

26 May 2025

**Independent Planning Commission
Level 15,
135 King Street,
SYDNEY NSW 2000**

Dear Commissioners

HARBOURSIDE REDEVELOPMENT SSD-49653211

I'm writing as a long-term resident of 'One Darling Harbour' whose apartment directly overlooks the proposed 'Harbourside' redevelopment, with uninterrupted exposure to both its visual and acoustic impacts.

I express my formal objection to aspects relating to the site, which are

1. Noise Impacts from Open Space Activation

While the intent to activate the public domain is appreciated, the proposal to host:

- a 1,500m² 24/7 alcohol-free public garden, and
- a multi-level 2,000m² licensed hospitality venue which has the capacity to operate until 3.00am directly across from my balcony (approx. 40metres away), raises serious concerns about the residential amenity.

As is currently evident during the reconstruction of Harbourside, noise levels regularly exceed 90 decibels, which significantly impacts on our quality of life. Allowing ongoing night-time trading at close proximity - particularly in open-air spaces above podium height - is not compatible with the surrounding residential setting. While construction noise is temporary, allowing late night trading from permanent hospitality venues is totally unacceptable.

I urge the Commission to:

- Require an independent noise impact assessment inclusive of cumulative operational impacts during construction.
- Impose strict limitations on venue hours, particularly for amplified music or outdoor seating.
- Ensure acoustic treatments and physical separation buffers are considered in the design.

2. Inadequate Security and Access Controls

A 'Security Management Plan' should be made a condition of approval which is open to community review.

From what I have read, the proposal states that security will be ‘provided by Mirvac’ but offers no detail about its form, duration or authority. The absence of a publicly available security management plan, especially for 24-hour public access, is highly concerning. Residents close to Darling Harbour deserve clarity on:

- Whether security will be on-site 24/7;
- How behaviour and safety in the garden and multi-levels above will be monitored;
- Protocols for anti-social activity or emergency response.

3. Podium Landscaping and Tree Heights

View corridors should be established.

Again, from what I have read, the proposed tree heights of up to 12-metres on the podium level are excessive given their elevated location. Such heights will likely obstruct views and introduce overshadowing into nearby private residences. I strongly recommend limiting tree heights to 3–5 metres, particularly for slow-growing species to ensure landscaping enhances rather than detracts from residential outlooks and solar access.

4. Reinstatement of the North Bridge – Misalignment of Access

From what I have read the current proposal reinstates a north pedestrian footbridge which offsets from the original alignment, routing foot traffic through the proposed garden area before reaching Pyrmont Bridge via stairs. This is:

- Indirect and counterintuitive,
- Unfriendly to mobility-impaired users, and
- Less safe, as it funnels pedestrians into a hospitality-activated zone.

By contrast, the original bridge alignment provided a direct and efficient link between Bunn Street, allowing not only residents of ‘One Darling Harbour’ but the greater Pyrmont/Ultimo community, clear access to Pyrmont Bridge - without requiring navigation through a mixed-use garden.

I strongly urge the Commission to require:

- The reinstatement of the footbridge in line with the original location and alignment, and
- A design that prioritises safe, direct pedestrian connectivity over Darling Drive particularly with extra traffic generated by the redevelopment of ‘Harbourside’.

5. Intersection Safety – Darling Drive & Murray Street

Lastly, the Darling Drive-Murray Street intersection is already notoriously unsafe for pedestrians, particularly during peak periods. Relying on this intersection as a primary access point for Pyrmont Bridge users is not viable and increases pedestrian risk. The bridge

offers a far safer and more logical route to and from community hubs in Pymont and Ultimo.

In conclusion, I support the revitalisation of the Harbourside precinct but urge the Commission to balance economic activation with liveability and public safety. The success of the precinct must be measured not only by its commercial performance but also by its compatibility with the surrounding residential environment.

The long-term success of this development relies not just on commercial outcomes but on its ability to integrate sensitively with existing residential infrastructure and amenity. I respectfully ask the Commission to act on these concerns in the interest of balanced urban renewal.

Thank you for considering this submission. I would welcome an opportunity to participate in any further consultation.

Kind regards,

Mark Constantine

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]