



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-1453799

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

DEPARTMENT STAKEHOLDER MEETING

RE: HARBOURSIDE SHOPPING CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT (SSD 7874)

PANEL: **DIANNE LEESON, Chair**
WENDY LEWIN

OFFICE OF IPC: **KATE MOORE**
KANE WINWOOD
SAMMY HAMILTON

DEPARTMENT: **ANTHONY WITHERDIN**
AMY WATSON
DAVID GLASGOW

DATE: **12.00 PM, TUESDAY, 20 APRIL 2021**

VENUE: **Videoconference**

MS D. LEESON: All right. Well, before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Harbourside Shopping Centre Redevelopment Project. The Harbourside Shopping Centre is located towards the north-western corner of the Darling Harbour precinct on the southwestern 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's buildings and structures.

10 My name is Dianne Leeson. I am the Chair of this Commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner, Wendy Lewin. We're also joined by Kate Moore from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission, and Kane 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 information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

20 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 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 they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. Well, thank you for your time. We appreciate the Department assisting us in this one.

30 We've provided an agenda which has quite a few items on it, and we also sent an email about further themes that we would like the Department to talk through in today's meeting, and that was particularly the analysis of the building envelopes, both the podium and tower, in consideration of public domain overshadowing, view impact and sharing, including any alternatives; and the relevance and consideration of the proposed Design and Place SEPP, noting that the explanation of intended effect is on exhibition. So they were two matters we would particularly like to discuss today. Before we get to that matter, though, I will turn it over to the Department to provide a brief summary of the Department's assessment report and recommendation. You are on mute, I think – no. You may need to turn up your volume.

MR WITHERDIN: Hello, can you hear us now?

45 MS LEESON: We can hear you now. Thank you.

MR A. WITHERDIN: Okay. Yes. So good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Anthony Witherdin, and I'm the Director of Key Sites, and I'm here today with my colleagues Amy Watson, who is a team leader in my team, and David Glasgow; he's a principal planner. And we've all assessed the proposal before us today. I've asked
5 Amy and David to provide a brief summary of the Department's assessment report and to run through the key issues associated with the proposal, so that takes up agenda item 2 and 3. And we will also touch on the additional questions that the Commission sent through on the proposal. So if the Commission would like, we can just start with running through the Department's summary of our assessment report.

10 MS LEESON: Thank you, Anthony. That would be good.

MR WITHERDIN: Amy will run through the summary of our assessment report.

15 MS A. WATSON: My name is Amy Watson, and I'm just going to run through a summary of our assessment report and recommendations. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing shopping centre and concept approval for a building envelope comprising the residential tower and non-residential podium. The proposal would have a maximum height of RL166.95 42,000 square metres of residential
20 floorspace and 45,000 square metres of non-residential floorspace. It also involves three and a half thousand square metres of new publicly accessible open space, in addition to enlarge and revitalise public domain along the foreshore and new through-site links.

25 The proposal was first submitted in late 2016 and revised by the Applicant on three occasions in response to concerns raised by the community, Council, agencies, and the Department. The Department engaged Professor Peter Webber as an independent design advisor to review the proposal on an iterative basis. The advisor attended several workshops and provided feedback through the assessment process.

30 Following a thorough review of the impacts and benefits of the proposal, the advisor now supports the final built form that has been presented to the Commission. The Department's assessment concludes:

35 *The proposal is consistent with the strategic context for Darling Harbour, as it contributes to economic growth, job creation, and will deliver new and improved public domain activation, accessibility and connectivity. The height, bulk and scale is compatible with the existing and emerging character of Darling Harbour and complies with the maximum height in the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy.*

40 *The impacts of the proposal have been mitigated by the Applicant and are on balance reasonable and acceptable in terms of view loss, overshadowing to traffic, and the proposal would result in substantial public benefits, including three and a half thousand square metres of new publicly accessible open space,*
45 *new through-site pedestrian links, an enlarged and upgraded pedestrian foreshore, affordable housing, contribution to public art and heritage interpretation. Overall, the Department considers the proposal is in the public*

interest and is approvable subject to a suite of conditions to ensure that the future application proposes a development that is capable of delivering design excellence and a high-quality built form and public domain outcome for Darling Harbour.

