SUBMISSION FOR APPLICATION No. SSD6116 Please find the submission below that strongly OBJECTS to the current Development Application SSD6116

Darling Harbour has something the rest of the world does not have, ambiance, a family friendly, relaxed feel that at present manages to mingle this with the business being done at the Convention and Exhibition Centre all surrounding a beautiful body of water. This proposed 38 storey ICC Hotel will change this casual ambience, making it more of a business centre, no longer as appealing to families with the extra crowds that this development proposal will bring.

We (my husband and I) very strongly object to the following development proposal on the following grounds.

We are firstly rate payers of the City of Sydney and secondly owners of 2 apartments in the Goldsbrough Building and this development will severely affect our investment and the ambience of the wonderful world class area called Darling Harbour. We have listed our objections, below and hope that you consider our points of view with the utmost consideration.

Please note each objection is just as important as each other!

1) Blocking afternoon western sun into 'Harbourside' area

This 38 storey ICC Hotel tower proposed will elevate the building height around the foreshore of Darling Harbour, thus spoiling the open nature of the area, closing it in and blocking the all important western sun in winter time. The shadow that the new Hotel Tower will cast over 'Harbourside' will make this area cold and dark much earlier than now, reaching right across the harbour onto the eastern side. This much higher development will be at odds to the eastern side of the Darling Harbour foreshore which is 2-3 levels at most. This will detract from the western side especially on the weekend afternoons when this area is its most busy with young families.

2) The heritage Goldsbrough Building's prominence in the western view of Darling Harbour will be blocked from public view forever.

The proposed ICC Hotel Tower will obscure the public view of the Goldsbrough which is a building of heritage significance in Sydney. (see previous submission re- this point for **SSD5752**)

3) The height proposed for this building (38 storeys is against all other buildings in the area and out of place

Notice that the skyline in the photo, the Goldsbrough and the Novotel are in line with each other. The new ICC Hotel is ugly, straight sided, too tall, and in the wrong area.

Current view from Darling Harbour



Verses current proposal

4) Blocking of morning sunlight & overshadowing of the Goldsbrough by the proposed Hotel

The Hotel shadow diagrams show that there will be significant overshadowing of the Goldsbrough from the new hotel tower, taking away morning sunlight in the all important winter mornings. This will result in increased heating costs (for this side of the building, our air conditioner rarely runs during winter in the day time) as well as the loss of valuable morning winter sunlight.

From the Shadow analysis diagrams in the DA it shows a significant loss of sunlight on Pyrmont St in front of the building and the Eastern face of the Goldsbrough in winter.

This is in direct contradiction in trying to make Sydney's buildings more environmentally friendly. And will severely affect the building's plans to install solar panels in the future.

5) Removal of the safe walkway from the Goldsbrough and other western buildings to Darling Harbour

The proposed changes at Darling Harbour seem to take away an extremely important thoroughfare for the residents and guests of the Goldsbrough and all regular users from the public carparks on the Western side of Darling Harbour, the commercial building at 135 Pyrmont St as well as all the residential buildings on Harris and Pyrmont St. in Pyrmont.

Currently it is the **safest** walkway to enter the Darling Harbour precinct from the Western side.

If this entry to Darling Harbour is removed it will be a total disaster for many of the pedestrians who regularly use it as well as visitors to the area. Currently it is estimated that there are around 7000 pedestrian traffic movements across this walkway on a regular day and many more on busy event days. It is the only safe way to cross the light rail tracks and Darling Drive and is the direct access for 2 major carparks servicing Darling Harbour. This walkway is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with continuous public access.

The alternative link from the Western Distributor is not a convenient alternative to what is currently there. How are pedestrians especially with children meant to cross to and from Darling Harbour in a safe way at all hours?

There has been no mention of the increased traffic flow within the immediate vicinity of the proposed complex. In particular, the impact that such an increased amount of traffic will have on the ability of people to cross the road and the obvious increase in delays for traffic as people use the ground level pedestrian crossing.

This is the walkway being



removed

6) The size of this proposed ICC Hotel will cause a huge burden to not only automobile traffic but pedestrian traffic around Darling Harbour; pedestrian traffic around Harbourside is already congested on weekends when the Convention and Exhibition centres are being used.

7) Finally it would appear from the previous proposal SSD5752, submissions against the ICC and Exhibition Centres that these were barely taken into consideration, with a few very minor amendments. This appears to be a done deal with Lend Lease and the public exhibition is just a smoke screen for something that is truthfully not up for negotiation or discussion, it will go ahead....what type of development is this for Sydney, where the public have NO SAY!

In conclusion we urge that the above objections are taken seriously as the proposed development will have a major **<u>adverse impact</u>** to the City of Sydney's heritage / identity, to over 500 apartments in the Goldsbrough building alone, neighboring buildings and the many businesses that make up this great precinct.

Yours sincerely Sandra and Paul Rynehart