

Formal Objection to 45-53 Macleay Street Redevelopment (SSD-10830)

To Whom It May Concern,

I am lodging this objection to the proposed redevelopment of 45-53 Macleay Street, Potts Point (Project ID: SSD-79316759) as the owner of apartment 6, 57-59 Macleay Street Potts Point - which is a close neighbour to the proposal. I have reviewed the application material and believe the proposal, as currently submitted, contains a considerable number of errors, as well as concerning lack of overall transparency.

My grounds for objection:

1. Omission of neighbouring apartments significantly impacted

In the attachment ***Solar Access Data Tables*** provided in SJB's document titled **Concept SSDA Design Report**, pages 57, 58 and 59 make reference to the impacts on natural light upon only a select group of units within 57-59 Macleay Street. There is no mention of my property (lot 6 on level 3). Nor is there mention of any of the Northwest facing apartments (3, 6, 8, and 9) spread across all levels in our building, of which four at least will be greatly impacted by this proposal since their only access to natural light and outlook faces the proposed redevelopment site. The increased bulk and height of this proposal will adversely affect our apartments in numerous ways. Not only do the provided graphs within the impact statement not include these apartments, nor do the charts state what time of the year they relate to. The document claims there are only 5 apartments in 57-59 Macleay Street, when there are actually 9 residential apartments and two commercial lots within the building, the majority of which, for some strange reason, have not been included in the data.

The proximity to 55 Macleay Street of the out-door facilities proposed for both the ground floor level and the third-floor, raises legitimate concerns regarding possible undisclosed cooperation between developers sharing these facilities or some other mutually beneficial arrangement as White House Developments currently holds an approved DA for the redevelopment of the adjoining property at 55 Macleay Street (D/2016/1079). Whilst there appears to be no disclosure of any potential conflicts of interest in the application material, it is noted that Time & Place were apparently unable to gain access to 55 Macleay Street to include that property in their impact statement. I find this to be most unusual as SJB Architects (used by Time & Place for this proposal) are the same architects used by White House Developments in the redevelopment of 55 Macleay Street Potts Point.

2. Significant Reduction of amenity

a) Loss of Light

As mentioned above lot 6 will be seriously impacted by the reduction or elimination of natural light resulting from this proposal which would mean a greater reliance on artificial lighting, leading to increased energy consumption, costs and potential impact on residents well being. Nothing in the proposal's provided documentation references the impact of loss of natural light on lot 6, or any other of the Northwest facing apartments in 57-59 Macleay Street. I believe this omission does not provide best practices for planning and should therefore render the proposal incomplete.

b) Reduced Ventilation and Air Quality

The size and overshadowing of this proposal will reduce ventilation and affect air

quality currently available in my apartment which will again increase reliance on energy consumption and costs involved in providing artificial air circulation (air-conditioning) as well as potentially negatively impact the well being of residents.

c) Devaluation of Property

The significant loss of natural light, outlook/views, privacy, peaceful enjoyment of one's own lot and overall amenity due to overshadowing will negatively impact the market value and desirability of all the apartments in 57-59 Macleay Street, including my own.

c) Privacy Breaches

The proposed open-air gym on the third level of the redevelopment facing Southwest presents concerning privacy issues for all the rear verandahs and windows of the apartments in 57-59 Macleay Street. No mitigation measures have been included in the proposal to alleviate the impact of this reduced privacy.

d) Noise and Amenity Impacts

The scale and intensity of the proposed communal recreation area facilities on both the ground floor level and the third floor will significantly impact the amenity of residents in 57-59 Macleay Street, particularly those residents in units closest to the swimming pool and gym areas, like my own apartment. Our amenity will be impacted by increased noise from the pool area including water splashing, raised human voices, pool equipment, gym equipment, music, as well as the odor of chlorine and other chemicals. The increased noise pollution generated by these areas is being proposed in an otherwise quiet residential area.

3. Lack of Genuine Affordable Housing Commitment

The application uses the concept of "affordable housing" to justify significant height and density increases. However, the proposal does not provide a binding commitment to deliver any specific quantity or type of affordable housing, nor any assurance that affordable units will be retained in perpetuity.

In order to justify the additional height and bulk the proposal mentions "up to 20%" will be designated as affordable housing. Needless to say this is a small fraction of the 80 or so affordable housing units the site currently provides in the Chimes building. The current apartments are small studio flats with few amenities which keeps the cost of the apartments down. To replace these with a luxury high-rise building that contains a few one bedroom apartments with expensive communal facilities (multiple swimming pools, gym and recreational areas) will mean these few affordable apartments will be far more expensive than what they would be replacing.

4. Unsustainable Demolition Practices

The Chimes is a structurally sound building. Demolishing and replacing it, rather than adaptively reusing or upgrading it, contradicts the City's stated commitments to sustainability and climate responsibility.

Tearing down existing viable structures creates unnecessary emissions and landfill waste. Further excavation around the very precious heritage items along Macleay Street puts these buildings and their occupants in grave danger especially given the heritage buildings are already to be impacted by excessive excavation planned by White House Developments at 55 and 61-63 Macleay Street.

5. Lack of Meaningful Community Benefit

The inclusion of a retail lot and a vague mention of "public art spaces" does not constitute a meaningful or proportional public benefit. There is no serious provision for

public open space, community infrastructure, or services that would genuinely offset the significant harm this development would cause to the surrounding residents. The bulk and scale of the proposed redevelopment will obstruct from public view (via MacDonald Street) the Yellowhouse Art Screens on the Western facade of 57-59 Macleay Street (known as The Yellow House) which were designed by Australian artist Matthew Johnson in consultation with the Art Gallery of NSW and formed an integral part of the DA conditions of consent relating to public art when the Yellowhouse was redeveloped 20 plus years ago.

6. Excessive Height, Scale, and Bulk

The proposed height and bulk is grossly disproportionate to the surrounding character of Macleay Street. The building will tower over neighbouring properties in a manner that is visually overbearing. I strongly believe it would create an environment of visual oppression and claustrophobia for all apartments within 57-59 Macleay Street and the surrounding properties.

Conclusion:

This redevelopment proposal is incompatible, and damaging to the fabric of 'the Parisian end of Potts Point'. It prioritises developer profits over resident welfare, sustainability, and community values.

We respectfully but firmly urge NSW Planning, the City of Sydney and all relevant planning authorities to reject this application in its current form. A redevelopment of this site needs to be respectful of its context, its neighbours, and its environmental responsibilities.

Yours sincerely,
Stephanie Burgess
6/57-59 Macleay Street
Potts Point NSW 2011