

Attachment A

Summary of Submissions and Responses

Community submissions

132 submissions were received from the general community. Multiple submissions from individuals / body corporates have been counted as single submissions.

Summary of submissions	Response
Objection to the proposal (114 submissions including a petition with 769 signatures)	
Objection to the proposal.	Objection to the proposal is noted. Responses to specific matters are provided below.
Support for the proposal (17 submissions)	
Support for the proposal.	Support for the proposal is noted. Responses to specific matters are provided below.
Mixed response (1 submission)	
No objection to height and FSR control changes, but raises issues of concern.	Responses to specific matters are provided below.
Height, bulk and scale (106 submissions)	
Objection – 100 submissions - The proposed height control of 25 metres is excessive, more than doubling the existing 12 metre height control for the site. - The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) of 3.8:1, is almost double the existing 2:1 limit, and represents an unacceptable intensification of built form in an area that needs careful, respectful planning to balance and fully consider commercial and residential interests. - The proposed controls would allow a building that would overscale nearby heritage listed buildings (Lesseys Garage at 55-61 Riley Street and the Brandt Bros building at 41 Riley Street) and visually dominate the 2 storey terrace building at 53 Riley Street. - The proposed controls would allow a building that would tower over the adjacent building at 43-45 Riley Street building by more than 9 metres.	The site is located in a part of Woolloomooloo which has low, mid and high rise buildings of differing scale and architectural styles. The site is surrounded on the east, south and west with high rise buildings. The site is within a street block comprised of 5 buildings which are low to mid-rise in scale. The height and scale of the buildings in the street block are unlikely to alter to a significant degree in the future as the buildings at 41 Riley Street (Brandt Bros Ltd) and 55-61 Riley Street (Lesseys Garage) are heritage items, the building at 53 Riley Street is identified as a “contributory” building in the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area and the building at 43 Riley Street is relatively new (approved in 2012). It is recommended that the proposed maximum building height and maximum FSR for the site be reduced to ensure a better relationship with adjoining buildings in the street block, which in turn will reduce any

Summary of submissions	Response
• The proposed controls would allow a building that is too imposing and bulky for the site. • The proposal would allow a gross overdevelopment that disregards the carefully considered planning controls which preserve the balance between residential and commercial spaces in Woolloomooloo. • The proposal would permit a building that would significantly increase the sense of enclosure in nearby apartments. • The proposed controls would permit a building with an imposing presence that is not suitable for the area. • No justification in urban design terms has been offered as to why the subject site should benefit from a permitted height substantially greater than any other site in the street block. • Statements about “middle height” buildings providing a visual bridge between low and high buildings and to justify larger buildings in Woolloomooloo on the basis that there are nearby ones on William Street are specious. William Street is a major thoroughfare lined with modern high rise buildings – it is not Woolloomooloo. • The planning proposal is contrary to the height of buildings objectives of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 which include: - to ensure the height of development is appropriate to the condition of the site and its context; - to ensure appropriate height transitions between new development and heritage items and buildings in heritage conservation areas or special character areas; and - to promote the sharing of views outside Central Sydney. • The proposed changes to the FSR and building height for the site are at odds with two principles that apply to the Cathedral Street locality as set out in Sydney Development Control Plan 2012:: (i) to maintain the low scale of development within the centre of the locality and taller buildings located along William Street; and	future building’s visual impact on the streetscape. It is recommended that: • the proposed maximum building height be reduced by 7.1m to RL25.5m from the exhibited maximum height of RL32.6m; and • the proposed maximum floor space ratio be reduced from 3.8:1 to 3.2:1. As was the case with the exhibited proposal, these controls will only apply for a building on the site which will be used for a commercial premises. A maximum building height of RL 25.5m and a maximum FSR control of 3.2:1 would permit a 4-storey commercial building on the site which: • has a ground floor level which responds to flood planning levels; and • has floor to floor heights which comply with section 4.2.1.2 of the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 which states that buildings with a commercial or retail use are to have a minimum floor to floor height of: - 4.5m on the ground floor; and - 3.6m on the first commercial floor and any commercial floor above. A 4 storey commercial building built to a maximum height of RL 25.5m would result in a building that is the tallest within the street block, but one which has a better height relationship with the buildings in the street block. In addition, to further reduce height and bulk and to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties, it is recommended that there be a planning control which makes no allowance above the RL25.5m maximum height control for a roof top lift overrun, building plant, pergola structure or communal open space. Rather, the building shall use a machine-room less lift, have distributed plant and a non-trafficable green roof.

