

To: Independent Planning Commission

Submission on Additional Material

I support the IPC envelope as it provides genuine public benefit through the provision of a significant public amenity in the form of the single contiguous tier at the Northern Podium at RL11.8 and permitting redevelopment that is profitable for Mirvac.

The Mirvac's alternative proposal does not address previous objections and does not achieve any further benefits. In particular, I note the following in respect of the Mirvac's alternative proposal:

1. Current Mirvac development proposal is for the benefit and interest of its stakeholders rather than public.
2. Does not achieve view sharing with ODH residents. Whilst a reduction of one level is welcome, it does not make any sufficient difference and it is still significantly higher than the current shopping centre.
3. Alternative envelope has increased the northern podium maximum height from RL26.5 to RL31.
4. Still dominates the Pymont Bridge as the Northern podium at RL21.5 is still significantly higher than the bridge which is still close to twice the height of the Bridge RL11.8.
5. The proposed envelope does not include lift overrun nor the height of landscaping or amenities which will further add to the bulk and scale of the northern podium. The envelope should include all landscaping and lift overruns.
6. Notwithstanding the removal of the overhang to foreshore, the new proposal for the northern podium still unreasonably impacts on the surrounding area, particularly the public domain at the foreshore and the heritage Pymont Bridge, and is not commensurate in bulk and scale with neighbouring Cockle Bay redevelopment providing two inconsistent character of addressing the Cockle Bay basin.
7. Mirvac has not demonstrated why the project is "not viable". If the Cockle Bay Wharf Redevelopment was considered commercially viable at 3.57:1 FSR compared to Mirvac's request of 4.24 FSR. Mirvac's' GFA could be reduced by 13,815sqm (GFA difference between FSR of 4.24 and 3.57) and would be as viable as the Cockle Bay Development.
8. If Mirvac reduced the RL to 12.05, comparable to Cockle Bay, the loss of floorspace would be only 11,000sqm.
9. A small reduction to floor space, particularly accounting for a two level podium, would be offset by the increase in tower height from 166m to 170m.
10. The Cockle Bay development of RL12 must be efficient otherwise it would not have been approved. The next level up is RL 13.75 (3.5+5.0+4.0+1.5), clearly this is efficient as it is Mirvac's calculation.
11. Mirvac is not creating 2,000 jobs as claimed but rather 2,000 work spaces, which is not clear how they will be filled in post-COVID environment.
12. Mirvac's Harbourside redevelopment has some 50% GFA for residential apartment.
13. Comparison to the RL 17.8 of the current shopping centre is not appropriate as the Mirvac is proposing to build tower of RL 170 and podium with a maximum height RL 31.
14. When people enter the Pymont Bridge entrance to the new development they will be faced with the same number of non contiguous levels of RL13.75, RL17.6, RL 21.35, RL26.5 and RL31.0. 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.
15. The lowering of the northern podium to RL 11.8 (or alternatively to RL 13.75) would enhance a contemporary high quality domain which is not over shadowed and provide for improved waters edge experience.

Submitted by:

Janis Elksnis, owner of Unit 304, 50 Murray St.