

25<sup>th</sup> September 2012

20/88 Albert Avenue  
Chatswood NSW 2067

Director  
Metropolitan & Regional Projects North  
Department of Planning and Infrastructure  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: **Your Reference: MP 09 0066 MOD 3**  
**Thomas Street Carpark Development**

I am very disappointed and displeased that the very first notification any of the owners/residents of 88 Albert Avenue Chatswood received about the above Development was on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> September 2012 when I received a letter dated 17<sup>th</sup> September re MP 09\_0066 MOD 3 and subsequently discovered that the original Development Application had been approved by the State Government back in 2010, without us having had the opportunity to submit any objections. In light of the fact that the development is going to affect our property so drastically, I think it is grossly unfair that we were not notified when the original DA was first lodged. No letter was sent to the residents or owners advising them of the proposed development. Is this even legal?

For the last 40 years, since our 9 storey block of 36 units was built in the 1970s, there has been no development built along the northern side of Albert Avenue, which affects residential property on the southern side of Albert Avenue, such as MP 09\_0066 shall affect our building. The development shall dwarf our building by almost 3 times its height and leave us in shadow for all but a few hours in the morning, changing what has always been a light, warm, sunny aspect to a bleak, cold, dark building. This will totally devalue each of the 36 units, but most especially those 18 units which face north-east.

As soon as I received the notification of the modified application of the development on the 18<sup>th</sup> September 2012 I contacted Ms Sara Roach to enquire whether the developer had any obligation to undertake a Dilapidation Report of our building and Sara advised that as part of the original consent the developer was required to undertake a Dilapidation Report of "adjoining properties". However, as this is a very general term I would like to submit that 88-92 Albert Avenue and 94-100 Albert Avenue be specifically included as adjoining properties to ensure that the developer conducts a Dilapidation Report of these properties, as at present the Applicant does not believe that they are required to undertake a Dilapidation Report of 88-92 Albert Avenue.

I was also concerned that the developer is trying to change to the wording of the existing Condition C15. I would therefore like to submit that the existing Condition C15 not be replaced with the Applicant's proposed substitution, which would seem to reduce the Applicant's responsibility to ensure that adjoining properties are not adversely affected by the deep excavations required by the Applicant's works and that any damage to these properties is made good by the Applicant. Accordingly, I request that the wording of the Condition which "requires detailing of structural

adequacy of adjoining properties to withstand excavation and ensure that no damage will occur during works”, be retained.

I would appreciate if you would kindly not disclose my name and address to the proponent or on the website.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "R. Edwards". The signature is written in dark ink on a light-colored, slightly textured background.

Robyn Edwards