



**New South Wales Government**  
Independent Planning Commission

## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

**RE: HARBOURSIDE SHOPPING CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT – PUBLIC  
DOMAIN AND BRIDGES (SSD-49653211)**

### **DEPARTMENT MEETING**

**PANEL:** ANDREW MILLS (CHAIR)  
SHELLEY PENN AM  
RICHARD PEARSON

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:** KENDALL CLYDSDALE  
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

**DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING, HOUSING  
AND INFRASTRUCTURE:** ANTHONY WITHERDIN  
DAVID GLASGOW

**LOCATION:** ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

**DATE:** 2:40PM – 3:20PM  
WEDNESDAY, 14 MAY 2025

## <THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MR ANDREW MILLS:** Well, good afternoon, and welcome. Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

10 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Harbour Shopping Centre Redevelopment – Public Domain and Bridges State Significant Development Application (SSD-49653211) currently before the Commission for determination.

15 The Applicant, Mirvac Retail Sub SPV Pty Ltd, is seeking approval for the construction and operation of the Harbourside Redevelopment's public domain spaces, including the Waterfront Promenade, Waterfront Steps, Waterfront Garden, Pyrmont Steps, North and South Walkes, Bunn Street Bridge, North Bridge, and Darling Drive Arrival.

20 My name is Andrew Mills, and I am the Chair of the Independent Planning Commission and of this Commission Panel. I am joined by my fellow commissioners, Shelley Penn and Richard Pearson. We are also joined by Kendall Clydsdale and Tahlia Hutchinson from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure full capture of the information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

30 The 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.

35 It is important for 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 on our website.

40 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.

45 Thank you. We will begin. So, perhaps Anthony and David, you would be happy to start off with any Department views around the application, in particular those that we have highlighted prior to the meeting.

**MR DAVID GLASGOW:** Sure, I can do that. The Department supports the application, the final stage in this long-running Harbourside program which is, this is the third SSD, the final one for the landscaping. It's consistent with the concept

approval. It's been reviewed iteratively by the Design Integrity Panel who's endorsed the proposal that we've assessed. And it provides significant public benefits and is in fact the key public benefit for the overall scheme.

5 It enhances the public domain significantly, improves the through-site links that are secured through the base building DA and all of those areas that were secured through that approval – the pedestrian bridges for connections across Darling Drive, upgrades to the cycleway and the wider and improved Waterfront Promenade, and the detailed landscaping treatments of the Waterfront Garden on  
10 the podium deck.

We consider the proposal to be in the public interest and we've recommended for it to be approved subject to conditions, which we think are appropriate and able to mitigate any negative impacts.

15 **MR MILLS:** Thank you for that. In terms of the amenity impacts that were identified and there certainly were various concerns early on, are you satisfied that those areas, the impacts of construction noise, operational noise, and security and lighting have been adequately addressed?

20 **MR GLASGOW:** Yes, we are. Our report goes into detail about those three particular areas. So, the operational noise, the main concern there was about the public domain area with the Waterfront Garden and its proximity to residential units. And initially, the application came in and events were proposed for that  
25 space, but that's since now changed. And it's designed to function as a local park, a space for passive recreation.

The noise impacts of that space have been thoroughly tested in terms of cumulative impacts of the future retail tenancies as well as the noise from the park  
30 itself and been found to comply with noise limits. The park itself is not expected to generate noise above background, even at capacity, overnight. And those retail tenancies, although they've been modelled for completeness, are subject to future DAs and the noise generated from those will be considered separately.

35 For construction noise, the construction – it's a rolling construction program over the three DAs. So, they're now building the podium and tower elements, and the construction elements of this particular application are not expected to generate substantial noise or noise equivalent to those works that's involved in the demolition and bulk excavation.

