



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1451016

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: HARBOURSIDE SHOPPING CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT (SSD 7874)

PANEL: **DIANNE LEESON (Chair)**
WENDY LEWIN

OFFICE OF IPC: **LINDSEY BLECHER**
KATE MOORE

ASSISTING PANEL: **KANE WINWOOD**
SAMMY HAMILTON

APPLICANT: **LACHLAN ATTIWILL**
TIM BLYTHE
ALEXIS CELLA
SACHA COLES
RICHARD FRANCIS-JONES
DAVID HOGENDIJK
SEAN McPEAKE
ELIZA POTTER
ASHLEIGH RYAN

LOCATION: **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **1.36 PM, TUESDAY, 20 APRIL 2021**

MS D. LEESON: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation today, and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Harbourside Shopping
5 Centre Redevelopment Project SSD 7874. The Harbourside Shopping Centre is located towards the north-western corner of the Darling Harbour precinct and the south-western foreshore of Darling Harbour, Cockle Bay. Consent is sought for a concept proposal for a residential and commercial building envelope and stage 1 early works for the demolition of the existing Harbourside Shopping Centre
10 buildings and structures.

My name is Dianne Leeson. I am the chair of this Commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner, Wendy Lewin. We are also joined by Lindsay Blecher and Kate Moore from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission, and Kane
15 Winwood and Sammy Hamilton, consultants assisting the Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of
20 information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide
25 any additional information in writing which we will then put up on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. So thank you and welcome again. David, thank you.

30 MR D. HOGENDIJK: Thanks Dianne.

MS LEESON: I understand you have got a presentation to start with first – start us off with first, and then we'll get into matters of the agenda. And it's entirely up to
35 you, but are you happy for us to ask questions along the way that will cover things off in the agenda, or circle back on them?

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes. Well, we've kind of crafted our presentation that it kind of covers - - -

40 MS LEESON: From our list?

MR HOGENDIJK: - - - the whole agenda items.

45 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR HOGENDIJK: So we can kind of pause - - -

MS LEESON: Then we might ask some questions on the way.

5 MR HOGENDIJK: Yes. Yes, correct.

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes.

10

MS LEESON: That's – that's fine. Thank you. Does that work for you, Wendy?

MS LEWIN: Yes, of course.

15 MS LEESON: Yes. Okay.

MR HOGENDIJK: So our – our presentation follows your exact agenda. So once we – once we get it back - - -

20 MS LEESON: Yes. Thank you.

MR HOGENDIJK: - - - up on the screen, we can – we can walk through the points as listed.

25 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR A. CELLA: So just in the host of the - - -

MS LEESON: And you'll present at the public meeting next week.

30

MR A. CELLA: Yes.

MS LEESON: Always helpful.

35 MR A. CELLA: Is it okay – would we be at the start or the end?

MS K. MOORE: The beginning.

MR A. CELLA: At the beginning, yes.

40

MS MOORE: After the Department.

MS MOORE: Yes. The Department will be talking itself.

45 MS LEESON: The normal sequence will be an opening statement from the Commission - - -

MR A. CELLA: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - the Department's assessment and then the Applicant. And then we'll go into other presenters that have registered to speak.

5

MR A. CELLA: Okay. Roughly how long will we have?

MS MOORE: We can talk about that after this.

10 : Okay. That will be good, yes.

MR A. CELLA: Sorry. It's roughly - - -

MS LEESON: All right. We'll hand across to you. Thank you.

15

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes. Thanks. Okay. So David Hogendijk, Director from Mirvac. The first part of the agenda was the brief overview project vision. So I might just read out a prepared statement that I've - I've got in terms of the - the fundamental aspects of the project. So thank you for your time today. The redevelopment of Harbourside is a unique opportunity to revitalise Western Darling Harbour with the vibrant mixed use development which will deliver significant public domain and open space improvements. Importantly, it will ensure increased permeability, accessibility activation at the ground plane and podium levels.

20

25 Over the past four and a half years, we have worked with the New South Wales Government, including the landowner, formerly SHFA, now Place Management New South Wales, DPIE to develop public domain concepts in the immediate and wider precinct to remove pedestrian pinch points for events, in addition to delivering high quality civic spaces of over three and a half thousand square metres within the development footprint. The planning of the podium and the tower has taken into careful consideration of the many immediate adjoining stakeholders, including the ICC, the Sofitel Hotel, the Novotel, Ibis and 50 Murray Street. This has necessitated an approach that strikes an appropriate balance between protecting existing public/private views and the appropriate level of redevelopment of the site.

30

35

Concurrently with the - concurrently and independently with the planning process, Mirvac - Mirvac is presently in the stage 3 of an unsolicited proposal with the New South Wales Department of Premier and Cabinet which seeks to encapsulate the delivery framework of the project - specifically, the public realm - whilst extending Mirvac's existing leasehold arrangements from 60 - 65 years to 99 years at completion of the project. The redevelopment is sought to provide a mix of residential, office and retail land uses that are in keeping with the District Plan and the relevant strategic and statutory frameworks that align with the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy. These land uses are vital in terms of supporting productivity, liveability, sustainability in the longer term.

40

45

The proposal includes GFA – a maximum GFA of 87,000 square metres, made up of 42,000 of residential GFA and 45,000 of non-residential GFA. A complementary mix of uses, including residential/office and retail, add diversity and they support a 24/7 precinct activation. This proposal will retain a predominance of
5 retail/commercial and entertainment uses on the site as more than 50 per cent of the proposed GFA is non-residential floor space. This further supports the objectives of the Darling Harbour Development Plan. Importantly, the proposal more than doubles the public domain from 4,300 square metres to over 10,000 square metres, of which 5,500 square metres is located within the development boundary and is
10 accessible 24/7, ensuring the podium and its surrounds are true public spaces.

The inclusion of the 45,000 square metres of employment generating floor space will enable the development to contribute significantly to economic growth and job creation with a circa 100 per cent increase in employment generating floor space,
15 compared to what is there now. And finally, the carefully balanced mix of uses that Mirvac has proposed will ultimately provide an additional 4,400 long-term jobs, whilst fully funding the construction and delivery of over 10,000 square metres of public realm. That's – that's my introduction.

20 MS LEESON: Thank you, David.

MR HOGENDIJK: I handover now to Alexis to run through our planning.

MR CELLA: Thanks, David. Alexis Cella from Ethos Urban. So I'm just going to
25 cover a bit of the – the planning proposal that we're going to be considering today. Thanks, Sean. Next slide. So there are a number of special precincts within the City of Sydney LGA that are afforded State significant status, and Darling Harbour – you can see in the image there on the left – is one of those. The image on the right there has got our site, Harbourside. We thought it's worth also noting the Cockle Bay
30 proposal in blue there, and we kind of talked through that in our site visit last Tuesday. So the area in grey is the Darling Harbour Development Plan area. There are a lot of similarities between Harbourside and the Cockle Bay redevelopment. There's the same planning controls. The IPC considered Cockle Bay back in 2019 and endorsed that proposal.

35 There are, you know, some key differences though in terms of land use. Obviously on the eastern side, Cockle Bay is relating to the CBD; whereas, you know, we've got Pyrmont and that kind of more mixed use, vibrant character. So as David noted, the proposals, you know, are fundamentally consistent with all the key planning
40 controls that apply to the site. Thanks, Sean. So clarity around the strategic direction for Pyrmont has recently been set by the New South Wales Government. As noted by David, that's enshrined in the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy. So Pyrmont's locational advantages in terms of its proximity to Central Sydney, and its context within the innovation corridor has been embraced as part of this next – as
45 part of its next evolution. Thanks, Sean.

