

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

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.

We object to the applicant building such an unnecessarily wide and tall building over the station at Pitt Street South.

This is an OBJECTION against lawlessness which is taking place against all owners and occupiers living at Princeton Tower at 308 Pitt Street.

Shame on the applicant for not complying with planning legislation, guidelines and instruments! They have not even complied with the very lenient conditions of consent for stage 1 approval.

It should be noted that a number of people lodging submissions experienced difficulty when registering on the planning portal. From numerous error messages, contact form failures to verification emails that were not sent to even log on to the portal. The closing date on the website was incorrect making it appear as the deadline for lodging submissions was later than stated in the documents. I can imagine numerous non-English speaking users gave up on lodging submissions due to these difficulties.

The applicant has freely admitted that they are in breach of the following:

- Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements
- Environmental Planning Instruments
- State Environmental Planning Policy 65
- The Apartment Design Guidelines
- Conditions of stage 1 concept consent

The applicant is trying to cram as many units on to the site as possible. Due to the nature of the site being unsuitable, surrounded by Princeton, Edinburgh Castle Hotel and the Fire Station, they have attempted to maximise profit by cramming too many small apartments into the building with little to no sunlight for its residents. Not only are they forcefully removing sunlight and amenity for Princeton, their own development will not even receive the required amenity under the ADG. This is a complete failure on both counts. It is difficult to find one redeeming feature of the proposed development from the dated colour scheme to the lack of natural light which is further blocked out by the vertical structures, balustrades and louvres which do not adequately address privacy concerns. I find the appearance of the development reminds me of a vertical prison cell block confining its inhabitants inside with insufficient access to light. It is difficult to imagine any young professionals wanting to rent in this building but I can foresee it may be popular with international students as its marketing suggests.

The owners at Princeton should not be punished because of the applicant's inability and failure to select a suitable site for the trial of its untested build to rent model.

We OBJECT because we want to protect our building's sunshine and daylight.

I am not anti-development and would welcome something beautiful and useful to be built on Sydney Metro's site however I do not believe it necessary to build such a tall and wide building where it is not needed. Especially if this is carried out at the expense of sacrificing privacy, solar access and amenity of adjoining residents.

I am shocked that only 6 units out of 116 at Princeton Apartments will get the required sunlight after the proposed development is constructed. Has the applicant even considered the additional devastating effects on mental health this would cause?

I am horrified that the applicant has proposed zero separation on lower floors and a 12 metre building separation on higher floors. This is a blatant breach of the Apartment Design Guidelines 2F. I note that the lower floors of the development will contain plant and equipment at zero setback to units in Princeton, communal bbq area and gym. Can you image have plant and equipment for a 39 storey building located right outside your apartment window or next to your communal outdoor area. The proposition is astounding. And to have the applicant apply for a separate application to go beyond the approved envelope is unbelievable.

I am appalled that the Shadow Analysis Report (buried deep within the applicant's volumes of annexures) shows there will be additional shadowing caused by the development to Hyde Park. This is a major substantial adverse effect on this public park.

This development application cannot proceed in its current form. Please listen to the objections and assist protect residents amenity, privacy, solar access, sustainability and heritage of our great city.