well, right next to, and, in fact, part of – because of its great links to the main city. So a couple of things we want to do is actually draw on some international comparisons for you, because we think that's incredibly important.  
40 Isn't it interesting how much has happened in this precinct over the last decade or two with the incredible change, and I suspect another couple of decades of incredible change is the opportunity.

So we, you know, it was a cottage area back some way ago. Now, real change from  
45 the, sort of, 90s in this region and now we are providing that mixed use with great connections. Transport is, obviously, crucial for all of these regions and, sort of, strongly recognised by Greater Sydney Commission – active transport being part of that story and a big opportunity, but as soon as you get that walkability, you've got to have, you know, strong transport links to – to deliver. So we think understand the  
50 opportunities of that transport ..... crucially import, Metro being one of the key

decisions still to be made. What else do I want to say there? We think there is a real opportunity for office to grow again here and, as I said, as part of that mixed use story. Vacancy is low in the CBD and there is ..... already good take up.

5 There could be more take up, we think, in greater density ..... office space, so that's the purpose of that slide, and then I mentioned the rail. So there is West Metro – obviously has the potential of – of rail and the we would encourage the review to be thinking about rail is – and – and living in relation to rail is that opportunity to walk to transport and then to be able to get to your job, be it walking as part of that  
10 precinct or catching rail to walk to a next space. The – I think the real opportunity here is to deliver that mixed use solution and a great need for that. So target of 54,000 additional jobs by 2036 is a significant target for this region, so office will be needed to deliver on that and – and real opportunities for ..... those railway stations. The other thing we would, sort of, get people to be thinking about is the cost of living  
15 when it comes to these centres. So if you could walk and use public transport, then you don't need to two cars or you don't need a car at all, which really does give you a broad demographic of people being about to use it, particularly young people, which is a big part of this location. We do international study tours each year, so we've drawn on a couple of case studies and actually attached a couple of the articles  
20 from our international magazine you mind find quite helpful. We'll show you those at the end, but Kings Cross is one of the ones that comes to mind in London, where – you know, crucially enabled by its rail connection.

25 An old, derelict site for some time – some heritage – significant heritage, which there is in this precinct too and then this amazing mixed use precinct that's coming out. Real focus on design quality, but then also that mixed of design. We visited Kings Cross last year and, of course, Google is now building their HQ in this location. Significant retail, which we would have thought was one of the big opportunities relative to the rail for Pymont – together with the rail opportunities, and then just  
30 these amazing precincts for living at the same time. Kings Cross is a super example. Also Hong Kong – much greater density, but just the MTR model of rail plus property is quite compelling. They're changing their city by using rail, and density's a very important part of making that work.

35 There's a real focus on place. They understand the 400 metre connections. Slightly different climate in Hong Kong, obviously, to the rail and that integration of retail and of living spaces is incredible within Hong Kong, so you'll see a couple of articles on that from last year. This year, we – one of our visits was to Hafencity in Hamburg in Germany. There's a shot there from – my photo of the – of the modern  
40 itself and Hafencity already has a fair bit built, as you can see, but there's another significant precinct being developed with much greater scale. You can see the big tower close to the bottom of that photo. That's proposed – the red still to be built. So Hafencity, another fantastic global example of what can be done with a – a near city precinct and with water exposure.

45 So fantastic residential accommodation there. Office and, in fact, that's their opera house – just that building out on the peninsula there, so another really good opportunity to show what can be achieved, and then we just gave you a little bit around how we think you can bring this to the community. So we – we've developed  
50 capability to project the 3D city and co-design the city through our urban keyboard,



and also the ability to co-design park – parkland spaces using augmented reality – through our R&D projects. So that type of engagement with the community might be very helpful as you look to bring density to the city. Just quickly, in terms of where those articles actually sit in the attached ..... so page 7 of the first one, urban renewal, covers the Kings Cross and the Hong Kong, together with a little bit more on Battersea Power Station as well – big urban project, and then for this year’s projects, page 17, play smoking and Hafencity.

5  
10 MS SMALLEY: Thanks. All done then?

MR MANN: There you go.

MS SMALLEY: Steph and Dan, do you have any – do you want anything clarified?

15 MS BARKER: No. Look, thank you for those examples. Is there any comments you want to make relative back to the – the planning framework as it currently is?

MR MANN: Yes. We think quite clearly that greater density is part of what’s needed to achieve these outcomes and we think it’s particularly important close to major transport, because that’s what gives you the – the future city walkability, the cost of living, opportunities for residential and the – the walkability to jobs.

MS BARKER: Okay.

25 MR MANN: And we think shopping’s probably the other major .....

MS BARKER: Yes.

MR STONE: And I think with the Pyrmont, in terms of the Greater Sydney Commission plan ..... prepared ..... provide the – very strong, like, you have metro being within Pyrmont, so I think that sort of need to look at what is the next evolution of Pyrmont with metro and that next stage of urban renewal is really important for the area as a whole.

35 MS BARKER: All right.

MS SMALLEY: Are you happy for us to make this available as part of the transcripts, as you referred to it?

40 MR MANN: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Yes? If you can just – I’m – we’ll get someone in touch to get a soft copy that we can just link to on the website.

45 MR MANN: Yes, not a problem.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074616

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: MICHAEL TILT**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR TILT: Yes. Michael Tilt from MacroPlan.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. So that's it from me. Over to you.

MR TILT: Thank you very much. So there's two parts, I suppose, to me being here today. Obviously, from a MacroPlan perspective, just to share a few views from the strategic context and, obviously, as I said in my email, we're here representing Vision Land who are a long-term owner in the precinct who also share the government's vision in terms of seeing its activation as much as delivering opportunity for future commercial-type tenants. So that's the sort of lens that we're here for. A couple of items that we just probably want to raise and this is just sort of looking at the strategic framework. So one is just having a look at the Metropolitan Three Cities document. Objective 18 is, obviously, identifying the need to maximise vertical development opportunities and, obviously, with a focus on strengthening the – not just the economic, but the cultural capacity of the precinct of which Pymont is part of that.

We see there's a great opportunity to attract and retain businesses to locate in these types of precincts. However, the planning controls or the current planning controls as we see them may be inconsistent and there's just a couple of elements I just want to sort of flag in that context. There's just a couple of documents I want to take you through. Just in terms of the Eastern Inner City District Plan, as I said, whilst I don't see that the current controls align with the vision for Pymont itself which is the area that we're sort of focused on, the elements of that, I suppose, to take you through is the priority number E6 where it's identified as Pymont being an area of city hi-rise locations. So there's some inconsistency, firstly, in terms of floor space in terms of heights just in terms of those statutory controls that have been placed in that precinct. One of the things, just to take you through from a precinct point of view, is that, as I said, we're not here to talk about specific sites, but in terms of the Pymont precinct itself, we just see there's an inconsistency in terms of the controls that have been applied which don't necessarily maximise what the zoning intentions are for the precinct. One of the things just to question is perhaps how the applications of heights have come about to where they are today and just to consider that in the context, I suppose, of the strategic vision for the area and how they might be reviewed in context of where the government wants to get to. I'm appreciative that there are some significant proposals or precincts within some of these areas that are quite significant in terms scale, but I think it's just important to understand the whole precinct and what else might be able to be achieved and how the planning framework might be able to maximise that opportunity.

And, as I said, I think the last thing just around the – it's not just about building heights, but the way that the floor space controls have been placed. Obviously, there's a lot of focus around the waterfront itself and we'd just like to see that that sort of central core of the Pymont precinct is something that is reviewed in context of, obviously, achieving government's objective for Pymont itself. So I don't – obviously, I can't talk specifics about sites, but they're the general themes that we think that should be achieved and I really thank you for the opportunity just to note those down. We're going to be making a formal submission as well as part of that process. So – yes. Thank you very much.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you. Did you anyone want to clarify anything? No. Look, I think that's been pretty clear about relating it back to the planning framework so thank you.

MR TILT: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Did you want to leave that with us or - - -

MR TILT: We're going to package that up - - -

MS SMALLEY: - - - you're ..... submission.

MR TILT: - - - and send that in - - -

MS SMALLEY: Perfect. Okay.

MR TILT: - - - as part of our submission and we just attach that to the website itself?

MS SMALLEY: Yes. You can include attachments.

MR TILT: Fantastic. Well, thank you for the opportunity to - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Thank you very much.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074610

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: KEN LOUDEN**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR LOUDEN: I guess I'm representing me - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR LOUDEN: - - - my wife and I.

MS SMALLEY: Yes. Great.

MR LOUDEN: I'm a future – well, I will say that in the spiel but I'm a future resident of Pymont.

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MR LOUDEN: And so therefore – this isn't ..... but if you really think about when you – I'm a traditional downsizer, having moved from a big family home - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR LOUDEN: - - - children living overseas and, you know, when you look at where you wanted to spend your next phase – it's really important. You look at the research of the area. You look at the area.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR LOUDEN: And you visit it. And we've been continuing to visit that for many, many years now - - -

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MR LOUDEN: - - - as our apartment continues to be built. But – and it gives you a real perspective about the area, the adjoining area ..... and so - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great - - -

MS S. BARKER: .....

MS SMALLEY: ..... just finish your - - -

MR LOUDEN: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: So I will just - - -

MS BARKER: ..... yes – yes ..... thank you.

MS SMALLEY: So you're Ken?

MR LOUDEN: I'm Ken.

MS SMALLEY: You're Ken. Great. So just .....

MR LOUDEN: Yes. I'm a future resident of Pymont.

MS SMALLEY: So – okay. We will start. Your 10 minutes starts now.

MR LOUDEN: Cool. Thank you. Well, thank you very much for your time. By way of introduction, my name is Ken Louden. I'm a future resident of Pymont, having bought an off the plan apartment and I'm settling in December of this year ..... I recently wrote an objection regarding the Star Casino and I did speak at the IPC, so I'm familiar with some of the processes regarding my objections and my support of the New South Wales Department of Planning's recommendation for rejection of MOD 13. What I would like to do today is just briefly highlight a couple of areas that I think I would be grateful for the Greater Sydney Commission or GSC to take into consideration as you go through your review, mindful of your terms of reference.

I will just quickly touch on the urgency of the review, some of the current visions that I've seen, what I've read online – I'm not a planning expert but some of the things that I've seen and some of the recent successes around some of the developments which you've either influenced or you've been involved in, Pymont, it's history and how some of those, I think, have to be respected going forward, whatever your decision-making process is. So my understanding is that the GSC has had some excellent overall visions of Sydney which have been well received over a number of years, and you've got a number of footplates out there, as well. They appear to focus on the areas for population growth. They appear to focus – very forward looking on transport, infrastructure, with a strong emphasis on the north-west, the western and south-west of Sydney, as well.

What I noted when going through some of it online, just to bring myself slightly up to speed, is that Pymont hardly gets a mention, and I suspect that's due to the past planning of the 30 years past which have been quite successful in creating what part of the terms of reference was. It's a very vibrant and energetic community. That's one of the reasons we bought in to the area. I am concerned and worried that the – following the most recent recommended rejection of the Star Casino and MOD 13 by the New South Wales Department of Planning, an urgent review has been requested by the Premier. A 30 year review with a short consultant period is just not how great cities achieve great planning for both their communities, their residents and also for our visitors, as well.

Irrespective of the Premier's rationale, I urge the GSC to maintain integrity and discipline regarding Pymont that is not a priority for new development ..... and ask the GSC to focus on some sensible development plans or additional criteria over and above your current structured plan. I would certainly highlight the Fish Market and The Bays Precinct where I think there are some potential opportunities. I've been very impressed with some recent new and past planning successes which I think you and the New South Wales Department of Planning have influenced. These include Central Park and the Chippendale Green area which is a mixed commercial residential development area that covers its density very well.

The new Darling Square development has an excellent feel and ambiance. And the Pymont developments which have been achieved over about 30 years has got a

really good balance between liveability, commercial demand and tourism. In all cases, I note that they've been achieved and this balance has been achieved without the need for high-rise skyscrapers. The height of these new and past developments are very complementary to the local area and the surrounding areas. My sense is the GSC and the New South Wales Department of Planning vision and planning and the review processes of the past have been well respected by the developers, it's created with discipline and in consultation with the community, they've achieved a balanced outcome which provides Sydney with either suburbs or areas that enhance the skyscraper high-rise of the CBD and now the buildings of Barangaroo.

I personally think Sydney is a lucky city, with its natural assets and how, at least at present, we've planned some of the developing areas to complement the CBD and Barangaroo. And if I look to the east, the Woolloomooloo and the eastern suburbs, a relatively low rise that rises up towards, and then on the west, you've got the Pymont Ultimo that again creates this. So when you look from the harbour or you look north, you get this beautiful balance of a city. A lot of cities don't have that. They're a jungle. Pymont is not the CBD, it is not zone Barangaroo and it is – nor is it Darling Harbour. The GSC should not be pressured into allowing or considering massive high-rise across an already high density suburb. I'm sure other people have spoken about the 15-off thousand in Pymont, etcetera.

I urge the GSC to think about the areas that can be planning for appropriate transport infrastructure and can carry out that planned development without impacting materially on existing communities. It's one thing to plan an area, but is it going to be incredibly disruptive in small roads, in high density? I certainly don't object to low or medium rise buildings being planned or envisaged across some parts of the western harbour and you have a mandate to ..... at large. But I also think that whatever you decide and also ..... your mandate, it has got to respect and comply with current planning laws, rules and heights.

My wife and I bought in to Pymont due to its history and its heritage, its community feel, its ambiance, vibrancy and proximity to the city. It's a great walking suburb – that's one of your mandates. And it carries that high density well across workers, residents, community and tourists. Pymont is busy. It is not well serviced. One of its elements of the past is its infrastructure services is not well serviced. It doesn't have major rail systems. It has a light rail, which is pretty congested. These were not well planned in past visions. And I think it should be taking into consideration, as you ..... as you look at future growth of certain areas and suburbs, as well. Pymont is certainly attractive. High increases of school groups, tourists, city visitors due to its history and heritage.

On our many visits over the last four years to see our apartment being built, the volume of foot traffic and car traffic continues to increase. It does have road blocks and traffic blocks. Pymont has a strong naval history. It has got an important war history. It's a busy destination. It was a busy destination for New South Wales wool and grain. When you look at the past photos, it was and maintains its respect to its low rise landmarks and harbour location. We just should not ruin the harbour. Its heritage buildings, its wharves, cottages, terraces sit comfortably with the low rise commercial buildings that are now housing thousands upon thousands of workers



each day and they continue to come down the pipe with the Googles of the world and the building developments which are in the pipeline at this particular time.

The history and the heritage of Pyrmont is recognised by the many plaques and local information boards that we continue to look at as we walk around the suburb and we did before we made a very large commitment. These significant legacies of the past have been respected, maintaining a low rise height discipline meaning the area is not prone to a lack of natural light. It is not prone to overshadowing. It is not prone to the issues around wind and other issues ..... congestion. Pyrmont has a balance and that has been achieved through sensible planning and good balance in the past. I urge the GSC to allow Pyrmont to complement and enhance the city by allowing it to continue to evolve gracefully and not be a jumbled extension to the CBD.

..... your committee should show planning leadership and reject the Premier's influence to allow the MOD 13 to be a precedent. The Greater Sydney Commission should voice their support for some – many elements of the recommendation to reject MOD 13. Pyrmont is not an area that should be prioritised around high future, high growth – high-rise growth should I say. It is already struggling with its density, transport congestion and lack of infrastructure. It is a location that should be preserved to complement and enhance our great City of Sydney. What I want to do, and I've ..... I've got about three or four minutes to go. I wanted

MS L. IRWIN: ..... minutes - - -

MR LOUDEN: - - - to just basically touch on a couple of these things, just to sort of emphasise them - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes. Please do.

MR LOUDEN: - - - as a little voice. And I think sometimes the little voice doesn't get heard over the big voices. The big voices have a lot of machinery behind them. I spoke about the successes of Central Park and Chippendale and Darling Square which we regularly visit. We still coming – living out in the 'burbs and we come in by train and then we commute around this area. In all these areas, pretty much, they started with a clean slate. And what they've been able to do is then respect the surrounding areas and they have been able to develop them in line with the current laws and create excellent precincts. They've also not destroyed the look and feel of the areas.

If I look at some of the areas of – the Tooths Brewery and I look at some of the areas down towards what used to be – you know, which is now the Darling Square and haven't actually done it by ..... just go to – putting up these monstrous scale of high-rises as well – what I call vertical cities. I get very frustrated when I hear Pyrmont being roped into the same element as Darling Harbour. And I also get frustrated when they say it's going to be the next Barangaroo. This is just absolute rubbish. I do enjoy Barangaroo. I think it's a wonderful place. But, again, it started with a clean slate. If you think about Barangaroo itself, they're building Metros. They've invested in Wynyard Park and there's an excellent amount of new green area that is invested in complementing the other areas that's being done to ensure that you get that balance right. It is not a jumble.

Pymont can not, and will never be, a Chippendale or a Barangaroo and the committee should turn their minds to broaden – to look at the broader footplate of the western harbour and where you can generally influence and achieve - - -

MS IRWIN: One minute to go.

MR LOUDEN: - - - and achieve a great forward-looking element to provide transport, infrastructure, commercial and tourism and you can establish it in a way that basically continues to complement and balance the aesthetics of our city. This happened in Pymont about 30 years ago. It has been a wonderful success, one of the reasons why I'm buying into it but I very much want to emphasise it was done in compliance with the laws, the heights and the development rules of its day and forward looking, as well. Those rules haven't changed.

I think this review, like the IPC, is a tipping point, it really is. And I think ..... looked upon how Sydney achieves well balanced outcomes going forward, respecting history, respecting liveability and how future generations can actually live in what ultimately is one of the greatest cities in the world without eleventh hour political influence. Liveability and aesthetics, I think, is a really important thing. The CBD to me ..... well. It's a complex area but it crosses perimeters. It actually has that counter-balance which I think is so important. A lot of cities don't have that natural landscape environment. Almost finished. Liveability, in my view, is about feeling pretty good in the environment or the city or the suburb in which you live. It's about living, walking, working. Pymont in its past development has achieved that. I'm very concerned that will be broken. It will broken because of a change in planning development and abuse of that planning development, and ignorance to it, as well. The Star high-rise was a poor example of scale, bulk, abuse of planning and height  
- - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOUDEN: - - - and I really - - -

MS SMALLEY: So - - -

MR LOUDEN: I - - -

MS SMALLEY: - - - we will need to wrap it up. Have you got any final points you want to make?