5

So if you like, we can now move on to our discussion on the key themes of the new agenda.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

10

MS WATSON: Okay. So the first theme was the integration of spaces and connectivity. So the Department supports the proposed works to improve pedestrian movement in and around the site, which include increasing the boulevard width from 14 to 20 metres, providing a new through-site link from the waterfront and through
15 the site to a new pedestrian bridge over Darling Drive and the rail corridor to Bunn Street and providing new stairs from Pymont Bridge down to the waterfront. The Department also considers the two new areas of publicly accessible rooftop space will provide a valuable asset to Darling Harbour and Pymont.

20

These include the lower 1500 square metre open space aligning with the deck level of the Pymont Bridge, and a further 2000 square metres of open space on the upper northern podium roof, which was previously proposed as a landscape roof but is capable of being an attractive and functional area of open space in conjunction with the lower 1500 square metre area. The Department notes that the detailed design of
25 these spaces will be subject to resolution through the design competition and the future DA, and we recommend a condition to ensure that the transition between the levels is of civic quality, encouraging connection and connectivity, and the landscaping and other elements provide attractive, activated and high amenity open spaces. I will now move on to land use. So the Department - - -

30

MS LEESON: Before you move on – sorry, before you move on, can we just talk about that promenade space a little more. As we understand it, the Applicant proposes to widen the promenade in two locations, being at the southern and northern end of the site, to achieve 20 metres, but pull back the width that's currently
35 29 metres to around – to 20 metres, so that you get a consistent 20 metres up until that 14-metre transition. And the 14-metre transition and the 20-metre area to the south are both obviously improvements to what's existing at the moment. The other is pulling it back a little.

40

Has any pedestrian modelling been done to support the analysis around the width of the promenade and what needs to be there? And the reason I ask is that there are two issues at play, I think, for our minds. One is around the future of the Ferris wheel that's there and whether that's likely to remain, and the other is whether the 20 metres is a free and uncluttered 20 metres, so without occupation by, for example,
45 café tables and seating. So is it a clear – do you understand it to be a clear 20-metre width, or it's likely to be in fact a reduced width once there's some outdoor seating

and dining put in? And that's driving, I think, the question around what pedestrian modelling might have been undertaken.

5 MR WITHERDIN: In terms of the modelling, we will be happy to take that on notice so that we can come back with the accurate answer on that. And in terms of whether or not the 20 metres is clear or uncluttered, my understanding is that that 20 metres would be clear.

10 MS WATSON: We will confirm that.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR D. GLASGOW: There are areas along for the seating the frontage.

15 MR WITHERDIN:

MS LEESON: Sorry, David, you're hard to hear. Can you get closer to the microphone, David?

20 MR GLASGOW: So there are areas along the frontage for seating. There's sections provided for that in the Applicant's design report, which compare that to the existing, which also has seating areas. So we can provide those to you separately, but they show sections of the promenade in those three sections, including the 20-metre sections, and they all include an area of seating and a clear area, and that's compared to the existing, which the existing also has areas of seating in the existing promenade width.

MS LEESON: Thank you. If you can give us - - -

30 MR GLASGOW:

MS LEESON: Sorry, David, what was that?

35 MR GLASGOW: I said, so the existing widths that are noted for comparison, they also include seating areas as well. The Applicant's design report has comparative sections of existing and proposed which compare existing and proposed, taking account of existing seating and proposed seating in that width.

40 MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. If you're able to provide that reference point in the documentation, that would be appreciated. Thank you. And just while we're on that promenade area of the site generally, can you confirm whether the lot boundary reflects the existing lease boundary or if it's not reflective of the current development site. We're trying to work out lot boundaries, lease boundaries and future proposed development boundary.

45 MS W. LEWIN: And to add to that, usually there's a legal definition of a site for development, and broadly we're wondering how is this site legally described. With

that comes, is it the lot boundary, and what are the boundaries that are able to be used to describe that lot if that is indeed the area that this development is intended to occupy? We see also that there's a very different boundary for the DA, and it's – none of it has been described in a quantifiable way.

