
From: Bernie Wallace [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 20 May 2021 4:18 PM
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Harbourside Shopping Centre Redevelopment, Darling Harbour (SSD 7874) - Additional Information

Dear Commissioners,

As an owner of an east facing Level 2 apartment in One Darling Harbour (ODH) I was excited at the prospect of a lower podium level with a maximum height of RL 11.8. which mirrors the approved podium height on the opposite foreshore in the Cockle Bay development.

For ODH owners and residents it would go a long way to compensate for a massive view loss to the south.



Kitchen View

Balcony View

In relation to the tower-“A loss of more than 30% of residential floor space (loss of more than 100 homes)”. We didn’t ever think that a tower of residents would be built here when we bought an apartment in ODH. The smaller the tower the better for the public.

On March 10, 2021 Tenant CS | Commercial Real Estate reports;

‘...the vacancy rate is now hovering at an average of 8% in the Sydney CBD. The steep spike in vacancy has been spurred by:

- An increase in subleasing stock, which is now at a record high as companies reassess their current and future needs
- New stock, which is due to hit the market over the coming 12 months’

It begs the question - Is office space in the Harbourside site necessary at all?

Mirvac’s statement that IPCs reduced envelope is: “Undermining the site’s State significance and contribution to local, district and regional planning objective” is at odds with the fact that many believe that Mirvac’s Concept Proposal already does that.

A lower northern podium establishes better accessibility to a roof top facility and smooths the way for a variety of uses that will have less annoying consequences for adjacent residents and hotel guests.

Mirvac's proposal lacks foresight and creativity e.g. the northern podium could become a suitable space for open-air markets creating another level of shopping, entertainment and education in a Covid safer environment.

In this regard an additional drop off area could be incorporated at 11.8 level at the bridge end of the northern podium and even a sheltered section running on the western boundary to connect to the Bunn St bridge.

Open air markets across a major part of the northern podium would be an enduring link back to the traditional history of Cockle Bay and fulfil the government’s ‘future vision’ adding real purpose and vibe to the precinct.

Although it is very encouraging that the IPC has forced Mirvac to examine a different building envelope, Mirvac’s ‘alternate proposal’ resumes the prospect of a devastating loss of amenity.

Mirvac continues to intentionally disregard the magnitude of the public and private concerns about the northern podium that were expressed early in the planning process.

Lowering the podium in two sight lines of one apartment on level 2 of ODH when the podium had already been raised multiple levels is not a 'sensitive' concession.

In fact, Mirvac's concession strategies and lack of vision do not inspire much confidence for their ability to redevelop the site appropriately.

Since the amount of floor space is so critical to the viability of the project I agree that this is not a suitable site for what Mirvac say they have to achieve.

If Mirvac decide to walk away from the 'Redevelopment of The Harbourside Shopping Centre', which has been left to deteriorate, they need to be made responsible for the rehabilitation of the site after such neglect.

Finally, after seeing the good work of the commission, I believe everyone would have benefited had the IPC intervened earlier in the planning process to assess, in particular, the planning goals for sites made available for partnerships between the NSW government and private enterprise in order to ensure genuine progress and proper, acceptable outcomes for all.

ODH apartment owner