MR LOUDEN: Sure. Yes. I would just like to – thank you. I suspect more so that I think as you turn your mind to the review and what you think has to be changed, I just ask you not to throw out the current laws and rules and height restrictions unnecessarily, and that Pymont is part of your review process to ensure an adequate outcome for the current, as well as future, residents of the whole of the Western Harbour Precinct.

MS SMALLEY: Great. Thank you.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074620

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: DAVID BRENNICK  
MADONNA LOCKE**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MS LOCKE: We've got a couple of bits of information.

MR BRENNICK: Have we started yet, or - - -

MS SMALLEY: We have.

MR BRENNICK: Sorry. I've got – thank you for having us today. Obviously we've done the introductions already, so as – the Star – we're here on behalf of the Star, which is a significant stakeholder in the Western Harbour Precinct, and as a result, we're obviously pleased that we have the opportunity to come and present to the forum today in terms of a review of the planning framework of that Western Harbour Precinct and the Pymont Peninsula.

Our site – I won't talk about our site individually – does occupy an area that sits within the Western Harbour Precinct, neighboured by the ICC, which is obviously a world-class convention and exhibition centre. We have the Maritime Museum. We have Darling Harbour Foreshore and the Harbourside Centre. So it's – our Western Harbour Precinct, I guess, is clearly a significant and important corridor in terms of our international competitiveness and will play a pivotal role in the cultural and entertainment and tourism and leisure development of Sydney going forward. But our discussion today is to respond to the three key questions that were put forward by the – in the public notice, so I'll hand over to Madonna to take you through that in more detail, or as much as she can in the time.

MS LOCKE: Thank you.

MR BRENNICK: And let her go through that.

MS LOCKE: We've just put together a couple of slides to support our discussion. So we had a look at the strategic direction that's set for the site, which is outlined in both the Eastern City District Plan and also the draft City of Sydney Local Strategic Planning Statement, and these documents identify that the study area is located within the Harbour CBD, which is Australia's global gateway and financial capital; that it's located in the Innovation Corridor, which supports the global competitiveness of the Harbour CBD, and specifically within the Innovation Corridor, the Darling Harbour Precinct is identified as a major entertainment precinct, and the plan acknowledges that we need to continue to build a more diverse and competitive offering in the sectors of tourism, conferences, entertainment and culture in order to support the innovation precinct.

The Darling Harbour Precinct in the District Plan is identified as being located predominantly on the western side of the harbour. The City of Sydney's draft Local Strategic Planning Statement supports the location of the Innovation Corridor and the study area as located within this. It also identifies that there is a need to ensure that internationally competitive industries and clusters in the Innovation Corridor can innovate, agglomerate and grow.

We also had a look at, I guess, some success factors for innovation precincts, and the New South Wales Government has produced a government. I think key to us is it

identified that the importance of mixed use live, work, play environments, day and night-time activity, physical and digital connectivity, and agglomeration and concentration of complementary industries. One of the things it also looks at is barriers to success of innovation precincts, and specifically in relation to I guess this context is that restrictive regulations such as land use zoning and multiple different layers of entities looking over a particular area can actually cause some barriers to success of innovation precincts.

The next slide just talks to, I guess, the complexity of the existing statutory controls which apply to the development – the study area, and this includes the Sydney LEP and DCP 2012, the Sydney LEP 2005, the SREP, Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005, the Darling Harbour Development Plan No. 1, the SREP 26 City West, and also state environmental planning policies, including Major Development 2005 and the state and regional development. I guess what's clear in this plan, and we've put a few red dots on there, is just that the last two state environmental planning policies are the way by which major redevelopment sites are actually occurring in the study area, and that's facilitating development outside of the LEP and SREP controls.

So we had a little bit of a look, then, I guess, at a review of the planning controls, and what it identifies for us is that the statutory development controls such as height and FSR were sort of adopted around – the current were adopted around 2005 LEP, and they largely reflected just the built form of the time, so the height and FSR largely reflected what was currently built. And the 2012 review of the controls essentially in principle adopted those controls, the FSR and height, and largely carried them forward. So what this sort of demonstrates to us is there hasn't really been any clear consideration of the statutory controls since the vision, the strategic direction for the site as an innovation precinct was established in 2018. And so the – I guess the challenge is really about implementation of the strategic vision.

The next part of the presentation talks to, I guess, the second question around delivering quality places for people to live, work and visit. And I guess what we wanted to highlight here is there are some other mechanisms which are in place for which to consider how these can be developed if the statutory controls aren't there. Best practice approach in the absence of the right controls to facilitate development is things like the local character and place assessment, and there's a guide recently introduced by the New South Wales Government, and also design excellence processes, and a comprehensive assessment of local context includes things like changing nature of the site over time, its historical development, and also future proposals, different scales of development, so from a regional down to a very local scale, and also different things such as movement, place, connectivity, character and use.

There's been some work done through the proposal that we did within the study area and at a large scale, and I guess what this identified for us is that there has been an evolution of the site, but historically there's been some clear distinctions between different land uses of the area, including identifying the waterfront and harbour front uses and the industrial uses of Darling Harbour, as well as the finer grain character of the Harris Street and the conservation area in Pyrmont Peninsula. So the analysis over time demonstrated that, but also the analysis of the current situation, also in

terms of things like topography and the changes in levels around that area demonstrates similar principles, and also wayfinding around the site.

We also had a look at the City of Sydney's Character Map that's produced as part of the draft LSPS, and this character map identifies colour areas for different shading of character, but it also has some white lines to sort of outline different precincts. What's interesting in this is that the character areas and the white lines don't necessarily correspond, so it reflects that character can exist in different locations and be similar, and also within one location there can be different characters. I think the key insight that we saw from here is there's a mid-purple tone around areas of the Western Darling – the Western Harbour Precinct at Barangaroo and the northern part of Pyrmont, and a darker purple colour which reflects the finer grain character areas of the Harris Street precinct. So generally this character map is reflective of the similar findings that were undertaken in that context assessment.

In terms of the large sites map, this really reflects, I guess, both the development proposals that have been utilising the set pathways, but also the large sites that have – are redundant had have come about from the industrial development on the waterfront, and this really just, I guess, brings together those key things of there is different character areas within the Western Harbour Precinct and the Pyrmont Peninsula study area, and that this is reflective of the historical development over time of these areas. I guess the last sort of piece of that puzzle is really about the land uses that exist in that location, and again, there has been, I guess, a growing momentum and concentration of the tourism, entertainment, conference and cultural

- - -

MS L. IRWIN: One minute to go.

MS LOCKE: - - - facilities across this area. So that just again, from the historical development through to the current character and grain and through to the land uses, as well as the strategic directions for the site, all sort of tie a lot of those pieces together about the different characters of those areas. And I'll just quickly hand back to David - - -

MR BRENNICK: Yes. I'll get - - -

MS LOCKE: - - - to talk to the final question.

MR BRENNICK: Yes. Thank you. So I guess if we reflect back on the key question, which is around implementation and how is the strategic vision for an innovation precinct going to be realised. I think we can say that the current situation reflects that the – clearly statutory development controls are needed going forward, and that those controls should reflect both the strategic direction as outlined by the Greater Sydney Commission already in terms of the Greater Sydney Regional Plan and the Eastern City District Plan, but also these controls need to equally recognise that across the study area the different characters, as Madonna has touched on, including the large-scale industrial sites, the emerging towers of the Western Harbour Precinct, as well as that fine grain heritage character along Harris Street's spine, which needs to be retained. So we will obviously provide all this in a

submission ..... next Tuesday, but we certainly appreciate the opportunity to come and present here in person and just run through that, I guess, at a very high level.

MS SMALLEY: Could – we be able to get a softcopy of this just so that we can publish this along with the transcript? So we'll have someone to contact - - -

MS LOCKE: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: - - - you and Madonna.

MS LOCKE: Yes. You mean the ..... slides?

MS SMALLEY: Yes. That would be great. Thank you. All right. Thank you very much for your - - -

MS LOCKE: Yes. Thank you. Thanks for your time.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**



**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: WIL NINO  
CLARE BROWN**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR NINO: Sure. My name is Wil Nino, representing Emag Apartments, the landowner of a site at 32 to 34 Bunn Street, Pyrmont.

MS BARKER: Great.

MS BROWN: Clare Brown, town planner with Urbis.

MR NINO: Okay. Well, thank you very much for the opportunity to present to the panel. I represent Emag Apartments, who is the landowner of a site to the west of Darling Drive, located at 32 to 34 Bunn Street, Pyrmont. It is approximately 2200 square metres of land. It accommodates a building of approximately six to eight storeys in height, ranging in approximately 88 apartments and about 100 car spaces in a three level basement. Emag Apartments are a landowner, a builder, a developer, and have owned the site since 1997. They have also lived there – the directors. They have also their offices there as well, and they also have interests in other lands in close proximity to the study area, and I guess Clare Brown is our town planner, who has been engaged to present to the panel on our behalf, and I will turn over to Clare.

MS BROWN: Thank you. Thank you, Wil. So I think at the outset what I would like to say is that Emag supports the Greater Sydney Commission's Eastern Sydney District Plan and the recognition in that plan of the Harbour CBD, the Western Harbour Precinct and the Innovation Corridor that is proposed – the strategic framework that has been set out in the Eastern District Plan is and will be supposed by Emag Apartments, and the fact that the site sits within the Darling Harbour Precinct under that Innovation Corridor is also recognised by Emag and supported. I think it's also important that the district plan recognises that the Darling Harbour Precinct, which sits within the Western Harbour area, has a role to play in supporting the global competitiveness of the Harbour CBD, providing a diverse and vibrant night-time economic and promoting economic diversity within that precinct.

So, again, that is welcomed by Emag, and it's something they support. I think, as Wil said, the site is held in single ownership. Whilst it's 88 apartments, it's actually not strata titled; it's in single ownership. And it's quite a large site. It's bound by Harwood Street, Harwood Lane, Union Lane and Bunn Street. It's a two minute walk to the western edge of the Pyrmont Bridge, which takes you directly into the CBD. You have got Darling Harbour on the opposite side of Murray Street, a two minute walk away. We're just to the south of Union Street, and so in terms of proximity within the study area that you're considering here today, we are located in this area here – so in the centre of the study area, quite proximate to the Pyrmont Bridge and – sorry, got it wrong. Here, proximate to the - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes, yes. Yes.

MS BROWN: - - - Pyrmont Bridge and Darling Harbour.

MR NINO: We did bring some site plans and some - - -

MS BARKER: Great.

MR NINO: - - - site photos if you would like me to circulate them.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Give them to .....

MR NINO: Yes. So on that you will see the six maps outlining the site. It is one block to the west of Murray Street, behind the – in the precinct of the Novotel, the Ibis and, I guess, Darling Harbour shopping centre, and ..... some photos as well of the existing building. It's an island site, so it's got four street frontages. It's, like I said, 2200 square metres of land, and it is in single ownership.

MS BROWN: And so the photographs that are behind this, the aerial photograph, just show you different elevations and views of the site. It shows you the proximity of the site to the CBD and to the Pyrmont Bridge and just some close-ups of the building. It also provides context – that this is a six to eight storey building, but surrounding it you have 12 to 14 storey buildings and 16 storey buildings fronting Murray Street.

MR NINO: Correct, and on the point of Murray Street to the west – to the east of the site, that's another block of land where it's owned by, I believe, four separate owners. So this is four separate commercial buildings – similar scale type building or block where, I guess, it could readily also be available for amalgamation.

MS BROWN: So the area is about level 4 for redevelopment. There are large landholdings within this part of the Darling Harbour Precinct that are capable of redevelopment – capable of achieving the objectives of the Innovation Corridor as set out in the Eastern Sydney District Plan.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. So the, sort of – do you want to link this back to the planning framework - - -

MS BROWN: Yes. About - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MS BROWN: - - - to do that.

MS SMALLEY: Fantastic. Thank you.

MS BROWN: So the site itself is zoned B4 under the Sydney LEP 2012. It has a floor space ratio of four to one, and it has a height of buildings of - - -

MR NINO: 30 metres.

MS BROWN: - - - 30 metres. So that's as set out here. The development consent – so this is zoned under Sydney LEP 2012 and the controls of the DCP 2012. The interesting thing is, though, the development that sits on the site today, which was granted consent in 1988, has a floor space ratio approved of 4.38 to one and an

approved height of roughly 25 metres. If the site was to be redeveloped, it would actually – under the current controls it would actually lose floor space. It would lose .38 to one floor space if there was to be any redevelopment under the Sydney LEP 2012. So there is absolutely no incentive under the current controls for any renewal – any redevelopment. And that is the same for the majority of the properties in this part of your study area. The LEP controls that are in place today reflect exactly what was built in 1998, or a bit less than that.

So the controls today maintain the status quo. There has been no review – refresh of the controls under the LEP 2012. They reflect largely what was happening in 2005, which reflects largely what was happening in the REP 26. So it's basically seen a rollover of the statutory provisions. We have a strategic context where there is innovation, where there is growth, where there is to be renewal – to be gateway to the Western Harbour of the Harbour Precinct to the global city, but the statutory controls, as it relates to this site and a large part of your study area, don't reflect and will not facilitate that innovation – that growth – that renewal.

What you also find through the study area is the fact that you have a multiplicity of planning controls that apply. So you have got Sydney LEP 2012. In some parts, you have got Sydney LEP 2005 still applying. You have REP 26. You have the Sydney Harbour Foreshores REP. And, as well, within Darling Harbour you have the development control code number 1. So you have a multiplicity of overlapping but also disparate planning controls, but then sitting on top of that, where those controls don't facilitate development – don't facilitate renewal, you have SEPP (Major Projects) 2005, SEPP (State and Regional Development) 2011 and what was part 3A and what is now state significant development precincts and state significant development application processes.

So where the controls don't facilitate development, renewal, innovation – you had ad hoc applications where you have got different built forms coming up which are inconsistent with the controls, because those controls don't facilitate innovation. So in answer to the primary question that, I think, the panel is here today to consider – is will the control facilitate innovation? I think our answer to that question is “no”. But, saying that, there is definite different character areas within your study area. So, for example, you have your harbour waterfront, where you have a predominance of larger-scale sites - - -

MS IRWIN: One minute to go.

MS BROWN: - - - larger-scale buildings. You then have Wattle Street, and on the – sorry, Pyrmont Street, and on the western side of Pyrmont Street you have the finer grain smaller scale heritage precincts. You've got the heritage areas there. So it's not that your study area is one large homogenous area. There is a lot of different characteristics, and the I think the controls don't reflect that, and I think the investigations you're doing need to reflect the different characters but also tailor those controls to the area.

The question is how do you do that. You don't want to maintain the status quo. You don't want to have spot re-zonings. You don't want people using set major development or state regional development to do ad hoc developments. This needs a

comprehensive mechanisms to actually implement to provide the statutory structure for the implementation of the Greater Sydney Commission. We can't rely on a multiplicity of different local and state environmental planning instruments to deliver that vision.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great.

MS IRWIN: We're at 10 minutes. Did you want to - - -

MS BROWN: No. I think that's it.

MR NINO: I think that's it.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074604

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: DAVID HOGENDIJK  
ALEXIS CELLA**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR HOGENDIJK: Sure. David Hogendijk. I'm a Development Director with Mirvac.

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MR HOGENDIJK: I've – I'm looking after our Harbourside Shopping Centre proposal which is currently with the Department ..... Infrastructure.

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MS CELLA: Alexis Cella from Ethos Urban, planning consultants assisting Mirvac on Harbourside.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. So, over to you.

MR HOGENDIJK: Okay. All right. Thanks very much. So, look, Mirvac appreciates the opportunity to come and have a chat with you. As you may or may not know, Mirvac is the owner of the Harbour Shopping Centre. We purchased that in late 2013. We've been working with the Department of Planning for about three and a half years on a redevelopment of the centre. As you may or may not be aware, Harbourside sits in its own State Significant Precinct, which is the Darling Harbour Precinct. It's obviously one of a number of State Significant Precincts. Harbourside is obviously this – the orange here on the plan. This is the outline of the State Significant Precinct. The – there was a recent approval that you may be aware of at Cockle Bay Wharf that was approved recently. That's sort of a similar process to what we've been through. So we started consultation back in 2015. It's been – sort of been a three-and-a-half-year process for us to date.

We lodged our preferred scheme with the Department back in December '16. And we then were sort of – we sort of went quiet for a little while while the Government Property did a strategic landowners review of the Pyrmont Precinct. So that was in April '17. We then – from between January and June '18, we sort of did a number of workshops with the Department of Planning to try and agree an envelope. And they involved Professor Peter Webber, the ex-Government architect, in that process. So at this stage, we believe that we have an agreed envelope with the Department of Planning. And we would be looking to lodge a final DA in the near future. The Darling Harbour Precinct, as you probably know, is quite a – it's a horseshoe shape. There's about 15 billion dollars' worth of work going on in that precinct that's either been completed or is underway. Harbourside sits in that – sits within that horseshoe. We were particularly interested to see when the GSC's study review area came out ..... your red line here, how that, you know, related back to the State Significant Precinct. And we noted the terms of reference that made specific note that your review would also take into account the significant projects that were either planned or underway. And I think we believe that we've progressed a fair way with our proposal. And we obviously would like you to just take into consideration with your own assessment as to where we're up to in our process. So it's fairly – I think, from our perspective, we're very supportive. We'd like to help wherever we can. You know, we think that Pyrmont and particularly Darling Harbour itself is meant to be a very activated precinct. It's a very mixed-use precinct. There's a lot of residential,

you know, on the perimeter, but there's also a lot of – there's growing commercial, there's entertainment, there's food and beverage and retail. So it's a very mixed-use precinct. And we sort of think that our proposal that we discussed with Planning, you know, very much suits the nature of what that State Significant Precinct is trying to actually achieve. Is there anything else you - - -

MS CELLA: Yes. I – just to emphasise, so the planning framework, that applies to Darling Harbour. So we're putting Mirvac's Harbourside hat on. You know, we're supportive of that current framework that applies. It's been in place since the late 1980s. So it's helped facilitate, as David mentioned, 15 billion dollars' worth of investment that's occurred or planned to occur over the last five or so years. So the land that Harbourside sits on is actually State Government-owned land. So Mirvac has the lease over that land. So, ultimately, the State Government gets to decide the outcome that happens on that site. Not only from a planning, decision-making outcome, but also from a placemaking ..... landowner as well. So, you know, Mirvac's following a process that, as David mentioned ..... I know ..... has, that Ribbon has, Lendlease through Darling Square has - - -

MR HOGENDIJK: And .....