40 We've got a condition, C21, for a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan which will look comprehensively at the impacts and includes monitoring and mitigation measures. We've got conditions for respite periods and they're controlling the hours consistent with the previous consents. There's also a live  
45 Construction and Noise Vibration Management Plan associated with the previous SSD that's managing those impacts, so this is the sort of billet-and-braces approach because they are split up, we're hoping to sort of duplicate those measures. But anything else, anything that will all looked afresh again with the

works specific to this application.

Could you just remind me of the third point you raised?

5 **MR MILLS:** Security and lighting.

**MR GLASGOW:** Security and lighting, that was raised in submissions early on and then their lighting strategy was amended to take account of light spill to those residential properties. So, we have secured the lighting strategy which is  
10 referenced to all relevant Australian Standards in the consent.

The lighting design is also to be finalised in consultation with Place Management NSW under condition B1 which is for the final detailed of landscaping and materials, so the lighting is included in that. So, there's a condition to ensure that it  
15 meets Australian Standards and complies with the strategy that takes account of amenity impacts to surrounding properties. And then there's the design, which will be finalised in consultation with the DIP and Place Management.

The security issue, there's a condition for an Operational Management Plan, which  
20 will combine the draft Events Management Plan that was submitted with the application. It includes measures, or will include measures, for Applicant-managed public domain areas, securing the capacity of the Waterfront Garden during events, as well as things like CCTV and management, there's a crime prevention CPTED condition as well. And that report and measures that make up that will be  
25 refined in consultation with Place Management, as was requested during the application as well.

So, I think with those conditions, all of those, initial issues have been sort of closed out over the course of the assessment, and we feel like that with the  
30 conditions that we've attached that there won't be any impacts in those areas.

**MR MILLS:** Does the Department have any views on how the Applicant has managed the objections to the original application and the way that it's been modified?  
35

**MR ANTHONY WITHERDIN:** Sorry, Anthony Witherdin, I'm the Director of Key Sites Assessments. Andrew, I know that the Applicant has been conducting quite a bit of consultation with neighbouring property owners. And we have also undertaken some extensive notifications and consultations as part of our  
40 development assessment process. So, I feel that the community has had sufficient chance to make comment on the proposal, and we've certainly gone through the comments from the community and a full assessment of all the concerns.

**MR MILLS:** Yes, that –  
45

**MR RICHARD PEARSON:** Can I just – oh, sorry, Andrew, do you want to go?

**MR MILLS:** No, you go.

5 **MR PEARSON:** Probably, in addition to the operational noise from the park, which I understand the point about it now going away from being an events-based site. But, say visual impact was probably a very significant issue in the initial round of submissions to the EIS.

10 I guess, picking up on Andrew's question, what has the Applicant done in relation to visual impact that maybe has addressed some of those concerns that were being raised in submissions? Can you unpack that? Because there was concern about mounding, there was concern about vegetation blocking views. What's your view on how they've dealt with the view loss issue?

15 **MR GLASGOW:** I can take that, Richard. So, the view loss issue is a longstanding one which goes back to the original submission and then the original podium dimensions and then now to the landscaping on top of the podium. And so the landscaping on top of the podium was always being envisaged by the concept approval, but it's always been caveated that it needs to be sensitively designed.

20 So, we've always been seeking the balance between providing amenity on that important public space and some shade, and some useability for what can't really be a blank 35,000 square metre area, with obviously the sensitivities of residents who look directly across it.

25 So, the Applicant's provided quite a lot of information, a detailed visual impact assessment with this application and in previous applications where the provision for the soil mounding was made in the concept approval. And those – that assessment fairly clearly demonstrates that the mounding itself has no impact on views above the podium to the water. And then the landscaping has been designed in accordance with condition A16 of the concept, which specifies that it has to be  
30 – that the visibility through it and views through it from residents has to be considered in its design.

35 So, the Applicant has changed that slightly over the course of pre-application and through the application to change species to have like sparser, more singular trunk species. I think they were changed to gums with a sparser canopy, and the arrangement of them, I know they've reduced some of the trees near Pymont Bridge, used some – changed some of the spacing on some of the trees.

