

Attachment F

Submissions

From: <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 7:49:36 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Elizabeth,

As a local resident, I have received the letter about this concept development application. My feedback can be summarised as follows:

- Council depot does not belong to densely populated inner city residential area. This site is bounded by residential buildings on both Wattle and Bay Streets. Even at present, the site generates excessive noise. In particular, I can hear the industrial grade noise coming from the site every day - it is not only vehicles but also recycling facility. Unfortunately, it often happens in the middle of night creating significant hardship for local residents who are trying to sleep.
- The proposed development is the worst possible option. It will create additional issues over the extended period of time. There will be an unbearable noise during the demolition phase and construction phase. The interim car park will also contribute to this problem. The proposed building envelope is excessive and is likely to be a poor fit for the surrounding area. Industrial buildings do not belong here.
- Ideally, Bay St Council depot should be relocated to an industrial area. This site should be developed as a combination of low-rise residential buildings and additional park landscaping. Heritage buildings should be preserved. This will contribute to the increased residential amenity and create a more pleasant urban environment for residents and visitors alike. This will fit well into the proposed Pyrmont-Ultimo long-term strategic plan. The proposed Landream Pyrmont Place residential development is a good example of what can be achieved as a result of proper planning - a former quarry and Council depot will be converted into a landmark mixed-use complex. The Bay St depot site is a golden opportunity to achieve something similar, albeit on a much larger scale. This preferred option will take many years to plan and develop. Meanwhile, Bay St depot should remain as is.

Best regards,

Goran Krezic
99 Jones St, Ultimo

From: MJ Daly <[REDACTED]> on behalf of MJ Daly <[REDACTED]> <MJ Daly <[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 5:39:10 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

My name is MJ Daly and I live across the street in Dalgety Square.

The proposed multi-level development would completely remove the natural light from my apartment and significantly lower my value and liveability of my apartment.

As the building stands now it allows natural light into my apartment but a new development would ruin that.

From: Virginia <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Virginia <[REDACTED]> <Virginia
<[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Monday, May 5, 2025 9:46:59 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hello,

As a resident of the Dalgety Square Apartments on Jones Street, with a direct view of the Ultimo Council Depot across Wattle Street, I am writing to express several key concerns regarding its proposed redevelopment.

The plan to elevate the depot to four storeys is particularly worrying. From my fourth-floor vantage point facing Wattle Street, and considering the orientation of other apartments facing Wattle Street, I foresee a considerable reduction in the amount of natural light and, importantly, the direct sunlight that currently graces our living spaces. While acknowledging that shade assessments were a part of the planning process, it's vital to recognize that these studies don't always fully convey the tangible impact of losing direct sunlight due to a significantly taller building directly opposite. This will undoubtedly diminish the quality of life within our homes.

Beyond the issue of sunlight, I also have serious reservations about potential increases in both noise and air pollution. The construction of a substantially taller building directly adjacent to our residential complex, situated on a busy corridor like Wattle Street, could create conditions that trap and amplify traffic noise. Furthermore, such a structure might impede the natural dispersal of airborne pollutants, potentially leading to a noticeable decline in the air quality we experience.

Given these points, I urge the committee to carefully consider the tangible impact of the increased building height on the direct sunlight available to neighbouring residences – an impact that may not be fully captured by standard shade studies. I also request a thorough evaluation of the potential for amplified noise and worsened air quality resulting from the proposed taller building's proximity to our homes on a busy street. Perhaps the committee could consider an option that would minimise the increased building height (for example, is it possible for the depot to have certain levels underground? The depot would still have more space without increasing building height)

Finally, in reviewing the provided architectural documents, it proved difficult to truly grasp the implications of the proposed design changes without a clear visual comparison to the existing two-storey structure. To aid understanding, I believe providing residents with a visual overlay comparing the new and existing structures would be invaluable.

Thank you for considering these crucial concerns during this consultation. I trust that the committee will weigh them thoughtfully as part of the overall redevelopment assessment. I look forward to understanding how these issues will be addressed.