MS CELLA: ..... as well. So that's the Sofitel Hotel and the new exhibition and convention centre facilities. So, you know, the instrument that applies is crucial to ensuring the continued success of Darling Harbour in terms of its ability to allow flexible land uses, flexibility in terms of ..... outcomes, in terms of ..... space. So, as David mentioned, we've been through a very rigorous process. Engaged a lot of the community. You know, we've made significant amendments to the design throughout the assessment process to accommodate all the needs and requirements of the stakeholders. So we're at a point where we're pretty much close to the finish line of getting this thing approved. So, I suppose, just that recognition of, you know, what you're embarking on that recognises where we are in that process and acknowledges that there is significant potential for development to happen on the site. And, I suppose, just more broadly speaking, Mirvac obviously has a number of different hats. And ..... in this precinct. But we'll making some – Mirvac will be making submissions on it separately. But today we're just talking about Harbourside. Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Great. Okay.

MR HOGENDIJK: That's pretty much - - -

MS SMALLEY: That's it?

MS CELLA: Yes.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**



**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: ANNIE GUO  
JOHN SMOLDERS**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR SMOLDERS: Well, I'm John Smolders.

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MR SMOLDERS: I'm one of owners of one - - -

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MR SMOLDERS: - - - of the properties in question on this particular project.

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MR SMOLDERS: I've been in Pymont since 1989.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR SMOLDERS: I've seen the place redeveloped. I've seen a lot of demolition going on, and, essentially, I have a general interest of the area, what's going to happen in the future, as you can see what's happened in the past.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR SMOLDERS: And with all the talk that's going on I'm a little bit confused as to what is going on in Pymont.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR SMOLDERS: So I'd like to get some clarity.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR SMOLDERS: We have some issues on this – this is where we live.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. So we'll do some stuff around the review and then we'll let you - - -

MR SMOLDERS: Sure.

MS SMALLEY: - - - outline your concerns and what you would like clarity around. And sorry, you are?

MS GUO: My names Annie, Annie Guo. I'll just give my card.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MS GUO: So I'm also a property owner in Pymont. I'm owner of [REDACTED]

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MS GUO: And units at [REDACTED] as well.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MS GUO: And I just sold another property in [REDACTED] So I've been living in Pymont for 15 years and same as John said, we actually represent many residents in that particular street in [REDACTED] I also have a business in .....

MS SMALLEY: So do you officially represent them? Are you a community group or you're land owners? Just so that we've got clarity.

MR SMOLDERS: Land owners.

MS GUO: We're land owners.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great.

MS GUO: I mean, many people want to come today but without having enough time, so we actually – two of us got elected to ..... - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great.

MS GUO: - - - many people behind us.

MS SMALLEY: We can put in a submission and all those people can put in submissions as well, but - - -

MS GUO: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: - - - you can put in a submission and if they wanted to support you - - -

MR SMOLDERS: Sure.

MS SMALLEY: - - - around that you could - - -

MS GUO: Yes.

MR SMOLDERS: Do you want to start or shall I start?

MS GUO: You start.

MR SMOLDERS: Okay. Look, as I began to say earlier, we just want some clarity. I've been there since 1989. I've got a lot of problems with two properties on that particular. I sold one. One of the major issues is with the council with their trees. These particular properties have no footings on them whatsoever. They're just one single brick of edge on the building and, henceforth, the tree roots have cause undue problems with the properties – uplifting rock. I mean, there has been a lot of costs involved in trying to maintain the buildings, and after spending nearly a quarter of a

million dollars on one of the properties, it's starting to go again, and there's no stopping these tree roots, so we've got a major tree root in the backyard and we've got trees in the front yard. Council are at odds to take any responsibility for it, so we're copping it.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Is there anything in the planning framework that you'd like addressed to see that issue ..... ?

MR SMOLDERS: Well, again, I think the issue is do we continue spending a lot of money on these properties that are just unrepairable? That's really what the issue is, you know. Look, it's lovely and all that sort of stuff, but we've got mosquitos, we've got rats, we've got vermin, we get all sorts of problem and we have a big cost ahead of us to try and maintain the properties and their state to make it give a certain character. If the decision ultimately to get a high-rise in a particular area, well, that's good for one reason. We haven't got ..... any more money. We're just trying to be sensible about the whole thing because you can't – we don't know what to do, and we just really want to know what the go is for Pymont, you know.

MS SMALLEY: So you're asking for – you'd like some clarity on what the planning controls and framework is in the study area?

MS GUO: Yes. I'd like to add in just - - -

MS BARKER: I might just – I'm sorry. Just the tree roots that you're talking about, can I clarify if they are trees growing in the public domain?

MR SMOLDERS: Yes.

MS BARKER: Thank you.

MS GUO: Okay. So I'd like to also – further to what John says, three points. First point is, overall, as a resident of Pymont and a business owner in Pymont – I have two businesses in Pymont – and I say, on behalf of a few people – many people – I saw Pymont need to continue with Sydney CBD's global city status and need to go high-end residential ..... and high-rise mixed business and residential use. Overall, Pymont, we think, is – some ..... part is too old and some parts have been developed and some parts not. We saw on the website this beautiful outlook of Pymont with high-rises. That's exactly what we want, and I completely disagree with the council's view that some very rundown houses need to be kept.

No, they need to be developed. We need to go higher. We need to go more dense building to – because the Pymont Peninsula is so close in proximity to the CBD and we think that it should be developed together with the city as an extension of Sydney CBD because it's very, very close location to the city. So that's the first point overall. And second point, I'd like to echo what John said because we, you know – there's some streets, for example [REDACTED] and that is exactly stuck in between all these high-rises, and there's streets like that here and there, everywhere in Pymont, and this is actually absolutely no value to Pymont. It's such a bad condition, and what John just said about the very, very bad living condition. Health hazard, fire hazard and including those trees.

We actually applied to council many times. Nobody actually ever listened to us. There's kids, there's elderly living in that street, and there's one older man who was just sent to hospital for cancer because there's absolutely no sunlight in that little street, and this is just example. We don't want to draw attention to a particular site, but there's a couple of that street in Pyrmont and that is one typical example. 40 little houses rundown, and we represent three of them, and we actually probably represent a whole lot. So that's the second part that I want to say. The third - - -

MS BARKER: Can I just clarify – sorry – when you're saying that they're rundown, is that to do – like, is it heritage? Is it anything to do with the planning?

MS GUO: Okay. That's a good question. I want to leave that to my third part because the city is a triangle and this again an example of Pyrmont, and this triangle back in 1995 per the Trotman's Heritage Report. The whole thing is a heritage. Whereas all these buildings been – bad condition house been knocked down and only left one gap, and this is currently – this is heritage – state heritage. But it used to be one item heritage. So some part has been developed and some part is left, and there's only few streets like this in Pyrmont left and this [REDACTED] is one of them, and it's currently listed heritage, so this - - -

MS BARKER: Are you able to clarify - - -

MS GUO: Yes.

MS BARKER: - - - when the change happened for the heritage listings for the - - -

MS GUO: Yes. So just suddenly there's one day that we got a letter from council saying - - -

MS BARKER: Okay.

MS GUO: - - - this street allowed to be built up, and that street allowed to be built.

MS BARKER: All right.

MS GUO: That's Murray Street.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MS GUO: And they want to draw everybody attention this street. It's one street next to Darling Harbour. So that's next to Pyrmont Street with all the way to Sydney CBD with all the tourists passing and everything, so it's really bad look.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MS GUO: So to answer your question, so the reason it's in bad condition because built in 1890s, and then it's very much deteriorated. John pointed out it too. And also there's no sunlight whatsoever. Because you can see there's absolutely no sunlight. Stuck in the middle.

So points like that, gaps like that in Pyrmont need to be cleaned up and need to be built up to make the Pyrmont look in line with what a city should look like. And there's a lot of missing gaps and there's a lot of health hazards in there as well, you know, and we couldn't really open windows because there's mosquitos, rats and everything in that street. It's just ridiculous for somewhere so close for to Sydney CBD, and we've been voicing that for years and nobody actually listens to us. We really fortunate, we think, today we have this opportunity that we can voice our concern to the committee.

MS BARKER: So have you voiced just to the council? You've voiced - - -

MS GUO: Yes.

MS BARKER: - - - your concerns just to the council, yes.

MS GUO: Yes.

MR SMOLDERS: You just need to have a look in the backyard. Go for a walk in the backyard and see the slummy atmosphere that you have there. It really is slummy.

MS GUO: Yes. It's, like, a slummy suburb, because I actually sent an email to the committee on that date and listed all the conditions because it's a health hazard as well. Because there's no sunlight, it's so damp, and the kitchen actually sank in for about two centimetres, and that was actually one of the new kitchen, two years ago.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MS GUO: So the point is, this house in so bad condition. It's beyond repair status. It's only going to get worse, and the question is, these houses have been knocked down and rebuilt to 10 levels, and they were actually in worse condition than those houses here, so what is the status here? Where is the principle?

MS BARKER: And so you're saying that those properties in that row, they have state heritage or is it local heritage or - - -

MS GUO: I think it's state heritage.

MS BARKER: Okay.

MS GUO: And then one document which I sent in that email, which attachment to the Commissioner, and say the whole street, this whole triangle was one item and somehow part of that got developed, somehow small part is left there. We don't think, you know - if it's got some heritage ..... , fair enough, you know, but it's not.

MR SMOLDERS: There's no ..... .

MS GUO: We have a first ..... of seeing that because we live there and then there's little kids and, you know, my next door Malcolm, he just sent to hospital for skin

cancer, you know, and because he just has absolutely no sunlight in that place. We don't see any value to keep those houses here.

MS BARKER: Yes. I've got the heritage - - -

MS GUO: Yes.

MS BARKER: - - - maps here from the - - -

MS GUO: Yes.

MS BARKER: - - - Sydney - - -

MS GUO: We can see that's actually a serious issue because there's some big trees. Like, the tree's actually a ..... , so it's a ..... tree in the back and the trunk is about a quarter of this room, and we applied to the council saying you should cut the tree, because what about the fire hazard? One day one branch got fire in the hot weather. The whole street, because it's all semi-detached houses, and we got – we sent them a few emails. We got record. And we got sent back say, “Look, we don't want to kill the species in the trees”, the species being rats and the mosquitoes.

MS BARKER: So they're street trees, are they? The - - -

MR SMOLDERS: There's one giant rubber tree.

MS GUO: Rubber tree. So see the grey thing?

MS BARKER: Yes.

MR BRIGHT: In the side.

MS BARKER: Rubber tree.

MS GUO: It's basically covered everything, and this tree should be considered too big even in the Botanic Gardens.

MS SMALLEY: One minute to go.

MS BARKER: All right.

MS GUO: So overall, on behalf of residents in Pymont and in particular in that street, we really want the Commission to consider just to redevelop the – knock down these houses, which doesn't have any existing value, and then make Pymont – redevelop it and in line with overall standard of Pymont being part of the city.

MR SMOLDERS: You've got to see it. It is an eyesore. You've just got to see it.

MS GUO: It's slums.

MR SMOLDERS: Yes.

MS GUO: Literally. And we feel embarrassed for Sydney. It shouldn't be, you know – all the tourists – all the people live there and people walk to the city. We need to provide more living space.

MR SMOLDERS: It's a gateway to the city and it's not a good example of what Sydney has to offer.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MR SMOLDERS: Simple answer.

MS GUO: That's right. So overall we want it to be developed.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MS GUO: For that street and all the streets similar to that in Pymont.

MS BARKER: So I can clarify that you're questioning the heritage value or the ability to maintain - - -

MS GUO: Yes. I mean, even we have to keep the façade.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MS GUO: Sorry to interrupt you.

MS BARKER: No, that's - - -

MS GUO: But even if it's – we have to keep the façade, but we need to build up to make sure people has a good living status, being so close to the city.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right.

MS GUO: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: Well, thank you.

MR SMOLDERS: Thanks very much.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**



**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074615

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: CHRIS JOHNSON**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND  
DISCLAIMERS.**

MS SMALLEY: Over to you and we'll start your 10 minutes now.

MR JOHNSON: Thanks for that, Danielle. Look, I've got a little presentation here and I wanted to just open each page. They've got a number on them. Page 2 is the document you've got sitting around here, the Eastern City District Plan. It's obviously a key document that relates to what's actually happening here, but over the page – I'll refer you to page 46 of the document in the Eastern Sydney District Plan and I'll read on the right-hand side the large type:

*The districts many great places also include neighbourhoods and leafy suburbs like Bellevue Hill and Strathfield, inner city mixed used places around Potts Point and Surrey Hills and the city high rise areas of Pyrmont and the Sydney CBD.*

So I'm reading this a fairly clear statement from the Greater Sydney Commission that there are two high rise areas in the Eastern Sydney – City District Plan that are Pyrmont and Sydney CBD. So I think that's a good starting point, but over the page – page 4, I've got an image of the Local Character and Place Guideline. This is a document Department of Planning put out in February 2019. In fact, it came out during the caretaker mode of the government and I think it's a flawed document, but I think the Department of Planning is using it in a lot of the advice they've given, including advice related to Pyrmont. There are no examples of medium or high rise density in this document. The tallest building in this whole document ..... Place, is three storey's high.

It's just amazing that it's a total suburb document. It implies that all the local character in place is about that, so there's no advocacy for the changing nature of urban characters, which I think is a – is a big problem, and I think the report that was done by the Department of Planning refers a lot to local character and that the proposed building is out of character – like the character as it is at the moment. Over the page, I've got a statement of ..... city's grow. Sydney CBD very rarely is talked about by being high rise. Sydney CBD was once low rise, just like Pyrmont is generally at the moment. You can see a six – eight storey type grade of the Sydney CBD back in 1938, but if we move over to page 6, this is currently what's happening in Sydney.

Sydney's changed quite dramatically, and just in the same vein, I think Pyrmont can change as well. So the local neighbourhood character, if – if it was defined as the one on page 5 – none of what has happened on page 6 could – could occur. So I'm arguing too much focus on local character and these particular ..... page 7, reason to – in – in which we put out a new vision for Sydney 40 years down the track that can go even higher. So – so our belief is cities evolve and change over time and the two peninsulas of the CBD and Pyrmont need to be very much part of this sort of character.

Over the page – 8 – the change happens not incrementally, a floor at a time, but by big interventions of tall buildings. In the Sydney CBD, it was two buildings on the right-hand side. You can see the GPO back in the 1890s. Eight times taller than the surrounding buildings. If there was any argument that – there were complaints in the local papers. This was too big, too high for the terrace houses that adjoined it, yet it's now dwarfed by what's happening in Sydney. On the left-hand side, Australia Square, one of the first tall skyscraper buildings – again, eight storeys – eight times higher than the existing character of the buildings around it. So catalyst buildings come at particular times to create change on areas that are listed as ultimately being high rise. I mention here a little bit about The Star, and I know we're not contravening on a particular building, but a lot of what it went through seemed to me to be encouraged by government, and so I get a sense that government was encouraging a tall building in my reading of the ..... requirements and that side ..... competition with ..... architect .....

Page 10, city of Sydney approvals are dropping fast. We need more development. You can see on that blue line a big drop from about 2016-17 right down below here. So there's a 28 per cent – 30 per cent drop in housing approvals. There's a bit of a discussion as to what housing – hotels, etcetera. In my opinion, that's a critical thing to do. The city of Sydney promotes mixed use, so my argument about Pymont would be it must be mixed use. The city of Sydney's draft Central Sydney planning strategy proposes 50 per cent commercial and 50 per cent residential, and proposals like The Star's are actually doing that. So I think the city has put a stake in the ground that they want mixed use type developments and I think that's highly appropriate for Pymont.

Page 12, the New South Wales premier wants Pymont to be open for business and ready to be taken to the next level. I interpret next level as meaning height – that this is a call for the high rise that is in the District Plan and she's supportive of that. So media release of 19<sup>th</sup> of August talks about what the new government wants. Bottom line, a vibrant residential entertainment innovation hub, but Department of Planning report that relates to that particular building on the site there is a very negative report. At the bottom, there's a quote ..... justification for ..... also fails to adequately response to the local character of Pymont. So I think there's a misfit here between growing cities and taller building and the local character, which is defined by that particular document.

Page 14, I talk about Pymont now looking similar to Sydney CBD of 70 years ago before the high rise started coming. Just as Sydney's CBD has now become an iconic high rise city, so too can the Pymont area. So here's an image looking at Pymont as it is at the moment, which has got relatively low buildings, just as Sydney CBD did in the 1930s. Over the page, Pymont into the future, the Urban Taskforce agrees with the Greater Sydney Commission that both the Sydney CBD and Pymont are the high rise areas of the eastern city district and we agree with the New South Wales premier that Pymont must be open for business and, indeed, lifted to another level. So just as the GPO in Martin Place, and much later, the Australia Square tower initiated to the growth of the surrounding areas in the high rise

precincts, so too can The Star Ritz-Carlton building be the catalyst for Pymont's development as a high rise area, and over the page – the final one – I've given our vision for Pymont as a high rise precinct.

