

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.

My objection to the proposed over station development at Pitt Street South is based on breaches of the following items:

1. Secretary's Environmental. Assessment Requirements;
2. City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012;
3. Apartment Design Guide;
4. Sydney Metro Design Excellence Strategy and OSD Design Guideline;
5. Stage 1 development conditions of consent.

There are multiple breaches of the above standards in relation to overshadowing, separation, privacy, loss of solar light, heritage, loss of view.

The applicant's attitude to the numerous breaches seems to be that we should expect bad planning and the removal of our amenity because we live in the city. Surely it is in the city where spaces is more scarce should planning regulations be most stringently enforced. This defies logic. It is clearly evident that the applicant does not understand the way planning controls should be applied.

One example is the disregard displayed in the body of the application to the Apartment Design Guide while simultaneously referencing this in their guidelines as "requirements" they must abide by. They are clearly confused in this regard.

The proposed development doesn't even meet the standards for amenity for its own residents let alone the drastic effect it will have on its neighbours. Sustainability is quoted as being a key metric and is championed by the applicant without acknowledging its complete failure to develop a sustainable building.

State significant applications with the potential to destroy families' amenity need to be properly assessed by an independent body comprising of planning experts. I understand this may not be done purely because of a loophole unless the application receives a threshold number of submissions. But it is precisely the fact that the development is state significant should the application be independently assessed. The motives of the applicant appear to be to fit in the most amount of apartments into the smallest space at the cost of everyone's amenity. This will no doubt cause numerous issues including increased reliance on artificial heating and lighting in winter and cooling in summer (sustainability), mental health issues affecting 48 families in Princeton who will lose their solar access, prevention of Princeton adopting planned installation of solar panels to reduce carbon footprint and loss of privacy to name a few.

I note also that the modification application seeks to develop outside the stage 1 approved envelope and will further reduce separation between the development and Princeton by 45cm to 11.55m. This is obviously a further breach of the above standards. It also does not take into the account the operability of any windows/louvres on the southern side, which I presume will reduce separation even further. The applicant appears to have failed to even meet its own non-compliant metrics.

I trust the objections raised to the application will be taken into account. The applicant must be accountable to the public if their actions have the potential to damage the amenity of the residents in Sydney.