

MoreNSW Planning & Environment

ATTN Lisa Miller

11 September 2018

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Sydney, NSW 2000

AUSTRALIA

Email: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir,

**OBJECTION – SSD 17 8876, Over Station Development at**

**125-129 & 131-135 Bathurst Street and 296-302 Pitt Street**

We live in the building adjoining the above and are travelling overseas at present and have limited access to internet and computers so please overlook any formatting or submission errors in our submission.

We have become aware of the above application and wish to object and **REQUEST THAT YOU REFUSE THIS APPLICATION**. Our reasons and concerns include:

**Gross Overdevelopment** – when we purchased our unit in early 2016 the site presented as being a future 6 story redevelopment which whilst double the existing building (3 storey from memory) seemed tolerable. The current suggestion of 30 to 35 storeys PLUS 8 floors of “podium” or 43 floors in total seems unreasonable and excessive.

**Impacts on Adjoining Owners** – the large scale building now proposed will impact us as immediately adjoining owners and due to its scale it will affect owners and occupiers within 1 to 2 city blocks. Effects will include overshadowing, reduction in natural daylight, noise both during construction and by future occupiers and loss of privacy as owners from both buildings will have picture views into each others apartments. We also believe that the proposal FAILS to achieve adequate separation making these problems worse and exposing both buildings to fire and safety risks. As described the building seems likely to even overshadow Hyde Park affecting this valuable amenity shared by all Sydney residents and visitors.

**Restrictive Covenant Proposed on our building** – we have been advised that the impact of the proposed building is so great that a restrictive covenant will be imposed on owners and occupiers of our building. We do not have details and do not understand how a 3<sup>rd</sup> party could

impose this without consent or due process. If the applicant has suggested this this is either in place or agreed please be aware that this is not correct and we, together with many other owners of our building would actively resist such an attempt.

**Failure to Comply with Planning Requirements** – we have been advised that the application fails to address essential planning requirements including SEPP 65, LEP 2012. Your agency would be failing in its responsibilities to permit a defective and incomplete application.

**Historic Setting Compromised** – the nearby buildings are generally low rise historic buildings that will be immediately impacted and compromised by this proposal. In addition the loss of this heritage this site will easily become the “thin end of the wedge” that will be used to justify further destruction of Sydney’s remaining heritage as these adjoining sites are compromised by any outrageous president set for this site.

**Traffic and Parking** – our local streets are largely unchanged from what existed 150 years ago despite the ongoing growth in the city. Adding 43 floors of additional apartments – probably 300 units will cause further traffic and congestion particularly at peak times when everybody is leaving and returning from school and work. The 34 parking spaces will fall far short of serving residents needs and the regular visits of removalists, tradesmen, maintenance and repair staff, deliveries and garbage and recycling services appear to have been completely overlooked or more likely ignored as “sombodys problem”.

Given the proposal is so grossly and unreasonably excessive I hope that your department is already preparing a decision to REJECT THIS APPLICATION. I am happy for you to quote both the details and the sentiment of this letter to support this reaction and **I REQUEST THAT THIS APPLICATION BE REFUSED.**

Yours Sincerely