Summary of submissions	Response
(ii) encourage a 3-storey street wall along Riley Street to define the streetscape and provide a transition to taller development along William Street. • Even a reduction in the proposed height to 21 metres (inclusive of roof top structures) would still impact existing valuable layered foreground views. It would be excessive in height and scale for this locality and would not maintain consistency with the existing streetscape and appropriately respect adjoining and adjacent heritage and contributory buildings. • The height of the proposed building appears to be 28.1m, plus guardrail 29.3m with the services pergola rising to 32.6m. • A half metre setback on Riley Lane is inappropriate. <i>Recommendations for height, bulk and scale</i> • The proposal should be refused, and there should be no change to the existing LEP and DCP controls for the site and the proposal be refused. The existing 3 storey / 12 metre height control is much more in keeping with the street and neighbourhood. • Council should reduce the proposed building height control and FSR control to mitigate negative impacts. • The permitted building height be limited to the height of the current structure on the site. • The number of storeys proposed should be reduced. • The proposed building height should be no higher than the curved roof of the immediately adjacent building to the north at 43-45 Riley Street. • Four storeys plus rooftop would be more suited to the location. • The proposed building height should be reduced to be more in line with adjacent structures.	

Summary of submissions	Response
• The building height should be limited to the height of the roof plant on the PCYC City of Sydney-Woolloomooloo building at 51 Cathedral Street. • The building height should be a maximum of 6 metres higher than the existing height control of 12 metres (which is still a 50% increase in the control). • An 18 metre height control is the maximum height that would maintain consistency of scale with the surrounding heritage listed and contributory buildings, but even this height limit would negatively impact the high quality views available from level 4 of Paramount Apartments. • A lower building height control of 16.5 metres (a near 40% increase over the current 12 metre height control) is more appropriate for the site to: - ensure consistency of scale with the existing streetscape; - achieve a balanced visual relationship with adjoining and adjacent heritage and contributory buildings; and - maintain current high quality outlook enjoyed by all levels including and above level 4 of Paramount Apartments. • A 16.5 metre building height control would allow an open rooftop on the site at a level consistent with the curved roof of the building to the immediate north (43-45 Riley Street). The FSR should be reduced accordingly to a maximum of 3:1. • Further assessment by Council is not possible without further site specific analysis being undertaken: - accurate, pedestrian level visual impact analysis from surrounding public domain vantage points; - additional assessment of the relationship between the likely future development on the site and adjoining/adjacent heritage and contributory buildings; - redesign of the reference scheme to reduce height, bulk and scale (including Riley Street front wall) to improve relationship with sites to the north and south; - soundly based view and visual impact	

Summary of submissions	Response
studies. If council does not adopt amended controls of 16.5m building height and 3:1 FSR control, then the additional work and studies scheduled above should be undertaken prior to the determination of the planning proposal and not deferred to the later development application stage. If the increased height and FSR controls are finalised before suitably detailed studies, any future DA proposal would seek to maximum development potential within the revised controls resulting in significant negative impacts on the amenity of surrounding residential apartments which have not to date been appropriately considered or assessed in this Planning Proposal. • A 2 - 3 storey lightweight structure over the existing building could be an option, eliminating need for messy demolition. • A more moderate height limit (such as 2 storeys) consistent with surrounding buildings would better balance development needs with community interests. • There should be no additional height allowed for lifts or rooftop plant. Support – 6 submissions • The proposed building height is well within the height precedents set by surrounding tall buildings. • The proposed building height is reasonable (being only 5 storeys) and remains significantly lower than the height of neighbouring apartment buildings. • It is ironic that the people who are opposing this development live in a building more than twice the height of the proposed development which does not match the area's aesthetic. • We should be encouraging new developments like this, including increased building heights. • The building height is appropriate in its local context.	

