

RE: Sydney Metro City & Southwest – Pitts Street (South) Concept Development application for Over Station Development – SSD 8876

I write to object to the above concept development application.

I am the owner of lot [REDACTED] Princeton, the building directly adjacent to the south side of the Sydney Metro City Pitt Street station. The proposal has significant non-compliances with Environmental Planning Instruments ("EPI") which the applicant makes no attempt to address. The well-being of residents in my apartment will be significantly impaired if the following issues are not satisfactorily rectified.

1. Loss of sunlight hours during mid-winter

ADG3B of the Australia Design Guide clearly states the need to minimise shadow over neighbouring properties during mid-winter. The Solar access studies undertaken by the applicant show a loss of sunlight in my apartment between 12pm and 2pm as at 21st June. The living area where residents of my apartment will spend their time between 12pm and 2pm will be casted in a shadow - an unacceptable condition to force any human being to endure.

2. Insufficient separation between proposal development and Princeton

ADG 2F specifies that minimum building separation between buildings should be 18-24 metres for all levels above level 9. The room in my apartment that faces the south side of the proposed development is a living area where we spend most of our time, a separation of 24 metres (under the current rule) is the only acceptable mean to provide adequate privacy and amenity to us. The proposed separation of 12 metres is clearly a blatant abuse of the current rule.

3. Overshadowing of Hyde Park

The applicant's own shadow study outlines additional overshadowing of Hyde Park. Hyde Park is the nearest green space frequently enjoyed by residents of my apartment, particularly during the winter months where most of the city streets are under shadow. This simple pleasure of life will be adversely impacted by the proposal.

Should I move to make way for development or progress?

Critics of my submission will probably say - Why don't you move to make way for new development or progress? To them I say since I lived the Sydney city centre in 2005, I have contributed in excess of 100K in stamp duties to the coffer of the NSW Government, averaging over \$10k per year plus countless fees and GST. I am fair to say I have paid my share to be a resident of the Sydney city. Not that money matters. Like most NSW citizens including NSW premier, Gladys Berejiklian I believe in a "fair go". When the "Corky" TfNSW representative who lectured Princeton residents about our building not meeting the current planning standards, I would like to remind the buteaucracy of TfNSW, Princeton was built 25 year ago meeting all planning requirements at that time. It is a common Government practice – also a sensible practice, to apply the grandfather policy where old rules to existing situations while new rules to all future cases. The proposed concept development application (SSD 8876) is planned for the future, it must abide by the current rules. This is clearly not the case and as a citizen of NSW, I strongly urge the NSW Government to rectify the situation.