
From: Jie Christy Liang [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 19 May 2021 10:31 PM
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Objection re Mirvac proposed redevelopment of the Harbourside Shopping Centre - HARBOURSIDE REDEVELOPMENT (SSD 7874)

TO: IPC
Date: 19 May 2021

SUBMITTER: OWNER OF 702/50 Murray Street Pyrmont

Dear Director of IPC,

Hope this email finds you well! Thank you kindly for making a great effort to protect the darling harbour and doing what is right.

Please find my responses to Mirvac's latest proposal below

The Darling Harbour Development Plan No.1 is the environmental planning instrument which provides land use controls for land within the Darling Harbour precinct which includes the Harbourside Shopping Centre. It points out that the development of the Darling Harbour and the Cockle Bay development should all have a similar strategy to ensure good urban design; consistency in building envelopes and setbacks in regard to the heritage Pyrmont Bridge and the water; as well as meeting the needs of all stakeholders.

The most relevant development to Harbourside Shopping Centre in the precinct is the Cockle Bay Redevelopment both has the same relationship to the Heritage-listed Pyrmont Bridge and both frames the east and west access to Darling Harbour. The Cockle Bay Wharf development has the same planning controls, landowner and consent authority as the Harbourside Shopping Mall development. The Cockle Bay redevelopment was approved with an RL 12 for some 95m away from the Bridge. The IPC asked consideration of options relating to RL 11.8 for some 130 m away from the Bridge. It is considered that the IPC request is reasonable.

It is challenging to see what the people of NSW get in 'expanding and enhancing the public domain and publically accessible space' to balance Mirvac getting an **INCREASE OF 66,434 SQM of GFA** for their own benefit. It is further challenging how a Re-Development of Shopping Mall ends being a development where about 50% of GFA is allocated to high rise residential apartments in a tourism and entertainment precinct.

Although the applicant needed to address all relevant issues with substantial reports, there were no details on this assessment for "NOT VIABLE" other than the CEO saying it. Ethos Urban has raised several financial impacts rather than planning grounds for not considering IPC options seriously. Companies continually revalue their property assets to represent market value, which again produces various outcomes when determining the viability of projects. After all, Mirvac is not the owner of the land and only lease the land which complicates evaluations.

Impact on view sharing with 50 Murray Street Pyrmont

I set out below the relief that the new proposal has on the loss of view sharing on those apartments that IPC visited and reference in the report.

The 'Potential envelop addition' has been included in the diagram and shows clearly that there would be **further significant loss** of views (almost total in some case) of the CBD and highly valued water view in the case of Unit 504 and removes the relief offered by reducing the RL from 25.0 to 21.35. If the 'Potential envelop addition' is not to be included the units on level get some relief of seeing the less valued view of the CBD but unto 504 still gets on relief of the highly valued water views

Impact of the new proposal on connectivity and contiguous upper open space.

Darling Harbour, in normal time, receives 26million visitors for a year. They come to look at events, entertainment, dine and walk with their families as they enjoy the public domain. These families will use the new Metro just announced for Pymont and the light rail; they will walk across the Pymont Bridge from the north, families from the suburbs will park under Novotel and they all channel through the Pymont Bridge entrance to the new development. The IPC must consider how are families with prams, people with disability or senior going to access this irregular network of paths climbing some 90 metres requiring some 90 stairs.

In brief, If we convert darling harbour also to high rise development, darling labour will be no longer the real darling harbour. The new material updated by Mirvac has an impact on the public domain particularly the heritage-listed Pymont Bridge and the public waterfront walkway, as well as the functionality of the proposed park and its accessibility. My major recommendation is the proposed envelope from the Pymont bridge commence with the current RL of 13.75 for 65m rising to an RL of 17.60 extending south 75m from the Pymont Bridge.

Many thanks for your valuable time and strong support in advance!

Christy Jie Liang