

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.

No because not enough setbacks and building separation. The modification application further demonstrates the applicant's disregard for planning controls and conditions of stage 1 consent.

The applicant has given no thought whatsoever to the surrounding heritage buildings such as the Fire Station on Castlereagh Street which is immediately behind the proposed building and the Edinburgh Castle Hotel which is immediately adjacent next door to the north. From looking at the design plans. they have not given enough setbacks to these two heritage buildings.

There is also insufficient separation between Princeton and the development which means that it is unlawful under the Apartment Design Guidelines 2F. The lack of building separation and appropriate setbacks between Princeton and Sydney Metro's building is even more damaging because there are 116 units in Princeton.

I understand around half of these homes will be directly affected because they will overlook the new Sydney Metro Building.

This means there will be a general loss of amenity for me and my neighbours and we will lost views, privacy and sunlight. How can this development proceed when the applicant has not considered privacy for their neighbours despite this being a criteria under SEAR, the stage 1 conditions of consent and Sydney Metro design guideline requirements?

I want to make it clear that I do not oppose the overstation development as a concept in itself but I do oppose the sheer size, bulk, width and height.

The applicant has described their building as slender. I disagree. They can make it slimmer by ensuring that their proposal has the correct building separations under the Apartment Design Guidelines 2F as well as the correct setbacks.

The application fails to meet SSD 8876 concept approval conditions in relation to solar access, loss of views, loss of privacy, ADG building separation, overshadowing Hyde Park and arguably also heritage requirements. It is alarming the extent of these failures and attitude towards modifying the envelope to reduce setback even more. The new development must be sustainable not a towering slum full of tiny apartments marketed for foreign students.

To approve this application will set a dangerous precedent that any planning requirements can be ignored, residential amenity in the city is for sale and state significant developments are being sold off to untested models incorporating rented high rise slums in the heart of our great city. This is not representative of this city.