

Oral Submission IPC

Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to participate in this public meeting.

My name is David Palmer and I have been a resident in One Darling Harbour since its opening. I have an apartment on the fourth floor facing east. At the time I bought my apartment, albeit off the plan, I was under no illusion that Harbourside would be redeveloped at some stage. However, I had no idea at that time the redevelopment would be on the scale proposed by Mirvac. My naivety was dispelled as the Darling Harbour precinct has been slowly transformed; from King St Wharf to the the extensive development to the South. In every case the there has been a steady erosion of the public good to the benefit of private capital.

Mirvac's proposal is no exception. The latest reiteration of their plan, October 2020, is touted to be a vast improvement on their original scheme. The office tower, originally on the northerly end has been replaced by a residential tower which has moved south. However, this much vaunted concession by Mirvac doesn't alter the fact that development is nearly 4x greater than the existing Harbourside.

One of the many reasons I bought this apartment was an expansive view to the city with Cockle Bay in the foreground providing a natural relief from the built environment. The passive roof of the present Harbourside could be conveniently ignored. Indeed the roof is pitched which lessens its impact on the view as it slopes to the water, if flat and raised as proposed, the view of Cockle Bay is obliterated by the northern podium, consisting of, one over height retail floor with 4 levels of extra height offices on top of it. A far cry from the two floors of Harbourside at this end of the building adjacent to One Darling Harbour. For all of us living on the lower floors this development will not only impact our views but also the value of our apartments.

That this proposal could even advance to this stage is a travesty. In the absence of any planning controls, Mirvac exploited this situation to make an ambit claim to maximise their commercial gain. The consultants engaged by One Darling Harbour have raised many concerns in submissions relating to the process adopted by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. To my knowledge, there has been no satisfactory response that the matters raised have been addressed.

In its *Response to Submissions and Further Amended Concept Proposal* | 12 October 2020 Mirvac states "The position and premise that a benchmark for redeveloping the site is to put back in its place a building of the same height is considered unreasonable." This begs the question "Why?" It is disingenuous on Mirvac's part to say a reasonable benchmark is 'we can have a development with this height and mass because others in the vicinity have had like developments approved'. Let's be clear about this, they have acquired a prime piece of harbour foreshore to develop primarily as commercial office space and sought after residential apartments. A sop is thrown to Cerberus in the form of a much reduced retail and entertainment experience for visitors to Darling Harbour, a roof top public area on the northern end of the podium and landscaping, paving, trees etc in areas adjacent to their lease.

Turning to that roof top area dubbed "Guardian Square" by Mirvac, this is a belated attempt to appease concerns raised that there was insufficient public space in previous proposals. Rather than sacrificing any of their GFA to provide such a public amenity, a part of the flat roof on the northern podium, that was once going to be what looked like a grassy rooftop, is now a public space directly to the east of One Darling Harbour and only 40 odd meters away, open to the public 24/7. As this change occurred recently there has been little detailed discussion with residents here about what impact this will have for those apartments on the same level and above. Changing the area from being passive to active will require balustrades and landscaping in the form of trees, and shade structures will be required to ameliorate effects of the sunny northerly aspect. As there is some retail shown adjacent to this space it can be assumed that outdoor dining will be high on the list of activities, apart from taking in the view. At present residents on the east of the building only have to contend with traffic noise, but, as those who live at the northern end can attest, the noise level from the 24 hour pub across the road can be quite intrusive especially at night. Privacy of these lower floor apartments will also be affected. As well as the rooftop public space, the uppermost floors of offices will look directly into our apartments. As of now privacy is protected by distance, the nearest line of sight point, being well over 150 meters away.

In closing. I object to the proposed development in its current form. The impacts on One Darling Harbour have been down played by Mirvac and in the case of Guardian Square have not been addressed at all. This together with the size and nature of the development flouts any pretence that this anything but a cynical appropriation of public land.