## **ATTACHMENT A**

SUBMISSION, DATED 30 APRIL 2012, PREPARED BY AUBREY F. CRAWLEY & CO. Level 5 200 George Street Sydney NSW 2000 Australia DX 508 Sydney Telephone: (02) 9247 30

Telephone: (02) 9247 3000 Facsimile: (02) 9247 3777 Email: law@afcrawley.com





Our Ref: CWC:ak:210024 Your Reference:

30 April, 2012

Ms Nicole Reeve Senior Planner City of Sydney GPO Box 1591 SYDNEY NSW 2000

By email: nreeve@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Dear Nicole,

RE: JACKSONS ON GEORGE

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION - 1 ALFRED STREET, SYDNEY ("DA") VOLUNTARY PLANNING AGREEMENT ("VPA")

We refer to our recent correspondence.

We refer to the DA and VPA.

In the circumstances we wish you to assume that Jacksons on George remains as a hotel premises for the foreseeable future. Under such circumstances there would be great difficulty in implementing the terms of the Local Environment Plan and importantly the VPA.

The rights of carriageway attaching to Jacksons on George are private not public. Such rights and entitlements are vested interests, the benefit of which are secured by way of Section 88B of the Conveyancing Act and registered upon the title ("Jacksons Right of Way") (JRW).

Accordingly, there could not be implemented the proposed right of public way as contemplated in the VPA at any time during which Jacksons remained as a "stand alone" property. The proposed end height of the public right of way at the boundary to the Jacksons Right of Way could not be built as it would be over the JRW, and in fact would be at a height which would restrict all vehicle access to Jacksons.

Another matter of grave concern to our client is the reference in Attachment E Figure 2.64 – Vehicular Access Plan which provides that there be no access in the current laneway area between 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday. Jacksons on George is a viable operating business and the drop off point loading bay and service facility areas are located in the JRW and Rugby Place. The restriction proposed is wholly unacceptable to our client. It is impractical, and accordingly objected to. Further, it assumes that Valad has some legal right over the JRW the benefit of which is attached to our client's property.

These are serious issues which we have been instructed to raise and require resolution in the consideration of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and the Development Application.

Your sincerely

AUBREY F CRAWLEY & CO