Summary of submissions	Response
Impact on character of area, streetscape and public domain views (93 submissions)	
Objection – 84 submissions • The planning proposal would enable the construction of a large scale, overbearing development that will dominate the western side of Riley Street and be contrary to the low-rise development in the block bounded by Riley Street, Busby Lane and McCarthy Place. • The site-specific planning proposal is an example of ad hoc, piecemeal planning that fails to respect the context of the locality and the needs of the community. • The low rise nature of buildings in Woolloomooloo gives the area a distinctive character. The proposal is out of step with this character and would have an overbearing impact on the streetscape. • The substantial height increase would create a building with an imposing presence that's out of character with the local area. • The increase in height and the abrupt change in scale is not visually consistent with surrounding structures. The proposal would create an uncomfortable transition with the 2 storey terrace to the immediate south at 53 Riley Street. • The proposed building is lacking in aesthetic appeal. It looks cheap, boring, lacks elegance and will be lucky to be still standing or relevant in 50 years. It is unnecessarily chunky. • The proposed development will significantly detract from the streetscape's visual quality and cohesion. • Flour and Stone patisserie is located in premises on both sides of the subject site (at 43-45 Riley Street and at 53 Riley Street). It is of renowned fame, and has nestled discretely into the tree lined village of Woolloomooloo with its unique historic significance and architectural attractiveness. An oversized building full of office workers and a ground floor retail outlet in the middle of this fails to	It is recommended that the proposed maximum building height be reduced to RL 25.5m and the proposed maximum FSR be reduced to 3.2:1, so that a future building on this site will better relate to the other buildings within this street block. With a maximum building height of RL 25.5m, a future building will be the tallest building within the street block, but not significantly taller than the neighbouring building at 43 Riley Street or the heritage item (Brandt Bros) at 41 Riley Street. The reduction in the proposed maximum height and FSR will reduce the bulk and scale of a future building on the site and also reduce the visual impact of the southern elevation wall when viewed from the public domain. The additional recommendation that there be a planning control which makes no allowance above the RL 25.5m maximum height control for a roof top lift overrun, building plant, pergola structure or communal open space, is aimed at delivering a future building that reduces the visual impact of the development on the public domain while reducing potential impacts for neighbouring residential properties. If a future 4 storey building is to be built to the RL 25.5m height limit, the building shall use a machine-room less lift, have distributed plant and a non-trafficable green roof. It is considered that within the parameters of an RL 25.5m height limit and an FSR control of 3.2:1, the site will be able to support a quality commercial development that: • respects the scale of other development within the street block; • has an acceptable impact on the streetscape and the Woolloomooloo

Summary of submissions	Response
appreciate and poses a threat to the particular vibe that draws crowds to this charming quarter attractive to its neighbours, the Woolloomooloo residents and broader Sydneysiders. - The reference scheme building will impact on the Riley Street streetscape and the public domain views available from nearby William Street which has a high level of pedestrian patronage. It will present an abrupt change of scale, exposing a significant portion of blank wall as the backdrop to the heritage building at 55-61 Riley Street (Lessey's Garage). The building looms over the low scaled heritage item and the 4 storey blank wall protruding above the item will terminate pedestrian view lines from William Street. The building will visually interfere with pedestrian views and the "layered" composition of existing views. The building will block the existing sense of outlook available from William Street. Due to high levels of pedestrian patronage along William Street, alternative massing investigations should be presented to justify how the massing has been tailored to reduce visual bulk from pedestrian vantage points. - The resultant building form would become a dominating feature at a mid-block location. The reference scheme has been designed as an infill development but the nature of adjoining and surrounding development and proximity of heritage listed building is such that the overscaled boundary walls are likely to be visually exposed in perpetuity. The reference scheme design should be re-visited and redesigned as a building to be viewed for perpetuity "in the round". Alternative massing should be carefully examined.	Heritage Conservation Area and nearby heritage items; and is reasonable in terms of impacts on neighbouring residential properties. The development application (DA) stage will also provide opportunity for the detailed assessment of how a future building will impact on the character and appearance of the area and its fit with the streetscape. The DA stage will allow for assessment of the building in the context of the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area and impact on nearby heritage items.
Support – 9 submissions - The proposed built form respects the low and mid rise scale of adjoining properties through the use of a podium and 3 storey street wall height, and uses setbacks for upper levels to reduce impacts on the streetscape and provide a transition to the nearby high rise buildings. - The existing building has no heritage value, and the proposed design fits well with the	