So we believe that the twin peninsulas of the Sydney CBD and the Pymont Peninsula – going right back – as you indicate on your diagram here – towards Broadway where they become joint – are the two that are you plan – District Plan indicates are where high rise should go. I think there are a number of sites on this peninsula that are ready for development. The fish market site ..... change has got great potential. I think just as a lot of smaller and mid-rise buildings in the Sydney CBD changed over time and became high rise, the same can happen on the Pymont Peninsula, and just as the taller buildings of Darling Harbour move up the peninsula, the – the new hotel that's down next to the ICC – the potential for the Harbourside building and other sites in this area – so my position would be that, following your District Plan statement, this needs to be a parallel or adjoining peninsula for high rise, and here's an image of the fabulous and exciting environment that it could become. Thank you.

MS SMALLEY: Thanks, Chris. Now, I was remise – I didn't ask you, can we just confirm for the record that you are not a registered lobbyist?

MR JOHNSON: No. No, I'm not.

MS SMALLEY: Great. Steph, Dan, Renee, do you need anything clarified?

MR JOHNSON: Did I get under 10 minutes?

MS SMALLEY: I think you may have - - -

MS BARKER: Yes.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074605

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLING  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: DAVID MILES**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR D. MILES: David Miles.

MS D. SMALLEY: Hi, David. It's Great Sydney Commission calling you - - -

MR MILES: Hi.

MS SMALLEY: All of our panel. Hi. So my name's Danielle Smalley. I'm the chief operating officer at the commission, so I am just going to run you through a bit of spiel that we are doing with everyone before we kick off your 10 minutes.

MR MILES: Great.

MS SMALLEY: Just before we begin, can you just – just let us know your name and in what capacity you're participating in the review – whether you are representing anyone?

MR MILES: Sure. My name is David Miles and I and representing myself as a - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR MILES: - - - local resident and property owner.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Fantastic. So we're asking everybody just to confirm whether you are or are not a registered lobbyist.

MR MILES: I am a registered lobbyist - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR MILES: - - - because that is my business, but - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR MILES: - - - not for any business associated with anything operating or set to operate in Pymont.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great. So you're not representing any of your clients today?

MR MILES: No.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. So that's it from me. So we'll start your ten minutes and you just kick off and let us know what feedback you'd like to give.

MR MILES: Sure. Firstly, I wanted to say thank you for doing this by phone and I'm sorry I couldn't have been there in person today - - -

MS SMALLEY: No – no worries at all.

MR MILES: - - - but unfortunately something's happened that prevents me from doing that.

MS SMALLEY: Sure.

MR MILES: I guess the main purpose I wanted to be involved in this process is I've lived in Pymont now for nearer 16 years and I've lived in a number of places in Australia, but Pymont's now very much my home and I've watched it change and grow over the years and I think it has been a good thing, and I think it's largely been well managed. The developments at Jacksons Landing within the Pymont Precinct that was the old CSR refinery has been a boom for this suburb and we now have some – I think 14 and a half or 15,000 people living there, and I read recently that, I think, there's somewhere in the vicinity of 50,000 people coming into Pymont every day to work, and so it's been really good for the local area.

That having been said, that doesn't mean that's where it should stop, and there are certainly some great heritage buildings in Pymont and there's a flavour, if you like, to the Pymont Village, which really is centred around Harris Street, but then you've got the other parts of Pymont, which include, obviously, Star and it turns us down towards Darling Harbour, and as someone who's lived there a long time, I've always seen and – and everyone I know, kind of, sees Pymont almost in two parts and I think that's perhaps the most relevant thing for the commission to consider – is that when you have Pymont as part of the village, if you like, that runs along Harris Street, it's really, kind of, bordered by Pymont Street that runs up behind The Star and extends out on the western side, right up towards Anzac Bridge

And then you have what I would say is the more commercial or industrial part of Pymont that is to the east of Pymont Street, which obviously encompasses Star, but you've also got Google, what was Channel 7, which is shortly going to be Fairfax or – or 9 until they move, and that commercial enterprises – it runs around towards the Maritime Museum and then continues into Darling Harbour, and to me, that precinct of Pymont has really been – well, I think it should be seen as an extension of Darling Harbour and whatever happens there should be part of that inner city complex that incorporates the Convention Centre as it spreads all the way around the peninsula until it gets to the – essentially, to Jones Bay Wharf, which then converts into residential again and then extends around the point to Pirrama Park and extends around into the residential part.

So when it comes to planning and looking at the future plans at Pymont, I think it's always been done fairly appropriately in that the high rise apartment complexes as part of Jacksons Landing have been on that western side. The heritage has been maintained of terrace houses up and down Harris Street and on some of the adjoining streets of John Street and Mount Street, Little Mount Street – has still got all of that in there. There are still a lot of apartments around. I live on Point Street, which is the northern extension of Pymont Street, and that is essentially lined with apartments all the way down towards the water, but then you have, as I say, that more industrial complex that extends around from Darling Harbour – from the Maritime Museum, so I think, you know, maybe ..... the Ritz Carlton or – I know we're not talking about specific projects, but the point, I think, to make is that I – I've supported that and I've supported that publicly, because I see that in an area of

Pymont that is – should be seen – is it by a lot of people locally – seen as almost a separate part of Pymont and that's a part that should be developed in a way that is – can be bold and can be an extension of that precinct from Darling Harbour and, I think, that's an appropriate thing to consider when looking at planning decisions for the area.

It's not to say we – you know, I would want to blanket it with high rise, but it's currently planning approvals don't allow that anyway – but it should be something that is considered to link to not only Darling Harbour, but also to Barangaroo and on the other side of the water, because so much has been developed over there now, which I think is excellent, and Pymont is very close to it. It's a short walk across the Pymont Bridge and you're in it, and I think we live in this beautiful part of Sydney that is so close to the city and so easily accessible to the city, it also almost seems unfair not to share it with some more people and I think that would be appropriate – to look at how you can maximise the value of this inner city precinct of Pymont, not only for residential, but also for the entertainment side, because it logically links into Darling Harbour, the Convention Centre and, of course, across to Barangaroo and all those precincts over there at Cockle Bay as well.

They should be considered. Just because there's a waterway in between the two of them, they shouldn't be seen, in my view, as separate areas. I think they should be seen collectively as waterfront precincts in the inner city of Sydney. So I see Barangaroo and Cockle Bay as – as not fundamentally different from Darling Harbour and the eastern point, if you like – the north-eastern point of Pymont. So for the commission, I guess, to consider how it wants to advise government for future planning for the area and how it's to be considered – I think that is a model for an appropriate consideration of Pymont – is that extension of – of Darling Harbour.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Steph, Dan, did you want anything clarified - - -

MS S. BARKER: Not from me.

MS SMALLEY: So far? No, no? No ..... All right. Did you – have you got – you've still got quite a bit of time. Did you want to add anything else or you're done?

MR MILES: ..... I guess they're my main points, and – look, I talk - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR MILES: - - - to a lot of the local businesses in the area and, you know, they are all welcoming of more people in it, you know. The – well, there's a lot of businesses along Harris Street that still struggle, despite the number of people that are there, so the more – the more, the merrier as far as they can see it, and not just associated with, you know, The Star and – and hotels, because a lot of the people that work there tend to get fed and so on inside, but it's the people visiting there that you want to enhance and then build on that, and that, naturally, is going to extend up into Harris Street and then – and support local commercial activities, and then, I think, that would be, again, a – a benefit. I think we need to have planning rules for ..... policies that



facilitate that – facilitate bringing people into these areas as opposed to trying to keep them out.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right. All right. Well, fantastic. Thank you very much for your time. Have you got any questions before we go or you're all good?

MR MILES: No, I'm pretty good, I think .....

MS SMALLEY: Good. Excellent.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074620

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: ALEX GREENWICH MP**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR GREENWICH: I have a prepared statement. I'll start by saying that Pymont is a thriving inner city hub that demonstrates what can be achieved if high density living is properly planned for.

Levies under the Ultimo-Pymont plan have delivered hundreds of affordable homes and this has created diversity and vibrancy. Social housing tenants and affluent residents with harbour views all live in harmony together as a strong cohesive community.

While Pymont is one of the most densely populated areas in the country, it has retained a unique identity and vibrant community feel because of good planning decisions particularly around public space: Harris Street is an attractive food and beverage strip; Pymont Bay Park regularly hosts the Pymont Growers Market; and Union Square is a community meeting place.

Pymont-Ultimo is home to many thriving creative industries, including many digital co-working spaces. These industries are drawn to the close proximity the area has to the central business district and its village character in contrast to the towers of the CBD. These are economic growth industries.

Pymont is already plagued by serious traffic congestion and lacks public transport. Development in Darling Harbour has blocked direct walking links to the city.

Pymont's scale is at the appropriate level. Any attempt to increase the density and plod high rises in the peninsula to create a crammed and characterless super-dense precinct on the fringe of the city will harm the community and residents' health and welfare.

Of great concern is that this review of Pymont planning provisions – provisions established by the local council in consultation with the community – has been sparked because the planning department opposes Star Casino's desire to build a massive hotel residential tower on its site.

The tower breaches the LEP and would have a sundial affect over Pymont, overshadowing Union Square, Pymont Bay Park, footpaths and homes. The proposal doesn't come from any strategic planning and the residential purpose has no connection to the casino's core purpose. Its aim is blatantly to deliver a massive windfall to the casino.

Residents are also worried about the fish market site and The Bays Precinct. A rushed review of local planning laws is not the appropriate mechanism to determine the right mix and density of these sites.

Ad hoc planning will only lead to unhealthy communities with lack of public space, traffic gridlock and windy, sunless streets that people want to avoid. The Greater Sydney Regional Plan already sets out how to achieve residential and jobs growth in the area and further work should come from council and the community.

The peninsula has transformed from industrial to mixed use in a short period of time to become one of the city's most desirable places to live and work. A casino's plan to make money through a tower on its site should not drive any future phases of change in the region.

The Pymont community is overwhelmingly outraged over the original proposal and there is an attempt to override an independent planning decision.

For planning controls to be changed to allow this inappropriate casino tower and open the door for other inappropriate high rise development across the pristine harbour-front peninsular would be considered spot rezoning on steroids.

This review for Government is occurring because one casino operator has tower envy of their competitor and has engaged in a concerted media campaign to change the rules for their own profit. Any genuine plans to review planning controls in the Pymont peninsular must not be rushed, involve greater community and expert consultation, and be done in close collaboration with the City of Sydney.

MS SMALLEY: Do we need any need anything clarified? No? I think we're all good.

MR GREENWICH: Thank you so much.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074624

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: JOHN BROCKHOFF  
GREG NEW**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR BROCKHOFF: Sure. I'm John Brockhoff. I'm the national policy manager with the Planning Institute of Australia, PIA.

MR NEW: And I'm Greg New and one of the vice presidents of the New South Wales division of PIA.

MS SMALLEY: We will now start your time and hand over to you.

MR BROCKHOFF: Would you mind me kicking off, Greg?

MR NEW: I would like you to kick off.

MR BROCKHOFF: Good. Look, the first thing I would point out – in the terms of reference, it refers to the government's vision as opposed to the New South Wales Government's vision. I think that's important.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR BROCKHOFF: Because it does bear to the council's views, as well. And it does point to, well, what is the government's vision for the area and the precinct, and is that defined in the district plan, the metropolitan strategy, the local strategic planning statements and the inclusions in the various planning documents, including the council planning documents. And for the GSC to do their job and execute the terms of reference, they really need to come around to an interpretation of what the government's vision is for the proposal. Where the Planning Institute have an interest in this is not just around – and we don't want to comment on the merits of the Star Tower proposal, especially as that is before the Independent Planning Commission.

But what we do want to raise is the issues around trust in planning and the importance of that and the repercussions of a let-down in trust. In our view, the review that the GSC is going to ably undertake is not just about executing its terms of reference because even if you do execute your terms of reference, there can still be some impacts that are felt across the planning industry and across the way in which the community engage with the planning industry. And it's important that out of this process is a result not just where the terms of reference are dealt with and a satisfactory report is prepared but an ongoing goodwill and willingness to engage and trust that the land use planning system can be used to shape places in the public interest.

And, I guess, that feeds back into some material that our organisation has been talking about for some time and that the public value placed – delivered by planners and the planning profession more generally relies on the legitimacy that the community bestow on those decisions through their involvement and through their trusted involvement. And strong community participation and strong trust that they will be listened to allows the planning process to be accepted as a valid means for making the difficult trade-offs such as what you've got to do at the moment and ensures that even where they don't agree in decisions you might come up with or the

government might come up with, at least they understand the process is a valid one and a credible one.

And as we've said in our letter to the Minister and to your chair, that this proposal carries a lot of risk around trust. And I'm sure you're seeing it as you conduct all of your interviews the balancing act that you've got to do. Clearly - - -

MS SMALLEY: So can I just – when you say this proposal, are you talking about the review or - - -

MR BROCKHOFF: Sorry. This review. This review.

MS SMALLEY: Right. Thank you.

MR BROCKHOFF: Sorry. Not the proposal. This review. And, essentially, we trust that you will consider the substantial, you know, recent engagement processes that the community – not just the community but wider stakeholders that exist that relate to the peninsula and the city as a whole have been through in terms of the negotiations and – sorry, wrong word – the engagement around the district plan, the local strategic planning statements and even the Three Cities Plan as a whole. All of those things were considerable investments of time. I know all of you were involved in different ways around building goodwill around those strategies. And to continue that goodwill and continue to rely on the community's trust and support for the planning process, it's vital that that respect be shown in this process, as well. Do you want to add to that, Greg?

MR NEW: Sure. Yes. Just on the public trust and confidence in the planning system theme. Plainly, John has talked, I think, around the issue, but there's plainly limited time for meaningful public involvement and stakeholder engagement, particularly for members of the public. And the review is focused, as John said, on the efficacy and appropriateness of the planning framework and development of controls. I put it to you that the public would be hard pressed to comprehend the current controls let alone their efficacy and appropriateness in a very short time period like has been put out. So that sort of then leads to – that's probably the core of it as to the, you know, public trust being diminished in the planning process but also where does this lead.

So the documentation talks about a review of SREP 26 that the urgency of this review is tightly bound up in that. The public has been given no information on SREP 26 process, who is in charge of that, who is making decisions in relation to that. This seems to be a subset of that. It seems to be from the documentation that the perception is that this is the key review is not feeding the SREP 26. So, I mean, the planning system, as you know, is very complex as it is, and it would help if these things were explained more plainly to the public.

And the other thing, as I alluded to before, was the commenting on the efficacy of the controls. It would be useful – would have been useful – in fact, it would have been a minimum requirement, I would have thought, of any public exhibition to have some sort of summary of issues paper about what those controls are and what they do. That was all I wanted to add.

MR BROCKHOFF: No. I think having a summary of issues paper as a basis for engagement would have really helped.

MR NEW: Yes. And if – I would just go further and say, well, if that's not available – and you haven't had time. I appreciate that. So, I guess, our submission to the government would be that your review actually gets aired in public and people get a chance to comment on it and feedback come back with a more informed – and make a more informed response.

MR BROCKHOFF: Yes, and just to build on that, for the community to respond to the terms of reference and engage in a way that we're trying to, they need to understand, you know, at the heart of the terms of reference is a view around what is the government's vision and how do the planning frameworks respond to it. It would be helpful for the community to have a précis of the government's vision. I tried to tease it out in the last couple of weeks, looking at the Eastern Sydney District Plan, the LSPSs, the SREPs, the LEP, Sustainable Sydney 2030. Because I interpret it as the government's vision, local and state. And, you know, clearly, there's a whole range of points there that you could summarise in an issues paper around giving effect to the innovation corridor, vibrant mixed use, creative industries, start-ups, character buildings being part of the CBD, the harbour asset, the collaboration area and the ultimate Camperdown area. All of those things paint a picture around what the government's vision is that you can benchmark whether or not the existing planning frameworks talk to that vision. And it's perfectly fine for the government to have a new vision that appears, but at this stage we don't know. There's no words, no framework around what any new government vision is or why a change in step at this time in the face of previous engagement why that has come to the fore. So even more of a reason to elucidate what the government's vision is so that the community are able to engage around it. I was able to pull those dot points together because I knew where to look. A lot of people wouldn't know where to look.

MS BARKER: So I can clarify that, that you're concerned the community hasn't got a full understanding of the vision. Are you representing any community members?

MR BROCKHOFF: No, no, no. We're not.

MS BARKER: Or it's more a - - -

MR BROCKHOFF: It's a planning process.

MS BARKER: A planning process.

MR BROCKHOFF: Yes. We're representing - - -

MS BARKER: Yes.

MR BROCKHOFF: Just correct me if I'm wrong here, but my take on this is trust in planning.



MS BARKER: Yes.

MR BROCKHOFF: And for planning to be seen as relevant in managing the trade-offs in land use decisions.

MS BARKER: Yes.

MR BROCKHOFF: We're all – at least, I mightn't be speaking for you. I think all of us represent or are players in the planning system and if the communities lose faith in the planning system to add value in the way in which - - -

MS SMALLEY: I ..... that.

MR BROCKHOFF: Thank you. The way in which trade-offs are managed, then I think the public interest is let down because we have a unique value as planners in being able to look at multiple issues and come up with an outcome in the public interest. That ability to add value will be diminished if the community don't bequeath – lend their support and trust and faith in the planning system. And the risk here is that the – we will go into a trust deficit if they're – if they feel that they're not able to engage or unable to engage in good faith. Is that a summary that helps? You've got the last 30 seconds.

MR NEW: No. I'm happy to leave it there, but just to say, yes, it's about ..... representing trust in the planning system – all the players – and having the right information available to make informed involvement.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR NEW: So if it doesn't happen in this five, six week period, then could it happen after that.

MR BROCKHOFF: And we've already sent the letter into your chair. We will just top and tail that and that will be our submission.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074607

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEES: JOHN VASSALLO  
CARLOS FRIAS**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND  
DISCLAIMERS.**

MR FRIAS: So, Carlos Frias from Urbis. And I'm a director. And I'm representing John Vassallo from Celestino .....

MR VASSALLO: And John Vassallo. Senior of Celestino.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR VASSALLO: So, the company that owns the properties for EJC Pymont. But that's part of our group.

MS SMALLEY: So, over to you.

MR VASSALLO: Do you want me to give a - - -

MR FRIAS: Yes.

