

13 February 2017

Dear Sir

OBJECTION to MIRVAC's DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION
Application No: SSD 16_7874
RE-DEVELOPMENT OF HARBOURSIDE SHOPPING CENTRE, DARLING HARBOUR

I am the owner of unit 1412 at 50 Murray Street, an apartment building known as "One Darling Harbour" behind the Darling Harbour Harbourside Shopping Centre.

I'd like to submit my strongest objection about the development application submitted to the Department of Planning & Environment by Mirvac of the above reference.

A lot of owners like me in One Darling Harbour bought into the building due to its location and views over Darling Harbour over the years. It is the place where we have down-sized from previous residence and intended to move to the city for retirement. The proposed high rise residential tower directly in front of our building with close proximity to the old Pyrmont Bridge proposed by Mirvac will severely block our views and sunlight to the front of our building, seriously affecting our privacy by exposing our bedrooms, living rooms and balconies, and seriously damaging the value of our property.

In addition, such a tall apartment tower in the proposed location is a **total betrayal of public interest and denial of the intention of the shopping centre re-development:**

- a) It is totally inconsistent with the government's initial stated intention to redevelopment and revitalize the Harbourside Shopping Centre, for the benefit of the public good. The submitted design is purely in the interest of Mirvac maximizing its profit in building a high rise residential tower, with little regards for the benefit of general public who come to visit Darling Harbour (in particular in the said shopping centre areas), enjoying the environments, amenities and festivities that happens on a regular basis, and totally ignore the damages caused to the existing residents in One Darling Harbour.
- b) The location of the tower was chosen to be put in front of One Darling Harbour, and purposely avoid the blocking of lines of sight for IBIS and Novotel hotels. The choice of this particular location is highly suspicious of protecting commercial interests and abusing of interest of private property owners around the site.
- c) The residential tower is too close to the old Pyrmont Bridge. It would totally destroy the aesthetic and beauty of the historic bridge and the Darling Harbour precinct where public could enjoy the views and openness without obstruction, and could view fireworks from all directions;
- d) It does not maintain the consistency of sense of open space created by low rise buildings around the water edges in Darling Harbour, supported by slightly taller buildings at the back. Cockle Bay, King Street Wharf and Barangaroo on the other side provide good examples of how low rise buildings with step back from water edge plus taller buildings at the back could achieve a successful connection from buildings to waters, providing a good sense of openness in Darling Harbour.

e) The tower does not create a harmony with the historic Pyrmont Bridge and the Maritime Museum next to it. Darling Harbour is designated to be a tourist precinct, not an area for private high rise apartment right next to the historic bridge. The proposed tower will fundamentally change the character of Darling Harbour and surrounding areas.

f) The tower does not fit in well with the tourist/holiday/hotel atmosphere of the surrounding buildings on that side of Darling Harbour including the shopping centre, which provides a venue for shopping and dining for visitors of all budgets that the other side of Darling Harbour is lacking. Any excessive commercial and residential development at the site might prevent the provisions of appropriate amenities to the general public.

g) The public has witnessed the current over-development of the old Entertainment Centre areas and the old IMAX theatre. The last thing Darling Harbour would require is another high rise residential tower built amongst the general public amenities areas.

I absolutely see no merits or bases to claims that such a high rise residential tower would strengthen the role of Darling Harbour as a prominent Sydney tourist attraction. The application is not justified on any public interest and considerations for the architectural harmony at the location other than profit maximisation.

If a high rise apartment tower in such location is ever to be considered for government approval, the design should be open for international competition with proper considerations and consultations for all public and private interests as stated above. The position of the tower should be in the middle between the IBIS and the Novotel Hotels where a gap currently exists. The design and location of the high rise tower in the current application should be discarded.

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Wu, CPA