



2011 Residents' Association Inc.

ABN 78 862 101 665

PO Box 1513
Potts Point NSW 1335

26th April 2014

Objections: DA 2014/131: 40 Macleay Street Potts Point

Estimated Cost of Work:

\$2,296,298.00

Applicant:

Mr Craig Geoffrey Arnott

Application Lodgement Date:

24/02/2014

There are a number of concerns about this DA which have caused residents to submit their objection for this development to proceed. The objections are broadly:

Environmental

- **Loss of sunlight and light** to Macleay Street. Developments such as Icon, 81 Macleay Street and more recently the 22 Macleay Street have served to cut out light and sunlight from the Street. The street is in the shade for most of the day. There are now only a few places where sunlight hits the ground. The street looks desolate and trees do not flourish without light/sunlight.
- **Exacerbation of the wind tunnel effect.** The closing off of the street on both sides by taller buildings that abut each other has over the years created a wind tunnel. There are days when it is difficult to walk up the street due to the strength of the wind. The DA for changes to this building, encroach on both buildings either side of it and to the street; all setbacks that currently exist will be built in.

Aesthetic:

- 40 Macleay Street is one of few buildings built in 1960 that remains on the street. As such it will only be made to look worse by the proposed insensitive additions to it.
- The additions will impinge on both its neighbours, and will detract markedly from the heritage-listed *Manar*, so creating an adverse heritage impact.
- The design which is literally an 'add on', is not in sympathy with the original structure in terms of bulk, design, or building materials. The design massively increases the footprint and bulk of the two proposed top-most storeys, creating a "top-heavy" appearance.

- The existing building is constructed using red brick and grey tiles while the new design features white concrete. This will serve to increase the negative impact of an 'add-on'. White will make it look top heavy – rather like an ill-fitting dental crown. It will be obtrusive.
- The current building has a “split” design facade, creating texture to its facade: it also has balconies asymmetrically located on the northern side of its street-facing facade and grey tiles with fenestration on the southern side of its street façade. The new design or 'add-on' is a single, symmetrical, two-storey amorphous blank slab.
- The current building emphasises its verticality. The add-on is horizontal. Visually it will look top heavy. An already challenged building is made to look worse not better. The 1960's design is balanced and aesthetically pleasing, even if one does not subscribe to this style of architecture.
- There is no setback in the design facing the street on the first level; an adverse building quality impact.
- There are no side setbacks in the design facing north or south the street on the first or second levels; an adverse building quality impact
- From the southern perspective, the design increases the 'blank wall' aspect of the design to the streetscape from a view in the round, an adverse visual amenity impact.

Conclusions

Potts Point and Elizabeth Bay abound with ugly buildings which were built with little regard for aesthetics, location, or use. It is important not to add to the list by allowing this insensitive addition to 40 Macleay Street to proceed. The building as it exists is a good example of buildings of its era.

The proposal falls a long way short of meeting any measures of design excellence. The proposed 'add-on' does not use materials that are sympathetic to the original design. The proposed design not only detracts from the host building, but also detracts from the aesthetic of buildings that are either side of it, and from the entire Streetscape of Macleay Street. The design is completely out of character with the whole area.

For buildings which are accretions to an existing building to meet design standards of excellence, they must use sympathetic materials, not emphasising the new building over the old and not increasing any negative impacts of the old building.

We would like to see this DA rejected and new more sympathetic plans put forward.

For Sydney to compete with Melbourne, Councils need to be smarter about what they allow to be destroyed and what they keep.

Yours sincerely

Helen Crossing
 Convenor 2011 Residents' Association