

Objection from Ms Diana M Carmody and Dr John CARMODY to the proposal by “Built” to demolish 52 Phillip Street and construct a 48-storey tower in its place.

There are many possible objections to this proposal. All of them would be predicated upon the simple proposition that planning decisions should be based upon a single consideration: is the proposal likely to contribute to a more congenial and beautiful metropolitan environment? Put another way, this question should be: would it make the city a more pleasant and enjoyable place to visit or to live in?

The “social value” of the building industry, and the provision of “jobs”, should play no role in such decisions. Nor should short-term political advantage. Decisions should be made on no other basis but principle, uncommon though it has been for that *desideratum* to be met in Sydney. The fact that many misguided – and even evil – decisions have been made in the past should offer no “precedent” or encouragement for even more undesirable or devious decisions. And all submissions should, indeed, *must* -- for public trust to be sustained – be based on good faith.

This brings me to the single most pernicious aspect of the present application which should – if there were nothing else about it which is anti-social (and there is a super-abundance of *that*) – be an absolute disqualification.

It is, in the most stark and simple terms – and its very design betrays that odious fact – based on the most cynical ruse to circumvent the fundamentals of civic-regulations: *viz* the ratio of the height of the structure to the area which it occupies. The fact that the footing is smaller than the building’s true “footprint” – as is incontrovertibly indicated by the fact that its cantilevered design is intended to allow a far greater real “floorspace” than is claimed – is nothing but a brazen attempt to deceive the planning officials; to blind them to the truth and to allow the ruthless developers to circumvent that important legal principle, to their financial gain (and certainly not to the benefit of the environment of the city). If for no other reason, it should be summarily rejected. The comment of one planner – “Council should have no hesitation, from a heritage perspective, in approving the application” – indicates that this *soi-disant* “expert” is either the traditional “fool” or “knave”. Indeed, both the Council and the Government (and their staffs) should have no compunction about REJECTING it, forthwith, with all of the conviction and force which they can muster!

Let us give some context. Some years ago, when we arrived in Munich (in Bavaria), in order for JJC to undertake a year’s research in a Max-Planck-Institute there, we were – very early – struck by what a pleasant city it was, in which everything

seemed on a truly human scale. There were no sunless “canyons”. It was such a contrast to Sydney! This was because, in the post-war reconstruction, fundamental planning principles were strictly adhered to and, in the *Innenstadt*, no building was permitted to exceed three floors in height. As in so many respects, Australia would be well advised to follow Germany and not mercantile New York.

Ms Diana Carmody BA Dip. Soc. Wk

Dr John Carmody MB BS, MD.

11 May 2021.