

Barbara MacGregor

204/50 Murray St

Pymont NSW 2000

February 1, 2016



Application No SSD 7388

Location 31 Wheat Rd Sydney (Oots 401,402,403,404 and 405 in DP 862501)

Applicant Grocon (Darling Harbour) Developments Pty

I object to the proposal on the following grounds:

Over-development of the site. I understand that there are no restrictions on height of buildings around the Cockle Bay Precinct but this does not mean that the present lower rise buildings must be replaced with high rise.

Buildings already approved and half built have crowded the south western reaches of the bay with both bulk and height, replacing the graceful and prize winning buildings which had stood there. The only remaining building of grace and architectural merit within cooee is the Ian Thorpe Pool, a reminder of what has been and what architectural merit we have lost.

The aesthetic appeal of low rise near the water which has been the City of Sydney's successful regulation for years and which led to an aesthetically pleasing aspect, enhancing views of the city from the water, appears to have been overridden by corporate greed and weak governmental acquiescence approving any and all developments. The Darling Harbour waterfront will belong only to the corporate sector if this continues. The human scale of the waterfront is being taken from the public. Instead of having an attractive area for relaxation and entertainment we will be hemmed in and overshadowed

Car spaces. The proposal to provide 170 additional parking spaces indicates a projected rise in road traffic in an area already over- filled.

Relocation and upgrades of existing entertainments for children. I am assuming that these changes are proposed because their sites are required for this development which would be another encroachment on public land.

I have searched for the advertised exhibition of the DA in vain. Every possibility I followed resulted in the page being unavailable. Could the Department please change to the user-friendly web pages used by the City of Sydney for examination of exhibited plans?

B Macgregor

19 February 2016

The Hon. Rob Stokes, MP
Minister for Planning
GPO Box 5341
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Minister

31 Wheat Road, Sydney IMAX Building Redevelopment

The proposed IMAX building redevelopment will result in gross overdevelopment of Darling Harbour, reduce integration of the precinct with adjacent areas and impact on public space and neighbours. My submission presents very serious concerns about this proposal, which I oppose in its current form.

Concurrent DA

The site already has an approved development application for office, retail and entertainment purposes and the proponent is asking for a second approval for different functions, being hotel, serviced apartments, retail, function and entertainment use. The proponent essentially wants two valid approvals in order to keep options open.

This is an outrageous approach to planning that must be rejected. It is not strategic and weakens arguments for both proposals – there is clearly no urgent need for either. Allowing two different approvals on a parcel of land is ad hoc planning and allows the final determination of what will be developed on the site to occur behind closed doors. It sets a dangerous precedent and provides the community and other landowners with no certainty.

I understand it is normal procedure for a proponent to relinquish a previous approval before submitting a new one and this approach is vital for development on public space and that has potential impacts on large numbers of people.

The proponent should be required to select one approach for approval.

Bulk and Scale

The proposed development is for a 23 storey tower plus a separate two-storey building, with a total gross floor area of 63,500 square metres adjacent to Tumbalong Park and the waterfront. This is a massive increase in development compared to the existing 11-storey building with total gross floor space area of 7,389 square metres.

The proponent tries to justify the proposed increase as being in line with the change in scale, built form and character of the Sydney International Convention, Exhibition and Entertainment Centre Precinct plan from 'low rise valley' to high rise. This is unacceptable.

Darling Harbour will suffer from cumulative impacts and lose any human scale with too much high rise development. Darling Harbour's success as public space requires it to be an inviting public place to spend time, including for families with children. The proposed substantial IMAX tower is of particular concern given its location adjacent to public recreation space where amenity will be lost as a result of this proposal.



City Screen

The proposed city screen on the lower levels of the western façade represents commercialisation of public space and will prevent the quiet enjoyment of the space.

One of Darling Harbour's chief functions is to provide the public with open space and access to the harbour. As public space, Darling Harbour should not be commercialised with large signs, advertisements and movie trailers. The visual and audio pollution from the proposed screen will significantly reduce amenity in the precinct, will impact on the tranquillity of adjacent parks and areas and make Darling Harbour a less attractive place to visit.

The proposed city screen should be refused.