Virginia Tam
[REDACTED]

From: Trevor Clarkson <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Trevor Clarkson
<[REDACTED]> <Trevor Clarkson <[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Monday, May 5, 2025 8:25:56 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Hello,

I am writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Ultimo council depot located across the street from my residence. I live in the Dalgety Square Apartment Building on Jones Street, though my apartment faces Wattle Street and directly overlooks the depot.

As a resident directly affected by this project, I am concerned about the proposal to increase the depot building height from 2 to 4 floors. Living on the 4th floor, I believe this change will significantly reduce the natural light and sunlight entering my apartment and those of other residents facing Wattle Street, negatively impacting our quality of life. I urge the council to reconsider and retain the current 2-storey height to minimise disruption to nearby residents.

I understand that shade studies have been conducted as part of the planning process. However, I believe these studies may not fully capture the reduction in light experienced by residents living directly opposite the proposed development. I respectfully request that this be further reviewed during the assessment process.

I am also concerned about a potential increase in noise levels and a reduction in air quality. A taller building directly opposite residential apartments on a busy road may funnel and amplify both traffic noise and pollution between the two structures, further impacting the livability of our homes.

In reviewing the architectural drawings, I found it difficult to visualise the changes without a side-by-side comparison to the existing structure. An overlaid version would help residents better understand the visual and spatial impact of the proposed development.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback during this critical consultation phase and trust the council will weigh these concerns carefully alongside the broader goals of the redevelopment.

Thank you for considering my input. I look forward to hearing further updates on this matter.

Kind regards,
Trevor

From: Dr Bradley Dolph from RightPeople <[redacted]> on behalf of Dr Bradley Dolph from RightPeople <[redacted]> <Dr Bradley Dolph from RightPeople <[redacted]>
Sent on: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 11:37:18 AM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones
Attachments: Objection_Letter_Bradley_Melinda_Dolph.pdf (78.03 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached our objection to the concept development application.

Regards,

Bradley

Web [redacted]

Email [redacted]

Phone Australia Direct National Service International [redacted]

DR BRADLEY DOLPH

Head of Psychology

Registered Psychologist BSc, MA, PhD

RightPeople Candidate Testing

Bradley and Melinda Dolph
[REDACTED]

Ultimo NSW 2007

05 May 2025

To:

THE COUNCIL of the CITY OF SYDNEY

Reference: D/2025/276

Site Address: 10-16 Bay Street, Ultimo NSW 2007

Subject: Formal Objection to Proposed Council Depot Development Reference: D/2025/276

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to formally object to the proposed development of a council depot at 10-16 Bay Street, Ultimo NSW 2007, directly opposite our apartment building at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

As residents and ratepayers, we strongly oppose this development on the basis that it will significantly impact residential amenity, health, and lifestyle. The following concerns are central to our objection:

1. Loss of Natural Light and Sunlight

Our apartment and all others on the Wattle Street side lack balconies or outdoor drying areas, and the only source of natural light is from the front-facing windows overlooking the proposed site. The planned development will block sunlight, significantly reducing natural lighting.

Natural sunlight is essential not just for comfort, but for overall physical and mental health. Inadequate sunlight exposure has been linked to numerous serious health issues. These issues are exacerbated for residents who spend extended hours indoors—such as remote workers, elderly individuals, carers, or those with limited mobility—who rely heavily on sunlight for their daily wellbeing.

Moreover, we, like other residents maintain indoor plants near windows to enhance air quality, create a calming environment, and contribute to emotional wellbeing. The shadowing from the depot infrastructure will eliminate this possibility, depriving residents of a simple yet meaningful way to improve their living conditions. This level of environmental deprivation is not appropriate in a residential setting and contradicts the Council's stated goals around liveability and urban sustainability.

2. Noise Impact and Disruption

Construction and ongoing depot activity will result in substantial noise disruption for us and other residents in the building including and not limited to:

- Working from home post-COVID, with productivity being impaired.
- Young families with children who require daytime sleep.
- Elderly and vulnerable residents who need quiet surroundings.

3. Property Devaluation and Residential Character

A depot is industrial by nature and inconsistent with residential zoning. It will reduce property appeal and value and diminish the character of the neighbourhood.

4. Traffic, Safety and Access Concerns

Depot-related heavy vehicle traffic on residential streets poses serious safety concerns for pedestrians, especially children, and may obstruct local access and parking.

