

From: Yin Xu <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, 2 April 2021 10:34 AM
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Cc: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Re: Pitt Street South Over Station Development - SSD 10376 and SSD 8876 MOD 2 - Additional Information

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your below email. I am happy to provide some further comments in response to the new material from the developer.

This new material does not raise any real proposals for our consideration which leaves me slightly confused. I understood that the developer was to provide some further modelling and proposals to meet its obligations and to further discussions on how the development can be brought up to standard. When reading the material it became obvious that the developer does not intend to achieve any of these goals but attempt to justify why it should be made to comply with any planning controls.

The developer is not in a position to comment on the design of Princeton not being done (in the 1990s) to achieve solar access. First we have huge floor to ceiling glass panels in every single one of the apartments in Princeton and multiple "sunny rooms" with additional balconies. I have lived in many apartments in Sydney CBD and Princeton has the most activation to natural light, especially from its northern aspect which the developer intends to destroy. Also I didn't realise the developer knew what the design intent of the developers of Princeton in the 90s. Perhaps if they wish to continue discussions on this point we can approach Meriton to check if Princeton was designed with solar access in mind. I would expect that is entirely the reason why we have numerous north facing windows. Again its statements like this which reveal the true nature of the developer's attitude - blame and misdirection instead of productive engagement.

Reading the Chamfer material was a waste of time. A chamfer to the building to increase solar access must obviously be made to the building and not to the ground level. Complete incompetence once again from the developer.

Solar Access material contains no proposals but more excuses why a few token considerations should relieve them of their legal duty to comply with all conditions placed upon them. The writer seems to have thrown in as much incoherent, flawed material as possible to avoid their duty. This does not give us much confidence in the future development when they cannot comply with a basic request from IPC.

I hope that the IPC can see through the developer's attempts to avoid its duty and direct it to give meaningful consideration to its duties. We don't need more baseless excuses and deliver misinterpretations but actual engagement to improve the development to meet planning controls. This is a beautiful city and this rare corner plot deserves a sustainable and compliant development.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Ray

Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 at 6:02 PM
From: "IPCN Enquiries Mailbox" <ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au>
To: "IPCN Enquiries Mailbox" <ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: "Casey Joshua" <Casey.Joshua@ipcn.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Pitt Street South Over Station Development - SSD 10376 and SSD 8876 MOD 2 - Additional Information

Dear Sir/Madam

You are receiving this email because our records show you have previously made a submission about the Pitt Street South Over Station Development - SSD 10376 and SSD 8876 MOD 2, either to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (**Department**) or the Independent Planning Commission (**Commission**).

The Commission is re-opening public comment in relation to new information it has received from the Applicant on 26 March 2021. The new information includes the proponent's response to questions on notice at the public meeting on Chamfer (to the building envelope), Internal Amenity and Solar Access.

In accordance with the Commission's 'Additional Material' policy, the Panel considers that it would be assisted by public comment, via email only, on the following new material provided to the Commission:

- Applicant's Response to public meeting question on notice on Chamfer, dated 26 March 2021
- Applicant's Response to public meeting question on notice on Internal Amenity, dated 26 March 2021
- Applicant's Response to public meeting question on notice on Solar Access, dated 26 March 2021.

Please find a copy of this information on the Commission's website:

<https://www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au/projects/2021/02/pitt-street-south-over-station-development-ssd-10376-and-ssd-8876-mod-2>

Public comment must be received via email (ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au) by 5pm AEST on Friday 2 April 2021. *This deadline will be strictly enforced, and late submissions will not be considered by the Panel nor uploaded to the Commission's website.*

Yours sincerely,

Office of the Independent Planning Commission NSW

Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street Sydney NSW 2000

e: ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au p: +61 2 9383 2100 www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

FOLLOW US ON:



 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorised to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.