

30 June 2020

The Director Key Sites Assessments
Major Project 34311 Pitt St South OSD
NSW Government Department of Planning Industry and Environment
Parramatta

SUBMISSION

OBJECTION to the

DETAILED DA SSD 10376 OSD PITT STREET SOUTH SYDNEY 2000

I am the owner of apartment 46 'Princeton Apartments' 308 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000.

My property is adjacent to the proposed development for which the Detailed DA SSD 10376 has been submitted to the NSW Government Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.

There are numerous non compliances with the consent conditions of the Concept DA for major project 34311 (Pitt Street South OSD) which have surfaced in the Detailed DA SSD 10376. These non-compliances are a major cause for concern, and they anchor my objections to the Detailed DA SSD 10376. I am directly affected by the proposed development.

My primary objections are to the unreasonable reduction of Solar Access to my unit, the proposed twelve metre separation between DA SSD 10376 and my unit, and the non-alignment of the Pitt Street setback of DA SSD 10736 with the main body of the Princeton building (as opposed to aligning with the heritage façade of the Princeton building). These objections relate to the failure of the Detailed DA to give effect to condition A24 and B3 of the Concept DA consent.

I further object to the non-compliance of the Detailed DA with the requirements of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). With particularity objective 3B-2 of the ADG requires,

“Where an adjoining property does not currently receive the required hours of solar access the proposed building ensures solar access to the neighbouring properties is not reduced by more than 20%.”

46 per cent of Princeton Apartments currently receive the minimum requirement for solar access of two hours of sunlight between 9.00am and 3.00pm in mid-winter. The OSD will reduce this solar access to only 5.2 per cent of Princeton Apartments, meaning only six of the 116 apartments will receive the required hours of solar access. This 41 per cent reduction is greater than the 20 per cent requirement of Objective 3B-2 of the ADG, a significant breach.

Condition A24 of the Concept DA specifically A24(c)(i)(c) requires articulation of built forms from the Pitt Street boundary of the site should be such as to maximize solar access to the living rooms of Princeton apartments between 9.00am and 3.00pm at winter solstice. I do

not agree with the DPIE that the Detailed DA SSD 10376 satisfies condition A24 of the Concept DA (Design Guideline conditions).

Condition A24 (F) requires the design guidelines to be amended to give effect to maximum solar access between 12noon- 2pm at other times of the year.

The OSD is also in breach of condition B3(h) of the Concept DA which requires compliance with SEPP65 and the ADG. The ADG also requires a minimum of 24 metres separation between habitable rooms for developments over 25 metres in height. The Detailed DA SSD 10376 heralds a 12-metre separation when it should be 24 metres. I object to a 12-metre separation as it will compound the loss of amenity including solar access, that result from an inadequate Pitt St setback by the OSD combined and compounded with a 12-metre separation.

Condition B3 of the concept DA requires the Detailed DA to address the built form considerations specifically B3 (d)....any structure or built forms within the structure reservation zone must be designed to minimize its impacts to the outlook and amenity of the adjoining Princeton apartments. The Detailed DA will result in loss of views from my apartment north along Pitt Street.

A reduced separation of 12 metres will give rise to acoustic concerns as the terrace communal open space of the OHD is immediately adjacent to the Princeton Apartments. This will impact my apartment.

A 12-metre separation will impact ventilation and privacy. The lack of louvres extending across living room windows on the southern side of the OSD will impact on my apartment sunroom.

Condition B3 of the Concept DA consent requires the Detailed DA to address built form considerations namely,

(e) a varied setback from the Pitt Street boundary of the site, with the articulation of built forms be designed to minimise solar impacts to the living rooms of Princeton Apartments.

(h) for a residential scheme, achieve compliance with the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development and the accompanying Apartment Design Guide.

I submit that the setback for the OSD new structure from Pitt Street should align with the main structure of the Princeton apartment block behind the Princeton Heritage façade, then the new OSD structure could curve towards Pitt St as it approaches Bathurst St, and increase the Floor Space Ratios to compensate. This would allow more sunlight into Princeton apartments and minimize the impact on the outlook from the Princeton apartments, as required by the consent conditions B3(d)(e) in the OSD Concept DA.

Failure to align the OSD with the main Princeton tower will result in a 'sandwich effect' Along the Pitt Street streetscape. Instead of a continuous streetscape from the main Princeton Tower to Bathurst Street, Princeton Tower will be sandwiched in between Telstra

Tower and the OSD towers. The substantial loss of amenity to Princeton Apartments will be glaringly obvious to all who cast their eyes on such a streetscape. This planning outcome is not in the public interest, my interest or the Princeton owners' interests.

The concept of the Metro Pitt St South OSD is a wonderful concept, however, the OSD should not take place at the expense of owners and tenants of Princeton Apartments. The 'rob Peter to pay Paul' approach of the OSD will result in considerable loss of value and amenity to my property and other owners.

The Detailed DA does not reflect the letter or spirit of the approval conditions of the Concept DA for this unique site.

The Concept DA conditions of approval have been circumvented by the Detailed DA in an attempt to maximise development on the OSD site in an inappropriate way and this 'squeeze the lemon until the pips squeak' approach by the OSD developer at the expense of my apartment and other Princeton tenants and owners is objectionable .

I hope proper consideration will be given to an amended design where the outcome is satisfactory to my interests, Princeton owners interests, the developers interests and the wider community interest, such that all four can enjoy this great improvement to Sydney's infrastructure as envisaged in the Concept DA for the OSD Pitt Street South site.