So the Harbourside site is identified as one of four key sites within the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy. It's really important to understand that these key sites are critical to the vision for Pyrmont because they're doing a lot of the heavy lifting in terms of the jobs and dwelling growth forecast for this area. So this balanced
5 approach of, you know, focusing and targeting growth to particular areas really supports the community's feedback around balanced growth. And, so, you know, the proposal has really strong alignment and consistency with the Pyrmont Place Strategy. We're talking, you know, jobs, tech, media. So aligning with the innovation corridor aspirations. It's got the housing. We've touched on open space
10 which Sacha and – and Richard are going to come through a bit further at the end. Activation, connectivity, east-west, north and south. And, you know, as noted, they're protecting the existing character. Thanks.

So as David mentioned, the site is very unique. It's located on government-owned
15 land and will remain under government ownership and will continue to be subject to a long-term leasing arrangement following renewal. So there's been really considerable engagement and, ultimately, agreement with the landowner to the proposal before Excuse me. The best cities in the world are mixed-use cities. And the proposal providing for a genuine mixed-use outcome will positively
20 contribute to the character and vibrancy of Darling Harbour and Pyrmont more broadly. There will be an injection of energy and life across the precinct at all hours and of every day of the week.

So the image on the right there provides an overview of, you know, Darling Harbour,
25 but also the broader, you know, Cockle Bay and Sydney Harbour precincts. You can see there's – there's quite a diverse mix of land uses that we're looking to respond to. And, you know, that evolution that's – that's occurred with Barangaroo, King Street Wharf, Jones – Jones Bay, the – you know, there is this complementary residential/commercial/retail precinct that's forming around this part of Sydney
30 Harbour. Actually – so, again, just picked up some of the points that were noted by David. You know, our proposal prioritises employment. You know, really responding to the key strategic directions of the Pyrmont Place Strategy. You know, more than doubling the amount of employment floor space that the site currently exists. And, you know, really balancing that, the residential, office and retail
35 diversity. Thanks, Sean.

So Mirvac has invested over – I think it's close to five years now, consulting and collaborating with a range of stakeholders to developing the form of the final
40 proposal with you. We have a little animation which Richard will take through later that kind of shows the evolution of the proposal. But you can see these kind of key steps that are made along the way. So the project has, in my mind, benefitted from three separate rounds of exhibition. Mirvac has really genuinely listened to the community and responded in terms of, you know, key – key amendments along the way. So, you know, from my perspective, you know, the example set by Mirvac,
45 you know, in terms of really listening and responding to, you know, sets a really high bar for developers to follow.

This – it’s important to note that this consultation process has included critical design review and advice from Professor Peter Webber. So he was engaged by the Department of Planning as an independent urban design expert to provide comment on the proposal. So we were quite pleased that at the end of the process that Richard
5 – that Peter was supportive of the proposal. Thanks, Sean.

MS LEESON: And the switch from commercial to residential, was it – that’s suggesting it was based on allowing a smaller floor plate. Was – was that the only driver for - - -
10

MR HOGENDIJK: I think at the time - - -

MS LEESON: - - - changing it?

15 MR HOGENDIJK: I think, you know, probably there was two issues. One, there wasn’t the market there for commercial. You know, probably a much longer term approach. And – and Pymont probably wasn’t quite ready for that much commercial space. And, secondly, obviously having a changing use back to ressie and having a blended use of ressie and commercial enabled us to have a smaller
20 footprint along the tower to deal with view loss issues, but still retain a – a significant amount of – of commercial, as we’ve done now.

MS LEESON: And all pre-COVID.

25 MR HOGENDIJK: That’s right. So but I think it’s – you know, it’s a – it’s a mix now where we’ve had to respond again though with retail. So retail, there’s less retail than originally proposed, which was 20,000 of or nearly 28,000 of retail. So we’re now at 8,000. But we’ve got flexibility in our first level of office to convert that back to retail if the market is to improve. But we fundamentally will always
30 deliver the 8,000 of the ground plane to ensure the activated ground plane.

MS LEESON: Thanks, David.

MR CELLA: Thanks, Sean.
35

MR HOGENDIJK: It sometimes freezes - - -

MS LEESON: Is it stuck?

40 MR HOGENDIJK: - - - when it’s on the zoom, I found. Sean, you may need to, you know, key out of that sometimes.

MR S. McPEAKE: Yes, thanks.

45 MS LEESON: Warm it up a bit.

MR CELLA: So these images show the final envelope that was developed, you know, responding to the site constraints, the feedback from stakeholders, Professor Webber's input. And it also retains a degree of flexibility to leave the design excellence process unfettered. Thanks, Sean. And then lastly, you know, I've kind of touched on the extensive planning process we've been through. But we're – we're still really at the beginning of the process. We're only talking about the concept proposal, you know, seeking a number of those key elements, built form, GFA, land use. There's obviously early works, demolition. But, you know, we've got future stages to occur.

10 We've got an international design competition which is going to encapsulate the whole of the – whole of precinct, public domain, podium, tower, six architectural firms. So, you know, that's saying we're really excited to – to hopefully get to very soon. And also I'll just pick up on – on the Department's recommendation. Mirvac fully supports the recommendation for approval, subject to conditions. I'm sure you're aware the assessment report is comprehensive. It addresses all key issues and justification for supporting the project. And the draft conditions are acceptable and considered to appropriate – are considered appropriate to guide a future detailed design and ensure potential impacts are suitably minimised. Thank you.

20 MR R. FRANCIS-JONES: Thanks, Alexis. So I'm going to take us through - - -

MS LEESON: Richard Francis-Jones.

25 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. Sorry, Richard Francis-Jones, Design Director of FJMT, architects for the project. And I'm going to take you through this next section of the presentation. I'm going to throw to Sacha Coles and then also back to Alexis at the appropriate moment. So first of all, I just wanted to zoom out a bit and talk about the context. I'm sure you know a lot about the evolution of this part of Sydney. It is interesting to look back to those early years after settlement, that photograph on the – on the left there from 1816, and realise how quickly actually the landscape of Sydney changed, and that the harbour here became a really important industrial site for services to be unloaded, the construction of the bridge that you can see there on the right.

35 And then, really, the whole kind of logistical nature of Darling Harbour, dominated by railways and wharves which was, of course, then tripped into obsolescence through containerisation. And then what we saw was a very ambitious government project in the 80s to convert it to, you know, pedestrian-focused and with public facilities and commercial facilities. And that was when Harbourside was constructed. And they then also went through another phase of development in recent years which has also changed and remade Darling Harbour. Next.

45 And so that image that you can see there, the plan on the left and the – and the views on the right show the progressive re-building of Darling Harbour from the 1988 works which have included, more recently, the Exhibition complex, an Exhibition and Convention Centre development, associated hotel. Cockle Bay recently being

approved, of course, and Barangaroo extending that waterfront use north. And in many senses, it's the Harbourside site that is perhaps the one that is yet to be developed. But when it does get developed, it will then extend and connect that whole development through to the Maritime Museum and beyond.

5

In terms of the uses that are being proposed, Alexis and David have explained those proportional uses. So this is really a genuine mixed-use project, one of – one of the most genuine mixed-use projects we've been involved with, including extensive commercial floors at the lower levels where there's great flexibility for floor plate sizes and configurations, retails uses activating the ground plane, and connecting entertainment and cultural uses, of course, which are key to Darling Harbour, and then the residential uses in the tower that is set back above. That distribution of uses: currently on the site, there are 20,000 square metres GFA of non-residential uses, predominantly retail. And what is being proposed is a doubling – more than

10

15

doubling of that area which will include commercial and retail uses of 45,000 square metres, and then residential uses above.