MR VASSALLO: - - - quick overview, and I'll ..... time? So, thanks for meeting us. We are a private group, private company that undertakes property development. Generally we've focused on Greenfield developments in the northwest growth centre. We've got the Gables. We've got Sydney Science Park. We were initially, I guess, attracted to this site through just listening to David Pitchford speaking, when he was the head of UrbanGrowth, about the vision to create a global precinct for the Bays Precinct. And, you know, we agreed with that vision that that area had that potential, given its location, it's under development, and, you know, its position on the water and access to the city and access to universities, all the other things.

MS SMALLEY: And are you clear on what – where that site is? .....

MR VASSALLO: So our site is on Bank Street. So we're two doors from the fish markets.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR VASSALLO: So we're on a waterfront site.

MR FRIAS: So that's the bridge. It's .....

MR VASSALLO: So we're one of three private landowners in that Markets Precinct of the Bays Precinct.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR VASSALLO: So we actually – not long after purchasing the site, we had, you know, a vision – a loose vision, but a vision to create a mixed-use building that was – had a decent percentage – probably about a third – dedicated to startups and to tech companies and things like that, you know; with an atrium down the bottom; and ..... you know, kind of porous, you know ..... place; and some micro living backing on to the motorway; and then some, you know, more executive style living – potentially a hotel, but more executive style living on the high levels. And to make that a link to

the Science Park; so, link the city's global tech hub with the western city's tech hub, which, you know ..... developer of Sydney Science Park.

So that was our vision. We approached the Department of Planning with that vision. And ..... support us lodging a planning proposal to – you know, to realise that. And we were told at the time that – and I've got my letter here, but it's about three years ago – that we approached – June 2017, I think it was – that – and there was discussions before that – that the Department itself was going on to take the planning proposal process – led by UrbanGrowth, I think, was going to be the proponent, and the Department would be the assessment authority, I think. And there'd be a potential collaboration with City Council. And we were asked, you know ..... work with that process, which we did. So we looked to collaborate with the process. And to be honest, you know, in that two and a half years, we have seen, to be honest, no progress. You know, we – it seemed to go backwards, if anything. You know, the vision that was there at the beginning seemed to get watered down every time we spoke. And the meetings were few and far between. So we - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay. So is the point you're making about the planning framework, that they're ..... not clear on the vision?

MR VASSALLO: It has – it's not realising the global - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR VASSALLO: It's been watered down to the point that – there's more ambition in Blacktown and – you know, and Penrith than there is in Pymont. And I don't see that being a global ambition. And there's more density out there, too. You know?

MS BARKER: Can I clarify, are you still part of a process that's ongoing with ..... or - - -

MR VASSALLO: Well, we are officially, but there's no - - -

MS BARKER: Okay.

MR VASSALLO: We got told at the beginning of this year, Carlos – they'd come back to us at the end of this year, maybe next year. So – or come back at another year. Like, there's nothing happening. So we basically said to Carlos, like, weeks before this process started, "Carlos, I'm going to give up. We're bashing our head against the wall. This is going to take 10 years to sort out. It's going to revolve around the Metro and all the other things that are happening. And we're just going to lease the property out for 10 years and just forget about it, because I – you know, we've got other things happening. And why go on – you know, go for all this effort when we're only a –" you know, it's a decent site. 3000 square metres on a waterfront is a decent site. But in the scheme of things, we're not – you know, we're not that big.

MS SMALLEY: So in relation to the planning framework, are there some things you want to draw out of that?

MR FRIAS: Yes. ....

MR VASSALLO: I'll let Carlos talk about that.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR FRIAS: So, look, the first thing is .... Celestino have been working with the other two landowners .... site.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR FRIAS: And they're working with urban designers and architects to get a scheme that can .... be presented to UrbanGrowth. And UrbanGrowth has .... modelled the site. So they're working .... model the site and understanding the impacts. And we've always - - -

MS SMALLEY: And so where is that map from that you're showing us?

MR FRIAS: So this is done by UrbanGrowth - - -

MS SMALLEY: Right.

MR FRIAS: - - - with the information by the .... landowners. So it's done by ....

MS SMALLEY: Right. Okay.

MR FRIAS: Yes.

MR VASSALLO: That's what they gave us.

MS SMALLEY: That's what they gave you?

MR FRIAS: Yes. Yes.

MS SMALLEY: So you're happy to leave that with us? Or we can get a copy of it?

MR VASSALLO: Yes. .... you've got a soft copy of that, haven't you?

MR FRIAS: Yes, I have a copy.

MR VASSALLO: Yes, you can have it.

MR FRIAS: Yes, you can - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR FRIAS: So the key thing in there is that for the landowners at the developer's site they need a certain amount of .... that can make it work, and they need, obviously, considering the – the height of the building – the side of the building, that translates to a taller building, yeah. So we're talking that – for the case of Celestino

they need around 40 – 24,000 square metres of GFA between the commercial, the retail and some apartments in there. The modelling that has done, we think that it can work in terms of what Urban Growth ..... achieve in terms of overshadowing and all that, but it never got worked out.

MS SMALLEY: I suppose I might just take it up a level - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: - - - because I'm not – we're not interested in the site specifics.

MR FRIAS: Specifics.

MS SMALLEY: What I'm interested in understanding is how that relates to the planning framework.

MR FRIAS: So – yeah.

MS SMALLEY: I understand the planning framework in that area is a State Significant Precinct under the State - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah. Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: It was the State and regional development, so there – that's part of the precinct map.

MR FRIAS: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: So you're all parcelled in that. So if we could perhaps frame the discussion around the - - -

MR FRIAS: So yeah, okay. So one of the key things is that there's some controls in there that allow some development, but those controls would not allow for the redevelopment of the site, so there's, like, a two-to-one façade at the moment.

MS SMALLEY: Which is under the - - -

MR VASSALLO: Two and a-half to one.

MR FRIAS: Two and a-half to one, which is under the - - -

MS SMALLEY: The City of Sydney LEP.

MR FRIAS: - - - ..... control. Yeah, exactly, but - - -

MR VASSALLO: What they presented back to us is - - -

MS SMALLEY: I see .....

MR VASSALLO: - - - two and a-half to one.

MS SMALLEY: Yeah.

MR VASSALLO: So it's not being developed now two and a-half to one. What's going to make it get developed under a new - - -

MR FRIAS: Exactly, and one of the key things about the site is in the three sites is that they're on the waterfront, and one of the visions of Urban Growth has always been to connect Glebe back to Woolloomooloo, and that's the missing puzzle to connect the site. So if that achievement, in terms of creating place for Pyrmont, wants to be achieved there needs to be redevelopment to this site and as John was saying, because there hasn't been any incentive for higher GFA controls and there hasn't been any incentive, really, to consult with the landowners to get something across the line he's going to have to wait 10 years to get something done, which - - -

MR VASSALLO: I mean, that's the last time we had ..... - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah, which we think it's going to just - - -

MR VASSALLO: - - - February '18.

MR FRIAS: You know, it's going to, kind of, you know, minimise that opportunity of delivering something great for Pyrmont.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR FRIAS: And that's kind of the concern.

MR VASSALLO: So in the terms of the planning - - -

MS SMALLEY: So I can - - -

MR VASSALLO: - - - framework, it's not happening.

MS SMALLEY: Yeah.

MR VASSALLO: It's just come to a halt, and we have taken the view that it's just stagnated and we're going to give - we're going to lease the site on this - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MR VASSALLO: - - - not ..... planning framework. We've got a lease for 10 years, we're not going to .....

MR FRIAS: Look, and some of the diagram that are in this control is in terms of the promenade and they talk about how wide is the promenade. The City of Sydney has come back saying they want 30-metre wide promenade from the boundary, which basically leaves - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yeah.

MR FRIAS: - - - no development potential at the site, so it's, again, if you want to promenade to happen you would really need to work with the landowners to achieve a building envelope that can be viable, yeah, and Urban Growth, kind of, haven't supported ..... between the 10 and the 12 metres, different from what the City of Sydney wanted, which is 30 metres. So again - - -

MS SMALLEY: Can I just clarify that - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: - - - that's been part of ongoing discussion, so that - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: - - - there's no formal position.

MR FRIAS: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Yes, thank you.

MR FRIAS: But the key thing is that if we want to develop the waterfront, that western end of the waterfront in Pyrmont, those sites need to be redeveloped, or if not they're just going to stay the way it is and John can get revenue out of his leasing of the land.

MS SMALLEY: Yeah.

MR VASSALLO: I've seen images - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MR VASSALLO: - - - they're in here, of, you know, the precinct being developed for 30/40 storey buildings and all these private landholdings at eight stories. I think that is - it's not really - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah. Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: Yeah, again I don't want to - - -

MR FRIAS: We're not - yeah - - -

MR VASSALLO: But they just won't be developed.

MS SMALLEY: We're not here to talk about site specifics, but things - - -

MR VASSALLO: What I'm saying is they just won't be developed.

MR FRIAS: Yeah. Yeah. So the - - -

MS SMALLEY: Things like the foreshore link - - -



MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: - - - that relate to how the planning framework works at that strategic level for the whole review area.

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: We can see that you've got a point - - -

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: - - - there about different - - -

MS BARKER: .....

MR FRIAS: Yeah. So, look, the key thing for us is that - - -

MS SMALLEY: I accept that.

MR FRIAS: - - - we do want to be part of the precinct. We want to see people redevelop. We want to see the public benefit. We want to see the walkway and the waterfront activated. We can help, but they need envelope control that can help them redevelop the site, and we want also to be engaged with government, which is not happening, yeah.

MS SMALLEY: That's not - - -

MR FRIAS: So over the last six months ..... - - -

MR VASSALLO: They can't just leave it sitting there indefinitely.

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MR VASSALLO: It's been empty sitting there for three years.

MR FRIAS: So for the last six months nothing has happened with Urban Growth, and something needs to happen, and we're hoping that this is something – will turn out into something meaningful.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right. No, look, that's pretty clear and you're welcome to make a written submission, too, if you wanted to clarify - - -

MR VASSALLO: That's got to be in by next Monday, right?

MS SMALLEY: - - - any of those dates. Yeah.

MR FRIAS: Yeah.

MS SMALLEY: 5 o'clock next Monday, but we're very keen to just keep it to the specific - - -

MR VASSALLO: Yeah, I understand.

MR FRIAS: Yeah. Yeah, I understand.

MS BARKER: So do we want any of that material? No.

MR VASSALLO: No, I didn't think you would, I mean, that's - - -

MR FRIAS: I mean, this document is Urban Growth's.

MS BARKER: That's a no - - - .....

MR VASSALLO: It's their own document.

MS BARKER: Yeah.

MR VASSALLO: That's their presentation to us.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Well, if you feel it's useful then provide it in the - in your - - -

MR VASSALLO: In the submissions.

MS SMALLEY: In your submissions.

MR VASSALLO: Yeah, no worries.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: DARREN WILLIAMSON  
ADAM HADDOW**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MR WILLIAMSON: Sure. My name's Darren Williamson. I have a company called Citi 88 and we've got a land holding in Pymont and we've been working and doing projects in Pymont for the last 10 years.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR HADDOW: And Adam Haddow, architect from SJB Architects. I'm here as Darren's consultant.

MR WILLIAMSON: So, first of all, I just wanted to thank you for the opportunity to come and talk to the review. We have been working in Pymont for, you know, probably the last 10 years on various number of sites and we greatly recognise the potential of Pymont to contribute to the capacity of Sydney to be a global city. A site – a precinct like this which is, really, in a lot of cases within a 10 minute walk of the CBD is pretty rare, particularly in Sydney and one of the things we've noticed over the last 10 years in doing a few projects with Darren is that traditionally Pymont had been understood as a bit of a dormitory suburb, as a residential and casino suburb, really, and just even injecting a quantity of commercial offices, as we've done in the last few years, into Pymont has seen that part of Harris Street become incredibly – much more vibrant. It's actually working towards making part of it – part of that part of the city an 18 hour city so you get the diversity. It becomes a proper village.

People can live and work within the space as opposed to commuting to and from the space every day. We also see the capacity of something like the redevelopment of the fish markets and Wentworth Park, potentially, as being those connectors across the kind of east-west connections across Pymont where there is already a really, I think, clearly understood north-west connection along Harris Street from the harbour back towards the universities. But that east-west connector which would help connect the city to Pymont across Darling Harbour would be an amazing opportunity, I think, once you could work from – walk from central to the fish markets within 10 minutes would be pretty remarkable. We think that there are sites within Pymont that could do – that could deal with that greater level of density.

We don't think it's a crazy level of density. We're not supportive of, you know, massive heights and massive – and so on but we are – we do think there is capacity to increase some of those sites with very little impact on the amenity to existing residents and people who live and work there. We – you know, there are sites that have quite large footprints and could start to, I suppose, deal with some of the appetite for some larger tenants in the city who are looking for fringe areas, not necessarily CBD locations, but big footprints. Places like Surrey Hills are really – which have, you know, similar qualities, I suppose, don't really have the capacity to deal with that type of environment, whereas places in Pymont can get fairly large footprints and the building we did at 100 Harris Street was a 5000 square metre footprint building and that was the first we work in Sydney and just that kind of level of energy became, you know, incredible for that part of the city.

We do think that that needs to be underpinned with things like, you know, more ferry wharfs and connections with public transport and the potential for metro stations and, you know, blah, blah, blah. I'm sure everyone is talking about that, but as a piece of

land with such proximity to the city, we think it would be a shame to miss that opportunity to really connect in to the city in a meaningful way. It feels a little bit isolated at the moment and that level of density that could be occurred in the daytime activity. It obviously has one of the largest residential densities at the northern end of Pyrmont, I think. It's one of the largest densities in the country, actually. But in terms of the daily activity of commercial office and university or hotels, it's lacking significantly. So we think that that would be - - -

MR HADDOW: Even the Pyrmont Bridge - - -

MR WILLIAMSON: .....

MR HADDOW: - - - Walk, if that could be upgraded with a travelator or cycleway or covered or something just speed that walk up 15 to five.

MR WILLIAMSON: Yes. Yes. I mean, there are moments where you can walk from the city across to Pyrmont, but they're fairly sketchy. The redevelopment of Darling Harbour has seen some improvement of those, but really not to the level which is needed for the type of development that could occur in Pyrmont. I mean, Darling Harbour should be the centre part of the city as opposed to the edge of the city and Pyrmont, really, is the – from our point of view, there's the potential to unlock that potential for it to have activation on both sides. It's a very one-sided affair down at Darling Harbour at the moment.

MR HADDOW: The biggest feedback we receive from tenants that are looking for commercial space is that public transport access and the availability of a metro station. They don't see the light rail. It's still not recognised like the metro. So there's still a little bit of resistance, but it's probably the last hurdle and there's still a lot of them to get across the line with that. Car parking is not so much an issue any more. That requirement's reducing, but the public transport and the end of trip facilities are important.

MR WILLIAMSON: And I think, you know, some simple things like more ferry terminals at the northern end could help a lot of that. There's obviously some existing, but to kind of increase that capacity in the short term would help long term if there was a strategy for more integrated, metro public transport would be amazing. But we do – I mean, the long and short of it is we do think there is great capacity in it. We don't think it's a kind of boom or bust scenario where it has to be, you know, all massive or nothing at all. We have – on numerous occasions with sites that a number of clients inclusive of Darren have approached Local Government authorities to look at potential for uplifting sites and have been met with great resistance and even in very minor ways to try and improve the capacity of the space.

So we do think that – and we understand that it's very difficult to look at spot re-zonings and, kind of, to manage those as a local government. But as a State Government, the capacity to look at it holistically, we think, offers that opportunity to really drill down in a lot more detail into some of the – some of the areas of Pyrmont which could handle that density.

MR HADDOW: Just a couple of – just other things to add. The big tenants like Google, most of their leases expire in 2024 and they're a 45,000 square metre user. They're struggling to find a site in Pyrmont that would work and it'll be a shame to lose that technology Silicon Valley of Sydney from the precinct. So the more we could do to bring the tech start-ups and the – those sort of groups in and provide the infrastructure for them, it'd benefit the precinct.

MR WILLIAMSON: We see there's great capacity in Pyrmont in some of the existing buildings to deal with the small start-up companies who feed off the back of the larger ones, but really providing that base – that base accommodation for those really large tenants who can then start to feed the kind of surrounding business is really important.

MR HADDOW: We also did about four or five years ago a boutique hotel in Pyrmont and that was amazingly received and almost full occupancy from day 1 and there's still major hotel groups that still want to come into Pyrmont that can't get that location so - - -

MR WILLIAMSON: Yes. And I think that also ties in to the fact that I think the fish market's like the second-most visited place in Sydney, ridiculously, and, obviously, with the kind of investment the government's placing into the fish market, just making better use of that connectivity and it not just being a kind of isolated island site, but actually being part of Pyrmont and being connected into Pyrmont and providing some of the capacity for – to, you know, work and stay close to the fish market would be good.

MS SMALLEY: Can I just clarify. When you say the hotels can't get into the area, is that because there's not the capacity there or there's something to do with the planning - - -

MR HADDOW: You just can't a - - -

MS SMALLEY: - - - framework?

MR HADDOW: - - - a building or a site - - -

MS SMALLEY: Right.

MR HADDOW: - - - that can accommodate 200 rooms or - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR HADDOW: That they need to for an international quality hotel.

MS SMALLEY: Yes. Okay.

MR HADDOW: And just, it's not available in the current - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR HADDOW: - - - controls.

MS SMALLEY: Yes. Did you want to add anything else?

MR WILLIAMSON: No.

MR HADDOW: No.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: TOM LOCKLEY**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**



MR LOCKLEY: My name is Tom Lockley. I am the convenor of an email group that began on May 1 2015. It has, sort of, grown. And I can give you the website reference but we put out bulletins when there are things to discuss and we get feedback.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOCKLEY: The group consists of about 180 people. There are 40 approximately Powerhouse employees who are prevented from talking, so I just get their feedback anonymously. About 40 volunteers. I'm a volunteer. And the other 100 are a wide range of people. We've got truck drivers, we've got mothers at home, we've got former directors, whatever.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. And that's – you've missed off – where you're the Powerhouse Museum Alliance – that's - - -

MR LOCKLEY: No, we're not.

MS SMALLEY: You're not?

