

SUBMISSION TO THE INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION REGARDING THE  
PROPOSED STAR REDEVELOPMENT

Presented at the Public Meeting on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> August 2019 at Customs House,  
Sydney.

For the last 10 years I have owned and lived in an apartment in Pyrmont in close  
proximity to the Star, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to address you  
about the current redevelopment plans.

I have carefully read the widely researched and detailed report of the  
Department of Planning and Infrastructure. I strongly support the decision to  
reject the proposal of the Star to build a skyscraper that would accommodate a  
new Ritz Carlton hotel and would incorporate new luxury residential  
apartments.

There are many reasons for my objections to the Star's proposals.  
I will list them and elaborate as time allows, but will put further details in the  
postscript at the end of my submission.

I OBJECT TO;

1. the excessive height, bulk and dominating visual impact of the tower
2. an isolated skyscraper placed totally out of context with its low to  
medium height surrounds
3. the extent of overshadowing that would result from such a tall structure
4. the great increase in both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in a suburb  
which already has the highest population density in the country
5. the many special lighting displays planned to emanate from the tower,  
when lights would be beamed over the whole suburb
6. the total disregard of the Star for the current established planning  
regulations
7. the total indifference of the Star to the area as a whole, and its ignoring of  
the 2018 report of the Greater Sydney Commission.
8. the facile invention by the Star of the concept of a "Global Waterfront  
Precinct"
9. setting the precedent for the uncontrolled development of further  
waterfront sites
10. the underlying assumption that the success of a city depends on its  
globalisation and its attraction to big business tourists
11. the wooing of the local community by the inclusion of a Neighbourhood  
Community Centre in the new tower
12. the building site that would surround this massive construction where  
we would have at least 3 years of road closures and bus service  
disruption.
13. The recent statements and action of our premier.

I note a few alarming comments in the Star's application----

They say the tower would be part of a "global waterfront precinct skyline", and they ask us to "consider the tower in its current and future context"

It seems pretty clear that they are hoping to position themselves for maximal commercial gain in a future where they envisage skyscrapers lining our shores. Their vision of the future is globalisation/homogenisation---and the allure to tourists and big business is the criterion for success.

For the thirteen thousand or so residents of the 2009 postcode, our wellbeing is defined by quite different issues, and our quality of life has to be balanced with planned and orderly development . There has, in fact, been much well planned urban renewal activity in Pymont over the last 30 years. The suburb is now an appealing mix of new apartments and small shops, old pubs, refitted wool stores and large industrial buildings, early 19<sup>th</sup> century shops and terraces. It has a village atmosphere, wonderful waterfront parklands and is a very pleasant and desirable place to live. Apart from the travesty of dismantling the Powerhouse Museum, we have valued and celebrated our history. We reject the suggestion by the premier that we need a facelift. We do not need either skyscrapers or more tourists in our already crowded home.

And that brings me to the last point—the recent comments and actions of our premier. For someone who said recently, that in the case of conflicting views we should "respect due process", it was breathtaking hypocrisy for her to personally endorse the Star's application, thus overriding the considered assessment of her own Department of Planning. And in the next breath, realising that the Star's plans did not fit in with the 2018 vision of the Greater Sydney Commission, she asked the Commission for a further assessment, giving them 5 weeks to report back to her. A perfect example of—if you don't like the results, change the rules retrospectively.

Let us just hope that the Greater Sydney Commission manages to consult with other than Star stakeholders.

Thank you for listening.

Raema Lancaster

#### Additional comments

It is likely that the Star itself was emboldened to submit this way out of range application because of the precedent set by, and the subsequent success of, the building of the Crown tower and Barangaroo complex ,which were similarly approved by changing zoning and planning regulations.

The community of Pymont is active and vibrant and the heart of the community is the neighbourhood community centre. It is the nucleus of a huge number of

activities where locals meet, exercise, share mutual arts, crafts and games, take their children and have a monthly fund raising community dinner.

There is a great need for expanded premises for our neighbourhood centre and the Star has offered our community a new home and apparently have guaranteed free usage until 2093 when the current lease expires. This has been touted as a very big positive for the community in the Star's redevelopment application.

Superficially this sounds appealing and has some local community support.

However, on closer inspection, the spaces offered are very fragmented and each level is broken up by a staircase, and several of the huge support pillars needed for the tower. It seems that we have been offered the left over spaces that could be put to no commercial use by the casino. And, they do not fit well with the needs of a community centre.

And—I personally-- have huge reservations about the heart of a community being under the patronage of a casino. What effect on families to be regularly dropping in to the casino as if it were a home? (Leave the kids in playgroup and hop next door for a quick turn on the pokies?) I have been a GP for 50 years and I do not think that casinos contribute in any way to the well being of a community.

And—at the end of the day, a change in ownership could negate the whole deal!