There is a – the residential tower is set back 32 metres from the shoreline and positioned in the deepest area of the site in order to create good setbacks for the tower from the podium. So you can see there are 14 metre setback from the face of the podium, 32 metres from the foreshore. And that allows us to really reduce the presence and the impact of the tower form on the scale of the public space and the pedestrian experience. design principles which have underpinned the development. And one of those that is most fundamental is – is connections, particularly pedestrian connections. As Alexis was outlining, the development sits right at the threshold of the – of the Pyrmont extensive, I guess, of the city westward, particularly in the form of the bay's development and other developments that are occurring around fish markets and so on. And so that connection east-west is really important, but also north-south. Next.

20

25

30

The connection north leads through to the Maritime Museum and, of course, the future redevelopment around the Maritime Museum that is anticipated. And this project, while that connection exists at the moment, it gets very narrow, particularly around the bridge. And it is also actually narrow around the new Convention Centre. So the development proposes to increase the public space at that point, not only for use, but also for the free movement of people north and south along this edge. East-west perhaps is more critical. I mean, you know, city – Sydney has always struggled a little bit with its east-west connections. They have tended to be compromised.

35

This site, particularly through its industrial use, has a history of that, alienation of those connections to the waterfront. And in many ways, the very large developments along this edge have actually made that difficult as well. So we're paying particular attention to those. In terms of hierarchy, there's the Pyrmont Bridge connection, the Munn Street connection which is actually going to be a new connection, a very enhanced connection. And then an enhancement of already important link that goes through from the light rail around the Convention Centre, the hotel and Exhibition Centre.

40

45

The other really fundamental aspect of this project is recognition that it is part of the kind of experience of Darling Harbour as a great amphitheatre for public festivals and events that are focused on the waterfront. It's been part of a history of Darling Harbour since 1988. And so the creation of more public space along the foreshore and then terraced spaces that can be occupied by the public up through the podium are integral to our thinking about how this project contributes to the cultural life of Darling Harbour. To go through the public domain strategy and – and offering more detail, I might throw over to you, Sacha.

5
10 MR S. COLES: Sacha Coles, Director of ASPECT Studios. Thank you, Richard and everyone else that's gone before. So I might start again a little more back, strategically looking at what the role that Harbourside might play in the life of the waterfront of Sydney. And these three diagrams here go to illustrate that it's not just the waterfront boulevard experience which this forms a major part of. It's recently
15 opened the waterfront of Sydney, but it's also the roofscape which when looked at above is about eight/nine – eight and a half to 9000 square metres of greenspace, some of which is public – and I'll take you through that, the hectare of open – public open space – with the rest of it being extensive green roof, non-accessible, but still planted. So it's a - - -

20 MS LEESON: Would that be accessible to occupants of that building? Or you're just fixing it - - -

MR COLES: There is.

25 MS LEESON: - - - purely as a green roof?

MR COLES: I'll take you through both. There's really three components. One is publicly accessible open space for everybody. The next is the public – well, private
30 communal space for the residential. And then the third is just extensive green roof.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR COLES: So there's three parts to it.

35 MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR COLES: Next, please, Sean. Richard has just taken you through some of the key strategic moves. But this slide here really just talks to the existing public domain
40 area which is close to four and a half thousand square metres. Pretty much all of it is that waterfront boulevard which is un-articulated brick paving for the majority. And the proposal which extends that to 10,000 square metres or a hectare which takes into account the waterfront plus the – the public spaces which come and connect from Pymont Bridge and Pymont, which I'll take you through, Guardian Square, and
45 another 2,000 square metres of accessible roof space. Next.

And that diagram breaks down something like this. All of these spaces in blue are the 24/7 public domain offer and provision which goes with this scheme. So Richard talked about the bridge connections in 7 and 6, I believe it is from here. And then if we take it from the top, the waterfront boulevard number 1 which, again, I'll go into a bit more detail. The event steps which leads people up from the waterfront and then up to the Bunn Street bridge which also forms a – a amphitheatre. Guardian Square, significant entry which we together stood and looked out over the waterfront, imagined actually on site the other day of our tour. Pymont Steps, Pymont Bridge landing, Richard has taken you through those, and Murray Street Bridge, as well as the Bunn Street pedestrian bridge which is a significant connection to Pymont.

And then the other through-site links that – the podium rooftop which is that 2,000 square metres which adjoins Guardian Square as a publicly accessible 24/7 provision of open space. And then the Pymont Bridge paving upgrade which actually sits outside of our – our site, but we'll take you through that as well, experts. Existing photos, we all walked it the other day. Again, doesn't comply with the public domain material standards of the new Darling Harbour. And also this shows the pinch-point of the southern part of the site which is the tightest of spaces. Thanks, Sean.

The minimum or the worst case scenario is that 7.8 metres in the south. And this was the – one of the key discussion points possibly ever since four and a half years ago. We have been involved with government, Place Management New South Wales. The intent was always to widen that pinch-point, both at the south and at the north as it goes up to the Maritime under the bridge, to get – next slide – something more consistent – thank you – which is that 20-metre width from the waterfront edge back to the building edge. That flexes a little bit in terms of the lease-line between three and five metres along the building. But, essentially, what's happened is that Mirvac have pulled their – their building line back to enable that 20 metres in the south. In other cases, that's come forward in the middle, and then pushed back again as you go to the north towards Maritime, to try and remove the pinch-point and get as much space as we possibly can from the promenade.

MS LEWIN: Okay. So, Sacha, just to - - -

MR COLES: Yes.

MS LEWIN: - - - ask a question about that. The – you're suggesting then the – the title or the – the description for the site boundary is, as on one of the plans, described as the lot boundary? And there's an encroachment of built work or the envelope over that lot boundary in two places and the sections of the lower tower. Is that the - - -

MR COLES: That would be for the middle. I'm not sure about the technical lot – Alexis, it's probably a question for you, or David, rather than - - -

MS LEWIN: How would we describe - - -

MR COLES: Yes.

MS LEWIN: How would we understand the site – the legal description of this site in relation to your list of - - -

5

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes. So I guess as part of the arrangement with the unsolicited proposal, there'll be a realignment of the site's boundaries. So in this case here, the footprint will be altered so that we give 474 square metres back to the promenade. So that becomes a Place Management space, additional space, which we're giving up from our site. So on adjustment, there will be a new set of – you know, a new set of – you know, a boundary, you know, guidelines drawn up. There will be a new – you know, a new set of plans that outline the – the new alignment of the leasehold for – for our interests.

10

15 MS LEWIN: Is that in train?

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes, it is. Yes. So that's – that's – there's currently an AFL that's in draft form that's – that's dealing with all these sorts of issues. But, fundamentally on this ground plane, there's a – we've given back 474 square metres of our footprint. And then that will then deal with the – the vertical as well as the – as the horizontal.

20

MS LEWIN: As a trade-off - - -

25 MR HOGENDIJK: That's right.

MS LEWIN: - - - basically. Yes.

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes. Yes.

30

MS LEESON: So the new lease boundary will reflect the footprint of the new – the new building.

MR HOGENDIJK: That's – that's right. So what you see here – or previous slide, I think, with the – have you got the – the Sean? Now, this one here. So that – that's the new – effectively, that is the new lot boundary. So there's – where you see the 20 metre zone, that – the red zone, that goes all around the perimeter of the project. The – where the – where we've shown 15, yes, that's – that's the agreed intrusion zone, if you like, the licensed area for the retail. That can be granted by Place Management down the track. But there's always got to be a maintained – you know, we've got to maintain 15 metres of clear space in those zones, as we've noted there now.

35

40

MS LEESON: And on the northern end then, that's where it drops back to three.

45

MR COLES: Correct.

