

I have lived in the city centre for nearly thirty years. I am dismayed at the over-crowding that is now happening in the southern part of the city centre.

### **The new units must comply with the Apartment Design Guide**

The new units must comply with the Apartment Design Guide. This was a condition of the concept consent. It is important because building sub-standard apartments increases the risks of this part of the city centre becoming a slum. Overcrowding of units is already common.

### **The impacts of the building on solar access and outlook of nearby apartments must be reduced**

The building does not comply with Principle 1 of SEPP 65's Design Quality Principles:

Well designed buildings respond to and enhance the qualities and identity of the area including the adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood.

The proposal does not enhance the qualities and identity of adjacent sites, streetscape and neighbourhood. To comply with SEPP 65, the impacts of the building on the solar access and outlook of nearby apartment buildings must be reduced. This was a condition of the concept consent. Sub-standard apartments increase the risk of this part of the city centre becoming a slum. Overcrowding of units is already common. It is misleading of the EIS documents to say that adjusting the configuration of the building has little impact on the solar access and outlook of nearby apartment buildings: there would be no impacts at all if there was no tower!

### **Commercial use of the site would be better**

The EIS states:

Commercial use of the site would facilitate a high level of employment generating uses and usage of the Sydney metro infrastructure for workers; however the benefits this use would not deliver or outweigh the wider benefits of the large-scale build-to-rent accommodation within the Sydney CBD.

The reference to "build-to-rent" is misleading. This is not the Government's build-to-rent social housing model. As many city-centre units sold are leased by owners, the impact on the availability of units for rental is little different from a build-to-sell development.

When the world's first metro lines were built in London in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they were built to enable workers to commute instead of having to live in grossly over-crowded and insanitary conditions. They were successful in eliminating over-crowding. In Sydney, the logic of building a metro system seems not to be understood. Commercial use of the site is best, but if it is to be residential the units must comply with the Apartment Design Guide.

### **Economic impacts not considered**

The Government's approach to the metro station considers only what is good for its finances rather than what is good for the state's economy. If state finances are all that matters, why not close all public schools, fire the teachers, and sell the sites? If the Government was not so fixated about its finances to the disregard of everything else, it could accept a smaller building over the station that would have greater net economic benefit because it would do less damage to Hyde Park, less harm to the amenity of neighbouring apartment units, and cause less congestion. The concept consent was conditional on compliance with the Apartment Design Guide and reduced impacts on the amenity of neighbouring units, and if that necessitates a smaller building that would be a good thing.