Major Projects Assessment Department of Planning GPO Box 39 Sydney New South Wales 2001

Unit 803 40 Stephen Street Paddington NSW 2011

14th Dec 2010

Dear Minister,

I am a resident of the Harry Seidler building at 40 Stephen Street, Paddington and am writing to inform you of my objections to the Scottish Hospital redevelopment as it is currently proposed. I should clarify that I am in favour of the redevelopment of the hospital in principle but cannot agree to the proposed size, scale, character and loss of amenity, particularly as it affects the residents of Stephen Street.

The size and scale of the development is far too big for this corner of Paddington. The proposed buildings would dwarf the Scottish Hospital heritage building and render our leafy street a narrow, unpleasant concrete corridor. In its present form this is not a suitable development for an area of such rich Australian heritage significance.

The number of trees being removed from the site is excessive. I refer here particularly to the 9 beautiful mature trees located within a meter of the Stephen Street boundary, some reaching 19 meters in height. These trees, it was admitted by the PAC's arborist during the recent community 'consultation' on Nov 29th, are being removed solely to make room for the new building. This, despite the much touted design principle that "any development should seek to maintain as many trees as possible to maintain landscape edges to the site and screen further development." It is galling to hear these fine specimens being referred to by the developers as weeds, when in fact they are subject to a Woollarah Council Tree Preservation Order.

From the view analysis provided by the developers for our apartment the tall building on Brown Street is not situated below the tree canopy as promised. It sits at least 2 stories above the vast majority of the trees and as such should be reduced by 2 floors.

Some of the buildings on Stephen Street have zero setback while the setback of the RACF building is as little as 3.25 meters. The RACF building is to be situated directly across the street from 40 Stephen Street with only 16 meters between our living room windows and the proposed structure. This negatively affects our privacy and our views. This lack of setback, mirrored underground in the development's car parks and basements precludes the retention or growing of significant sized trees along Stephen Street.

The proposed service entry on Stephen Street is problematic on a number of levels. Stephen Street is a narrow cul-de-sac and is unsuitable for such purposes, particularly when the RACF building could readily be serviced from the main Brown Street entrance. To locate the entrance directly opposite the entrance to 40 Stephen Street seems unthoughtful at best when you consider the noise of trucks and vans arriving, turning, reversing and leaving our street. The cliffs and building in the area at present create a funnel affect which magnifies the noise at street level and passes it up to the upper floors of 40 Stephen Street. How much worse would this echoed noise be if the proposed development were allowed to go ahead, given the height and lack of setback of the proposed buildings on Stephen Street and the removal of all trees.

As far as I am aware there is no precedence for a service entrance on Stephen Street as has been claimed by the developers. Certainly there has been no entrance there in the memory of any of the residents of 40 Stephen Street, some of whom have been here since the Seidler building was first built.

To locate the air conditioning units for the entire Scottish Hospital complex across from 40 Stephen Street is also unacceptable, from both a noise and visual amenity point of view.

I trust that you will take my concerns on board and be mindful of the heritage significance of Paddington, not just for Sydneysiders but for all Australians, when reviewing and rejecting this proposal as it currently stands.

Yours sincerely,

Mícheál Ó Curraoin