MR HOGENDIJK: That's right.

MS LEESON: Yes.

5 MR HOGENDIJK: That's right, yes.

MS LEESON: Okay.

10 MR HOGENDIJK: So that was one of the fundamental things that we worked out with SHFA at the very outset of the project.

MS LEESON: And have you done any pedestrian modelling around that, that 15 metres clear, and 11 in the north, clear width for - - -

15 MR HOGENDIJK: We've done some initial modelling, yes. So – so that was – so I think, yes, with others, which is some time ago now. But we can – we can give that to you if – if it's - - -

20 MS LEESON: If it's in – if it's one of the appendices to the EIS, don't – don't worry. We'll - - -

MR COLES: Yes. We looked at level of service - - -

25 MS LEESON: We'll pick it up.

MR COLES: - - - for that.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thanks.

30 MR COLES: Is it okay, Wendy? Keep moving?

MS LEESON: Yes. Thanks, yes.

35 MR COLES: Yes. Thank you. Back – okay. This is – I think back one, Sean, just very quickly. Was just the – the point on this one really was to say that a lot of these that you're seeing in here tie back to the bigger strategic move of coming from Central Station down the boulevard all the way to the Maritime. So through the new Convention and Exhibition Centre, past Tumbalong, down, extending on the western side of Darling Harbour. So that's the trees, and that's this idea of a pedestrian
40 boulevard, with a residential – sorry, with a retail spine elevation which is slightly elevated from the waterfront. Next, please.

45 And this is a detailed slide of the event stairs that was mentioned. It goes up to the Bunn Street connection. Again, one of the – the key suggestions from Place Management New South Wales was more opportunities for events and programming. And this gives an amphitheatre – a public amphitheatre, publicly accessible

opportunity for events to happen in Darling Harbour, and to be viewed by a large population. Next.

5 MS LEESON: So in – in terms of gathering space, you'd have that large 29-metre area at the moment. Although I don't know how many people that takes in event mode. Do you have equivalent capacity by that new proposed piece off the events stairs?

10 MR COLES: We – we have more in total because we've got more space back on the waterfront. I think it's the 480 square metres on the waterfront. So there's more capacity for people, plus – plus this as well. So I think the - - -

MS LEESON: So – so that's overall, the extra 400 - - -

15 MR COLES: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - and 74 square metres. But I'm just thinking. You know, quite often you will have, you know, a small concert or something like that, and there must be a capacity of people in that 29-metre zone at the moment. That area is to the north
20 that you're proposing. Is that of equivalent capacity, more, less? Do you – do you know?

MR COLES: Well, we could come back with a detailed answer to that. But my gut feeling would be more, well more, because you've got the depth of the event stairs
25 and the width of those. And it goes back 40 metres or thereabouts. Plus the elevation, so you get higher, deeper. And the 20 metres consistent gives you more space overall. So without having the exact plan you're after, I would think it would be more.

30 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR COLES: Yes.

MS LEESON: No, I was just thinking of that – sort of that future through-thing - - -
35

MR COLES: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - and an event space. And if – if Sydney is only going to grow
40 and if this precinct is going to have more people in it, it's certainly something we need to consider.

MR CELLA: The event steps are more flexible, aren't they? They're more diverse in terms of - - -

45 MR COLES: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR CELLA: - - -

MR COLES: Everyday users.

5 MR CELLA: There's a different profile - - -

MR COLES: Events.

10 MR CELLA: - - - of events.

MR COLES: I mean, the other thing that I would say on that one, in terms of useability is that because you have these pinch-points, it was very hard to manage that wider space in between. And it was one of the biggest risks that then over Place Management told us was that it was the tight spaces that pinch-points were –
15 were the real problem, people getting in to that. So that's another consideration.

MS LEESON: And the Ferris wheel.

20 MR COLES: Again, I think I'm pretty naïve to its lease obligations. But David - - -

MR HOGENDIJK: Well, the Ferris wheel, I guess, it's a temporary – it's a temporary thing that Place Management run which – which Mirvac supports. And – and they're looking at that currently as to where they might locate that. So I think it's – it's always a bit of a – you know, you have to balance about, you know, the
25 width of the promenade or if you want a really tight promenade and then wide in other areas and create pinch-points. I think that's why also – you know, the introduction of Guardian Square has helped, you know, provide another public space, a 1,500 square metre space that is level with the bridge that looks out over the north. So you could say, "Okay, on balance, we've got another – we've given 470 square
30 metres back to the promenade itself, and then created another 1,500 square metres at Guardian Square." So it's a bit of a balancing act. And I think, you know, that's Place Management. And originally SHFA were – were – the priority for them was to get a consistent lease-line through our – past our projects so that they didn't have that – that pinch-point there on the south particularly.

35 MR COLES: I think it was – also safety was a big issue, on the things like New Year's Eve and – and other events like that. The – the 11 metres was – was not working at all.

40 MR HOGENDIJK: Yes. And I think the other thing at the back – the space at the moment is broken up. So where the Ferris wheel is, it then drops down another - - -

MR COLES: Yes.

45 MR HOGENDIJK: - - - you know, few stairs to the water's edge. So it's a - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR HOGENDIJK: It's not a – it's not the most useable space at either. So – but, look, these are things we obviously developed with the landowner. It wasn't – wasn't – it was something that was collaboratively chosen to do. And it was a bit of a balancing act.

5

MR COLES: So jumping forward, just talking – conscious of time. Talking to level changes. What you can see here is Guardian Square and then the 2,000 square metre roof space which sits above Guardian Square. So together three and a half thousand. And the hope is that through the design excellence process, there is a very seamless way of connecting those two spaces so they read as a larger envelope of space. At the moment, it's the entry forecourt, if you like, which is a big green space. Next, Sean. And that's the – a kind of a skeleton view of the model of what it might be like as you walk out onto Guardian Square towards the water, a skyline view harbour. Next. And then just – they're coming later, aren't they, the other views?

10

15

MS LEESON: So just while you're – excuse me - - -

MR COLES: Yes.

20

MS LEESON: - - - back on that one.

MR COLES: Yes. Go back one.

25

MS LEESON: We've got the – we've had a meeting with the Department this morning. We'll meet with Council this afternoon. But we had a conversation with the Department, just trying to be really clear around the RL of the bridge deck level at that - - -

30

MR COLES: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - point - - -

MR COLES: Yes.

35

MS LEESON: - - - and what the RL of Guardian Square will be at its finished level - - -

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes.

40

MS LEESON: - - - if you like. Are they the same, and the difference is then simply balustrading and/or other structures and trees and things on the space? So the two floor levels, if I can describe it that way - - -

45

MR HOGENDIJK: Sure.

MS LEESON: - - - they're in – they're the same?

MR HOGENDIJK: More – more or less.

MR COLES: Yes. I'd say correct.

5 MR HOGENDIJK: I think it's actually - - -

MR COLES:

10 MS LEESON: It's more or less that keeps me sort of - - -

MR COLES: If you go back – back two - - -

MS LEESON: Because on this - - -

15 MR HOGENDIJK: They both – they both contemplate - - -

MS LEESON: - - - at a quandary.

20 MR HOGENDIJK: - - - contemplate

MR COLES: That one.

25 MR HOGENDIJK: I just want to – I don't want to give you the specific. We can give you the relatives, I think. Have we got the RLs?

MS LEWIN: Yes. There's roughly a two-metre difference.

MR COLES: Yes. Fifty mil?

30 MR L. ATTIWILL: It's within 50 mil, the Pymont Bridge is 11.8.

MS LEWIN: Yes.

