
From: Michael Yin [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 19 May 2021 10:11 PM
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Objection re Mirvac proposed redevelopment of the Harbourside Shopping Centre

Chair

Independent Planning Commission

Dear Chairperson.

Harbourside Shopping Centre Redevelopment SSD-7874

I am writing about the new material you provide and let you know that I strongly support IPC's suggestion and object to Mirvac's alternative.

The IPC envelope ideally balances providing public amenity in the popular Darling Harbour Precinct with permitting redevelopment that is profitable for Mirvac. **The IPC envelope provides genuine public benefit through the provision of a significant public amenity.** Darling Harbour attracts many families who have small children and bring prams or bring elderly family members and **that a public amenity must meet their needs to be the fairly considered provision of public benefit.** Additionally, one contiguous tier is essential to provide fair disabled access to the public amenity, so that they are not excluded or deterred from using the amenity. **Having the one level tier extend from Pyrmont Bridge to the Tower at one level is consistent with the Cockle Bay Wharf redevelopment,** as it also has one level tier of 12m from the Pyrmont Bridge to the Tower. The foreshore of the proposed Harbourside Redevelopment is an essential part of many members of the public daily life as they enjoy walks along the water. **The Northern Podium height at RL11.8 significantly improves the solar and sky access at the foreshore,** particularly as there is no more overhang to shadow most of the walkway. The Northern Podium will only be widened from 11m to 14m, and as the narrowest part of the public foreshore of the entire Harbourside Redevelopment site, would significantly benefit from the increase in solar and sky access. **Achieves genuine view sharing with One Darling Harbour (ODH) residents.** Most residents either maintain or improve their existing water views of Cockle Bay, with the primary impact to views being partial framing by the 170m tall tower. At the RL11.8 height, additional landscaping height will still achieve view sharing with ODH residents. **Importantly to respect the significant heritage of Pyrmont Bridge,** as the Northern Podium will not be dominating as it is no longer higher than the Pyrmont Bridge. **Provides an opportunity to allow event and gathering capacity** to replace what is lost by narrowing the widest part of the foreshore where the Ferris Wheel currently sits.

Mirvac Alternative: The new proposed Mirvac envelope comprises a mass of stairs to join three tiers at different elevations and **has made no attempt to address the issues of access that would be family-friendly, pram-friendly and disabled-access friendly.** The sheer number of stairs proposed will unfairly restrict access to the public amenity on top of the Northern Podium to the youthful and able-bodied. There will still be choke points at access points at busy times such as festivals and fireworks, creating long lines for those who require prams and wheelchairs with Mirvac's Alternative design. **Does not achieve view sharing with ODH residents,** as an RL of 21.35, while providing minor improvement, still destroys valuable whole water views of Cockle Bay, taken by Mirvac for its own enjoyment. Additionally, Mirvac seeks to increase an already high (RL26.5) portion of the Northern Podium to RL31. For many apartments, any view improvement by reducing the Northern Podium by one level is taken away by worsening an equivalent portion, resulting in a net improvement of zero. Landscaping has also not been included in the envelope which will add further bulk and scale that will create additional view loss. It is simply not correct that some residents in One Darling Harbour will be permanently adversely affected by Mirvac's proposed option. Mirvac, being a large company of good corporate citizen, could take more positive actions in the resolution of the view-sharing problems with the residents. There are many senior residents spending a lot of times at home and enjoying the current views when they bought into the building. Putting a massive podium in front of their homes would be devastating, not to mention the substantial financial loss they might suffer.

Therefore, any reduction in bulk and scale of the tower possible will be beneficial in terms of reducing shadowing of the public domain. \$17,000/sqm the project would already break-even without considering commercial and retail GFA.

The Cockle Bay Wharf Redevelopment is the most similar site in terms of location and attributes to the Harbourside site and therefore should be primary comparison. If the Cockle Bay Wharf Redevelopment was considered commercially viable at 3.57:1 FSR, it is unlikely that the Harbourside Redevelopment would not be viable at the same 3.57:1 FSR.

There are a number of strategy objectives in the PPPS, Mirvac appears to pick and choose a strategy objectives, focusing on building a tower of 170m in height without delivering publicly accessible open space on rooftop **areas** (no access to Southern Podium) or safe, activated and inviting streetscape on service areas (no design excellence applied to the back of house areas).

Please note that **170m the tower** is planned to be built, 170m is **significantly higher** than the existing centre height of RL17.64. The two podiums, both front and back, provide plenty of opportunity for retail activation.

In light of Covid, and the move towards remote WFH, the commercial offering should be reconsidered. There is already significant commercial floorspace in the Cockle Bay Wharf Redevelopment. A greater focus on retail would appear to be a more appropriate use of land in a tourism and entertainment district. Additionally, the public is able to access retail, while commercial space restricts access to employees

The primary public benefit is the protection of the existing sun and sky access on the public foreshore and the permeability of the site by the public through the entire shopping centre.

Kind Regards,

Michael Yin

Sent from my iPhone