

To NSW Planning & Infrastructure Department,

I am the homeowner of 625-629 South Dowling Street, Surry Hills and I am writing to support the preferred option as defined by the EIS, option 1b, as this option would result in my residence at 625-629 South Dowling Street, being outside of the defined area for compulsory acquisition. My home is located within option 1c, as outlined in the EIS.

Having always held a passion for innovation and design that stemmed from my business life, I purchased the warehouse property on 1st July 2012 to create my dream home. I have been through an exhaustive and costly process of **three DA's** to get the unique home I wanted to create approved. I have invested **\$8m** into acquiring, developing and fitting out my home, which will be due for completion in a few weeks. Therefore, after much emotional, physical and financial investment, I am supportive of option 1b, as it provides for the potential integration of major developments along the light rail line, which may have a number of positive social and economic outcomes, without the need for compulsory acquisition of the subject premises.

I am also supportive of option 1b, as this is the route with least environmental impact, as it allows strong physical and vegetation screening through this residential area.

Although option 1b is the route with the least environmental impact it does remove substantial mature vegetation within Olivia Gardens. It is acknowledged within the EIS that the applicants will carry out an extensive landscaping exercise to enhance the environment within Olivia Gardens and also Wimbo Park. In this regard, it is essential that the applicants carry out extensive advanced landscaping between the light rail corridor and my property at 625-629 South Dowling Street. This would create a neighbourhood precinct and an effective buffer zone between the residential developments to the south of the light rail line.

If option 1b were approved, I would ask that stringent conditions must be placed to ensure that the project during both construction and operational phases is within the prescribed acceptable vibration and acoustic limits of having a residence that abuts the light rail system.

In summary, I am supportive of option 1b and would object to option 1c, as it will result in the acquisition of my home. I would like to stress that I would be devastated to lose a home that I have spent **five years** on making become a reality, as it's a **rare warehouse property**.

My objection, apart from being driven by my ownership of a property that could be acquired, is also based on the following logical reasons:

- **Two reasonable routes with the less impact on residents**- Option 1c will impact the most amount of residents (acquisition of more residential properties), option 1a and 1b impacts the least amount of resident and impact a Government owned car park. Why take a house when you can go through a car park.
- **Financial** - Transport NSW have informed me that option 1c is the most expensive option and as a tax payer, I would implore the State Government to consider the more cost effective options, option 1a and 1b, which doesn't result in purchasing a home worth \$8m and go through a State Government owned car park. Why spend an extra \$8m when there are other plausible routes.
- **Noise** – Option 1a and 1b have the straightest run, therefore less curves and changes in route resulting in less noise and impacts.
- **Safety** – As parkland will replace Olivia Gardens, if option 1c is chosen, Bourke Street Public School Students will have to cross the light rail to access the park.
- **Cultural** – My house will be a unique architectural masterpiece – it would be a loss of an iconic Surry Hills and Sydney home.

Kind Regards,
John Winning