35 MR ATTIWILL: The finished floor level of Guardian Square at the moment is 12.5. And then you will see the envelope height is 13.5 or 13.75. So that extra height is to the – the balustrading and light. But the intention and DA conditions is that - - -

MR COLES: It's - - -

40 MR ATTIWILL: - - - Pymont Bridge level and Guardian Square will be designed to be level.

MS LEWIN: So the envelope height is not the deck height.

45 MR ATTIWILL: No.

MR COLES: No.

MR ATTIWILL: No.

MR COLES: No, no.

5 MR ATTIWILL: No. It's to take any landscaping or balustrade height.

MS LEWIN: And confirming that the difference in the proposed RL for Guardian Square is in the order of a metre or under. Is that correct?

10 MR ATTIWILL: So finished floor level at the moment is 12.5 and the envelope is 13.75. So it's about a metre and 25.

MR COLES: But that's the envelope. But the floor levels - - -

15 MR ATTIWILL: Envelope, yes.

MR COLES: - - - are within - - -

MS LEWIN: Floor levels are to be - - -

20

MR ATTIWILL: Floor levels - - -

MR COLES: - - - way less than a metre.

25 MR ATTIWILL: - - - within 50 or – yes. They're 50 minus 70 mil.

MR COLES: Or mils? Less than – or 500, yes.

MS LEWIN: Yes.

30

MR ATTIWILL: Half a metre. So yes.

MR COLES: Half a metre, 500.

35 MR ATTIWILL: 11.8 to - - -

MR COLES: Yes.

MR ATTIWILL: - - - 12.5 is the difference.

40

MS LEESON: Okay. And for the transcript, this was - - -

MR ATTIWILL: Sorry.

45 MS LEESON: Lachlan - - -

MR ATTIWILL: Lachlan Attiwill, I forgot.

MS LEESON: Lachlan Attiwill. Thank you.

MR ATTIWILL: Mirvac.

5 MR HOGENDIJK: Okay.

MR COLES: Yes. I just thought that view there might – I mean, I know it's a render. But it might - - -

10 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR COLES: - - - talk to the intent of that, where you can go from Pymont Bridge back to Murray Darling Drive, turn around. Or if you're coming from the west, come straight on, DDA accessible. All the public spaces are DDA accessible within
15 that 10,000 square metres.

MS LEESON: And I hope you can see our point, that we're trying to be really clear about the - - -

20 MR COLES: Absolutely.

MS LEESON: - - - deck level and the Guardian Square level - - -

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes.

25

MS LEESON: - - - from the overall impact.

MR COLES: I think the intended question was: are you looking into built form, or are you looking back on directly into public realm? And it's the latter.

30

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR COLES: Yes.

35 MR BLECHER: I have a quick question on that as well, if it's all right.

MS LEESON: Yes, certainly.

MR BLECHER: Just I can see that there's trees in the indicative rendering. Is the
40 intent to include deep-soil planting in Guardian Square?

MR COLES: There will be, yes, set down. Like the dimension is set down. Like, the dimension is set down. I can't remember off the top of my head.

45 MR BLECHER: So set down below deck level?

MR COLES: Correct.

MR BLECHER: Okay.

MR COLES: Yes.

5 MR BLECHER: Yes. Thanks.

MR COLES: Next. That view, and we'll just keep going. This is the 2,000 square
metre zone which sits above Guardian Square, which will be accessible from the
bridge across Darling Drive. And, again, this is the area that we – we hope will be
10 resolved together, to be a continuous space through the competition. Next. So scale
comparisons. I might not talk to these, but I'll leave them with you. What they do
show is that this is a – a medium to large piece of open space at three and a half
thousand square metres. Australia Square on the left at the 1,500. Opera House
stairs about four – five and a half thousand. So you can see it's in that mid-range
15 between them, and then Martin Place in the primary public – public place with
Sydney at 7,800. Next.

And then just a couple more views as you get to the edge. And this one actually does
illustrate that relationship with Pyrmont Bridge quite well. I think where you see the
20 balustrade at the water edge filled in. And, again, these are possibilities for Guardian
Square. How this evolves is part and parcel with the design competition. Next. Just
a final render of that one as well. Yes. The next. Thanks, Sean. And then just my
last slide is to say that it's not just the one hectare of open space. I think that's there.
But it's also a \$7 million fund that Mirvac is putting up for place activation as well,
25 which is – which goes to maintenance, which goes to curation of the space as well.
That goes to Government. Back to you, Richard.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Thanks, Sacha. So another important frontage and address
for the project is Darling Drive. And it's important also because it's in pretty bad
30 condition. It's a pretty alienating environment for pedestrians. And part of the
Pyrmont Pace strategy is to try and actually begin to turn that around. We have
got some challenges there, because there's the elevated approach to Pyrmont Bridge.
But our strategy here is to try and enhance and address Darling Drive as much as we
possibly can. So there is an important connection where the light rail is and the
35 Convention Centre just off the image here. That is the roundabout which you can see
there. And our – our strategy here is to look to create a link and an address at this
point too. So it can actually service people arriving from the light rail, arriving by
vehicle.

40 They will be able to move through to the waterfront. They will also be able to move
through into the commercial lobby which is at the upper level, and then through also
into residential lobby and other retail spaces. So as far as possible, we want to have
an active address here. As we go further north and the road abutment elevates, there
is the loading access which is then servicing all the vehicle access requirements, both
45 parking and loading. Height, bulk and scale, something that has been looked at very
closely. The first of those to really talk about is height. In relation to that, we are
within the 170 RL requirement that is identified in the pin-up against the Place

Strategy. And then, of course, there is the podium heights which have undergone considerable refinement consultation during this process.

5 This drawing here also places them in a broader context around Darling Harbour and continuing up to Barangaroo. And if you look at those elevations, you can see RLs at around 13, coming down to 20 or 22 around the bridge, and then coming up again to 25, wrapping around where they connect to the pool deck of the hotel, which is about 27. And then they step down to the north of our site to align with the deck level of Pyrmont Bridge and then, of course, extend up again as we come to the
10 Maritime Museum. So this is just really looking at that context of podium and human scale that forms that ring around Darling Harbour and north towards Barangaroo. If we then elevate that relationship, you can see here this elevation shows the tower sitting below the 170 RL, and then shows the different levels of the podium. Next.

15 MS LEESON: Just on that one there, where you have the built form, the envelope control at 80 per cent for the tower and the podium. That's what the Department's recommending.

20 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MS LEESON: We note in the documentation there's a – there was a request for flexibility to, I think, 88 per cent. Was that across the tower and the podium?

25 MR HOGENDIJK: No. Just - - -

MS LEESON: Or just one? And - - -

MR HOGENDIJK: Just – just the podium.
30

MS LEESON: And the reason for that being?

MR HOGENDIJK: Well, I think from our – I mean, we – we can live with the 80 per cent. But you will see in the upcoming slides about the – the numerous changes
35 that are being made around the envelope itself on the podium. In particular, probably the northern end is under more pressure in terms of being very close to the actual final floor levels that are on the reference scheme now. So I guess our view was to have more flexibility than less within an agreed envelope was our preference. But we understood the Department's logic. I think having looked at it, we – we can – we
40 can live with it. The tower, we had a lot more time because we did like a lot of different schemes within that – within that 80 per cent control. But the 80 per cent control on the podium was something we sort of discussed relatively late in the process.

45 But I think in retrospect, given where Guardian Square is and how that works, we – we can – we can make it work. But I think as we all know, you agree an envelope these days and then having another – effectively another envelope within an

envelope makes it harder to – to really give it to the architects to – to create something that’s unusual. But having said that, I think there’s – you know, there’s more flexibility in some elements of the podium than others. But I think we are quite constrained on that northern end, in particular.

