

30th June 2020

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

Dear Sir

RE: SSD 10376 Sydney Metro Pitt Street (South) Over the Station Development - Stage 2 and SSD 8876 MOD 2

I writing to object to the above Development Applications which will have a significant impact on my apartment's amenity.

The new building will be too close to the Princeton apartments and will block a significant amount of winter sun to the living areas. I have read the reports and even the developer has advised that they do not comply with the Apartment Design Guideline (ADG) for Solar Access. The report states that they will reduce the amount of apartments receiving solar access to living area for a minimum of 2 hours between 9am and 3pm as at 21st June, from 54 apartments out of 116 (being 46.55%) to 6 apartments out of 116. That is a reduction of 41.4% which is in breach of the ADG which states that solar access cannot be reduced by more than 20% if the existing building does not already receive the minimum of 70% solar access as at 21st June.

The suggested structure is being built too close to the Princeton apartments, which is causing the impact on solar access, which also reducing privacy and the amenity of our apartments. Further the SSD 8876 MOD 2 suggests that they are even be closer than the 12 metres, as the developer now wants to exceed the approved envelope by more than 500mm on each façade, leading to even more impacts.

Blocking the sun access to our living rooms during winter will also lead to increased power use and costs, leading less sustainable building.

The design is also very unsympathetic to the surrounding heritage items such as the Edinburgh Hotel. The structure looks very brutal and prison like. Very poor choice of colours and structural elements.

It is clear that the developer did not even consider the consent conditions for the SSD 8776 stage 1 DA, which clearly stated in condition B3 *(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*

In it's design the developer has:

Gone outside the envelope as proposed in SSD 8876 MOD 2 by up to 500mm.
Has significantly reduced the solar access to Princeton apartments and breached ADG 3B
Not complied with the ADG 2F requiring a 24 metre separation form habitable to habitable rooms, impacting on privacy and amenity of apartments.

The above non compliances and disregard to even attempt to reduce the impacts to the Princeton Apartments and other surrounding neighbours shows that the developer does not care about being responsible whilst also suggesting that the consent authority will be compliant in its breaches of the ADG and conditions of consent for SSD 8876 consent.

Poor design and planning leads to poor outcomes.

This application needs to be refused and a redesigned to be undertaken to remove any impacts to the Princeton apartments and it's neighbours.