5. Site Suitability

More appropriate locations should be identified within industrial zones that would not adversely affect residential dwellings.

We urge the City of Sydney to reject this application in light of its significant negative impact on our homes and community. We are available to discuss these issues further and request that an alternative, more suitable site be considered.

Sincerely,

Bradley and Melinda Dolph

From: Neil Li <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Neil Li <[REDACTED]> <Neil Li <[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Saturday, May 10, 2025 3:42:42 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Elizabeth L Jones,

I am writing to provide a submission regarding Development Application D/2025/276 for 10–16 Bay Street, Ultimo.

My partner and I recently moved into an apartment directly opposite the proposed development site at 89 Bay Street, Glebe. We are extremely concerned about the long-term impact of this project on our well-being and quality of life.

Over the past week, we have already experienced early morning construction noise starting as early as 7:00 AM, which has had a noticeable effect on our mental health and daily comfort. We are deeply worried that if this project proceeds, it may lead to even more significant disruption due to heavy demolition, long-term construction, and depot operations.

In particular, we are concerned about:

Ongoing construction noise, especially early in the morning

Airborne dust and potential pollutants during demolition and excavation

Traffic congestion and increased safety risks for pedestrians

The overall erosion of a peaceful and healthy living environment

Additionally, my partner has a history of clinical depression and is very sensitive to environmental stress and noise. The recent construction noise has already caused heightened anxiety and disruption to her recovery. Prolonged exposure to such stressors could have serious consequences for their mental health.

Furthermore, we are currently planning to have a baby. We are concerned that long-term exposure to dust, noise, and general construction-related stress could negatively affect maternal health and well-being. We hope this consideration will be taken seriously in assessing the project's community impact.

Given all of the above, we respectfully request the City of Sydney to:

Reassess the impact of the proposed development on nearby residents

Ensure a full environmental, acoustic, and social impact assessment is conducted

Restrict construction hours to more reasonable times, starting no earlier than 9:00 AM on weekdays

Implement strict dust suppression, noise mitigation, and community notification protocols

Lastly, I would be grateful if you could advise how residents may access the planned construction timeline and associated environmental management plans (EMP), if available. Understanding the expected schedule would allow us to better prepare and protect our household's health and wellbeing.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this submission and sincerely hope that the voices of local residents—

especially those with health concerns—will be taken seriously in the decision-making process.

Kind regards,
Neil Li
Apartment, 89 Bay Street
Glebe NSW 2037

From: Salil Akolkar <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Salil Akolkar <[REDACTED]> <Salil Akolkar <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Saturday, May 10, 2025 5:46:40 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
CC: sgy nx <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Reference: D/2025/276 - Objections to proposed redevelopment of Bay Street East depot.
Attachments: DA Concept development application objections.pdf (54.87 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Elizabeth L Jones,

Please find our objections to the Bay Street East depot demolition and redevelopment as part of the larger Bay Street Depot project.

We are available for attending any discussion sessions if necessary.

Regards,
Sarita Yerandekar & Salil Akolkar

10 May 2025

Submission Reference: D/2025/276

10-16 Bay Street, ULTIMO, NSW 2007

Attention: Elizabeth L Jones

Subject: Formal Objections to Proposed changes to Council Depot ref: D/2025/276

This letter is a formal objection to the proposed developments at 10-16 Bay Street, Ultimo NSW 2007 specifically the proposed re-construction of Bay Street Depot East which directly faces our apartment at 620/99 Jones Street Ultimo.

We as residents of 620/99 Jones Street Ultimo and ratepayers to City of Sydney council oppose the proposed development of Bay Street East depot for the following reasons –

1. Site Suitability and Traffic Impacts

The Bay Street East Depot is located in close proximity to residential buildings (incl. Heritage buildings). While the current Bay Street East depot is a 2-storey structure stretching halfway of the length of Wattle Street, the redevelopment proposes a 4-level structure stretching along the full length of Wattle Street indicating more than 2-3x volume of the existing space. The rationale for an increase of capacity between 2-3x of existing space is unclear from the proposal.

