

25th September 2023

**Re Redevelopment of Harbourside SSD 7874:
Mirvac Modification Applications 4.55 (1A)**

Dear Sir

I wish to make **strong objection to the proposed amendments** as laid out in Mirvac's recent Modification Application. It seems yet again they are refusing to accept the original approved building conditions re restrictions placed on height of the Northern Podium. ie that the podium " was to be a single level, open public space with a deck height control of RL 12.5m"

The current proposal seeks to raise the height to 13.3m to accommodate hard landscaping. And this will end up higher again depending on the type of plants and trees put in place. This will impact significantly on the views from my home, and that of many other residents on the East facing side of One Darling Harbour. So much for Mirvac's commitment to view sharing!

Moreover the manner in which they propose to construct the garden - above, rather than in sink holes below the podium deck, means that the amenity of the so-called "open space" of the Podium will also be reduced. This proposal is a blatant attempt by Mirvac to push back against the findings and conditions set by the Independent Planning Commission.

I would also like to point out that the issue of lighting in the podium area has not been addressed. The fact that the area will be accessible 24/7 will present safety and security issues at night. Lighting of the area will need to take into account the impact on existing residences. Attention to the direction and strength of lighting will be essential. Otherwise there will further erosion of our capacity to enjoy our home without being put in the spotlight or being forced to close ourselves in to avoid intrusive glare.

When the planned redevelopment was proposed we looked to the new development to ease current points of congestion on the main boardwalk, especially at the northern end of the site where the walkway is closest to the water. Mirvac presented a 20m wide public waterfront walkway to address these concerns and gain permission for its redevelopment plan.

However in this amendment they want to now limit that strip of public waterfront space to just 6 metres. We will end up with the same pinch points for foot traffic as before - in exactly the same places. **I object to this proposed amendment.** It leaves us with a solution which does little to honour a real commitment to enhanced public amenity and safe, open spaces.

Having lived with the redevelopment in progress for just on 9 months now I would like to draw attention to the issue of noise. There are two aspects to this issue. Firstly the level of noise and dust currently being endured and which will continue for a number of years. At the final presentation by Mirvac prior to commencement of the project they were asked by the community how they intended to deal with the these issues. I the case of dust

mitigation we were told that the latest technology would deal with that issue effectively. When it was noted by my husband that a man holding a hose was not effective dust mitigation, this comment was laughed off by the presenters. Yet for a number of months we watched from our balcony as one or two hand held garden hoses were indeed played on the site to address dust mitigation! Now there is a small mechanical fan in use at the northern end, which when the wind blows send the water everywhere but there the machinery is working.

We have not been able to open windows or doors since work began due to the dust and the noise. We have not been able to use the balcony area, which is an important living space for our family. We have monitored noise levels close to 115 decibels at times and spoke with the site-foreman by phone on one occasion when the consistent noise of 4 large jackhammers extended to 6pm at night. I do not look forward to another 4 years or more of this constant noise. Is Mirvac able/willing to do something to help with this real and ever-present bombardment - some type of acoustic window treatment - given it is such a long term project?

The second aspect regarding noise relates to the ongoing noise which the development will present for its neighbouring residents. For example:

- the waterfront garden public space and the provision of retail outlets that will open out on to that area
- provision of access to the Garden (24/7) along the walkway in front of our apartment block, especially when events are held and people seek a raised viewpoint
- vehicular entry of residents of the new Mirvac tower and shoppers/tenants carpark will be right outside One Darling Harbour
- regulation of venues so that all speakers be directed internally to reduce excess noise

These present just a few of examples of how this redevelopment will present new and permanent noise challenges for the residents of one Darling Harbour, especially for those on the East facing side as we are. There **will** be a significant noise impact on local residents (and associated security and safety issues). This is even indicated by the recommendation made by one of Mirvac's own experts that there needs to be acoustic upgrades on its own residential tower.

In reviewing this amendment proposal I therefore ask these objections be addressed. We seek a solution that honours all the talk about a commitment to view sharing, enhanced public amenity and the provision of safe welcoming open spaces. Hold the developer to its original commitments and the findings of the Independent Planning Commission

Yours sincerely
Diane Waddington

Long term Resident of One Darling Harbour