
From: Edward Lee (APA) [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 20 May 2021 9:40 AM
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Response to Mirvac's latest proposal

TO: IPC
Date: 20 May 2021

SUBMITTER: OWNER OF 7/6 Cross Street, Pyrmont, NSW 2009

To Chair
Independent Planning Commission

Dear Chairperson.

Harbourside Shopping Centre Redevelopment SSD-7874

I am writing about the new material you provide. I really appreciate your decision to ask Mirvac to make the changes and have taken our points of view carefully.

The alternative proposed plan shows that Mirvac only put their shareholders' return as a priority higher than the long-term benefit of public amenities, privacy, and safety of residents and signature reputation of the darling harbour. Please see below my response to Mirvac's alternative plan as below:

Northern podium: With the announcement of the new Pyrmont Metro station, there will be a crowd of people, passing Pyrmont Bridge Road and Pyrmont bridge. The alternate promenade proposed have too many levels and steps on the top of the northern podium. Such a "walk" way is not safe and friendly for public users and residents, particularly our elder, children, people with disability. Darling Harbour is the unique and probably the one and only one open style place left in the city for children, and families. As a result, the rooftop park on the northern podium would be the last and the most important area for the general public to gather and enjoy the entertainment that Darling Harbour has to offer during celebrations like Australia Day, New Year's Eve etc. So, the park must be designed and constructed properly so it can stand the test of time. Such a design will make darling harbour similar to the Barangaroo, and circular quay, hence seriously damage the signature of Darling Harbour with magnificent paranormal city view in the backdrop. An alternative plan will break down the open plant and paranormal city views into pieces of blocks.

The approved Cockle Bay redevelopment only has an FSR of 3.57. If the same FSR is to be applied to Harbourside to be consistent, then Mirvac could only build a GFA of 73,400sqm, i.e. a reduction of 13,600 sqm from its proposed 87,000 sqm. This reduction could contribute to the RL 11.8 as requested by IPC so to produce better long term public amenities on top of the northern podium as a useable public park. a) Perhaps the same RL could be considered by IPC so to be consistent on either side of the Pyrmont Bridge.

Therefore, I strongly support the IPC suggestion for RL 11.8 flat space right up to the tower for the northern podium. That would create a 135m X 30m park space on one level with no access challenges for families and elderlies. The park could be easily connected to Pyrmont Bridge Road without any overwhelming effectiveness of the historic bridge.

It is simply not correct that some residents in One Darling Harbour should 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 and cause significant intrusive privacy issue, not to mention the substantial financial loss they might suffer.

Last but not least, residents in darling Harbour, Pymont and greater Sydney are the “owners” of the land not Mirvac. Their longer-term needs and requirements should not be sacrificed, by only one-party Mirvac. We need to collaboratively work out a new development for a more sustainable longer-term future and benefit all parties. I do hope IPC work with Mirvac for a more balanced solution for all the parties concerned, and not deterred by the threat Mirvac has made in their response.

Many thanks for your kind consideration!

Edward Lee