* Before I start I would like the IPC to note that I have been approached by numerous people from Princeton apartments who were unable to attend this meeting today due to work, other commitments or language barriers that will be lodging further submissions in writing.
* I don’t propose to mention all matters in which the applicant has failed the conditions of development consent, SEARS and Apartment Design Guide as these have been comprehensively set out in our objections to date which I understand the IPC is obliged to consider.
* I would like to make it clear that we are not anti-development, a view I believe I share with the Princeton executive committee.
	+ We support sensible, sustainable, balanced and compliant development however this application does not meet any of those criteria.
* Through my involvement in this process I have learned that State Significant development isn’t something that benefits the people of the state or is held even to the same base planning standards as other developments, rather a way to recover the costs of underlying infrastructure projects to be sold to the highest bidder without any regard for good design or sustainability, or without any real connection to the infrastructure which qualifies it as state significant.
* I was extremely disappointed to see that the planning department recommended approval of this application despite the applicant making no effort to comply with the conditions of consent.
	+ The department appears to have defined conditions then completely disregarded them and undermined its own authority.
	+ This demonstrates an inherent bias and lack of procedural fairness in the way State Significant Developments are assessed.
* Coming into this process from outside the industry I have discovered the inherent unfairness with government backed development.
	+ It seems there is one rule for the government and another for everyone else;
	+ Developers are held accountable to the smallest alleged breach of ADG while State Significant developments can flaunt every aspect of it with no recourse;
	+ Planning controls seem to be vigorously enforced against everyone except the government. This would not happen in most other industries and should not happen in this industry.
* The application proposes that 48 apartments in Princeton will lose their access to sunlight if the development is approved. That’s 48 family homes put into darkness by this development.
	+ The mental health impacts in similar circumstances are well documented and I would urge you to take this into account and be prepared to justify any adverse outcomes to each of the families affected;
	+ The conditions of consent specifically require that the development be designed to maximise solar access and minimise solar impacts to the living rooms of Princeton apartments;
	+ The conditions of consent also specifically require the development to comply with the requirements of SEPP 65 and the ADG;
	+ Neither of these requirements are optional or subjective in nature;
	+ Under the ADG new developments must provide 70% of apartments to sufficient solar access. As you know the applicant proposes to provide solar access to 50% of new apartments. Half of the proposed new apartments will not receive sufficient solar access. This along with the tiny propose apartment sizes and tenant only model is reminiscent of a high rise slum.
* The personal effects of the development in its current form are significant
	+ My apartment has approximately 16m2 of north facing windows in the living areas;
	+ I receive sunlight from the north in my living room and all of my bedroom areas. All of this is proposed to be removed by the applicant with no meaningful consideration of mitigating factors;
	+ Through my living room window I have views of Sydney harbour to the north that is also proposed to be removed.
* From my understanding of planning controls I found the applicant’s proposal to be entirely incompetent and fundamentally flawed, but that seems on the planning department’s assessment to meet the very low bar of controls applicable to State Significant developments.
* We have been forced throughout this process to expend considerable time and effort in having our voices heard and to have the matter referred to the IPC.
	+ There have been 3 rounds of submissions required with 174 objections made in total;
	+ It is clear from the numbers alone that it is the consensus of neighbours that this application is fundamentally flawed in its current form;
	+ Rubber stamping the application without holding the applicant to account would let every one of those 174 parties know that their voices have been ignored;
	+ If this were to happen we will be critically reviewing this decision and seriously questioning the apparent independence of the IPC.
* The message in our presentations today is not to feign outrage or stand in the way of development progression.
	+ Putting all the other shortfalls aside there is an opportunity here to promote decent, sustainable design by modifying the development to allow more access to natural light for both adjoining properties and new proposed apartments;
	+ For a development that is significant to the state we should be advancing planning controls and design guidelines not ignoring them;
	+ We are happy to work with the applicant to modify the proposed development for the improvement of the area but they have displayed an uncooperative attitude to date;
	+ I fully support the views and proposals of Ellen and Councillor Chung today and would be keen to be involved in any further discussions to improve a modified application.
* Thank you for your time and I remain hopeful that our views will be taken into account.