

The Secretary  
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
4 Parramatta Square  
12 Darcy Street  
Parramatta NSW 2150

By Email: [james.groundwater@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:james.groundwater@planning.nsw.gov.au)

**Submission: SSD 10376 Sydney Metro Pitt Street (South) Over Station Development – Stage 2 and SSD 8876 MOD 2**

This submission should be taken as an objection to both SSD-10376 and the modification SSD-8876 MOD 2.

I was excited to hear that a new development was being built next door to us. My excitement then turned to apprehension at the news that Sydney Metro had sold the rights to develop a high rise build to rent apartment block as an over station development. My fears have been confirmed when reading the development application.

I could go to great lengths to set out all of the applicant's failures and incorrect statements but they have admitted most themselves in the application. The objection process, like the applicant's suite of documents with numerous confusing annexures, has been challenging to navigate and the exhibition period has come during the busiest month of the year. I have tried countless times to register an account on the planning website with no success. I have noticed that the number of days for submissions to close on the website is also wrong, appearing as if we have more time before the deadline than we do. I wonder how many submissions have been lost in this process.

Our planning consultant has adequately set out the main issues however I would like to add that I worry for the physical and mental health of the residents in our building if this development is built blocking out all natural light, eliminating water views and invading privacy. Our outdoor bbq area will be put into darkness and in the place of sunshine will be multiple floors of plant and equipment supporting 234 apartments above. How is this taking our amenity concerns into account?

I think new development in Sydney is extremely positive when done properly and rules are followed. However this application is how not to conduct developments. Ignoring rules, neighbour amenity, public amenity and heritage sets a dangerous precedent. We cannot allow this application to be approved. And no modification should be allowed to approved envelopes for design features which can clearly be contained within the envelope. Is this how the applicant takes Princeton's amenity into account, by asking to build even closer than is permitted? It seems their actions are entirely to the contrary.