

I am a resident of 50 Murray St Sydney.

1. The proposed structure of the Contiguous Public Open Space above the Northern Podium does not support a safe communal space for the public to enjoy the foreshore and harbour due to soil mounding that is not publicly trafficable as it creates non-level flooring.

Waterfront Garden is intended to be a safe communal space for the public to enjoy event gathering activities, harbour views, and fireworks as a public amenity to compensate allowing **privatisation of the publicly owned site**.

The problem elements of the waterfront garden design is primarily due to the significant soil mounding (50% surface area) in Waterfront Garden which turns what should be completely accessible space into a site link. People do not gather to sit on pathways and the current design is a maze of hard paving through landscaped trees that you can't walk beneath/between due to soil mounding.

The garden is supposed to be an area for the public to enjoy water, city and firework views yet the proposal with high soil mounding (1.5m) covering half the area means that views/line of sight to the water are obscured, especially for children or people who sit in wheelchairs.

Soil mounding also creates hazards for little children to jump off and injure themselves, or opportunities for parents to lose line of sight of children. The waterfront garden should have no soil mounding, but soil pits to ensure one level contiguous space that was originally approved.

The design should be park-like such as Giba Park where you can walk between and sit under the trees to watch performances or look at the water views. Another notable example of appropriately sized trees are those planted in Darling Square or along the Barangaroo foreshore.



OPEN SPACE AREA AT RL 12.5 OR BELOW (50-55%)

2. I object to the trees of the landscaping protruding beyond the building envelope on the Northern and Central podium. Tree sizes should be human scaled to provide appropriate shade to the area immediately beneath them.

Having trees on top of a building can be hazardous, they should not be excessive in size. Trees should not be of excessive height or size. The purpose of the trees is to provide shade at the ground level immediately below. Tall trees of excessive height do not actually provide shade to the ground area immediately beneath, but the tree canopy shade will be projected outside of Waterfront Garden. Therefore, the trees should be closer to 3 or 4 metres in height to effectively provide shade. This would also reduce the hazard of having a large tree collapse, or drop branches in high winds which would be destructive. Please keep to the existing canopy approved by the IPC. Or potentially alter the canopy above Waterfront Garden evenly at maximum limits of 17m (12+5m).

3. I object to change of the proposed wording to the IPC approval at A16.

I refer to the clause of the proposal below. Please do not change the clause that was approved by the IPC.

NORTHERN PODIUM SOFT LANDSCAPING

*A16. Soft landscaping (including planting and trees) may extend above the building envelope where these components are within and relate specifically to improving the amenity of the **publicly accessible** open space above the ~~Northern and Central~~ Podium. Future Development Application(s) must demonstrate that any projection within this area above the building envelope will have minimal detrimental impact on views from neighbouring properties to the Pyrmont Bridge and harbour.*

I object to the proposed elimination of the requirement that the open space above the Northern and Central podium be ‘publicly accessible’. The whole point of Waterfront Garden and indeed, allowing the building of a such a tall residential tower **on publicly owned land** was conditional on significant public space being retained and to improve public amenity. This is an unacceptable encroachment on the IPC requirements and intention of improving public amenity. As written, the Central podium should be publicly accessible and not only limited to private residents.

I also do not agree that the tower height should be increased at all. It is unnecessary and the stated problem could be easily resolved by reducing the tower height.