

REDEVELOPMENT OF HARBOURSIDE SHOPPING CENTRE

SSD16_7874

My submission is based on the bulk and scale of the proposed development, loss of views, solar access and privacy, noise and impact on the heritage Pyrmont Bridge.

First it is important to say that I was consulted (a room was provided over several days to talk to Mirvac people) on a proposal that had no residential but commercial. I was not informed or consulted otherwise only to find that the proposal now put forward has no commercial but residential, 39 floors and based on the prices at Barangaroo a two bedroom will be selling upwards of \$3m. How lucky is Mirvac all this uplift for free. The GFA they are seeking is over many times what they have now. This is a totally different proposal so why was I not consulted as before?

Submission.

I reside in an east facing apartment (803) on the southern end of One Darling Harbour. I enjoy uninterrupted views of Cockle Bay and it particular the many national and local functions that are celebrated on the water at Darling Harbour. The place is famous for visits by tourists all around the world and families from all parts of Sydney who come in to enjoy the celebrations.

I question why will the Department of Planning allow residential so close to the foreshore, which is supposed to be a tourists destination and place for the people to enjoy. **It cannot enhance tourism**

We are told at the consultation that the site has no controls and Mirvac can propose anything it likes.

The Tower, particularly at the lower levels, is overpowering is its size and at higher levels in its height. The floor of the basin is characterized by the low restaurants at Cockle Bay as well as the low level of Harbourside Shopping Centre. Further back there are some taller buildings. The new ICC on Cockle Bay should be the height limit not the ICC hotel which is further from the foreshore and certainly not higher as proposed by Mirvac.

The proposal totally overpowers the heritage Pyrmont Bridge. We were told that Mirvac plans on moving it a little away from the bridge. However it is too overpowering and clearly takes away from the iconic nature of the famous bridge. Mirvac has another option called Central Option which places the tower between the gap of the Novatel and the IBIS hotels. This would be far better place for the tower than right on the bridge.

One Darling harbor was designed with the existing Harbourside Shopping Centre in front of it. This design maximized views and my lounge/kitchen, bedroom 1 and bedroom 2 have views direct east ie to Cockle Bay. The proposed residential tower with it very large floor areas at my level will have **residents looking straight into my private spaces**. It is not if I can change the design to adapt the situation. I will have a lack of privacy if the Tower is not moved to my preferred location of 'Central Tower'.

I presently have uninterrupted views from all three main rooms as well as my balcony of Cockle Bay and other icons such as the Pyrmont Bridge. The proposed development will totally rob me of my Cockle Bay water views, which is the focus of national and local celebrations throughout the year.

Out winter solar access is limited. However, I enjoy several hours of solar access from September to about April. The bulk of the development is directly west of my apartment and would totally **rob me of any solar access throughout the year**. I consider this as unacceptable.

As pointed out above and at the consultation, I would support the development if the tower was based on the 'Central Tower Option' and leave it to the Department of Planning to assess the merit of height, bulk and scale.

Proponent's Central Tower Option which would be reasonable and acceptable



Linda Joukhador
Resident
One Darling Harbour
803/50 Murray Street
Pyrmont NSW 2009