

Patricia Snyder
Unit 18/12-20 Rosebank Street
Darlinghurst NSW 2010

Date: 10/11/2025

To: The Assessment Officer

Subject: Formal Objection to Revised Development Proposal – SSD-80211463
(164-194 William Street, Woolloomooloo)

Dear Assessment Officer,

I am writing to formally object to the revised development proposal for the site located at 164-194 William Street, Woolloomooloo). As a resident and property owner in the vicinity, I have serious concerns regarding the scale, impact, and planning integrity of the proposed changes.

1) Significant Increase in Size Compared to Initial Proposal

The revised development is substantially larger than originally proposed. The current proposal represents a dramatic and unforeseen escalation in scale, which undermines the expectations set during the initial planning phase. Even with the initial proposal, we would have lost a large part of our view of the CBD, and when we purchased our apartment in 2003, the view from the apartment was a large factor in our decision to purchase this particular property.

2) Loss of Iconic Views and Financial Impact

The increased height and massing will completely obstruct my views of the City, and substantially affect our view of the Harbour Bridge—landmarks that significantly contribute to the value and appeal of my property. The Visual Impact Assessment included in the proposal is inadequate, having considered only a limited number of affected buildings while excluding many others in the surrounding area.

3) Negative Impact on Local Infrastructure and Environment

The proposed development will exacerbate existing pressures on local infrastructure and environmental conditions, including:

- Increased traffic congestion
- Altered wind patterns
- Additional strain on public transport and community services

4. Cumulative Effect of Multiple Large Developments

There is a concerning trend of oversized developments in the immediate area, including:

- 134 William Street
- Holiday Inn site
- 164 William Street

Each of these projects appears to be seeking not only the standard 30% uplift, but also substantial additional height. Under the current application process, these applications are looked at as "one offs" without considering the affect that multiple developments with the proposed dimensions hugely impact the local residents and the general positive livability of the area.

5) Vagueness in details of proposed "Private Park" and total Gross Floor Area

The proposal seems to calculate the total Gross Floor Area (GFA) without excluding the space designated for the private park. As this park spans roughly seven levels, its inclusion artificially increases the building's height, when it should have led to a proportional decrease in the overall floor area.

Conclusion

Considering the issues outlined above, I firmly oppose the updated development proposal. I respectfully call on the council to either deny the application or mandate substantial revisions to ensure it adheres to sound planning standards and genuinely represents the interests and values of the local community.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours sincerely,



Patricia Snyder

0415 186 500