5

MR WITHERDIN: We understand the question. We will look into that. We will take that on notice and we will get back to you with an answer.

MS LEWIN: Thank you very much.

10

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MS WATSON: Okay. So in relation to land use, the Department carefully considered Council's and the community's concerns about the residential use, and, on balance supports residential development on this site as it is permissible under the Darling Harbour Development Plan, it would not compromise the objects of the Darling Harbour Development Plan as it contributes to the creation of a mixed use precinct, it prioritises employment-generating floorspace by providing more than 50 per cent non-residential floorspace, and overall delivers significant public benefits, including increased open space, activation, accessibility, connectivity, and will contribute to the overall enjoyment of the foreshore on Darling Harbour as a public asset. And we've provided a more detailed discussion in that report. We're happy to take any further comments or questions on that.

MS LEESON: No, thank you for that. Just on that sort of land use, you mentioned public domain again. I should have asked at the last – when we were talking about the previous question. The 10,000 or the 10,200 square metres of public domain comprises, I think, 4800 square metres on the promenade, the additional three and a half thousand square metres on the northern podium. Is it right that the balance – so that gives 8200. Is it right that the balance of that is essentially then the connection through Bunn Street and the connection back up to Pyrmont Bridge?

MS WATSON: That's right. We have totalled it at 8200 square metres, but the Applicant has included additional areas of public domain that they would – that are shown in the indicative scheme that they would intend to deliver, but we haven't included those specific areas, noting that they are indicative at this point.

MS LEESON: Okay. So they're essentially calling that up as their public domain, and it's those connections. That's fine. I understand now. Thank you. Thanks. Wendy, do you have any other questions on sort of public domain issues while we're at this point?

MS LEWIN: No. I think we're fine.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: Something else might come up.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MS WATSON: That's okay. So the next item in the list of themes was height, bulk, scale and density. So firstly I will talk about height, bulk and scale. So the building envelope was critically reviewed by the Department's independent urban design advisor, who ultimately supported the tower with a height of up to RL166.95, which aligns with the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy and was centrally located to reduce its impact on the Pymont Bridge, minimise visual impact and relate to the ICC Sofitel Hotel and other towers along the southern edge of Cockle Bay.

The Department's assessment concluded that the height, bulk and scale of the tower is consistent with the existing and emerging character of Darling Harbour, and the location of the tower represents an acceptable outcome in terms of balancing visual impacts, view loss and heritage impacts. The tower floorplate was considered acceptable subject to a maximum volumetric utilisation of 80 per cent and the Applicant's commitment to a design competition. The Department concluded that the whole height, bulk and scale of the podium was acceptable, as it provided varied heights, responded to the neighbouring building and the Pymont Bridge, and is appropriately set back from the waterfront and the Pymont Bridge.

The northern podium height is lower than the ridgeline of the existing shopping centre and allows direct level access to the Pymont Bridge and the opportunity for significant new rooftop publicly accessible open space. The Department also recommended that the podium be subject to a maximum volumetric utilisation of 80 per cent to ensure that the final form achieves a high amount of articulation and allows flexibility in the design competition for various built form options to be explored. In terms of density, the Department notes that the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy envisages a tower of up to RL170 metres on the site, but it doesn't provide any objectives or directions in relation to density.

The Department considered the density on its merits and concluded that the increase in floorspace has strategic merit, as it provides a significant increase to employment-generating floorspace and has excellent access to existing and future public transport. It results in a floorspace ratio of approximately 4.2 to one, which is comparable with surrounding sites. The building height and scale are appropriate. It has acceptable overshadowing, view loss and traffic impacts, and will create significant public benefits.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Amy. We understand that the Pymont Peninsula Strategy is referencing a height of RL170 as appropriate, and we recognise your recommendation about an 80 per cent development compared to the envelope that's provided, and that applies both to the tower and to the podium. The indicative design that's represented in the concept material, is that reflective of 80 per cent, do you know, or is that reflective of the full envelope?

MS WATSON: It's below 80 per cent. So I think the podium was potentially 78. I don't have the numbers for the tower off the top of my head, but it is below 80 per cent for both of those.