MR LOCKLEY: We're associated with the Pyrmont History Group.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOCKLEY: But this group – this email group is an informal organisation.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right. So you're not representing the Powerhouse Museum Alliance today?

MR LOCKLEY: I'm not representing the Powerhouse Museum, I'm not representing the volunteers of the museum. I've been asked to make that clear.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOCKLEY: And I'm not representing the Pyrmont History Group but - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOCKLEY: .....

MS SMALLEY: So the email group – does it have a name or - - -

MR LOCKLEY: No.

MS SMALLEY: No. Okay. Great. All right. Thank you for that.

MR LOCKLEY: But I just want to make the point that this isn't just me talking.

MS SMALLEY: No. Fine.

MR LOCKLEY: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: All right. So now over to you.

MR LOCKLEY: Right. Well, I'm presenting you with - - -

MS SMALLEY: Thank you.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - the Powerhouse Museum as a case study. The Powerhouse Museum is a case study of what's good and what's bad in the move process. Now, what I would like to do for two minutes is just walk you through this very, very quickly and look at the headings. So if you go page 3. If the people had decided to put - I will start again. This is the worst possible decision to move the Powerhouse to Parramatta because you're moving an entire museum with huge exhibits. They have to be last out of Pyrmont, first in to Parramatta. The costs are enormous. That's dealt with on the first two pages.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOCKLEY: Turn over. The thing was announced late in 2014 and there was absolutely no research into alternatives. The trustees were told - found out about it when they read about it in The Telegraph, as did the Parramatta Council. There was no - I'm sorry. I ..... there. Sorry about that. There's no research into alternatives. The - Infrastructure New South Wales suggested it be examined and it was announced within 10 days and we've researched and researched and researched. Nobody said, "Should we have a museum, should we have an art gallery, should we have" - whatever. It was just, "We're going to have the Powerhouse in Parramatta.

MS SMALLEY: So we're happy to listen to you but - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: - - - I just want to make clear, this review is not about - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Yes, I know.

MS SMALLEY: - - - whether the Powerhouse will move or not.

MR LOCKLEY: I'm presenting it to you as a case study - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - right - of the sort of things that you're talking about.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right.

MR LOCKLEY: The initially announced budget was ridiculous. They were going to bulldoze the Powerhouse for urban renewal and then with the matter from that, they were going to build a wonderful museum at Parramatta and have money left over which they promised to use from the arts ..... now, it's so absurd because the

Government's valuation of the site is \$210 million. Our valuation was \$250 million. It would not pay for demolishing it and removing and storing the stuff. Since then it has been – the budget has gone up to well over \$1 billion and that is dealt with on page 9. On page 10, we talk about Parramatta Council. Parramatta Council passed four resolutions before they were disbanded because of amalgamation - - -

MS SMALLEY: .....

MR LOCKLEY: - - - all of which requested another site be used .....

MS SMALLEY: Right. I might just - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: We're keen to focus on the terms of reference around the planning framework.

MR LOCKLEY: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: So the planning framework around .....

MR LOCKLEY: I'm saying the planning is a disaster.

MS SMALLEY: The – okay.

MR LOCKLEY: And this is a case – I don't know how typical it is. I know a lot about this. But if this is the standard that you're accepting, then you've got problems. Okay. The Parramatta people would prefer other options. They've just been presented with the ..... and the Parramatta Residents Action Group in October 2016 had a huge meeting where they got alternatives. And the preference was for a new different museum to be erected on the Fleet Street precinct, with the .....

MS SMALLEY: I will just note that that's outside our terms of reference.

MR LOCKLEY: Okay. No problem.

MS SMALLEY: If we can come back to Pyrmont - - -

MR LOCKLEY: And – yes. Finally, I will come - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - back to that. Finally, the Powerhouse Museum is an invaluable item of Australian heritage – on page 14. And the value of that has not been considered – another defect in planning. Okay. And the Government has ignored massive opposition from the – virtually the entire arts community. We had the Museums and Galleries Inquiry which lasted for 14 sessions and well over two years and the response to that has been two pages simply saying:

*...we're going to move.*

Nobody is listening to reason at all. And if you have projects where nobody is listening to reason, you have problems and that's the relevance - - -

MS SMALLEY: Are you aware of some of the planning controls that apply to that site? There are some heritage controls there - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Yes. Exactly. And there – when the Government announced its competition for design, they produced a site plan for the people entering ..... competition, which did not indicate that the heritage ..... buildings had been – had to be preserved and did not indicate that to make the thing stack up financially, they also had to put a huge tower on that site - - -

MS SMALLEY: Mr Lockley, can I ask you why you think it's important to keep the museum in the Pymont - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: - - - area and what the - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: What you say is - - -

MR LOCKLEY: .....

MS SMALLEY: ..... you right – vision for the Pymont area - - -

MR LOCKLEY: This is the – Australia's only museum of the applied arts and sciences. It should be in the most central spot for the city, the state, the country, the world. And it should not be put out at Parramatta. Parramatta should have its own museum based on whatever the Parramatta people want. And somewhere in here, I've got a whole list of suggestions coming from the Parramatta people and coming from the inquiry - - -

MS SMALLEY: And so you see Pymont as a great place for it because it's - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Yes. It's so central and the - - -

MS SMALLEY: Central .....

MR LOCKLEY: - - - building is such a wonderful heritage building. In November 1897, there were open paddocks. Right. Within 25 months, they had built Australia's first commercial power station. Please – I live five minutes away. If you get a chance, go to the Powerhouse Museum, give me a call and I will be there and I will show you. I will show this absolutely wonderful building built in 25 months. And, at the same time, they built 10 kilometres of tram track and put 100 trams on it. It cost about the equivalent of \$1 billion but – and it was 10 per cent over budget and one month late and there was a government inquiry into it. But, I mean, you know, in comparison to – it was a wonderful thing. No machinery, no internet – and the

other buildings are equally brilliant. You have brick walls that wide of English brickwork. Please come and have a look. If you haven't had a look, from a volunteer, do it. Don't worry about the people who are there now. They know nothing. Okay.

Now – okay. So going on, the situation has developed. There's still no, kind of, consultation. The only consultation that ever occurred was in 2017 when they said, "We're going to have consultation". We all ..... up and said, "Beauty. At last we will get our feelings known". And we were asked what we wanted in the museum at Parramatta and what we wanted in the shell of the museum at Ultimo. That's what we were asked. That was the consultation and - - -

MS SMALLEY: So you feel like there needs to be more consultation around planning - - -

MR LOCKLEY: There needs to be some consultation - - -

MS SMALLEY: - - - for Pyrmont - - -

MR LOCKLEY: - - - that starts off at the beginning of the whole process and says what is the best thing to do. And the best thing is not to ..... the Powerhouse at Pyrmont and move it to Parramatta. It will just – you might as well take at least \$500 million – that's our figure – and another group has worked out to \$1 billion and another group has worked it out 1 billion and a half. You might as well take it and throw it away. It's an absolute waste of money which you, as Greater Sydney Commission, should get ..... the relevance.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you.

MR LOCKLEY: Okay. Looking at page 22. This is a statement from the Powerhouse Museum Alliance website summarised by me and Parramatta deserves a new museum of its own ..... we – I told you about our – at Pyrmont – the only museum of applied arts and sciences should be in the best site, in its best building, in the heritage building, at least, and the fabric of the museum – of the buildings should be preserved. Okay. That's a run through of the – run-through the document. The remaining pages are detailed references - - -

MS SMALLEY: Thank you.

MR LOCKLEY: .....

MS BARKER: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you. That's great.

MR LOCKLEY: Now, I would like you to go to page 3 and from here, for the remaining, I would like my - - -

MS L. IRWIN: One minute and 15 second.

MR LOCKLEY: One minute – that’s what I’ve used or got?

MS IRWIN: That’s what you’ve got left

MR LOCKLEY: That’s what I’ve got. Okay. Then I think I’ve covered it fairly well. I did want to talk about the way that the Minister has said that everything has been vetted by expert advisory panels - - -

MS SMALLEY: So this is the Minister for the Arts?

MR LOCKLEY: It’s the Minister for the Arts. And it hasn’t. It’s absolutely untrue. Now, finally, the consensus of – and I will be quite honest. The consensus of the people in the email group was that we’re wasting our time coming here, so I said ..... I would still have a good at it. And the argument was put up that the – yes – here we are. That you would say, “This is not our business”, you know, the waste of \$1 million and, you know, “This particular single building will not engage the Greater Sydney Commission”. So what a few of us did last night was just take this document and - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - and there are 37 annotations in there - - -

MS SMALLEY: Fantastic.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - pointing out the relevance of the Powerhouse - - -

MS SMALLEY: So that’s the Eastern - - -

MR LOCKLEY: That’s .....

MS SMALLEY: - - - City District Plan - - -

MR LOCKLEY: That’s .....

MS SMALLEY: - - - that you’ve shown us, and you’ve marked that up - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: - - - showing the relevance .....

MR LOCKLEY: So that’s one copy only.

MS SMALLEY: That’s fine.

MR LOCKLEY: It’s - - -

MS SMALLEY: Thank you.

MR LOCKLEY: I've given the ladies copies of – electronic copies of what I've given you. And .....

MS SMALLEY: Great. Thank you very much. We will put that up on our website.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - have 13 seconds.

MS SMALLEY: Sure.

MR LOCKLEY: This is our current brochure in two forms that we're ..... out - - -

MS SMALLEY: Thank you. Excellent.

MR LOCKLEY: And I will reiterate my invitation. Get down and see it and you will see what a disastrous lot of planning is happening in the Greater Sydney area. And we have sent these and the other material to all the politicians. There's a single copy. I'm not tabling it formally because it's online - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - but if you would like to take it - - -

MS SMALLEY: Right.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - and have a look at it yourself, I would be most appreciative.

MS SMALLEY: All right. Well, we - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Thank you for listening to me.

MS SMALLEY: - - - greatly appreciate your time.

MR D. BRIGHT: Thank you.

MS BARKER: Thank you so much, Tom .....

MS SMALLEY: Thank you very much.

MR LOCKLEY: Okay. We greatly appreciate you listening to us. And if you do decide it's not within your remit, you've got to get ..... the other document that we gave you - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes. So it's definitely not within our remit to look at - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: - - - whether it will or won't move - - -

MR LOCKLEY: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: - - - but we certainly have taken on board your comments about  
- - -

MR LOCKLEY: Okay. If that is - - -

MS SMALLEY: - - - importance ..... something like that.

MR LOCKLEY: - - - the standard of planning that you are putting up with, you  
have got huge problems and that is the point that we want to make.

MS SMALLEY: Great. All right.

MR LOCKLEY: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you very much, Mr Lockley.

MR LOCKLEY: Thank you very much.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**



**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: ZENA VAASSEN**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right. Let's go.

MS VAASSEN: Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I have attempted to provide some practical, constructive feedback and ideas today. A full written submission will be provided prior to the 16th ..... and expand ..... on the points mentioned. I'm ..... as part of the historical character of Pymont and ..... asset as a heritage item in the Sydney local environment plan listed on the LAP as having local significance, schedule 4 heritage item, part 1, items in the Ultimo-Pymont precinct, No.132. Now, they're located from the corner of Jones Bay Road. Our home, our terrace, [REDACTED] was purchased just shy of three decades ago. It is our home. The lay-out of the property is generally as it was when built some 135-plus years ago.

Throughout our home we have well-maintained original wall air vents, both the outside ..... of the master bedroom and the veranda off the living room are used for recreation, growing edible food, plus drying of bedding and clothes. In our backyard, we have 109 potted plants and our native garden bed and four mature trees, plus in the six rooms with direct sunlight, there are another 20 indoor plants. Our front veranda at two front rooms with direct sunlight have 31 potted plants. Currently our backyard does see over two hours of direct morning light each day of the year, yes, including winter. Critically, the morning sun also helps to reduce ..... deterioration from dampness in our heritage listed building.

The morning sun is critical to us during the winter suns, as it's the only direct sunlight that six rooms of our home and the backyard receive during this period to sustain our garden, provide light and natural warmth to our living spaces. Access to light is crucial to plant survival as well as health. These plants in truth have a job to do. They mitigate Pymont Street and Jones Bay Road noise pollution, light pollution, wind tunnelling and improves our privacy and security. I have lived through the transition of Pymont from an abandoned industrial suburb - - -

MS BARKER: Take your time.

MS VAASSEN: - - - to what it is today.

MS BARKER: Are you okay?

MS SMALLEY: Take your time. I'm going to come and sit ..... you.

MS VAASSEN: It's a well-planned vibrant dense residential and commercial area.

MS BARKER: You're okay. You can take as long as you need.

MS VAASSEN: .....

MS BARKER: No. Don't ..... These things can be very emotional for people. You're talking about your home. So it's fine. Just take a deep breath.

MS VAASSEN: Under the current planning controls, Pymont is already developed and has protected the remaining heritage buildings, conservation areas, natural public access parklands, public accessible ..... and access to direct sunlight in private and public spaces. Pymont today has more than 8,500-plus residents and seven developments currently under construction or awaiting approval. .... grow with hundreds of new residents and thousands of new workers as a result of just these seven developments. Further increase of ..... intensity and controls outside of the master and local environment plans will threaten access to direct sunlight.

MS BARKER: Take your time.

MS VAASSEN: Oh, dear. I'm so sorry.

MS BARKER: No. Please don't be sorry. Just focus on the words on the page.

MS VAASSEN: Risking the health of low-rise people in heritage buildings and people living in heritage homes while the Pymont peninsula is an example of successful urban renewal, with one of the highest residential densities in Australia, the increasing demand on public transport has perversely seen local services removed. .... residential and commercial developments including The Star in Pymont only provide on-site parking, ..... motorbikes, 10-minute drop-off and pick-up spaces and disabled parking to mitigate current and anticipated traffic impacts on local roads. Any new departmental modification refurbishment associated with the Star Casino and hotel should incorporate a 24-hour police station, as both of the Independent Planning Commission to the repercussions of ..... Ritz-Carlton Tower on our home and health as direct neighbours to the Star.

People in attendance from both sides expressed respect for where I was coming from and ..... such a deeply personal view. We are close neighbour to the Star via the corner of Jones Bay Road and Pymont Street. We're acknowledging the Star modifications. The last decade has ..... We're strongly opposed to the ..... tower for a multitude of reasons. The Mod 13 development application and response to submissions completely ignores the severity of overshadowing on our terrace home, which will be extensive. The tower will block direct sunlight to our trees and ..... windows or doors. The tower ..... would be overshadowing in proximity to our local heritage home. The prominence of the tower would be significantly detrimental to our home.

Increased wind tunnel conditions at ground level have been classified by the Star have been classified by the Star as suitable for public access ways and suitable for pedestrians sitting, standing, walking. Our home is within the wind tunnel. One large mature tree on our property partially obscures vistas from the proposed residential and hotel tower into our dining room, living room, kitchen, backyard and outdoor living space. This one tree loses its leaves for months each year, exposing its home. Even with all leaves intact, the tree is not large enough to block the upper levels of the proposed tower from seeing into two bedrooms and the bathroom windows of our home. The proposed retail, function, event, food and beverage tenancies to run along and above Jones Bay Road are sharing Jones Bay Road with residents.

Recommending the neighbourhood centre and SELS plaza close before 10 pm weeknights and 8 pm Sunday and public holidays. Further car motor and horn noise, as well as human waste will continue due to the taxi rank on Jones Bay Road; cigarette smoke entering our home on still evenings, due to the smoking balcony on Jones Bay Road; gaming machines in semi-open areas heard from bedrooms through closed windows; lack of CCTV, police, or security after dark keeping constant presence on all Star perimeters. Proposed storage of bicycles ..... along Jones Bay Road perimeter of the Star. Jones Bay Road is residential on one side. Recommendation that the Star should keep ..... bicycle storage internal and under surveillance.

Artificial lights go into bedrooms when established street footpath trees drop leaves for months each year. Pymont peninsula sits on an extensive deposit of sandstone. Pymont demolition, excavation, construction presents health concerns, especially in regards to the impact of excavation land decontamination. Air pollution, ..... sandstone, haulage routes and work sites on local roads, Pymont Street and Jones Bay Road are already full of construction and delivery vehicles associated with operations of the Star and add considerable noise emissions and traffic congestion. Further proposed truck haulage routes using Pymont Street and Jones Bay Road will exasperate the already high level of noise and air pollution.

Finally, being familiar with the [legislation.nsw.gov.au](http://legislation.nsw.gov.au) website, please note that Sydney regional environment plan no.26 and ..... 1 to 6 have been and still are inaccessible to the public, despite numerous attempts to gain access. Pymont consistently contributes to Sydney's status as a financial, commercial, residential and tourist-suitable destination of world standing, plus it's education exemplar of urban renewal with community consultations and has one of the highest residential densities in Australia. Further increasing ..... density and control outside of the master and local environment plan will threaten access to direct sunlight, risking the health and low-rise Pymont heritage buildings ..... heritage .....

MS BARKER: You're right. Take your time. You're almost there.

MS VAASSEN: I know. It's just the hardest paragraph.

MS BARKER: Yes. You can tell that you just living there.

MS VAASSEN: We chose to buy and live in Pymont almost three decades ago when its proximity to the CBD, ....., excellent ....., We chose to have a smaller environmental footprint by never owning a car as there was excellent public transport. We chose to live and remain and be in a heritage item, develop and implement a management plan for the conservation. We chose to enhance the character and heritage of our home with ongoing ....., We ....., Thank you.

MS BARKER: Well done.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you very much.

MS BARKER: Thank you.

MS VAASSEN: I'm so sorry.

MS BARKER: Thank you, Zena.

MS SMALLEY: Please don't apologise at all, Zena. It's very important to us that we hear from people who are long-term residents and who feel very passionate about the area, and we know obviously this was very hard for you and we greatly appreciate you taking the time to do it. So you've been there for 30 - - -

MS VAASSEN: Almost.

MS SMALLEY: - - - years. That's amazing. You must have seen it change a lot over that time. And what do you think about what – apart from the site right next door to you, just the area generally, what do you sort of see as it's – what's happening at the moment and its evolution to future.

MS VAASSEN: It's not easy to .....