Noting the depot is surrounded by residential buildings esp. two Heritage buildings along Wattle Street, it is not ideal to have a large industrial site with sizeable additional capacity leading to increased traffic movement in close proximity to residents.

Wattle Street is a busy street throughout the day and even during late hours of night and early morning. Further there are sizeable new residential developments planned like Pyrmont Place (237 apartments), large residential complex at the Sydney Fish market site and developments off Wentworth Park Road which will lead to increased residential traffic on Wattle Street. With the depot parking capacity increasing, this is likely to lead to increased traffic for apartments of residents of 99 Jones Street (west facing i.e. Wattle Street) and leading to higher noise and congestion which is not conducive for resident health and safety.

2. Noise impacts and Health impacts

The Wattle Street is a very busy street through the day and night making it noisy and relatively more polluted compared to other sides of 99 Jones Street. Demolition of the existing depot as well as construction of a new depot will lead to increase noise disturbance, additional dust as well as parking disturbance along Wattle Street (where there is free parking on weekends).

It is unclear from the proposal if the Bay Street East depot building has any asbestos issues and what could be potential impacts for residents of 99 Jones Street (west side) whose windows completely face only Wattle Street, and which is the only source of fresh air and

ventilation. This is likely to impact residents' health in terms of increased pollution, dust and noise and potentially asbestos exposure.

The existing parking structure houses garbage collection trucks and on occasion we get wafts of garbage and sewer smells while walking along Wattle Street (usually during warm weather). With significant parking space being added, we expect there would be further increases in garbage smells as well as risks of rodents and insects.

The proposed structure will be taller than existing structure as per designs provided leading to less wind flow and sunlight for the West side of 99 Jones Street. Exact construction timelines for the demolition and reconstruction are not specified in the proposal making it objectively hard to estimate the impact of the disruption.

3. Property Devaluation

With a large industrial 4 storey carpark on Wattle Street, we expect this will negatively impact property price for our apartment which faces Wattle Street. 99 Jones Street is a heritage building meaning banks usually lend no more than 80% of property value already restricting the number of buyers. With a sizeable industrial site with increased noise and pollution, this will have a negative bearing for our residence which has windows facing Wattle Street.

4. Wattle Street walkability

The section of Wattle Street along the East side of depot is as it is not very pleasant to walk currently. There are large trees (Port Jackson Figs) along one side and the road with dense canopy and the footpath is dark and uninhabited in late evenings. There are mentions of potential public artworks on the building with nighttime activation. Any further nighttime lights beyond 10pm are likely to increase light pollution for residential units facing Wattle Street (including our property).

5. Natural airflows and sunlight

In winter months or during rainy weather there is low natural light during late afternoon. This will be worsened by a larger structure on Wattle Street and studies are indicating even larger shadows than existing structure. Natural airflows will also be impacted by a 4-storey structure extending full length of Wattle Street. The sunlight and evening breeze are necessary for mental and physical well being and will be negatively affected by the proposed structure.

We urge the City of Sydney council to reject this application given sizeable negative impacts on resident well-being who reside in close proximity. We are available to review any alternatives and provide suggestions (e.g. 2 levels of underground parking while retaining current depot height will avoid sunlight/airflow impacts) or an alternative location for the depot.

Ultimo is increasingly getting gentrified given its close proximity to the CBD, harbour, dining/entertainment options and a large industrial site does not seem consistent with improving overall quality of life.

For avoidance of doubt our objections are specifically towards the Bay Street East Depot building reconstruction and we have no objections to other aspects of the overall Bay Street Depot development plans.

Sincerely,

Sarita Yerandekar and Salil Akolkar
620/99 Jones Street, Ultimo NSW 2007

From: Trevor Clarkson <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Trevor Clarkson
<[REDACTED]> <Trevor.Clarkson@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Sent on: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 7:00:46 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hi,

I have recently submitted a response to this proposal. Upon further thought and discussion with other residents of my building I am following up my initial reply with additional concerns and to state my opposition to this proposal. I live in Dalgety Square, which is at 99 Jones street and my apartment directly faces Wattle street and the council depot.

My opposition to the proposed development is for the following reasons:

1. Loss of Privacy and Visual Impact:

The proposed height increase will bring the new building in direct alignment with my apartment, significantly reducing my privacy and view. At present, the two-storey depot does not intrude on the outlook from my home. A four-storey structure, however, will face directly into my windows, compromising both privacy and comfort.

