



Email



9 Sept 2018

The Hon. Anthony Roberts MP
Minister for Planning
GPO BOX 5341
Sydney NSW 2001

RE: Proposed Pitt Street South Over Station Envelop

Dear Minister,

Recent weekend's newspapers [[development splits the shire](#), [George Miller furious over south head development](#), [more housing or unhappy locals nsw wrestles](#)] highlight community disgust at reliance on overdevelopment as a myopic policy approach at the cost of sustainability and the future of our younger generations. The current very tall envelop proposals for the over station developments in the city are another example of overdevelopment.

This letter is on behalf of numerous distressed residents of the Central Sydney City in relation to the proposed Pitt Street Metro Station South (PSMS S). I acknowledge the necessity of the metro as an infrastructure of importance for our city and fully appreciate the concept of value capture by selling space over proposed stations. However, in the case of Pitt Street Metro Station South, the proposed envelop to capture value, is not justifiable at the cost of more over crowding of a High Density area, poor disaster management strategy (both fire and terrorism related), potential damage to residents' health and well being, strained infrastructure, wind tunnel, decrease in sunlight to apartments in all nearby apartments and further damage to the city skyline views.

Here I make a case for the long term economic benefit beyond the state's coffers, even if the PSMS S envelop is restricted to 110 meters. A significant amount of value capture from the PSMS S can be transferred to PSMS North.

The proposed architect plans about the envelop do not provide the complete picture of what the development will be and what will happen in the near future. The effects of the 171m high envelop on Century Tower, Meriton's buildings, the new Castle residence and the heritage primus hotel are understated. Further the significant redevelopment on the same block further South on Pitt Castlereagh Liverpool streets is likely to lead to significant crowding and strain on infrastructure (Water, electricity, pedestrians). Even currently this is likely to bring in more than 15000 pedestrians per hour during its peak in the area.

The Cumulative effect in time and space of the proposed Event Cinema high rise will lead to a total meltdown of street level activity including pedestrian mobility and movement of cars and supply vehicles. I have lived in New York City (Manhattan) and Mumbai, and while our desire to be an International city with tall and impressive buildings is appreciated and supported, the reality is we do not have wide enough streets, avenues or boulevards to justify the type of density being proposed.

I have lived in this part of Central Sydney city for 14 years and while encouraging development all around including the Greenland complex, I can now confidently state that we are well beyond the point of over development, that will have significant cumulative adverse social, health and law & order implications. I am fearful of the ability of a high rise building fire in the area that will impact on nearby other buildings given the proximity of developments. The increasing high density of dwellings in this compact small area bound by York street and Castlereagh and Bathurst and Liverpool streets will cause a disaster for cross city clearances of traffic. My worst fears about the area becoming a dense enough target for terrorism related activity may not be justifiable, but are sufficient to share via this letter – I will hate to be in a situation to one day point out, “I said so”.

In short, I am a great supporter of development, but of the sustainable type (Lower height ones), I am also a great supporter of our current Premier but do not share her enthusiasm in relation to the PSMS S.

It will be appropriate and eye pleasing for the height of the PSMS S envelop to be similar to the ADF building, Castle residence and Princeton and not at all the current proposed envelop. I strongly suggest that the State consider the above recommendation at its planning approval stage, because as residents our alternatives appear to be non existent and hence likely to be an accentuated sense of frustrations and its inevitable consequences.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]