

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.

1. The proposals from the applicant represent an over-development of this small city-centre site. The proposals are designed to maximise revenue at the cost of amenity to neighbours and to new residents in the development. The size of the tower is too large and the apartment sizes within are too small. The build to rent model is untested and unwise in the current climate.
2. A key issue is the proposed 12metre separation between the buildings. This is much narrower than the 24 metre standard which is set out in the Apartment Design Guidelines 2F. The Princeton Tower at 308 Pitt Street is wholly a residential development (not offices, etc), and so privacy is a very important factor. You would not wish to re-create the mistakes made in neighbourhoods of Hong Kong where residential buildings are so close together in places they are regarded as high-rise "slums." Would we want to risk this mistake in Central Sydney? The privacy louvres proposed will be ineffective and in any event do not extend to the living areas in the development.
3. Due to the nature of the site there should be special regard for the quality of life of Sydney residents, and should therefore take full account of local concerns. Quality of life/amenity will be devastated by this development, both to Princeton by blocking out all natural light and to residents in the new development as it does not even comply with solar access requirements and sustainability metrics itself.
4. In the view of our professional advisers, the Princeton Tower has considerable architectural merit, in many ways comparable to outstanding high-rise buildings such as the Chrysler Building or the "Flat Iron" Building in New York. A large building mass in such close to proximity would substantially detract from its quality and impact.
5. The development should be rejected in its current form also because of the applicant's own shadow study shows that its proposal would cause additional overshadowing to Hyde Park. This is in contravention to the Sydney LEP 2012 (clause 6.17).
6. There is total loss of water views from multiple rooms in north facing apartments at Princeton. There is also total loss of the views to St. Mary's Cathedral for Century Tower.
7. The modification application seeks to further exceed the boundaries proposed by the concept envelope at stage 1. This will reduce the setback by 45cm to Princeton therefore they do even intend to comply with their 12m proposition which in itself isn't sufficient.
8. The applicant seems to focus on sustainability but the net effect of this development will be an increased reliance on artificial heating and lighting in the winter and artificial cooling in the summer at Princeton due to a complete block of our solar access.
9. The applicant proposes floors of plant and equipment immediately next to Princeton's outdoor bbq area, communal area, gym and multiple residential floors. This in itself imposes multiple

amenity, acoustic, health and safety issues. Little thought has gone into the devastating practical effect this will have on neighbouring residents.

10. The design of the building is well below what we should expect of a “state significant” development in this location. A huge orange, dated looking tower with minimum glass and limited access to natural light. At the very least the build form should be modern like the new developments all around it. It does not meet heritage requirements just because it adopts the same colour as the Edinburgh Castle Hotel.

11. Allowing this development in its present form would be reckless and damaging, and would be heavily criticised by future generations.

12. New developments must, at the minimum meet current planning requirements. To allow this application would create a precedent that requirements don’t matter. This should especially not be the case for state significant developments.