

Independent Planning Commission,
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street,
SYDNEY, NSW 2001

Email: ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au

Cc: [REDACTED]

Date: September 27, 2019

Dear Sir/ Madam

Re: Comments relating to the peer review titled 'Review of the Independent Assessment and Design Advice' by Ms Yvonne von Hartel, dated September 19, 2019,

I understand from the statement on your website that comments relating to the above peer review for the Star Casino Redevelopment (MP08_0098 MOD 13) are sought until 5pm September 27, 2019.

Before making comment I have looked at the following:

- Independent Assessment and Design Advice – Professor Peter Weber (July 2019).
- The Department's visual impact assessment in its' final report.
- The visual impact assessment from Architectus and the peer review of that by Richard Lamb & Associates.
- And the Urban Context Report by Olsson and Associates as well as the Moir landscap and visual assessment review.

It was refreshing to read a report (the Von Hartel Report) that responded so incisively and comprehensively to all of the elements that go to making up the visual amenity impacts of a development proposal wherever it is to be sited.

I note that this proposal was originally approved as a Part 3A proposal (with to date 14 Modified proposals submitted since) and I concur with the Von Hartel analysis in relation to the Urban Context Report by Olsson & Associates that the validity of arguing that the proposal falls within the Darling Harbour Precinct rather than in Pymont is questionable.

The existing planning controls (as the report's author notes) apply to the proposed development's location in Pymont - and to argue that planning controls should be disregarded because the proposal is in the proponent's self-declared "Darling Harbour Precinct" and that therefore ad-hoc spot re-zonings are acceptable is 'intellectually dishonest'.

Elsewhere as advanced in the von Hartel review the actual built form design of the proposal is problematic given the planning Departments 'design excellence guidelines' appear to have been badly compromised by a brief advanced to the three firms that competed in the original design competition for a tower that exceeded existing planning controls by a not 'insignificant amount'.

As such, even on the limited grounds I've referred to above, I concur with the Department's rejection of the proposal in the first instance and the summary undertaken by Von Hartel of those grounds.

There are other matters that I could comment on but the peer review conducted by Yvonne von Hartel so comprehensively covers these matters in such an incisive manner and with such professional skill and judgment that any further comments by me would be redundant.

Yours sincerely,

Jillian Grove

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.