

18 May 2021

Independent Planning Commission

Dear Sir, Ma'am

Re: SSD 7874 I wish to record my objection to the alternative Option and new proposal submitted 12 May 2021 by Mirvac in relation to the Harbourside Shopping Centre redevelopment.

I am the owner / occupier residing One Darling Harbour 504/50 Murray Street, Sydney.

The height of the northern podium will totally block out and remove the current views I have of Cockle Bay. Instead I will look out onto a concrete wall. The alternate diagrams supplied in the correspondence submitted by **ETHOS URBAN** show negligible improvement of views gained by Apartments 201 and 501, however this is against Mirvac's current submission not against the current views enjoyed by the apartment owners. My apartment 504 was visited during the IPC Site Inspection however is not considered or the issue of view loss addressed. In my view the height of the podium and the redevelopment of the Harbourside centre should not impact negatively on the apartment owners residing in One Darling Harbour.

Mr Hogendijk's letter to Mr Witherdin dated 12 May 2021 incorrectly states that the proposed reduction of the northern podium height by one level and removal of the podium cantilever over the northern end of the promenade will improve view sharing for 50 Murray Street apartments. This is not the case in relation to my apartment 504 and as such in my view is unreasonable.

I object to Mr Hogendijk's comment, "***If we are unable to identify a viable scheme, the existing Harbourside asset will remain undeveloped and will continue to negatively impact Darling Harbour for the remaining 65 years of the current leasehold.***" This is alarmist and intimidating and should not be considered.

In my view the request by the IPC for a maximum RL (roof line/height) of 11.8m from Pyrmont Bridge and across the northern podium is reasonable and my preferred option. I support the concept of a roof top garden at a height of 11.8m. the higher the northern podium the more imposing it becomes and detracts from open space and impacts on the historic Pyrmont Bridge.

I have concerns where Mr Hogendijk states in his correspondence, "***A loss of more than 16,000sqm (40%) of employment generating floor space (loss of more than 2500 jobs)*** Where is there any supporting evidence of this? How was the loss of 2500 jobs arrived at? I further note this is in conflict with the supporting?? correspondence submitted by ETHOS URBAN who record in 1.0 Executive Summary, "***A loss of more than 40% of employment generating floor space (loss of more than 1,700 jobs)*** How was the loss of now 1700 jobs determined? Where have these figures of 2500 or 1700 loss of jobs come from?

Please do not allow overdevelopment of this site, allowing a height of the northern podium greater than 11.8m is imposing and overbearing.

Thank you.

Christopher & Ellen Stiles

████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████