2. Loss of Natural Light:

The current open skyline above the two-storey depot allows for natural light in my apartment. A building of increased height would block this light, particularly in the afternoons and evenings, affecting the livability and enjoyment of my home.

3. Increased Noise and Traffic Disruption:

The site sits across a 3/4 lane busy road that already experiences high traffic volumes. Any expansion or intensification of activity on the depot site will add to the noise and congestion in an already strained traffic environment. This is a concern during both construction and ongoing use. Also with the new fish market and development of the old fish market I am expecting Wattle street traffic to continue to increase.

4. Construction Impacts:

Extended construction timelines for a project of this scale will cause considerable disruption. Noise, dust, and vibration from construction works will affect my quality of life and may pose health and safety concerns for nearby residents.

5. Negative Effect on Property Value:

The visual intrusion, noise, and loss of amenity associated with this development are likely to impact the desirability of properties in the vicinity, potentially decreasing property values, including my own.

6. Precedent for Future Development:

Approving a four-storey commercial/industrial structure in this location could set a precedent for further height increases in the area, changing the character of the neighbourhood and encouraging overdevelopment without adequate consideration for residential impacts.

7. Health & Environment Concerns:

Already with the current depot we can at times smell the garbage trucks etc from our side. Increased building height and use will undoubtedly make this worse. A building blocking our own will stop the open air flow, restricting our ability to open the windows and access clean fresh air.

I am not against having the Council Depot or its redevelopment and understand its necessity. But I would strongly

prefer it to be kept at its current height of 2 floors and am opposed to a height increase. If an increase in area is needed I would encourage the council to build downwards, my own building has many underground floors for parking so this does seem quite feasible.

Kind regards,
Trevor

From: Rachel g <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Rachel g <[REDACTED]> <Rachel.g@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

Sent on: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 8:58:38 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/276 - 10-16 Bay Street ULTIMO NSW 2007 - Attention Elizabeth L Jones

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hi Elizabeth

I live across from the West side of the depot on Bay Street, my apartment overlooks the the corrugated rooves and historic Mitchell Farming building.

I have lived here for 5 years and love the view of the depot, the historic buildings to the east and the general streetscape. I am incredibly fortunate to not be overlooked by another apartment building, which is a rare thing in Sydney. It is also a blessing to feel safe, as the lack of being overlooked allows me more freedom and enjoyment in my own space.

I fully support the refurbishment and potential development of the depot to keep it running for another 100 years. I think it is important to maintain working spaces in the city and surrounding suburbs.

However I don't agree with the height you are proposing to make the new Eastside building.

As stated in your planning proposal:

(b) requirements to minimise the detrimental impact of proposed development on view corridors,

The maximum height proposed as part of the envelope is significantly lower than the height of surrounding development to the west, east and south of the site and will therefore maintain existing view corridors surrounding the site. *(I do not believe it will maintain existing view corridors of the historic buildings next to the site and will greatly impact on the view corridor and streetscape for all residents on the West and South West side of the site, not to mention the residents of the historic buildings being completely overlooked by depot employees.)*

The proposed height of the reference scheme provides a transition in heights across the site in accordance with the existing built form. The eastern massing is appropriately setback from the smaller scale heritage listed buildings to the west.

(This may be true for the site itself but not for the relationship to the 2 historic buildings just across the street from the proposed Eastside depot building.)

The Concept proposal will improve the site's relationship with the public domain and replace an old ageing building that contributes little to the streetscape, with a high-quality design that must satisfy Council's Design Excellence criteria.

(The continual mention of satisfying the "Council's Design Excellence criteria", while innocuous at first, does make me question its genuine purpose. While striving for design excellence and opening up submissions for various design companies to creatively fulfil that desire is commendable, it seems more likely that you're choosing this option as a loophole to gain more height on the building than would otherwise be allowed.)

I reiterate that, I fully support the refurbishment and potential development of the depot to keep it running well into the future, I would just like to see it done with a little more sensitivity for the historic buildings, view corridor and surrounding residents.

Kind Regards
Rachel