5 MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. And I did see in the documentation that the Applicant was looking, I think, for flexibility to 88 per cent of the envelope in a built form outcome. Can you unpack that a little for us as to what the Applicant has been seeking there, why they seek that extra flexibility?

10 MS WATSON: So this is in relation to the podium utilisation. So they were comfortable with the tower, but the podium, they noted that it was – the indicative scheme was at 78 per cent, so if we were to recommend a condition for 80 per cent, that would only allow them, I guess, two per cent of flexibility in that 80. So they were just seeking to give themselves a bit more flexibility to fill that envelope a little
15 bit more to arrange their floorspace. However, we considered that the flexibility was best reserved in the amount of the envelope that was not filled to allow more flexibility in the design options, so we disagreed with that. And in the scheme of 45,000 square metres, two per cent is not completely insignificant, so we considered that they've demonstrated that they can have a scheme that complies with 80 per
20 cent, so there's no reason that other alternate schemes could not also accommodate that floor space within 80 per cent in different arrangements within the envelope.

MS LEESON: Right. And so the 88 per cent they were really just wanting to apply to the podium.

25

MS WATSON: Correct.

MS LEESON: Is that correct?

30 MS WATSON: Correct.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. Now might be a good time to talk about the Design and Place SEPP that's out on exhibition, or the Explanation of Intended Effect is out on exhibition. If we look at this building envelope, and at 80 per cent
35 that gives – I mean, I think they're talking a minimum floorplate of about 1000 square metres. We note from the Explanation of Intended Effect that there's guidance there proposing that residential towers above nine storeys have a floorplate of 700 square metres. Two questions there, I think. One is has the Department taken any of that into consideration in doing their assessment. And secondly – maybe I've
40 got the questions around the wrong way. Can the Department take that into consideration in preparing their assessment, and if so, have they in agreeing this or recommending a floorplate of effectively about 1000 square metres?

45 MR WITHERDIN: So in terms of the proposed Design and Place SEPP – and we note that it's only the Explanation of Intended Effects that is on exhibition at the moment, and it's still a work in progress at this point. But the Department is happy

to provide some supplementary advice around that Explanation of Intended Effect if the IPC wishes.

5 MS LEESON: Thank you. I think it's because it is on exhibition, is that a matter that is able to be taken into consideration by the Department? I know when there's a draft SEPP, it's certainly the case. I'm less clear about the Explanation of Intended Effect.

10 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. In terms of a statutory point of view, I would have to give you some further advice on that. I don't know the answer to that. But as I say, we are happy to consider that for the IPC if you wish.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Anthony. That would be appreciated.

15 MS LEWIN: Absolutely agree. Thank you.

MS LEESON: Wendy, any questions?

20 MS LEWIN: No, still – continue with that.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: We're fine.

25 MS LEESON: Thank you.

MS WATSON: The next theme was amenity impact, overshadowing and view loss. So the Department considers that overshadowing in the public domain is acceptable, as the overshadowing of the promenade is generally restricted to before 1
30 pm in mid-winter. Although overshadowing in the promenade is undesirable, given the location and the orientation of the site, any tower as envisaged by the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy would have similar overshadowing impact on the public domain, and the impacts are in part offset by significant new and enhanced public domain, including an additional 474 square metres on the actual foreshore itself and
35 a significant three and a half thousand square metres above the podium, which does benefit from year-round solar access.

In response to concerns about view loss, visual impacts and overshadowing, the Applicant has revised the proposal, including relocating the tower to the centre of the
40 site and lowering the relevant podium. The Department has undertaken assessment of the proposal principles in its report, and we acknowledge the proposal would impact views from neighbouring properties. However, the revised scheme has struck an appropriate balance between safeguarding existing public and private views and the appropriate redevelopment of the significant site. The interaction of existing
45 views currently impeded by the development is inevitable and reasonable in the context.

The upper northern podium on the left has a chamfered edge to allow 1 Darling Harbour residents to retain views over the lower levels. Any further reductions in podium height would compromise the delivery of employment-generating floorspace, which would be contrary to the strategic importance of the site in the renewal of Darling Harbour and Pyrmont Peninsula, and we note that many of the affected properties will now have an outlook over the landscape roof and retain some views of the water at Pyrmont Bridge and the city skyline. The Department also recommends that future DA consider view loss impacts, in particular in relation to structures and planting on the upper northern podium and opportunity to increase view sharing, particularly noting that the final detail design may only fill 80 per cent of the envelope.