MS BARKER: Yes. Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MS VAASSEN: Some great parks.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MS VAASSEN: People know each other.

MS SMALLEY: And so you want to maintain that in the area.

MS VAASSEN: .....

MS SMALLEY: Mmm.

MS VAASSEN: .....

MS SMALLEY: That's great.

MS VAASSEN: So that's nice.

MS SMALLEY: Yes. That's really nice. So did you want to let us know anything else about the area or planning in the area, the development that's happening apart from this site? Did you want to - - -

MS VAASSEN: There's so many of them. There's going to be so many people - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MS VAASSEN: - - - ..... residents and office workers.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. And do you have any concerns about that or do you think they can be accommodated?

MS VAASSEN: I think they can be.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MS VAASSEN: It's just the planning stuff .....

MS SMALLEY: Yes. And what sort of stuff? When you say planning stuff, what sort of stuff do you think would help with that?

MS VAASSEN: Transport.

MS BARKER: Transport.

MS SMALLEY: Transport. Yes.

MS VAASSEN: Whenever there's really massive developments, they always have to look at sewerage, water supply, electricity, because it's on .....

MS SMALLEY: That's really interesting. Yes. Of course. You would - - -

MS VAASSEN: Yes. .... under the ground. Other people do.

MS SMALLEY: Yes. That's right. But those three things needs to be considered.

MS BARKER: And I can see that overshadowing is in the way of - - -

MS VAASSEN: Yes. ....

MS BARKER: Yes. No. You've explained that well.

MS SMALLEY: Yes. Well, we really appreciate your time. Did you want to add anything else? Steph, Dan or Renee, have you got anything you want clarified?

MR BRIGHT: No. I don't think so.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right. Well, thank you, Zena.

MS VAASSEN: Sorry for being a mess.

MS SMALLEY: No. Please don't be sorry.

MS BARKER: We understand.

MS SMALLEY: No. Planning is about – like, it has big impacts on people and we understand, completely understand that, and these people are planners and that's why they're planners, to – you know, to help our city. So it's really sobering to hear from, you know, someone who lives there and loves it so much.

MS VAASSEN: ..... on the ground.

MS SMALLEY: Absolutely. Absolutely. All right. Thank you.

MS BARKER: Thank you so much.

MS VAASSEN: Thank you.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1075879

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: STEVAN PEJIC**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND  
DISCLAIMERS.**



MR PEJIC: Stevan Pejic, yeah. So - - -

MS SMALLEY: Stevan Pejic.

MR PEJIC: - - - I mean, rather than we start the clock now, I mean, what - - -

MS SMALLEY: Oh, no. No. I've got lots to say before we start the clock.

MR PEJIC: My - I'll just basically say it as it is. In my background, I worked for the Department of Planning.

MS SMALLEY: Yeah.

MR PEJIC: I've been a resident of Pyrmont for 20 years.

MS BARKER: Yep.

MR PEJIC: I've built shopping centre here for various developers in Sydney and the Middle East. And I guess it comes down to my knowledge, and I believe a volume of - well, a level of expertise when it comes to assessing and understanding developers - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR PEJIC: - - - particularly from a feasibility. But it's just - - -

MS SMALLEY: So just to clarify - - -

MR PEJIC: - - - a bit of an introduction.

MS SMALLEY: - - - on the record that - - -

MR PEJIC: Yes.

MS SMALLEY: - - - you are here in your capacity as a resident - - -

MR PEJIC: Yes.

MS BARKER: If I may, just, Stevan, if I can just clarify you're not currently working on any policy, property or assessment-related work in the department related to the review area?

MR PEJIC: Not related to this area.

MS BARKER: Yep.

MR PEJIC: Related way beyond - - -

MS BARKER: Great.

MR PEJIC: - - - just that.

MS BARKER: Thank you. I just wanted - - -

MR PEJIC: Yes.

MS BARKER: - - - to be - - -

MR PEJIC: Cool.

MS BARKER: - - - very clear.

MR PEJIC: Of course.

MS BARKER: Thank you very much.

MR PEJIC: I understand.

MS SMALLEY: Excellent. Thank you. Okay. Lara?

MR PEJIC: Okay. So, I mean, if we look at the Peninsula in – in its entirety in the day of the framing – the framework that’s in place now and what it can shape, it’s a matter of giving a little bit more stricter guidance associated with developments and the need for infrastructure. If we break that down to some of the basics, parking, power, you know, the juice that’s going to be needed in this particular area; gas, water. Even if you look at it from a carbon footprint and how are we going to kind of use this particular space as, I guess, a – a mechanism for generating almost a – a ..... in itself, be it through solar, wind, you know. But they’re really talking green initiatives, and that’s what kind of happens in these kind of precincts that are so closely associated with various other CPDs, because we do have that opportunity. The fact that it’s pretty much north-south facing has – has a great opportunity there for us.

The current framework, like, I can’t go into detail and it, kind of, I guess, delivers the message in relation to what the expectation is for a new development, and how they’re going to close out the needs for infrastructure, as opposed to just being taxed, if that’s the right word. So for argument’s sake, there’s a few developments happening along Harris Street, and if we think the guidelines would be at the LEP or the DCP through Sydney Council, or if it’s a – a State-significant development under the Planning Act, again, how are these developments countering the need for us as a community to be able to share that additional space that they’re going to encroach.

So look, like, at the whole variety, and say if we focus on, you know, some of these other larger developments happening around, we’ve got to focus on how we’re going to control the Peninsula on the ramifications of what’s going to happen if we do additional other types of development. I’m not going to focus on what’s happening at the casino. Forget that for the moment. Let’s focus on the whole Peninsula and the wider context of the area and its association with the CBD. The reality is that we’ve got – let’s call this the western side of Harris Street. Is heavily residential orientated. The eastern side is – let’s call it revitalised, industrial and commercial

orientated. That's where the two communities, for argument's sake, need to interlink. But if I don't have the infrastructure, it's almost a – a brick wall.

That's where the expertise need to come in from the new framework that's going to have to be a little bit more rigorous and very – actually, more policed in order to be able to ensure that all future developments cater for what we actually do need now, and be able to see in 50 years time, because the more vertical we go, the worse it's going to get because these roads are going to get wider. That's – that's the bottom line. Evidence too, for argument's sake, I guess, the distance between – for argument's sake – an issue in relation to health would say accident happens at the point – and on a Thursday night and the time needed for an ambulance to be able to get to a particular point. The – heaven forbid, a – a situation of where – what if people need to leave?

So if we've got New Year's events or Australia Day or something like that where we're basically at – you know, we're at – we're at a point. How are all these people meant to be safely getting out where vehicles are encroaching the already narrow-type streets? There – there's – there's so many elements to the equation where we've – more or less, we've run out of space. When you look at it, I get that we have the option of going up. I've worked in Department of Education. I was at the forefront of the revolution of the Arthur Phillip High School. But the reality is is that, again, it's – it's no point of just going up in order to get more space. You need to go wider at the bottom.

Just talking to a colleague recently, they're talking how in Singapore, you know, "Yes. We can go straight up." But it almost triggers an effect of going wider at the base in order to give you access to that building; be it parking, be it community, be it what not. Then it comes down to, again, the serviceability of what's here. In this whole precinct, like, you know, Broadway Shopping Centre isn't part of it, but, you know, look, knowing that what's going to be happening with the Darling Harbour redevelopment with Mirvac, again, it's a matter of, again, that space of going vertically. Again, I'm not trying to focus on it saying yes, or no, but it's just a matter of thinking of, "Okay. Let's go vertical. Let's build up, but let's think about what's around the outside."

The other – the other element there is – is safety. We really need to focus on how do we put the – put words in the new framework of safety of the end-user? And, again, that clash between, I guess, the – the joining of residential and commercial space. Safety being pedestrian safety. Safety being the types of businesses that will attract themselves once certain developments get pushed along. So for argument's sake, there may be an opportunity where if you are increasing the volume of, let's say, retail space, you might need more storage closer by, for argument's sake. Because that retail space, let's say for Woolworths for argument's sake, for them it's quite expensive to be able to have that storage within a shopping centre, but if they have storage offsite, be it say where the Kennards-Miller storage is, again, that creates an issue of safety in relation to the volume of trucks moving in and out.

Again, I'm not trying to kind of hone in on the casino development for argument's sake. But for argument's sake, is as that expands, as that all expands, it's the – it's the ramification of all other businesses that get attracted to that economic cycle,

because they feed one another. It's the type of businesses that thrive in that type of business, be it a casino-driven orientated business. Residential is quite different where it's a one-on-one transaction. I as developer find a plot of land. I've done my feasibility. I've built the block, for argument's sake, and it's just, "Here's a set of keys for a fee," and we just, sort of, walk away from each other, and we've done that transaction.

So for me, I have no responsibility at the end of the day, apart from a framework that might be a little bit outdated as it is now, but I've – but I've built within the framework in order to satisfy my needs, as opposed to all the infrastructure beyond it, if that all makes sense. Look, in summary, at the end of the day, I think very definitely is opportunity here. But I think before we push ahead on going vertical and, obviously, the ramifications of overshadowing a design and a whole lot of it behind that, and of being – of being part of those studies in the past or various type of projects. But the reality is is that we need to, kind of, see, and it's right here in front of us. What, as an aerial shot, can we do to improve the Peninsula? First, for the community, and then see if any vertical development will be able to facilitate or compliment what the infrastructure – has been delivered first.

You know, some, for example, key points is if we don't have to go up, why can't we go underground? You know, I understand we're at a – we're on bedrock. We're on Sydney sandstone here and, of course, it is very expensive for a developer to do that, but that's the name of the game. That – that's – that's reality, you know. If – if we're going to have a – a ratio applied, particularly in parking, well, that's – that's the name of the game. You need to stack your numbers up as a developer in order to be able to facilitate; not just your needs and your patrons and your, I guess, shared owner's needs, but you need to be able to facilitate your impact so it doesn't impact me, because I can't find parking on the street on any given day. It takes a while.

And it's almost like we're not learning from mistakes that are happening elsewhere, you know. Like, I – I – you know, I – I go statewide and I see it happening everywhere where, you know, we have an opportunity to be able to spread out. Here, we can't: I get that. So then let's – let's – let's develop elsewhere in order for people to be able to come into so it's almost as if we are trying to develop a city outside of this framework of promoting healthy walking and – and – and lifestyles and what not. Well, then, promote hotels and what not, which there are happening where the sale is the air and ..... The air in the Sofitel has already been built, so then let's have those patrons walk. But, unfortunately - - -

MS IRWIN: One minute - - -

MR PEJIC: - - - they're not - - -

MS IRWIN: - - - to go.

MR PEJIC: Oh, right. Unfortunately, they don't do that. Someone who's just paid 3 to 4 million for an apartment of something or other that he wants or she wants, to be able to go straight downstairs and use that space, you know, within a whisker, sort of thing. So we do have an opportunity, but I – I beg of you to be able to look at the infrastructure that we have in place, and focus on that first. And give that time to be

able to be developed, and give that first so that then we can – the wrong word is dictate, but give the guidance then to developers in order to say, “Well, this is what we delivered at an infrastructure level. Build to this.” If there’s some points that we can add to that by going a bit more underground, particularly for parking without having impact. Because I understand Metro and whatnot, you know, tunnels could be going one day through the future, but it’s – it’s something that we really need to look at. Thank you.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074614

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: LESLEY LYNCH  
ASA WAHLQUIST**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MS LYNCH: Yes. I'm Lesley Lynch. And I'm a co-convenor with my colleague here of what's called the Bays and Foreshores Group, which is part of the Glebe Society.

MS WAHLQUIST: The Glebe Society. Yes.

MS SMALLEY: Right. Okay. Fantastic.

MS LYNCH: Yes. So - - -

MS SMALLEY: And your name?

MS WAHLQUIST: I'm Asa. It's spelled A-s-a, but the first name's got a ..... circle on top. It's Swedish, so it's pronounced O-r-s-a.

MS SMALLEY: Asa.

MS WAHLQUIST: But if you mispronounce it, I won't care. I'm used to it.

MS SMALLEY: We'll try not to.

MS WAHLQUIST: And I have a very particular interest in the Bays and Foreshores. I'm also with the Glebe Society.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right. Thanks, Asa.

MS LYNCH: We're going to read, having had some feedback during the day ..... just read ..... ask questions. So forgive the boringness of it.

MS SMALLEY: No, no. That's - - -

MS LYNCH: ..... sitting around all day.

MS SMALLEY: I'm sure we won't find it boring.

MS LYNCH: And coming from the Glebe Society, we're closely engaged but we're not as deeply embedded ..... as the locals. But a quick ..... on the Glebe Society. The Glebe Society's got a financial membership at the moment of 406 people, and a much wider influence around that, and a 50-year history of community activism from a perspective – our three pillars are the standard ones: the environment, heritage and community. We're community-focused but we're not insular.

We work closely with the community in Pyrmont, Ultimo ..... on lots of matters of general concern. And we share our resources with them, especially space. .... We must make comment on the process. And we understand where you sit in this, and ..... But the time frame for submissions around this are unreasonable, as you, I'm sure, know. And particularly for community volunteer organisations. And for those ..... when you compare it with the time that has been extended – expended in developing the existing planning framework around the Ultimo-Pyrmont area, and of

course the finished Bays Precinct plan for the Bank Street and Blackwattle Bay area, when you compare those, it's not good. And the whole super-fast review process is a bit disturbing. And I – the Glebe Society is very concerned with the motive ..... process.

And we're a bit disturbed about the possible outcome. We think there's a clear risk that the exercise will further undermine community confidence in New South Wales's planning process. And that's the last thing we need. And of course, it could look like the GSC has been used to overturn planning recommendation, that the Premier ..... doesn't like. The Premier's view ..... vision for the area has now ..... planning process driving it. But anyone can see ..... is not clear. And I'm sure ..... The Glebe Society – a bit on our perspective about this – the Glebe Society has a long engagement with planning and development generally, but in recent years particularly around the Bays Precinct. And we do so, and we've always done so, from a wider community perspective of it being the western gateway to the CBD.

Our approach has been guided by clear planning principles developed by community and industry and government over multiple consultation processes. And a bundle of those – I think, all told, there's about 34 of them – but a bundle of those are highly pertinent to the underpinning debates of this review. And one of those is the basic priority of public good over private interest in development, and particularly ..... publicly owned foreshores ..... remember that actually sits in the Harbour .....

MS SMALLEY: Can I just clarify, you said there's 34 - - -

MS LYNCH: Well, I think there are about 34 principles in the - - -

MS SMALLEY: Principles.

MS LYNCH: - - - ..... in – you know, there are many versions of those principles that have been published in different format.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MS LYNCH: But they all came out of that early Bays Precinct process, which is where we decided early in the piece, if there weren't principles ..... couldn't take the next step. I mean, it's all pretty basic ..... but they were developed jointly with community, industry and government.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MS LYNCH: So the government ..... on those early .....

MR BRIGHT: Is that – so were they the principles documented in the Bays Transformation Plan? Are those the - - -

MS LYNCH: ..... That was – that's an UrbanGrowth version of them. An UrbanGrowth consultation. And that is – I'll send you .....

MS SMALLEY: Yes. ....



MS LYNCH: There's three .....

MR BRIGHT: Okay.

MS LYNCH: There's three versions .....

MS SMALLEY: ..... to see the principles that you're referring to. Yes.

MS LYNCH: And it was an excellent process. It was a – but, anyhow, the priority ..... the first one: no unsolicited development proposals for publicly owned areas, sites. The opening of the foreshores and the ..... were publicly owned sites. The notary of the ..... of publicly owned bits of the Foreshore – the Harbour Foreshore ..... Then the obvious ones ..... transport, traffic planning ..... preceding residential and other development, prior and/or simultaneous provision of social infrastructure – open space planning fields, schools, childcare, health services all seem critical ..... – as well as strong environmental values and community and heritage values.

From that perspective and those principles, our general comments on the Pyrmont-Ultimo scenario: we're not opposed to development, be it government or private enterprise-driven. We are opposed to development which ..... the public good for private interest and profit ..... We're not opposed to high-rise development, but we are opposed to unnecessary, inappropriate high-rise development, which destroys the design and amenity of an area. And we note ..... we were deeply involved in the Harold Park development, and strongly supported it against some members of the community who thought that should be open space. But we said ..... because the housing was needed ..... And we thought the outcome of that – which was a compromise ..... what they wanted – the outcome of that is a good example of a good high rise level ..... And it has 50-year affordable housing units coming up that are being built now. And .....

MS IRWIN: Yes. Six minutes.

MS LYNCH: That's a small number.

MS IRWIN: Six minutes.

MS LYNCH: Sorry. Okay.

MS IRWIN: .....

MS LYNCH: Okay. So given the – this context, we see the negative ..... sitting in this context. We're certain that the community does not regard twin casino towers dominating the western gateway as a desirable global image for our city. And we have to keep ..... with the ..... interest in favour of the Crown Casino, Barangaroo remains ..... across the community. And we shouldn't be duplicating ..... The Glebe Society ..... agrees with the Planning Department. The proposed 62-storey, 237-metre tower ..... casino is inconsistent with its immediate context. And the result ..... visual impacts and so on. You know that ..... that's the core finding. And we agree with that. And we agree that it fails to promote good design and amenity to the built environment.

The redevelopment of Pyrmont in the 1990s was an exemplary process. And the resulting plan, which has been built on by City of Sydney ..... over the last decade, has enabled preservation of much of the ..... housing ..... same time as ..... high rise ..... eight storeys. But it's ..... pretty vibrant, pretty interesting mix. We're not opposed to any further development in Pyrmont. That's pretty inevitable. Nor are we opposed to more high-rise development in the area. However, we do insist that existing planning rules must be respected, and that any changes to them must arise from a proper and fully consulting process.

In Glebe, we're now wondering and talking about, well, if the planning parameters which were developed in the intense ..... Pyrmont ..... And those planning ..... do sustain a vibrant village context in this area. Is Glebe next? And that's alerting us. We're pretty interested in the outcome of all of this. So we recommend – we have three recommendations. We recommend that the GSC supports the central aspects of the current ..... planning framework of Ultimo-Pyrmont ..... We recommend that the ..... – you're not going to do this – but we recommend that the assessment process ..... Star tower proceed under the current planning rules ..... the Department of Planning recommendation to reject the development and be referred to the ..... Commission for decision, as is proper. We recommend that any changes to the current framework ..... the Minister is speaking about should be developed - - -

MS IRWIN: One minute.

