

Final Submission – Objection to the Chimes Development, 4–6 MacLeay Street Potts Point

To: City of Sydney Council **Re:** Chimes Redevelopment – Development Application **From:**
Owner, Apartment 203, 12 MacLeay Street, Elizabeth Bay (MacLeay Regis)

I am the owner and resident of Apartment 203, 12 MacLeay Street. My apartment is specifically referenced in the proposal documents as one of the dwellings impacted by the development. I wish to lodge a formal objection on the following grounds:

1. **Significant loss of light and loss of views to my property**
2. **Excessive height and bulk of the proposed building**
3. **Unacceptable cumulative impacts on the Potts Point/Elizabeth Bay community, heritage character, and amenity**

1. Loss of Light and Loss of Views

1.1 Omission of community concerns

The proposal's summary of community consultation fails to acknowledge that many residents — including myself — raised concerns about loss of light and loss of views. This omission is inaccurate and misrepresents the feedback provided.

1.2 View loss – flawed and dismissive assessment

Appendix A states that lower-level units in MacLeay Regis, Selsdon and Pomeroy were excluded from modelling because view loss was assumed to be “limited”. This is incorrect.

My apartment has a clear city outlook from its main living areas. This view contributes significantly to amenity, natural light, and property value. The report's characterisation of this view as “fortuitously gained” and of “low scenic quality” is inappropriate and irrelevant. The planning test is **impact**, not whether the view is considered prestigious.

The development will **remove my existing city outlook entirely**. This is a material and adverse impact. Based on comparable sales, I estimate a reduction in property value of approximately **\$500,000**.

1.3 Light loss – understated and minimised

The solar access assessment acknowledges that Apartment 203 will lose winter sunlight but labels the reduction as “negligible” because it is “only 15 minutes” and because lower-level apartments are “inherently more difficult to protect”.

This reasoning is unacceptable. Winter sunlight is already limited in this apartment. A further reduction — particularly in the only rooms receiving direct light — has a real impact on amenity, heating, and liveability. The assessment does not reflect the lived experience of residents and does not meet the intent of SEPP 65 or the Apartment Design Guide regarding equitable solar access.

2. Excessive Height and Bulk

The proposal seeks a Clause 4.6 variation to increase the height to **56.01 metres**, nearly **6 metres above** the permitted height.

This is unreasonable because:

- Height was one of the strongest objections raised by the community.
- The variation is substantial and visually equivalent to approximately two additional storeys.
- The justification relies on architectural shaping rather than genuine planning merit.
- The increased height further blocks sky views, reduces solar access, and overshadows surrounding heritage buildings.

The variation appears driven by yield maximisation rather than public benefit and does not satisfy the Clause 4.6 requirement to demonstrate that compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary.

3. Broader Impacts on Potts Point and the Community

3.1 Parking, traffic and construction impacts

The proposal provides:

- **Only 2 retail parking spaces**, despite extensive retail floor area
- **Only 8 visitor spaces** for 44 apartments

This is inadequate in a suburb already experiencing extreme parking scarcity. Tradespeople, carers, and visitors will be forced into surrounding streets, worsening congestion and reducing amenity.

Construction impacts are also significantly understated. Removal of four levels of sandstone, crane operations, and truck movements will cause prolonged disruption to MacLeay Street and Billyard Avenue. Recent nearby developments demonstrate that such impacts are long-lasting.

3.2 Social and community impacts

Potts Point has historically been a diverse community with a mix of incomes and housing types. Reducing the number of dwellings from 80 to 44 does **not** support housing supply or affordability objectives.

The design also appears to create separation between different resident groups through separate entrances and communal areas. This is inconsistent with the inclusive character of the neighbourhood.

3.3 Heritage and character impacts

Potts Point's heritage significance lies in its human-scale streetscape and Interwar/Art Deco architecture. The proposed development — due to its height, bulk, and architectural expression — overwhelms adjacent heritage buildings, including MacLeay Regis, and erodes the established character of the area.

Conclusion

The proposal repeatedly characterises its impacts as “minor” or “negligible”. This does not reflect the reality for affected residents. The development will:

- Remove existing views
- Reduce already limited sunlight

- Increase overshadowing
- Intensify congestion
- Disrupt the neighbourhood for years
- Diminish the heritage character of Potts Point
- Reduce housing diversity while increasing high-end stock

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed development and request that Council refuse the application or require substantial redesign to address the issues raised.