

[REDACTED]

From: Hans Zoellner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, 2 April 2021 1:14 PM
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Submission on Pitt Street South Over Station Development - SSD 10376 and SSD 8876 MOD 2,

RE: Pitt Street (South) Over Station Development – SSD-10376 and Modification of SSD-8876 (MOD 2) Response to Additional Information submitted by Proponent at the request of the IPC

Dear Sir / Madam

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional feedback on the above mentioned proposed development.

I write as an owner-occupier of an apartment in the Princeton Building, that will be significantly impacted by the development.

Others have provided relevant feedback opposing various aspects of the development, and there seems little point me repeating those concerns. Instead, I will say that I am in general agreement with the broad sweep of objections raised by other owners of Princeton apartments, as well as by DFP Planning Consultants engaged on behalf of Princeton apartments.

Instead, I wish to add some aspects that seem to have been missed by others, and these are listed below.

1) There Is A Need to Improve Light Scatter Between the Princeton and New Development

The proposal still significantly reduces light access to Princeton apartments. While a focus on direct sunlight seems reasonable, it is also badly incomplete. Depending on orientation, most of the light that enters windows is scattered from surrounds, and not direct sunlight. Were that not the case, rooms that lack direct sunlight would be pitch black, but it is self-evident that they are not.

All discussion of light by the applicants in the current documentation, refers to direct sunlight alone, with no consideration at all of light scatter.

The amount of light scatter entering a window, is disproportionately affected by proximity of neighbouring walls. This is in a way that even a modest increase in space between walls, very greatly improves window lighting.

Currently, my windows receive light scattered from much of the mid-city, so there is very good lighting of my rooms throughout the day, even though there is relatively little direct sunlight. The proposed development is quite close to my windows. Modest further setback, would appreciably improve my daylight, as well as that of my current and future neighbours.

I request that action be taken to improve light scatter for the Princeton apartments, as well as the South side of the proposed development, by a combination of all the below:

a) Further set-back of the southern envelope of the proposed tower development, which would appreciably improve light entering the space between the two buildings.

b) Replacing the current proposed light-absorptive dark brown-toned Southern facade, with a more light-scattering 'light' colour. A matt or roughened surface would be preferable, to maximize scatter. Please note, the Princeton building is already painted a helpfully reflective light shade of yellow, and this will benefit future dwellers of the proposed development, by bouncing light into their windows.

c) Chamfering both South Eastern and South Western corners of the proposed development to improve light access to the space between buildings, and hence mutual scattering of light between them.

2) There is Transfer of the Purchased Asset of Light, Air and Views from Princeton Owners to the Developers, Without Compensation

While I do appreciate the importance of public amenity and development that the new Metro comprises, I do not see the importance or necessity of transferring an asset of mine, to the owners of the proposed development.

On purchasing my apartment, the price that I paid included the amenity of my view, the light entering my apartment, and the ventilation inherent to my apartment's location.

The proposed development will deny me my view, much of my light, and also impact my ventilation. Instead, those amenities will be enjoyed by whoever purchases the proposed apartments. The site developers will most certainly receive payment for the amenities they will have taken from me.

I see no consideration of the probity of making this transfer of my private and personal assets to a developer. I am effectively robbed of assets I have paid for.

I note that the applicants have concern for Canadian Pensioners who are invested in the development. I see no reason why there should be more concern for the personal investments of Canadians or the Developers, over myself and my fellow Princeton Sydney citizens.

There seems no clear reason why my State Government and local Council should collude in the transfer of assets privately held by myself and other Princeton owners, to any other party. That would seem a perversion of the normal function of Government.

3) The Previous Light Easement Should Be Restored

The comment by the applicant that 'Princeton apartments setbacks to the east or north were not designed to maximise solar access', implies that any loss of sunlight due to the new development is in some way the fault of Princeton owners. This is both inappropriate, and misleading.

At the time the Princeton apartments were built, there was a light easement on the North, guaranteeing solar access. As such, design for the Princeton apartments was entirely appropriate for the building site and conditions. It appears to have been self-evident to the Council of the time, that a light easement to the North of the Princeton apartments was both reasonable and necessary for proper residential development in the city.

I have lived in other cities, including New York, and do not recall ever seeing such close development of high-rise residential apartments in that city, as is now proposed here in Sydney. It appears that even in aggressively free-market New York, reasonable space between high-rise residential complexes is understood to be important. Why should the same not apply in Sydney?

It is regrettable that the light easement was removed by Council following application by the previous owners of 'Druid House'. Consideration should now be given, to returning the light easement, and limiting the Pitt St South development to the valuable public amenity of the Metro, whilst denying the overly-close residential development that is not for public benefit, but is instead for private profit alone.

With thanks for your time considering my suggestions, and with best regards,

Hans Zoellner


NSW 2000