MS LYNCH: - - - through a subsequent formal, considered and ..... process. And we're not having a go at you or this process; we're just saying this is too big to be knocked over in 50 days. In that context - - -

MS WAHLQUIST: So we're also particularly concerned about the development at the fish market site. Given its proximity, obviously, to Glebe, we're very interested in Blackwattle Bay, which we share, and the impact of that on the bay: the toxic sediments ..... traffic. And we're just concerned that – about how these processes of development are undertaken.

MS LYNCH: Yes. So I put the fish market – how are we going for time .....?

MS WAHLQUIST: Around about 30 seconds. Sorry, Leslie.

MS LYNCH: Okay.

MS WAHLQUIST: I just jumped in there so we - - -

MS LYNCH: No. No, that's fine.

MS WAHLQUIST: - - - make sure we have - - -

MS LYNCH: Fish market – we've got two big issues with the fish market. We've written about it all over the place. And we're going to give you a copy .....

MS SMALLEY: Terrific.

MS LYNCH: The fish market site, one – it’s probably ..... but the fish market site is a crazy site. And we’re deeply disturbed about the site. And ..... consultation ..... we think – we – we’re recommending that you have a think about all the implications of that site, all the difficulties which will be exacerbated by it. The bigger issue – we think that’s a big issue – but the other issue we want to flag here is the redevelopment of the current site. .... have no planning ..... there’ll be a considerable amount of residential development and high-rise development. This is a public – largely public-owned site ..... situated very close to the CBD. No significant intervention.

It will generate a lot of quite expensive – because of its location, not because of the desirable ..... It will be more expensive apartments ..... Given the housing – affordable housing crisis, the Glebe Society sees this as a superb opportunity for bodies such as yourself and others to do something transformational and affordable and social housing. Not the five per cent. Not the six per cent. We were pleased to see Labor and Greens and the government all lift their affordable housing targets, particularly for publicly owned lands ..... pre-election context. But they ranged from ..... about .....

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MS LYNCH: We think – and we’re going to campaign big time on this.

MS SMALLEY: Great. All right.

MS LYNCH: ..... if we can’t do it when we own the land, when we’re in the vicinity of ..... in terms of affordable housing.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Thank you. We will need to - - -

MS LYNCH: Thank you. ....

MS SMALLEY: - - - wrap up.

MS LYNCH: Yes, that’s fine. Yes.

MS SMALLEY: So are there are any ..... points?

MS LYNCH: No, no.

MS SMALLEY: You’ve covered everything?

MS LYNCH: .....

MS SMALLEY: And you’ll leave us with your submission.

MS WAHLQUIST: No, no, no. That’s – yes.

MS LYNCH: ..... Just want to point out that we are there.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MS LYNCH: I actually live there.

MS WAHLQUIST: So the – our interest - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Yes.

MS WAHLQUIST: We're not ..... any expressions of interest. And we have worked very, very hard over 50 years to get open space in that area. And we're very strongly committed to it. We're a suburb where we have a lot of social housing already. And the Glebe Society's fought to maintain that.

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MS WAHLQUIST: And they are, sort of, principles that are important to us. So  
- - -

MS LYNCH: I'll be ..... Can I make one more .....?

MS SMALLEY: Sure.

MS LYNCH: Wentworth Park.

MS WAHLQUIST: Yes.

MS LYNCH: Wentworth Park. Untouchable in terms of ..... to the public. We have fought hard to hold off - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MS LYNCH: - - - big stadiums or whatever .....

MS SMALLEY: Right.

MS LYNCH: And we'll fight hard .....

MS SMALLEY: All right. Good to know.

MS BARKER: Good to know.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074619

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: RAEMA LANCASTER**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MS LANCASTER: But I actually had there what I was going to say. I'm Raema Lancaster.

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MS LANCASTER: I'm – I have lived in Pymont and have lived in an apartment and owned an apartment - - -

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MS LANCASTER: - - - just at the western end of Pymont Bridge for 10 years.

MS SMALLEY: Mmm.

MS LANCASTER: I'm a neighbour of The Star.

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MS LANCASTER: I love the Pymont community.

MS SMALLEY: Great. All right.

MS LANCASTER: And I feel – I feel very involved with ideas about how it might be changing.

MS SMALLEY: Fantastic.

MS S. BARKER: Thank you. All right.

MS SMALLEY: Thanks, Raema. And I'll just confirm, I'm sure you're not, but we're asking everyone on this question, you're not registered lobbyists, no?

MS LANCASTER: Oh, no, no, no.

MS SMALLEY: No, good.

MS LANCASTER: I'm not a member of a political party - - -

MS SMALLEY: No. Good, that's fine.

MS LANCASTER: - - - I don't have any other commercial interests.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you.

MS LANCASTER: Okay. Thank you for the chance to speak to you all. Perhaps, as well as telling you that I'm unaligned and I have no – no specific interests in the – in the area, I should tell you that I have been stirred into action, really, but the disheartening disruption of the process surrounding the delicate – the Development Application of The Star. That's what really got me involved in thinking about the

whole area. Because the Department of Planning rightly rejected the proposed tower because it contravened almost all The Pyrmont Guidelines for Building. And the rejected proposal, as you said, is currently; well we're not talking about individual things.

But the rejected proposal is currently being assessed by the IPC to whom I made a submission. And I actually have that submission here if you were interested in seeing that, as well. Our Premier publically opposed the findings and the report of her own department, which troubled me a lot, overriding her Minister. And she's now asked your Commission to make a rapid reassessment of your vision for Pyrmont. I had, actually, read the vision of March 2018. And the Premier, obviously, hopes that you'll now see Pyrmont as another waterfront global precinct skyline. Perhaps, after all, The Star development can be fitted into your, newly, more considered vision. That's how it appeared to me as a Pyrmont resident.

Now, I know that ongoing development of the 2009 postcode is inevitable. And up until now, development has been for the most part, regulated and consistent. I found an absolutely wonderful map of Pyrmont, and this was even before the 2000 Olympics, where the building I live in wasn't there. There was nothing that looked as though it was over about three storeys high. There has been unprecedented development in Pyrmont over the last 30 years, any way. There are – there have been massive changes. It's been transformed from a rundown industrial site to a vibrant mixed development residential community of almost 15,000 residents, now.

There's been an attempt to retain history and to reuse solid old industrial buildings as offices, business centres and residential apartments. There's a beautiful waterfront parkland and walkway that's been established along the foreshores. The current planning guidelines have been so successful that Pyrmont is now the most densely populated suburb in the country. It's attractive, desirable and liveable precinct close to the CBD. And the current building height restrictions are critical in retaining the village ambience. In actual fact, a granddaughter of mine who goes to high school – who went to high school in Port Macquarie was trooped down from Port Macquarie with her class to walk around Pyrmont to – as a showpiece of successful urbanisation.

I exhort you to continue development here according to the current guidelines. But, I'm realistic. And I think that, inevitably, there will be demands for more high-rise blocks in our waterfront suburb. But I think the response to this is already mentioned in early planning papers. I had a look at some of those – I don't know if you call it SEPP - - -

MS SMALLEY: Yes.

MS LANCASTER: - - - or S-E-P-P 2005. And I think there's a solution there; that should actually be brought to the forefront of planner's thinking. I think the height of buildings in Pyrmont should be tiered. As in a theatre where the harbour is the stage. Built as low as possible closest to the water, then gradually allow increased building heights as you move inland. The Star tower would, in fact, be unchallenged in Broadway. This way views and amenity would be maximised for everyone. It

came to me the other night as I sat in the Opera House. This is the only way to – this is the only way to get a lot of people enjoying the superb area that we've got.

The Premier also said that she, “Wanted Pyrmont open for business.” I suggest that we make our business around the infrastructure of what – I don't know if it was you guys or other planners designated as the Innovation Corridor. Now, this sweeps from Prince Alfred Hospital, University of Sydney, Notre Dame, UTS, down past the Powerhouse Museum, which may or may not survive. The Maritime Museum, Media and Technology Hubs, Fairfax, Google and others. Our business, the business in Pyrmont, in my mind, should be to maximise and enable collaboration between these establishments. These educational, cultural and technical giants.

This style of business and the people who work in them do not match up with the skyscrapers that appear to be necessary to attract and house business tourists and corporate centres. Already, about a third of the population of Pyrmont walk to work. And the average age of the population in Pyrmont is 34. That's according to the 2016 Census. I haven't got later figures than that.

MS SMALLEY: Mmm.

MS LANCASTER: We may need – we probably will need more housing in our area. But it needs to be affordable. Not the luxury type of apartment envisaged by redevelopments such as The Star. We do not need a second high-rise city landscape on our waterfront. Skyscrapers fit in visually and contextually with other towers in the CBD, Barangaroo, Darling Harbour, Cockle Bay. Pyrmont is perfectly placed to develop in a different way, contributing to the city a different set of skills that could enhance the image of Sydney in a totally different way. I – last week, I was walking from The Conservatorium down to Circular Quay, through the city.

Not down Macquarie Street, I came down through the city. It was an absolutely beautiful late afternoon; the sun was out. I started walking down; the huge towers in that part of the city blocked any access to sun all the way down. The – the towers acted as a – as a wind tunnel in the road down the Harbour. And the view of the Harbour was blocked. And I thought, “This tragedy should not happen in Pyrmont.” In summary, current planning regulations have been well thought out and should not be able to be overturned by powerful vested interests. Pyrmont should be developed as an educational, cultural, high tech hub. Not just regarded as a good site for adding to the forest of skyscrapers deemed necessary for global attraction of the corporate sector.

And a liveable city needs spaces. And lower building profile retains a human dimension. And Pyrmont is a residential suburb as well as a business centre. And tiered development is, in my mind, what should happen. If this is the only way to meet the future demands of an increased population density. So they're my ideas. And I thought I needed to say them to somebody other than my friends. ....

MS SMALLEY: We're appreciative; you've clearly put a lot of work into that. So thank you.



MS LANCASTER: Because I feel very strongly that this is a fantastic chance to develop, like, a second – a second, a second city that's an adjunct to the CBD but is, gives you a totally different look at the city.

MS SMALLEY: That's great.

MS LANCASTER: Okay.

MS SMALLEY: Thank you very much.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1074617

**GREATER SYDNEY COMMISSION**

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**PYRMONT PLANNING REVIEW**

**PANEL: DANIELLE SMALLEY  
STEPHANIE BARKER  
DAN BRIGHT**

**INTERVIEWEE: YIMMY SEIFERT  
BILL D'ANTHES**

**LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY**

**DATE: THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**TRANSCRIPT COMMENCES AFTER INTRODUCTIONS AND DISCLAIMERS.**

MS SEIFERT: Sure. My name is Yimmy Seifert. I have been living in Ultimo since 1978 and I am chair of Ultimo Village Voice, a committee group in Ultimo. And I will explain a little bit more about our group later on.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. Great. And - - -

MR D'ANTHES: Once again, I'm the Deputy of this group as well, so - - -

MS SMALLEY: Great. Fantastic.

MR D'ANTHES: And I've been working in Ultimo since 1973 at UTS.

MS SMALLEY: Oh, wow.

MR D'ANTHES: And – for about 27 years. And I've lived here since about 1987.

MS SMALLEY: Great.

MR D'ANTHES: In various places.

MS SEIFERT: Thank you. Ultimo Village Voice is a Committee Group established in 2004. And we have a long history of involvement with Committee Consultations to developments in our area. We were involved in the design phase of the Ian Thorpe Aquatic Centre. And we successfully lobbied for the retention of the hydrotherapy pool which was to be scrapped from the original design. We also – Bill was actively involved in the building of the temporary school and the new primary school. And we attended numerous consultation sessions and made submissions on the Darling Harbour Redevelopment. And as recent as the Fish Market Redevelopment.

So and we have also been lobbying for better public transport in the area. Which is very important to us in terms of connectivity. This review, actually, is called Pyrmont Planning Review. But it – from the map you can see it covers a large chunk of Ultimo. So we believe that it is very relevant to us, as well. And therefore, we want to be involved with the Committee Consultation in this process, at the earliest opportunity. And that's why we're here. However, we believe that this snap review is very rushed, denying meaningful feedback from the community. Because we first received an email on the 30<sup>th</sup> of August with a closing date for submissions on the 16<sup>th</sup> of September.

And that is hardly enough time to provide meaningful community consultation feedback. We also believe that this snap review may have been triggered by the Department of Planning's recommendation regarding the enormous Star casino tower development. And we want to make sure that this review does not reverse engineer new controls, new planning controls to accommodate the Star's massive tower which has perverse impact on the local community creating extreme overshadowing of public and private spaces. And massively increased traffic congestion. We're of the view, therefore, that this review, actually, is unnecessary as planning should be ..... and undertaken by the Department of Planning and the City of Sydney.

We note that the current planning controls would actually, normally, prevent construction of the Star's 530 million tower owing to its excessive height, which is eight times the height allowed under existing rules. However, as this review has commenced, we want to be part of the process. And we want to point out that Ultimo has a mix of charming old terraces, in which I live in one of them, converted warehouse residential apartments and there are also new residential buildings under the current planning controls. And it is a vibrant mixed used precinct in possibility to the global Sydney CBD with a charming village atmosphere, which we treasure very much.

It has the Powerhouse Museum which we have fought hard in trying to retain in Ultimo. And we already have an Innovation Corridor, ABC, UTS, the TAFE and IT businesses, start-up businesses in the area. We believe this provides a correct mix already. Ultimo and Pyrmont have already been redeveloped to the highest density of any community in Australia. In less than 30 years, our area has outgrown the first Darling Harbour, two Ultimo Public Schools and all forms of public transport and other infrastructure. Whatever the height of the Ritz-Carlton is permitted to be built should not provide a precedent for further developments of similar dimensions in our community, such as the current Fish Market development.

Instead, all large developments should include open green space around them, as they do in Singapore. Like Singapore, Sydney needs to be more generous and compassionate to those displaced and encumbered by such developments. Furthermore, Ultimo is already hemmed in by the western side of the new Darling Harbour redevelopment, with its back to Ultimo. And we fought very hard. And we made our – our views known in numerous, on numerous occasions. So consequently, we are facing a huge wall of the Exhibition Centre, high-rises in the Haymarket area and the proposed high-rise development on the Harbour Side site. So we do not need any more towers in Ultimo, which would destroy our unique village atmosphere.

If there are further high-rise dense developments in Ultimo and Pyrmont, it would put pressure, excessive pressure on the already inadequate public transport, increased traffic, shelter infrastructure. With population demand on schools, social activities, etcetera. Now, currently, we actually do not have a high school in the area. And it is outside the catchment area of the new Surry Hills high school to be built on the site of the existing Cleveland Street Intensive English High School. So you can imagine the pressure it would put on the education facilities in the area. With now, so much increased population.

So as the – you pointed out, the Greater Sydney Commission is within the effectiveness of the planning framework to deliver the Government's vision for the Western Harbour Precinct and Pyrmont Peninsula as the western gateway of the Sydney CBD. So in conclusion, we hope that your finding is that the Government's vision for the Western Harbour precinct and the Pyrmont Peninsula, which includes Ultimo, is to maintain the current vibrant mixed used precinct and to refrain from overdevelopment with inadequate open space and infrastructure. Thank you.

MR D'ANTHES: I daresay the - - -

MS SEIFERT: And Bill, yes.

MR D'ANTHES: - - - as far as the schooling goes, as – as we said here, we've been through, actually, three schools, we're about to go through a fourth school on the same place, basically. Around the same area.

MS SEIFERT: Mmm.

MR D'ANTHES: Ultimo Public School is, where my first child went to, was redeveloped in 2002. And we told the Government at the time that it was going to be inadequate. They had originally decided to close that school and send our students to Glebe. Which the – I think, the Minister at the time said, "It's only 10 minutes away." I don't know – maybe, maybe in a truck.

MS SMALLEY: Mmm.

MR D'ANTHES: But certainly not walking.

MS SMALLEY: Mmm.

MR D'ANTHES: Certainly not from Jacksons Landing. And so we've – we've said that it wouldn't be adequate. And 15 years later, it's been outgrown. They planned a school for 10 – 4,000 on the site of the, next to the light rail, which was a library site that we had. It was passed by the Government, agreed to, and announced. And then after the next – the next election, the following election, which took them back. And they decided that they'd develop a school for 800 on the same half-hectare site that they had previously. So they've torn down what would be a relatively new school and replaced it with a large school that's basically high-rise. So you've got the high-rise kids going into a high-rise school. And with all the consequential problems of obesity, lack of exercise, etcetera.

And to be fair, the design is very good for what it is. But it's still going to include a 40-place childcare or preschool. And so that's, really, close to – closer to 1000 any way ..... Which we argue would be, sort of like, a battery hen thing. And after the planning of the school in Parramatta, they decided that they aren't going to have any more high-rise schools. But in order to do that, they actually had to make the classrooms smaller than Code. So they changed the Code to make it smaller.

MS SMALLEY: Mmm.

MR D'ANTHES: And the Principal, the Acting Principal and I went through the building the other day - - -

MS SMALLEY: One minute.

MR D'ANTHES: - - - and it's smaller, considerably smaller than the Code was. And the ceilings are lower as well. So - - -

MS SMALLEY: Okay.

MR D'ANTHES: - - - which gives you an indication of how we've been, sort of, slapped around by Planning.

MS SMALLEY: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. That's very well considered. Any clarification from - - -

MS BARKER: No, that's fine.

MR D. BRIGHT: Not from me.

MS SMALLEY: - - - anyone? No. All right. Well, we thank you very much for your – for your time. And we'll be delivering our advice to Government at the end of the month.

MS SEIFERT: Thank you for the opportunity to listen to us. And we really appreciate that and hope that there will be more opportunities in the future.

MS SMALLEY: Great. Thank you.

MR D'ANTHES: Best of luck. You've got an incredible job to do.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**