5

MS LEESON: Thanks. Sorry, Richard.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Thanks. No problem. Just illustrating that very point. There’s this series of images so that - - -

10

MS LEESON: I should have waited.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: So that the – yes. We could take away. Thank you, Commissioner. The frame is shown in blue there. And then what we’ve just demonstrated here is different ways in which you can occupy or fill that envelope with associated plan below. So there is the opportunity for the Department in the next stage to refine in particular the positioning and form of the tower. Coming to the podium. As David was alluding to, that has undergone a great deal of consultation. I’ll take you through this quite quickly. Here, we’re looking at the southern part of that podium, and there’s a set-down to take account of views. This is a little bit historic, so we’re going back to August 2016 where it was set-down in relation to the hotel pool deck. It was then actually – that set-down was extended so that the view sharing could be more broad, and also it could service the Convention Centre. And then, interesting enough, in 2016 in August then it was actually related to a pre-agreed level that had existed between the proponents for the hotel, so that was then applied all the way across there, with all of the stakeholders being satisfied with this approach, as far as I’m aware.

15

20

25

30

MS LEESON: And so those RLs as now proposed accommodate the agreement with the hotel?

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Correct. They follow that.

35

MR HOGENDIJK: And the ICC also, so - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: And the ICC.

MS LEESON: Okay.

40

45

MR FRANCIS-JONES: That’s right. Next. So then at the northern end this shows an earlier version – this was actually in May, so prior to another level of engagement, in particular, with the Department’s consultant, Professor Peter Webber, and this was where the mass at this northern part of the building was being adjusted to create a more satisfactory relationship with Pymont Bridge. Next.

And where that arrived is this diagram that you can see here. This was in May 2018 where that – lines were struck in relation to particular view lines from the lower

levels of the residential building, 50 Murray Street. Then a little bit later still, so now here in March and June in 2020, there was further consultation with the Department and their expert consultant, and as part of that there were these – what I think ended up being quite important refinements to that envelope, which dropped that envelope
5 down to the level that we’ve just been discussing that aligns with Pyrmont Bridge, but then also opened up additional view corridors, in particular, to the north-east from the Murray Street apartments. Next.

10 So just to illustrate to you that last adjustment that happened last year, this is at March 2020 prior to that final round with the Department and their consultant, and then this is after that consultation. This view is taken approximately from the position in which the Commission has requested some additional views. Part of that consultation process involved redistribution of the areas, as David was alluding to. It
15 – you know, the refinement of the envelope had actually created quite a tight relationship between GFA and envelope, and so part of that space was then redistributed to the tower.

To try and illustrate those as clearly as possible then we just animated our model here to give you a sense of not only those relationships but the more broader context of
20 the city, but also a sense of the process. So this is just a use illustration, similar to the one that Alexis took us through around Darling Harbour and the adjacent city and Pyrmont areas. There’s our site identified there. And then, of course, somewhere around there there will be the metro station. So that address to the north and that connection through Pyrmont is only going to become more important.

25 This diagram here illustrates the envelope and the existing podium condition or ground plane condition along the waterfront, and then how that has been adjusted and then increased to create more appropriate floor to floor heights. Connections through to always maintained. This shows an earlier version of the proposal
30 where the tower is located north, and then that was setback, but then it was also changed to residential, as along the lines we were just talking about, which allowed a much slimmer envelope, more adjustments to the podium, and then, finally, a tower position determined that would allow much greater view sharing and also alignment with Bunn Street, and also, of course, the east-west alignments with the foreshore
35 and Darling Drive. Very good separations were maintained with residential buildings and, in particular, with the hotel and, most important, Pyrmont Bridge.

And then the process of refinement of this envelope took place over a period of years, taking into account particular view lines from the Convention Centre, which
40 you see there from the sensitive areas of the hotel, most important being the pool deck. And then that was rationalised to the pre-agreement that we became aware of – subsequently became aware of, giving us those RLs that you can see there. And then the tower located on the southern alignment of Bunn Street, as I was just explaining. And then this northern approach went through an equally close look –
45 probably more so, actually, in terms of its relationship to the heritage items. And then, in particular, a final round of adjustments with the Department and their

consultant in relation to view sharing and also producing a more satisfactory and accommodating relationship to the bridge and an enhanced public domain.

5 Probably the final part of that process was the raised level that is identified there,
which was then always seen as a landscaped space, but then subsequently was
designated for public access. There were – there was some hesitation over that
during the process because of potential impacts on the residential building behind,
with that being a public use, but the Department subsequently made the decision that
10 that was appropriate. That then gave us the envelope and the configuration and the
guidelines that have been submitted and for which the Department have produced a
report.

15 So I mentioned that the – you know, the most important heritage item, of course, that
we are addressing is Pymont Bridge. Not only a really important heritage item, but
increasingly important pedestrian access into Pymont and into the city. One of the
most compromised areas of the current Harbourside development is this area around
the bridge. It is very compromised in terms of access and distance of separation,
and, therefore, this envelope is setback a minimum of seven metres from the
alignment of the bridge, which we saw during our site tour, and Sacha spoke about
20 that series of connections through and down, and those view lines which we think
create a sympathetic and satisfactory relationship with the bridge.

25 Another really important issue which has been constantly looked at during the
process is amenity impacts, both public and private. View sharing, perhaps, from the
private domain I might talk about first. This shows that kind of history of overlays
that you can see there, and throughout the process, moving from left to right, I think
there has been a noticeable and measurable increase in view sharing with the
apartments and the buildings behind. Next. During this process there has been a
priority given to those sensitive views, particularly to the north-east and where you
30 will look over the new public domain.

35 So if we just – we've looked at 11 sites there. You have all the analysis provided. I
will just quickly go through four of those buildings, perhaps starting with 4 Murray
Street. So modelling has taken place across all those apartments, including some
photomontage locations. Yes. Next. And this is an assessment following tenacity of
view impacts on those apartments. The ones located in red are identified as severe,
and they are at the lowest level towards the south, as you can see in that diagram.
There are four of those apartments. And there are a series of views that have been
provided with the data. This is an excerpt from those. This is from apartment 201. I
40 think that may have been one that you visited. Next. And then this is a view from
204, so this is the lowest - - -

MS LEWIN: Would you mind flipping back to that - - -

45 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Oh, sure.

MS LEWIN: - - - please?

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. Sorry, I was going a bit too fast, so - - -

MS LEWIN: No.

5 MR FRANCIS-JONES: So the image at the top shows where that apartment is
located, and then the bottom two images show a before, on the left, and a – an after
on the right. And these are images which were provided in accordance with Urbis’
analysis of the view. Next. Sorry and then this is another view, also from
10 apartment 204, so this is I think the most southern, lowest apartment. And this is –
again, there is – all the views are provided in the information. We’re here focusing
on the north-east.

MS LEESON: So this apartment here - - -

15 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. Could you go back, Sean

MS LEESON: This one here, I think - - -

MR CELLA: So we’ve selected those four apartments we visited last week.
20

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR CELLA: Yes.

25 MS LEESON: We - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: We have.

MS LEESON: We visited them last week. That’s right.
30

MR CELLA: Correct.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

35 MS LEESON: And so this one, I think we worked out doesn’t have a view over
Guardian Square. It looks straight to the podium, but has the upper level of public
domain; is that right?

40 MR FRANCIS-JONES: I think from this image you will see, actually, that it – that
from this particular view when you’re looking north-east it’s actually split halfway.
So that image that you can see on the right there shows the upper podium level - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

45 MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - which will be a publicly assessable - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - garden space. And then the lower – down low, actually behind that foliage is - - -

MS LEESON: Behind the shrub.