MS LEESON: Thank you. And that view impact assessment was done on the envelope, not on the indicative scheme, is that correct?

MS WATSON: Correct. Correct.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. Wendy?

MS LEWIN: No. Just to – well, no further points for discussion, but just to note that in the shadow analysis documents provided by the Applicant, it's not just a need in winter at 1 o'clock and afterwards it's at the equinox from 1 o'clock. Beyond it, the public open space is overshadowed by the podium, as well as the tower, but there are significant impacts for a substantial part of the year.

MS LEESON: Yes. Sorry. That was – I meant to say it's at the worst case at mid-winter. Sorry, that was a bit misleading. At the worst case it affects it – there's no shadow before 1 pm, but we do acknowledge that there is impacts at other times of the year as well.

MS LEWIN: Thank you. Thank you.

MS LEESON: Just on the view issue, I saw a reference somewhere in the documents to an agreement with Sofitel Hotel. Does this – and clearly the moving of the tower further south improves some view impact for people to the western side of Darling Drive. Is the current view impact analysis cognisant of the agreement with the Sofitel Hotel? I mean, is that – is it clear of trouble, if I can put it that way?

MS WATSON: So the location of the tower is as far south as it could be without impeding into the legal agreement between Government and the Sofitel Hotel.

MS LEESON: So that helped guide the location of the tower as far south as it is.

MS WATSON: That's right, yes.

MS LEESON: Okay, thank you. Thank you.

MS LEWIN: Okay.

MS LEESON: And I understand what you've said about the view impacts from 1
Darling Harbour. I suspect we will probably get some contrary views from residents
5 and representatives of that complex. Analysis of the view shadow – I'm sorry, the
shadow analysis is a little difficult to read and we will probably ask the Applicant if
they present some of that existing shadow in a different colour or a different outline
so that we can actually more easily tell – with all the greys and greens that are there,
it was a – it's a little difficult. So we will be seeking a bit - - -

10

MS LEWIN: For clarity.

MS LEESON: - - - just for clarity and a different way of presenting that material.
But other than that I think we understand. And what will be important for us is to
15 also understand the extent of overshadowing of the – by the podium itself, not just of
the tower. So that's something that we need to pay a bit more attention to. But thank
you for that. So we're happy for you to keep going.

MR GLASGOW: Okay. I'm going to take the final three points in the themes that
20 were forwarded to us. My name is David Glasgow. I'm the principal planner in the
Key Sites team. So the first theme of the next lot of themes is parking. The
Department supports the proposed residential car parking rates in accordance with
the Sydney Local Environmental Plan parking rates for category B land based on the
categorisation of the surrounding land in Pyrmont. This would result in up to 308 car
25 parking spaces for the indicative proposal. The Applicant's traffic and transport
impact assessment demonstrates that the proposal would have minimal impacts on
the surrounding road network, but the traffic generated by the development will
generate less peak hour trips than the existing development due to the reduction in
retail space in the indicative scheme, compared to existing.

30

The Department notes Council's comments regarding reducing carparking on site,
however it notes Council did not specify a recommended parking rate for the
development. The site is well-connected to public transport. In particular, the site is
within walking of light rail, bus and ferry services, as well as Town Hall Station.
35 The site will also be within walking distance of the future planned Pyrmont Metro
station. The Department notes the exact location and timeframe for the delivery of
the metro station has not yet been confirmed and therefore considers that the
proposed category 3 carpark remains appropriate. I will move on to - - -

40 MS LEESON: Is – is that your commentary on parking? No, I do have a couple of
questions around the parking, if I may. So it's proposed that the residential tower
have the 305 or 306 car parking spaces, and I think there was a reference that the

commercial areas would use a pre-existing arrangement elsewhere for parking for them. Is that understanding correct?

5 MR GLASGOW: Yes. That's correct. There's – there's an agreement they would park under the Novotel hotel. It's 255 car parking spaces and it's the Applicant's intention to continue that agreement to provide parking for the commercial component.