40 So, we feel that they have directly responded to those concerns and that we've assessed the visual impact of those objectively in our assessment, and consider those view impacts to be minor.

**MR PEARSON:** Thank you.

45 **MR MILLS:** And when we're talking about the local residents, they're apparently looking at the northern bridge, there was a fairly split view as to the retention or demolition of that bridge. Do you feel that the concerns of those who were objecting have been assuaged, and does it make sense?

**MR GLASGOW:** Particularly on that, it's almost out of the scope of the application, that northern bridge. In that, it's provided for in the concept to essentially be retained, and because of the demolition of the existing centre, they had to demolish the part of the bridge that lands on the site. So, a part of this application is now rebuilding it, but essentially it is a retention of the existing bridge.

Residents were concerned because it's changing the nature of the space where it lands to a public area may increase the use of the bridge. So, I think that's the basis of a lot of the concerns about the retention of the bridge. And also that the bridge, I'm not sure how popular it's been in the long term, but it did connect to the monorail station, and it does block views from the apartments, as is to the north, to the water.

So, it's equally split between people that were concerned about amenity impacts from increased use of it and/or who didn't like the obstructive visual nature of the bridge to start with. And then those that rely on it for access to the site, because the pedestrian environment connections at ground level rely on the crossing on Darling Drive which turns at a 90-degree angle and it's not particularly pedestrian-friendly, particularly for older road users or older pedestrians.

So, there's real points to be made both for and against that. But it's always been retained in the concept plan, so it's just come through as is, and I know the Applicant considered taking it out in response to those concerns, but that would require modification to the concept plan. So, that would almost have to be considered separately under another application.

**MS SHELLEY PENN:** David, can I ask how old is the original bridge? How long's it been there?

**MR GLASGOW:** I wouldn't like to say if it's recorded ...

**MS PENN:** Do you know? I'm sure I can find it.

**MR GLASGOW:** My understanding is that it's around the time – it's associated with the monorail, so around the '80s, I imagine.

**MR MILLS:** Fortunately, some of us are old enough to remember it.

**MS PENN:** The '70s.

**MR MILLS:** It was the '80s, definitely. Definitely the '80s, yes. But maybe the early '80s, yes.

**MS PENN:** Thanks.

**MR MILLS:** Are there any observations you'd like to make in relation to the

heritage impacts?

**MR GLASGOW:** The heritage impacts – there aren't any heritage impacts from this proposal in itself. The podium setback from the bridge was determined in the concept plan and was actually increased by the IPC in their determination of the concept approval.

So, the podium height and separation from the bridge has been determined and has been – the second SSD for the podium and tower has finalised the design of that. This application is just for the treatment of the stairs which are near the bridge and away below the bridge, and again that spatially has been provided for in the concept and the previous applications. So, this is really landscaping and fit-out of those spaces.

The planting is deliberately pulled away from the northeast corner of the Waterfront Garden, so there is consideration in the landscape design in terms of Pyrmont Bridge. And then the heritage interpretation, there's a draft that was submitted with the application that Place Management were very supportive of, and they're the delegate of Heritage NSW for this area, so they are the heritage authority and they're very supportive of it.

And our condition requires that that plan be developed in consultation with them and just making sure that it incorporates, we'll have two concurrent SSDs operating there, so there's a condition on the previous one about its heritage interpretation and making sure that they align and are unified essentially in this final plan. Because most of the heritage interpretation is in the public domain and is associated in the areas that are subject to this DA.

**MR MILLS:** Have the – just as a general point – have all of those conditions been discussed with the applicant?

**MR GLASGOW:** Yes, they've reviewed the conditions and come back with comments and asked and we've incorporated what we considered to be reasonable. So, they've had two reviews of the conditions.

**MR MILLS:** Richard, any other questions?

**MR PEARSON:** Yes, just on the, I guess, the foreshore promenade which – it's essentially a three kind of part promenade, isn't it? You've got the retail space. You've got the upper level, and then you've got the lower level.