This proposal has major deficiencies and serious impacts that mean it should be refused or approved with significant conditions imposed to protect public and neighbourhood amenity.

Could you please inform me what action you will take in response to these concerns?

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AG', written in a cursive style.

Alex Greenwich
Member for Sydney

Simon Truong

From: Brendon Roberts
Sent: Monday, 29 February 2016 4:24 PM
To: Simon Truong
Subject: FW: Submission Details for Irene Doutney of City of Sydney (object)
Attachments: IMAX development.pdf

One for you

From: system@affinitylive.com [<mailto:system@affinitylive.com>] **On Behalf Of** Irene Doutney
Sent: Monday, 29 February 2016 4:23 PM
To: Brendon Roberts
Cc: Amy Watson
Subject: Submission Details for Irene Doutney of City of Sydney (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Irene Doutney
Organisation: City of Sydney (Councillor)
Email: idoutney@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Address:
483 George St

Sydney, NSW
2000

Content:
See attachment below-

IP Address: 113-21-40-66.au.viaip.com - 113.21.40.66
Submission: Online Submission from Irene Doutney of City of Sydney (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=142498

Submission for Job: #7388 IMAX Redevelopment Option No 2
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=7388

Site: #2721 IMAX, Darling Harbour
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=2721

Irene Doutney

E : idoutney@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

IMAX development

The proposed IMAX development will have a significant impact on Darling Harbour, due to its proposed size, as well as the estimated time period of 36 months to complete construction. There are several matters in the EIS that the proposal needs to amend, to ensure that the outcome of such a proposal will be for public benefit. This is a proposal that will quite likely change the character of the major Sydney destination of Darling Harbour and surrounding areas. It therefore must do more to consider its impacts.

View from public domain:

This development is proposing some significant changes to views from several public domains. This will change the character of many public areas. The EIS says, "None of the views assessed were identified as being 'devastating'...which is a positive outcome". However, the EIS states that public domain views including on Harbour St/Day St, Bathurst St/Harbour St, King St Wharf- North, Wharf 10 in Pyrmont and the majority of Pyrmont Bridge and Cockle Bay will all be *significantly impacted* by the new IMAX development. That is not a positive outcome. This is devastating to the character of such areas, contrary to the minimising EIS assertion. The public will need to be compensated for such changes, and public improvement works should extend or be financed to all affected sites.

Vegetation:

With the bulk and scale of the proposal, including the increased height and width proposed, there will need to be significant investment into 'greening' the nearby area. This will not only assist in a more livable space surrounding this monstrous sized development, it will ameliorate the poor air quality which will be generated by the likely increase in cars to the area. As the development is encouraging driving into the heart of the city, as seen through its provision of 170 car spaces, it also has a responsibility to increase the trees and vegetation, in order to compensate for the additional pollution and congestion that this development will enable.

Cycling infrastructure:

In order to make this a more sustainable project, there needs to be funds invested to support other means of transport beyond driving. Bicycle spots must be provided in the complex, as well as funds dedicated to improving the cycle routes to the area. This will ensure that the public can access the site through a variety of means, and will ease congestion to Darling Harbour and surrounding locations. Whilst the Harbour St pedestrian link is a positive step in providing a safe walking route, a safe cycling route would enable improved sustainable access.

Sustainable energy:

'The Ribbon' development has been glorified in the EIS as being a 'world class design creating an iconic landmark'. However without globally revered sustainable measures in place, this building will remain a lackluster and unappealing slab of city concrete. Whilst the design attempts to capture the 'modern' appearance, and wants to be a building of the future, it will never appeal to as far an audience as desired, without implementing solar and wind power. If we consider the globally-renowned building of Central Park Sydney, it is evident what people want from modern buildings. Central Park has been the recipient of 4 Major construction Awards in the year 2015 alone, and was shortlisted for many more. This development is noted for its large green wall on the façade and its

implementation of sustainable measures including solar power. These are the types of developments that global cities such as Sydney need more of, and 'The Ribbon' falls very short on this.

Whilst this is by no means an exhaustive list of recommendations for this proposal, they are essential amendments to be considered. I urge you to truly make this an iconic vision, by implementing the suggestions proposed, and to ensure that this is a sustainable and appreciated addition to this famous city location.