

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 am an owner in Princeton which is next door to the proposed development. I wish to express my objection to the developer's application which is a gross overdevelopment of this site.

There is little regard in the application about neighbours and the planning process. The application is non-compliant on a staggering number of fundamental points including the SSD 8876 consent conditions, SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guidelines.

It is quite shocking how blatant the applicant admits to their failure to comply and even attempts to change ADG solar access requirements to suit their needs.

SSD 8876 consent condition A24 states that the development is to maximise solar access to Princeton. A 41.4% reduction in apartments receiving 2 hours of solar access to their living rooms between 9am - 3pm at 21 June is a complete failure to achieve this requirement.

Further consent condition B3 states any residential scheme being considered on the site must comply with SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guidelines. The ADG allows a maximum of 20% reduction of solar access for residential buildings not already meeting 70% solar access. The applicant has failed in this regard by more than double the required metric.

Separation is woefully inadequate between the buildings. The 0-12m separation is well below the required 24m under the ADG. And in fact the proposed modification to SSD 8876 would reduce separation to 11.55m between the development and Princeton.

Overshadowing over Hyde Park is another issue that should be avoided for new developments. This park is a rare sanctuary in the city which should have full access to sunlight.

The interaction between the development and Edinburgh Castle Hotel is inadequate and its only attempt to respect the heritage nature is by using a similar colour, which in my opinion does not suit the style of building.

The applicant's attempt to address privacy issues can be added to the long list of shortcomings. By placing louvres on bedroom windows facing Princeton does not protect the direct visual line between our apartments and the living rooms in the development. This follows a pattern of attempts by the developer to take very minimal steps to address the large issues at hand which is apparent throughout the application.

The net effect of the developer's failures if the development is approved in its current format would be disastrous for neighbouring residents and the general public. The amenity currently enjoyed by Princeton would be decimated causing many issues to the families that reside there. These issues range from increased reliance on artificial lighting and heating, loss of privacy, loss of views, acoustic impacts and sustainability. It also raises considerations of mental health issues where families' homes are put into darkness, views removed and privacy taken away.

We must ensure the application is considered by an independent panel who will hold the applicant to account and measure this application against the requirements it blatantly flaunts.