10 MS LEESON: So in – in essence then, there's 305 additional car spaces and the traffic analysis has been modelled on that over and above the 255 that are at – parked at the Novotel?

MR GLASGOW: I would have to check that but that's my understanding.

15 MS LEESON: If you could check that, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

MR GLASGOW: So I will move on to servicing.

20 MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR GLASGOW: The proposal – the proposal outlines indicative servicing arrangements for the development, including vehicle access and servicing via the existing access road from Darling Drive. The Kiss and Ride facility providing car and taxi drop off for – adjacent to the Darling Drive roundabout; ground and 25 basement loading docks, accommodating approximately 17 bays for small to heavy rigid vehicles. The Department has considered Council's concerns about the adequacy of the indicative loading facilities and the Applicant's response with respect to servicing capacity and notes that the proposed servicing capacity is indicative only, and servicing requirements will be dependent on a detailed final land 30 use mix and assessment under the future DA.

The Department therefore recommends future assessment requirements requiring submission of a servicing analysis with the future DA, to ensure adequate servicing and loading provision based on the final proposed land use mix. 35

MS LEESON: So David, given that, on my calculation the concept proposal is suggesting provision of 63 per cent of Council's requirement on – on their analysis, are you comfortable or confident that in a future development application, that issue can be satisfactorily resolved and servicing provided to support the development as 40 needed? Are you comfortable that that can actually be pushed off to a further DA stage?

MR GLASGOW: Yes. I don't know the final land use mix. They've got plenty of room in the basement to accommodate whatever the determined needs are and once 45 they know the final land use mix and they need to put forward a case for the amount of servicing that they're landing on, and we will have to consider that in the context

of other submissions received and potentially Council's requirements, if that's their requirement in the future also.

MS LEESON: Thank you. Thank you. And sustainability?

5

MR GLASGOW: Sustainability, I will that now. The Department has recommended that future DAs demonstrate the incorporation of ecological sustainable development principles in the design, construction and ongoing operation phase of the development. Through the assessment process, the Department requested the Applicant to increase its commitments to ESD, which resulted in a stretched Green Star target of six stars for the retail and residential components and a commitment to a six star Green Star rating for the commercial component. The Department considers the revised commitment to represent best practice sustainability and has recommended conditions to secure these targets accordingly.

10
15

MS LEESON: Thank you. And – and just on that, I noted in the Pymont Place strategy, there's a comment in there on sustainability about net zero emissions 2050 and – by 2050, as a – as a government aspiration or target. Are you – are the – I'm interested in the Department's views as to whether a six star stretch for retail and residential is in line with that sentiment in the – in the Pymont strategy?

20

MR GLASGOW: We will have to take that on notice and view that document and our other documents in relation to the net zero target.

MS LEESON: Yes. It's just that we see that in the – in the Pymont strategy, understand that six star is a stretch for retail and residential, but if we're looking at a future development here and - premised on the – on the new strategy, we would be interested to get the Department's viewpoints on that.

25

MR GLASGOW: I can certainly provide more detail on that.

30

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So that was the end of our presentation on those key issues. I'm happy to take any further or additional questions that the Commission might have.

35

MS LEWIN: I have one. We have been intrigued by the status of the Ferris wheel, both current and future. So the question is really around that, in relation to the current and future use of the foreshore public open space and the Ferris wheel. We have been advised that there is a proposal being considered by one of the arms of Government for a larger Ferris wheel to be in place and we would very much like to understand where that is, in terms of the consideration of a larger Ferris wheel or if indeed, the Ferris wheel will be there in the future.

40
45

MR WITHERDIN: Yes, okay. I will have to take that question on notice and I – I think we might have to talk to Place Management about that, and we can provide the Commission with some further details on that.

5 MS LEWIN: Very good.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Anthony. When we were on the site inspection last week, we understood that there is some speculation around that existing Ferris wheel and there may, in fact, be an application within Place Management for a larger Ferris
10 wheel to go in. And that ties back to the question we had earlier, around the pedestrian modelling and if there's a larger Ferris wheel to be put into place and then that area of promenade is reduced to 20 metres, how all of that is actually working together. So we are very interested to understand where that Ferris wheel sits in the scheme of things. And as we also indicated, with any sort of outdoor seating along
15 the – along the wall that might impinge on that space, as well. So if you could follow that up, that would be – that would be greatly appreciated.