5

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Is the Guardian Square space.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Next. And then this is a view slightly higher in the building from apartment 404, so this is where we start to see the water to the north of Pymont Bridge. And, again, this is quite a southern located apartment, but we are looking north-east.

15 MR HOGENDIJK: Just interesting to note, on the right-hand side that bridge is the existing pedestrian bridge that's currently in place that – that we retain, as requested by the residents.

MS LEESON: The right-hand view?

20

MR HOGENDIJK: That's right.

MS LEESON: Yes. Yes.

25 MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes. You can see it in both views, actually, because it is being retained.

MR HOGENDIJK: Yes.

30 MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: And then this is the view from 504, so slightly higher. A similar view position. And, Alexis, I think you wanted to - - -

35 MR CELLA: Yes.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: - - - make a few comments.

MR CELLA: Sure.

40

MR FRANCIS-JONES: I'll pass over to you for a second.

MR CELLA: Look, we – we've spent a lot of time over the last five years engaging with 50 Murray Street, One Darling Harbour. We've had a number of meetings with them. We've, you know, kind of bent over backwards to try and accommodate, as you can see through the scheme – you know, key moves, tower moving, podium reduction height. So, you know, I suppose the scheme we're putting forward to you

today has, you know, really tried to balance everything in terms of protecting views and kind of – you know, the view sharing principle. So, you know, you can see the amount of work and material that's submitted is comprehensive and, in my opinion, unprecedented, the level of assessment and analysis we've done.

5

You know, if we just look at those most affected apartments at 50 Murray – you know, two of those we went to, to 201 and 204. You know, they still retain expansive and dominant views of the CBD skyline, including Centrepont Tower. You might have picked that up. They still experience excellent outlook, expansive sky views, the benefit from enhanced views from the existing situation where they're looking over the – kind of the tired and dominant roofscape of Harbourside Shopping Centre, and, you know, this new and improved podium with a lot of focus on greenery on the rooftop. And also worth noting, you know, all apartments in 50 Murray have access to a communal rooftop space at the top which has, you know, 180 degree views across Sydney Harbour and the CBD.

I thought – there's a quote down the bottom there, that last point, and this is an extract from the Sydney Harbour Catchment REP, so it's kind of – you know, it's useful and it – it was kind of – it helped guide the assessment in terms of the visual impact, that – this principle of, you know, public good taking precedence over private good. So, you know, when considering, you know, the view impacts from a private perspective, you know, there is – when you, you know, chunk it up in terms of what the proposal is in front of you today, there is public good taking precedence over private good.

25

There's – you know, we're creating significant new areas of public open space, providing new opportunities for views. You'll see in those images we've provided – you know, Guardian Square, this new 2,000 square metre of open space, expansive views that, you know, not just people living in this area, but, you know, anywhere from Sydney, any international visitor can come and experience and really appreciate and enjoy, you know, everything that Sydney Harbour has to offer.

There's improved pedestrian connectivity, you know, with improving the north-south foreshore capacity, but, you know, really improving east-west connectivity across Pyrmont, which is, you know, one of the key constraints that, you know, the community has around getting around. You know, the whole public domain experience – Sacha's touched on, you know, the \$7 million of activation fund, you know, so Mirvac's not just upgrading, you know, the public realm, but they're also investing in the activation and ongoing vibrancy of this part of Darling Harbour.

40

And then, lastly, you know, the real focus and tension on, you know, trying to preserve and improve the appreciation of Pyrmont Bridge, you know, which is such a special heritage item. So, you know, just contextually understanding all those things, I thought it was worth highlighting, so - - -

45

MS LEESON: Thanks, Alexis.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Next. So, of course, there are other buildings. There's the Sofitel, the Convention Centre Hotel, so those viewpoints have also been looked at. Next. Perhaps most important in relation to the hotel is the view from the pool deck, so here you can see a before and after view of that, following, of course, the
5 established RLs that we talked about a moment ago. Next. And then also in relation to the Novotel Hotel, so all those positions have been studied and included in the assessment. Next. Looking at just one of those from a central position, we compare here a before and after view with what views been retained from that position. Next. And then looking north-east from that same position.

10 And then, of course, there is the Ibis Hotel, so we've also included analysis from that. I've just dipped into that for this presentation. Next. And that is showing a before and after from that position which has been indicated there in the top left. Next. Beyond views from private domain, there is, of course, the very important
15 views from the public spaces. There were a series of viewpoints that were determined and agreed with the Department for which analysis was undertaken, and with that, undertaken by a specialist consultant. In addition to that there were some views in which the Commission has requested during the site walk, which I think we sent through this morning.

20 MS LEESON: We've received some documents this morning, thank you.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Excellent. Thank you. Shadow analysis: I just wanted to touch on that in terms of those impacts. And just contextually here, if we look at this
25 view, one of the most important parameters for us was that we didn't create any additional overshadowing on Tumbalong Park, which it's not located. And then there are – there is the impact on the promenade around the bay. What is important, of course, is that it is seen in the context of an increased public domain, so an increased harbourside walk, but also the significant increase in public space north
30 facing on Guardian Square. Next.

So if we look at the overshadowing, this is 21st of June, you can see – if you look at those lower images, the bottom left shows you that view at 1 o'clock. So then after 1
35 o'clock, from 2 through to just before 3, there is a shadowing effect on that portion of the promenade. Next. And then at the equinox, of course, there is a shadowing effect, but it's much less. Important here is that that effect is not for long and that it is in the context of a development that is creating a more public space which is in continuous sunlight. Next.

40 Another very important microclimate effect is wind. There's been very extensive modelling of the wind effects. I won't go through this in too much detail. Next. What is important, I think, is that the – there were 38 positions that have been looked at. The overall outcome is comparable to the existing, on the whole. If you look at
45 the specific analysis on those points, you'll see most of them are actually either the same or enhanced, but a couple are slightly less, and that those areas of negative wind condition can be suitably mitigated. Some of those are – most of those are generally located up in the tower upper levels of the podium which are not publicly

accessible and, therefore, the Department had concluded that the wind effects can be managed, in terms of pedestrian amenity and comfort and safety.

5 Sustainability: there are some ambitious targets for sustainability that has been the subject of a lot of discussion with the Department. There are a series of Green Star's and neighbours' requirements and objectives that are shown there. There is also an ambition to go further than that which Mirvac are very interested in pursuing, which is the possibility of, I think, being the first Green Star retail and residential project, if that can be looked at. But the list that you see list that you see there represents
10 the targets that were agreed with the Department. Next.

Parking and servicing: there is car parking determined for the site which reflects the category B rates for the city of Sydney. I think that it's about 307 – 306 cars and they're accommodated in below grade car parking. Next. And the servicing that I
15 explained from that other image is from the northern end under the abutment of the Darling Drive access, so it's well separated from pedestrian movement areas, a safe and discrete way of servicing the site, and there is a secondary below grade basement dock servicing the southern portion of the site.

20 MS LEESON: And from – what we understand from Council's submission, this is proposing a level of servicing significantly below that which the DCP would require. Are you comfortable that in a future DA stage it can be adequately resolved, the level of servicing?

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

MS LEESON: I think it worked out something like 63 per cent of what Council's DCP would be is what's being proposed.

30 MR ATTIWILL: Yes. So – sure. Lachlan Attiwill from Mirvac. Yes, it is less than the City of Sydney DCP, but we've worked very closely with a number of industry experts in this. Mirvac will be a long-term owner so we've consulted closely with Mirvac asset management, who will run it in the future. We've also worked with management consultant, traffic advisers and FJMT. We've looked
35 at a number of other projects where they've also been less than the DCP, and through putting forward a compelling case, working with advisers and also putting management plans in place and through detailed design, we're satisfied that we think what we're proposing here is an effective and efficient loading dock solution.

