



planning consultants

31 March 2021  
Our Ref: 20550B.6ER\_Submission to IPC

The Office of the Independent Planning Commission  
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street  
Sydney NSW 2000

**Attention Casey Joshua**

Dear Casey

**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**

DFP Planning is assisting the Owners of SP51077, being Princeton Apartments Building at 304-308 Pitt Street, Sydney in relation to the State Significant Development Application (SSD-10376) for the Pitt Street South over station development (OSD) which is proposed on land to the immediate north of Princeton Apartments and SSD-8876 MOD 2 which is an application to modify the concept plan to accord with SSD-10376.

By letter dated 30 June 2020, DFP lodged a submission with NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) in relation to both applications. DFP also lodged submissions with DPIE in relation to concept plan application (SSD 8876) which was subsequently approved by the Minister.

On 22 March 2021, DFP addressed the public meeting hosted by the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) in relation to SSD 10376 and MOD 2 to SSD 8876.

On 26 March 2021, the applicant submitted additional information to IPC at the request of the Commissioners. Relevant to this submission is the following additional/supplementary information provided by the applicant:

- A response to the IPC question in relation to a building chamfer.
- A response to the IPC question in relation to solar access.

This submission relates to our assessment of the additional information provided by the applicant and should be read in conjunction with previous submissions prepared by DFP on behalf of the Owners Corporation of Princeton Apartments.

In summary, the additional information provided by the applicant does not, in our opinion, address the concerns raised in our previous submissions and the applicant has failed to explore all options with respect to modifications to the building envelope.

## 1.0 Solar Access

It was our understanding that the applicant was requested to explore options which would provide for an increase in solar access to Princeton apartments (consistent with condition B3(e) and B3(h) of the concept plan approval.

Whilst the applicant has explored some options, none of the options that have been modelled resulted in any substantive improvement in terms of solar access to Princeton apartments. Even the option which, by the applicant's own admission is not feasible, would not result in any significant or meaningful increase in solar access for Princeton residents.

The applicant has not provided any modelling to enable the IPC to understand what is required in order to achieve the ADG design guidance criteria of Objective 3B-2 which states the following:

*Where an adjoining property does not currently receive the required hours of solar access, the proposed building ensures solar access to neighbouring properties is not reduced by more than 20%.*

In this regard, an option based on the tower element of the over station development (OSD) being setback further than the required 12m from the common boundary with the Princeton apartment site has not been considered. An alternative option with the SE corner of the OSD tower being cut back (or chamfered) could and should be modelled. This will provide an appreciation of what modifications to the OSD tower might be required to satisfy the following conditions of the concept plan approval:

*Maximising sunlight access and views for adjoining and surrounding properties [Condition A24 of the Minister's approval in relation to SSD-8876];*

And

*Achieving compliance with the requirements of State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development and the accompanying Apartment Design Guide [Condition B3(h) of SSD-8876].*

Without exploring and modelling all possible options, it cannot be said that the Applicant has sought to *maximise solar access to Princeton Apartments* and to *minimise the impacts to the outlook and amenity of the adjoining Princeton Apartments* as required by the conditions of SSD-8876.

## 2.0 Building Chamfer

With respect to the request that modelling that tests what the outcomes might be if the SE corner of the OSD tower was chamfered, we make the following observations with respect to the additional information provided by the applicant:

- The cadastral boundaries of the site on which the Telstra tower is located have not been correctly notated on the applicant's supplementary submission. The chamfered Telstra tower has significant setbacks to its property boundaries.
- By contrast, the applicant has 'modelled' an outcome which considers a chamfered corner immediately adjacent to the SE of the OSD development site; not the tower element.
- It is anticipated that such an outcome (i.e. – a chamfered SE corner of the OSD tower) could have significant benefits in terms of solar access to Princeton Apartments.



### 3.0 Conclusion

We have reviewed the additional information provided by the proponent.

The information provided by the proponent has not allayed any of the concerns that have been raised in our previous submissions in relation to both SSD-10376 and SSD-8876 MOD 2 or the concerns that were raised in our submissions in relation to the original concept plan application - SSD-8876.

In our opinion, the proposal before the IPC will result in significant adverse impacts on residents of Princeton apartments primarily due to the reduced building separation and the loss of solar access.

We appreciate the opportunity afforded to us by IPC to participate in this process.

Should you have any questions regarding this or our previous submissions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

**DFP PLANNING PTY LTD**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'ERdt', written over a light blue horizontal line.

**ELLEN ROBERTSHAW  
DIRECTOR**



Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Hayer', written over a horizontal line.