From: Frank N. Lee

**Sent:** Friday, 2 April 2021 4:02 PM **To:** IPCN Enquiries Mailbox

Cc: Casey Joshua

**Subject:** Re: Pitt Street South Over Station Development - SSD 10376 and SSD 8876 MOD 2

- Additional Information

In reply to the statements made and position taken by the Developer, in particular, Study 5 - Increase eastern setback at corner (solar access):

- 1. It is nonsense to state that one corner cut makes the whole development unviable. There is no supporting evidence showing the economics of this development. This is a very large development and I am sure it will make very good profits for the developer and the Canadian pension fund. Should the developer wish to rely on this statement, then it should produce its feasibility studies. In any event, viability is not a matter to be taken into account by IPC. Rather, the developer is required to comply with the DA conditions and ADG. This is the crux of the matter.
- 2. It is also misleading to state that the SE corner apartment is the highest revenue generating apartment. The best apartments would be comparable apartments on the north and east sides, where there is maximum sunlight. These north or east apartments would be higher revenue generating, not the SE corner.
- 3. The internal design of the apartments on each floor should be redesigned to allow either the setback from the eastern boundary to be increased or to allow an increased set back to the south east corner, in order to maximise the solar access for Princeton apartments.
- **4.** The obligation is on the developer to "maximise" the solar access. This has not done demonstrated yet. And, to repeat, **viability of the development is not a factor to be taken into account.**

On Mon, 29 Mar 2021 at 18:06, IPCN Enquiries Mailbox < ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au > wrote:

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: <u>ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au</u> p: +61 2 9383 2100 <u>www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au</u>



## **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.