40 MS LEESON: And the car parking for the commercial precinct, I mean, you're not proposing any on this site. You're relying, I think, on existing lease arrangements with Novotel for - - -

45 MR HOGENDIJK: Yes. That's correct. So there's an entitlement in our current lease for up to 250 spaces in the Novotel. We don't think we will need anything like that. So that's another consideration that's being dealt with in the current AFL discussions. So at the end of that process, which is obviously separate to this

planning process, there will be a new lease which can advise all the new property boundaries, the new car parking arrangements, etcetera. So all the high level - - -

MS LEESON: Right.

5

MR HOGENDIJK: - - - issues that the landowner will sign up to with ourselves when they enter into a new 99-year lease.

MS LEESON: Okay.

10

MR HOGENDIJK: But I think what the – the beauty of that is we don't have to build more parking for office space, which is great. And I think - - -

MS LEESON: So then the parking or the traffic analysis that's been done is assuming the commercial car parking as part of the baseline analysis and only modelling the additional 307 spaces for the residential; is that how it's working?

15

MR ATTIWILL: The traffic modelling is for the basement car parking we're seeking on our site.

20

MS LEESON: Yes. So - - -

MR ATTIWILL: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - the other parking would be assumed to be in the baseline?

25

MR ATTIWILL: Correct. Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes. Okay.

30

MR ATTIWILL:

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR ATTIWILL: Yes.

35

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Thank you. I think I'll pass over to you now, David.

MR HOGENDIJK: Sure.

40

MS LEESON: I just have one – if you're going to wrap up, just one other question. You've called on the Pymont Peninsula Precinct Strategy, in terms of referencing the permissible RL for the precinct, and the Darling Harbour Development Plan that says residential is fine. We note in the Pymont Strategy that it calls out sustainability and looks at net zero emissions 2050. So you – you're identifying what you're calling stretch targets in here for this precinct. Have you given any further thought to perhaps net zero by 2050?

45

And then the second issue, I think, that we've gleaned from the strategy is around residential floor plates. Now, this is – sorry – the residential floor plates within the proposed Design and Place SEPP that's coming up. And we appreciate that that's a – an Explanation of Intended Effects that's on exhibition at the moment, so it's not
5 the draft SEPP, but heading to a view of floor plates of 700 metres or thereabouts, I think, for residential towers over nine storeys. This is clearly quite a lot larger than that. Have you had any sort of thoughts around that likely SEPP coming into – or that possible SEPP coming into play?

10 MR HOGENDIJK: Look, I – we have, but I think, you know, currently the controls allow for the floor plate sizes we – we've got and I think that we have to work with what's there now. The – it's a – you know, once again, it's a balance about utilising existing GFA that we've proposed and work with the Department. So, you know, the
15 various uses now sort of all form part of the overall proposal that works financially, because, you know, this project hopefully is something that can be delivered in the short-term, so it's not a long-term proposition.

As you know, we've got a design excellence process to run with the Department, which a Government Architect has now signed off. So that's been a pretty rigorous
20 process where we've now got six architects competing, rather than the three that was initially proposed. So a lot of those issues we will intend to explore further, but I think reality is that we've got a floor plate size for the tower at the moment that we're working to. It's very hard to redistribute space around the site.

25 The 87,000 square metres of GFA, I think the Department supports that being, you know, an appropriate amount of space for this site when you look at the FSR on the site, which I think is a little bit like – it's about 4.2:1. You know, behind us you've got 10.2:1, I think, from the ICC itself, and I think Cockle Bay is just under 4:1. So that all – the actual GFA and the actual FSR on the site we think, you know, works,
30 and it works for us in order to deliver the public realm, but I think if there's more pressuring in on the envelope to condense the floor plates, it does put further pressure on the project, in terms of delivering it, because it – basic commercial parameters are going to be at play.

35 MS LEESON: Yes. Thank you.

MR CELLA: I might just add, the – our proposed built form and envelope aligns with the City of Sydney's controls, in terms of floor plate size for residential towers. So they've got a control of 1,000 square metres, which we're consistent with. You
40 know, they'll – as I understand, there'll be transition arrangements if this new SEPP – amendments to SEPP 65 come in, so, you know, we're hoping we'll be protected through those transitional provisions our proposal, so - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

45 MR HOGENDIJK: But I think, as you've seen, it's a very complex site. There's numerous stakeholders involved and it's – you know, it's a real push/pull – you

know, if you pull a bit over here, you need to put a bit back there. It's – so we're really – it's been – you know, the Convention Centre, the hotel and the other hotels, the Novotel, and the apartment owners and – so it's been a you know, I think we started this journey with SHFA with Katherine Gallagher and Deborah Dearing.

5

So, you know, I think it's – I mean, I still think it'll be a fantastic project for Sydney. I think the introduction of Guardian Square, which the Department initiated with us, is a fantastic outcome. I think we said we'd like to try and link the additional 2,000 with that space, which we think a design competition will do, but it's – and I think the other thing is it is supporting, you know, non-residential uses. It's double the amount of GFA that's there that we've proposed. And we think it's a really sensible mix for this side of Darling Harbour. It's a great transition zone. It's – we're not in the CBD. We're not in Pyrmont proper. We're sort of – you know, we're in that transition between the two. So it's something that Mirvac's very passionate about. It's a real true mixed use project. It really has to work as one, and it's been a real juggling act to make it work. I think we've - - -

10

15

MS LEESON: Oh, there's no doubt you've been on a bit of a journey with that tower moving along the site and changing form quite - - -

20

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Yes.

MS LEESON: Quite significantly.

25

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Commissioner, I might just add in relation to Australian – the ADG, in terms of the objectives, I think – those controls, in terms of supporting high quality residential amenity, but also shared amenity, to make sure that's we think this proposal is very sound from that perspective. The amenity from being within this building with a floor plate that size is going to be exceptional. Certainly, solar access, view and scale and privacy are all good. And then building separation, as you probably saw from those diagrams, is actually very, very generous and well beyond that ADG. So we think in this instance, in this particular location, it's a very sound proposition.

30

35

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MS LEWIN: Thank you.

MR HOGENDIJK: Thanks for

40

MS LEESON: Well, thank you. Wendy, any questions from you?

MS LEWIN: I think many of the questions have been addressed - - -

45

MS LEESON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: - - - in the presentations and I think we can offer to follow-up with a few - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

5

MS LEWIN: - - - requests if – after this – after our discussions. Thank you. It was a comprehensive presentation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

10

MS LEESON: All right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure. Thank you.

15

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks for your time.

MS LEESON: Thank you very much for that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for your time.

20

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

MS LEESON: Thank you for the site inspection the other day and we will - - -

25

MS LEWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - see you again next week at the public - - -

MS LEWIN: Oh, there is - - -

30

MS LEESON: At the public meeting. Oh, sorry.

MS LEWIN: Excuse me. One question – one request: would you please provide on the solar analysis or shadow diagrams the existing shadows cast by Harbourside in red or something in a colour or a hash - - -

35

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Contrasting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

40

MS LEWIN: Something that is highly contrasting with the greys and greens that you provide in the it's simply as a base control for us - - -

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Okay. Sure. Sure. Yes.

45

MS LEWIN: - - - that we need to have. In all of the decisions that we make there's always got to be a reference to a base as a control.

MR FRANCIS-JONES: Sure

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

5 MS LEWIN: Baseline. Yes. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

10 MS LEESON: Thank you very much for that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Wendy. Thanks guys. Thanks for your time.

15 MS LEESON: Thanks. Thanks for your time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks.

MS LEESON: Close the meeting.

25 **RECORDING CONCLUDED** **[2.49 pm]**