

## Re Mirvac Proposal for Redevelopment of the Harbourside Shopping Centre

Dear Commissioner Leeson and panel members,

Following the public meeting that took place electronically on Wednesday April 28, I would like to **register my objection** to aspects of Mirvac's latest development proposal.

As a long term resident of One Darling Harbour (in our 21st year of residence) I have both a personal interest in the proposed redevelopment of the Harbourside Shopping Centre, as well as an interest as a member of the general public. Many of the submissions you heard last week indicated a mismatch between the original intention of providing developments in Darling Harbour that would benefit the public and Mirvac's mega development proposal for residential and commercial usage. ie- quality tourism and public amenity spaces vs private benefit. I strongly agree. This development will provide significant returns to Mirvac it is true, but I do not believe that it is in the greater public interest.

However the proposal has continued to progress. I would like to concentrate then on a few specific areas for your consideration relating to the latest Mirvac proposal.

- The height, mass and density of the proposed building envelope bears little resemblance to the current building being "redeveloped". It is a fourfold increase in building density that does not fit comfortably in its surroundings and impacts severely on the existing amenity of the surrounding area
- by overshadowing of public areas;
- affecting the ease of pedestrian circulation, especially on the northern end of the waterfront walkway where it is already at its narrowest, and
- overwhelming the significance of the historic Pyrmont Bridge.
- There is an apparent lack of coherence in the developments at the start and end of the Historic Pyrmont Bridge. The Northern podium envelope of the Harbourside Proposal should at least be consistent in bulk and scale with the neighbouring development in Cockle Bay, particularly adjacent to the Pyrmont Bridge. I believe that the State Heritage Pyrmont Bridge has been dealt with more sympathetically in that development. The current Mirvac proposal (RL26.5 for 70m along the water) is twice the height of the bridge platform and creates inconsistency in the character of the Cockle Bay basin, as the Cockle Bay Redevelopment was approved for RL12 for 65m along the water.
- A number of issues arising from the current Mirvac proposal could be partially addressed by reducing the northern podium to RL 13.75, the same height as the Pyrmont Bridge Platform and extending it south for 75m in **one** tier.
- the proposed three level park is not particularly user friendly to those with prams, or those requiring wheelchair/disabled access.
- accessing the three levels at peak times eg fireworks displays, Australia Day celebrations etc is likely to create unnecessary delay/blockage. Again this will impact more on families and those requiring disabled access.
- security issues and public safety issues could be addressed more effectively across one level than three, especially as it is proposed that the garden spaces would be open to the public 24/7.
- this slight reduction in height and format would also have some benefit regarding view sharing issues for some residents of One Darling Harbour.
- The proposed public gardens should be included within the RL 13.75 envelope suggested above. The inclusion of public rooftop gardens on the northern podium - the latest addition to Mirvac's proposal, has not only increased the overall height of the podium, but will add additional bulk and scale to the development. Landscaping, including trees, "soft structures", umbrellas, pavilions are included. Public toilets?, kiosks?, bars? - the possibilities are endless! By including this public access garden within the RL 13.75 envelope the inevitable increased view losses would be mitigated.
- Issues of privacy and security have been substantially increased by the inclusion of the rooftop garden open to the public 24/7 on the northern podium. Closing the Public Gardens at perhaps 8.00 or 10.00 o'clock each night would at least help minimise these issues and mitigate impact on local residents. For example:
- In the case of One Darling Harbour apartments, there will be a devastating loss of privacy for all those facing Cockle Bay when these gardens are open. These apartments were designed to face the Bay. They are glass fronted and have balconies. In our case, we use the balcony often, both day and night, as it is our escape from the four walls and allows us to enjoy fresh air, sunshine and the ever changing harbour and city before us. Now we stand to have our privacy totally invaded both while inside or out, with all our movements open to scrutiny by those in the garden.

- Public areas open at night require appropriate lighting to ensure safety . Has consideration been given to the impact of that on local residents? lights shining directly into apartments can be very intrusive.
- Has consideration been given to security issues and policing of this public area? Harbourside is in close proximity to an all night hotel; Star Casino is close by. Fights, police sirens are common occurrences in this area, especially on the week-ends. Who will be responsible for security? Harbourside Rangers are not policemen; and the police have finite, already overstretched resources.
- Noise issues are also of concern, especially if the gardens are open all night, every night.

In conclusion, I would like to address the personal losses arising from this redevelopment proposal. We bought our apartment in One Daring Harbour 21 years ago with a view to acquiring a solid investment, a lovely environment to live in and a home for our future retirement. We live on the 4th floor and currently have unfettered views of Pyrmont Bay, Pyrmont Bridge and the city from each bedroom and the living room (Another reason for our purchase). We have established a balcony garden as we currently receive direct morning sunlight and we enjoy the visiting birdlife. Our balcony is like an additional room to us - a place to sit and read, have meals and entertain.

We will be significantly impacted by the proposed redevelopment. Our view will be severely degraded and in this latest proposal, to our utter dismay, that loss will be increased by the new inclusion of a higher northern podium topped by a public garden. This loss of unfettered water and city views will inevitably impact on the value of our investment. But this loss of view, while significant is not the only loss involved. The impact on our privacy, represented by the public garden accessible to the public 24/7 directly outside our windows, is devastating. Add to this, a reduction of sunlight on the balcony, the impact of wind funnelling, additional noise and security issues. All of this will impact on the quiet enjoyment of our home.

I am not an "anti-developer". I look forward to the improvements that redevelopment of the Harbourside shopping centre will provide for the local precinct. That centre is tired and run down. But I strongly believe that these improvements could be equally achieved within the existing Harbourside envelope. We do not need to replace it with such a huge, bulky development.

At the very least I respectfully ask that the Commission take into consideration the concerns about the current Harbourside development proposal raised in this submission and the suggestions made to help mitigate some of those concerns.

Yours sincerely  
Diane Waddington