MS LEWIN: If any empirical information that describes certain areas that would be, let's say, quarantined along the foreshore for concessions or known concessions such
20 as the Ferris wheel or seated dining areas, would be appreciated.

MS LEESON: And if I could just take us back to some of the issues about height and levels and I'm more than happy for you to take this away on notice because it has – it has been a bit of a thing to fathom. The deck level of the Pyrmont Bridge,
25 adjacent that Guardian Square, I think we've seen it's referenced at RL11.5 or RL11.6, something of that order, and then the Guardian Square level is proposed at, I think, 13.75. And then in some documentation from the proponent, it suggests that this is almost level, which is not quite level in my view. Have you got any advice or guidance on what those respective RLs are and why the proponent might be
30 suggesting 13.75 being approximate to the deck level? There's just something I can't quite get clear off the drawings.

MS WATSON: So from our understanding, the northern podium envelope has a height of 13.75, but that reflects an additional accommodation for balustrades, other
35 structures and the like and the actual surface level of the northern podium where it meets the Pyrmont Bridge would be at grade. So we have recommended, in our recommended conditions, that the northern edge of that northern – of Guardian Square be no higher than the Pyrmont Bridge. So it doesn't preclude other parts of that 1500 square metre area raising up in height or varying in height, but it's a clear
40 understanding in our recommendation that the height did align at grade with the – the deck level of the bridge.

MS LEESON: So to make – to make sure that's clear to me, if the deck level of the bridge is 11.5 RL, the surface level of Guardian Square is also to be RL 11.5, but
45 what goes above that may be balustrading. Is that correct?

MS WATSON: Yes. And other structures planting, but it – it doesn't mean that the whole 1500 square metres needs to be at that 11.5. It just – we have – we have recommended a condition that says that the northern edge of it needs to be at the same level. So the finished terrace ground levels along the northern edge of that and
5 Guardian Square should not exceed the Pyrmont Bridge deck level. So we – we believe it's important that it has that clear transition and it is at grade, however, given that it's going to be read in conjunction with other open space at an upper level and also transition down to the foreshore, there will be varied levels in that space. So that higher envelope will allow that to happen whilst not being that – two metres high
10 up at the actual edge.

MS LEESON: So there would be a step within Guardian Square, of - - -

MS WATSON: It probably would be likely - - -
15

MS LEESON: - - - of levels.

MS WATSON: Yes, there would be. Subject to the future design.

MS LEWIN: It – it appears to me from the documents we've received from the Applicant that – and the discussions on site, that that only assures there is a – a level of access to the development off Pyrmont Bridge that provides a plaza, rather than a larger open space at that level. It's a transition space, as you suggested. The rest of it, which has got the higher RL, is to do with the surface of the – let's say the slab or
20 the ground plane, rather than any handrail and that's, I think, at the bottom of Di's question. What – what does that height actually describe? So I think there are a number of elements there that need to be further addressed in relation to height.
25

MS LEESON: It may just add – aid for a bit clarity on - - -
30

MS LEWIN: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - on what the levels are meant to be at that point, so - - -

MS LEWIN: Yes, exactly.
35

MS LEESON: - - - okay. Thank you. Do you have any other issues or questions you want to ask the Department today?

MS LEWIN: I don't think so. I think they're pretty well covered. Do you, Di?
40

MS LEESON: Yes. No, that's – that has been very helpful. So we have no further questions today for the Department. We understand you will be making a short presentation at the public meeting next week, is that correct?
45

MR WITHERDIN: Yes, that's correct.

MS LEESON: We look forward to seeing you again. We look forward to that. So
thank you for your time. There were a few things to follow up. We will formalise
those for you sometime today or tomorrow and get them back to you and if you
could return that at your earliest convenience, that would be much appreciated. So
5 thank you for your time today.

MR WITHERDIN: Thank you.

MS LEWIN: Thank you very much.
10

MS LEESON: Thanks, bye.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.44 pm]