Are you comfortable that the retail section, if you like, is still going to enable adequate pedestrian access through that area? That there are no kind of pinch-points or uncomfortableness about navigating that upper area, where you might be confused whether you're in a dining space or in a public space.

**MR GLASGOW:** There was some commentary from Council, I think, and over the iterative design process, as with the DIP about the treatment for that retail area

and whether there was going to be a pedestrian area close to the building running through that.

5 In the end, the Applicant didn't want to go that way, and we support that decision based on the overall design of the promenade and the examples that we've seen not work elsewhere, particularly along Barangaroo where those public access-ways close to the building get privatised and they require a lot of management, in this case, Place Management NSW, to keep it open.

10 There's also a sort of size requirement in terms of those spaces working, and that 5 metres doesn't really provide enough space to have a useable licensed area with a pedestrian thoroughfare wide enough to work. I think the example that we looked at with Place Management and the Applicant was on the other side next over from Darling Harbour, I can't think of the building, but it has a very wide  
15 colonnade which is kind of the requirement for that to work.

20 But overall, the promenade's been designed iteratively with the DIP and it's gone through quite a few reviews. So, that arrangement with the upper, lower, the landscaping, I know that's changed – there's been versions of that that weren't supported, and it's been redesigned in consultation with the DIP.

25 So, we're comfortable that it's logical, that it works for pedestrians. And then through this assessment process, there was the addition of two additional ramps in it to make it even more accessible. So, I think overall it's a pretty good outcome, and we support it.

**MR PEARSON:** Thank you.

30 **MS PENN:** Just one question from me. Apologies, I lost audio there for a second. Just to do with the slip lane. I think that's conditioned in SSDA2, so I realise that – I just wanted to make sure I'm understanding, Council has some concerns about the slip lane, I think, at Darling Drive. And I really just wanted to understand what the issue was there, and I think there is a condition in place already that requires them to look at options to narrow the slip lane.

35 **MR GLASGOW:** Yes.

**MS PENN:** But I just really wanted to understand what the issue was.

40 **MR GLASGOW:** Oh, well, there's two, sorry, so there's – yes, that's the driveway into the building on Darling Drive.

**MS PENN:** Okay.

45 **MR GLASGOW:** Which they want – Council want that narrowed. So, that's part of the previous SSDA.

**MS PENN:** Got you, thank you. Yes.



5 **MR GLASGOW:** The other issue they've raised is the design of the Darling Drive cycleway which is also subject to further consultation with Place Management and Transport in terms of finalising the actual design there. That relates to that crossing I mentioned before near 50 Murray Street where the revised cycle lane turns that same corner and ends up on the same pedestrian crossing.

**MS PENN:** Yes.

10 **MR GLASGOW:** So, there's some work to do there, I think, in terms of finalising how that works. But they're seeking to improve it, which was the requirement of the concept plan.

15 **MS PENN:** Got you, thank you, yes, I think I was conflating those somehow. Thank you.

**MR MILLS:** Thanks, David. Kendall or Tahlia, were there other points that we've otherwise discussed that we've overlooked?

20 **MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE:** No, there's nothing else from our perspective, Andrew.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you. Nothing else, Richard, from you either?

25 **MR PEARSON:** No, I mean, we just need to have a closer look at the recommended conditions of consent, should the IPC move towards approval. But yes, I've got no more specific questions on the assessment process.

30 **MR MILLS:** Nothing? All good?

**MS PENN:** No, I found it – I'm quite clear, thank you.

35 **MR MILLS:** Yes. Well, thank you both, Anthony and David, for your time, it's much appreciated. I think we've covered the things that we need to today. And appreciate the efforts.

**MR WITHERDIN:** Great.

40 **MR GLASGOW:** Thank you.

**MR WITHERDIN:** Thank you.

**MS PENN:** Great, thank you.

45 **MR MILLS:** Thanks, Anthony. Thanks, David.

**MR WITHERDIN:** Bye.

**MS PENN:** Bye.

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**