Summary of submissions	Response
area. Ground-floor retail will improve street activation and enhance the pedestrian experience. The proposed height is reasonable and remains significantly lower than neighbouring apartment buildings. The design includes setbacks to ensure it transitions well between mid-rise and high-rise buildings. • The building is a well balanced design with an appropriate height in its local context. • This is a well-designed, appropriately scaled proposal that will enhance the streetscape and contribute positively to Woolloomooloo's growth. • The planning proposal's design considerations, such as the three storey street wall and setbacks for upper levels demonstrate a commitment to contextually appropriate development. • This proposal presents an exciting opportunity to enhance the commercial vitality of the area while maintaining a sensitive response to the existing built environment. • With its well thought out design, the proposal encourages economic growth while maintaining the character of the neighbourhood. • The street elevation is fantastic. • The proposed changes will refresh the streetscape. • The proposal would be another improvement of the street. It would bring much needed additional facilities (retail space) to the neighbourhood as more people work and live in the area. • Welcome the rejuvenation of Riley Street, which currently lacks character and is not particularly appealing.	

Summary of submissions	Response
Impact on residential amenity (outlook, overshadowing, natural ventilation) and on energy efficiency of homes (92 submissions)	
Objection – 91 submissions - The site's proximity to large residential apartment buildings makes it a sensitive location with the potential to affect many residents. - The "micro-suburb" bounded by Crown Street, Yurong Parkway, William Street and Cathedral Street is an amazing community and an amazing place to live. It is very densely populated with the large blocks of Crown Gardens, the Hastings Deering Building, Paramount Apartments and Park Lane Towers forming a pocket that opens to the north to let the sun, views and summer breezes in. Any increase in density will throw the current balance out of whack. To have a new 25m high office building plopped into the low rise middle section will have a drastic impact on residential amenity. - The proposed planning controls would enable a taller, larger building to be built on the site, which will have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of existing nearby apartment buildings. - The planning proposal would destroy the amenity of nearby homes, changing them from being liveable and connected with community and nature, into a sterile concrete jungle. - The Planning proposal is inconsistent with the Eastern Sydney District Plan as it will have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents in the neighbouring locality. The development proposed through the planning proposal will impair, and in many cases, destroy the residential amenity of nearby residents. Obstruction of views / outlook - Many submissions state that the proposal's impact on the views and outlook would diminish the amenity, liveability and enjoyment of their homes.	The site is surrounded on three sides by high rise residential apartments. To the east, on the opposite side of Riley Street, is the Crown Gardens residential complex and the Riley Apartments. To the south is the Paramount Apartments building and to the west is Park Lane Towers. Collectively, there are approximately 395 residential apartments in high rise buildings within these buildings surrounding the site. Adjoining the site to the immediate north at 43-45 Riley Street is a mixed use 5 storey building, with residences on all levels above the ground floor. To reduce the overall impact of the proposal on nearby residential properties, it is recommended that: - the proposed maximum building height be reduced to RL 25.5m; and - the proposed maximum floor space ratio be reduced from 3.8:1 to 3.2:1. As was the case with the exhibited proposal, these controls will only apply for a building on the site which will be used for commercial premises. In addition, it is recommended that there be a planning control which makes no allowance above the maximum height control of RL 25.5m for a roof top lift overrun, building plant, pergola structure or communal open space. Rather, if a future building is to be built to the RL25.5m height limit, the building shall use a machine-room less lift, have distributed plant and a non-trafficable green roof. This will assist in mitigating potential amenity impacts upon neighbouring residences (e.g. noise and privacy impacts from the communal open space).

Summary of submissions	Response
- The proposal's impact on views / outlook is addressed in more detail under a separate heading in this document. Overshadowing - Many submissions raise concern about a taller building blocking sunlight from entering apartments. - The planning proposal documentation identifies two apartments in Paramount Apartments which would experience overshadowing but notes they will still retain 2 hours of solar access in winter. It is likely that more apartments would experience overshadowing. Paramount Apartments currently enjoy about eight hours of sunlight in winter and the loss of sunlight access could be severe. - The one bedroom apartments in the Paramount Apartments rely on the openings on the northern side of the apartment for all light and outlook. There are no other window openings in the one bedroom apartments. This proposal would impact the only outlook and source of natural light for the one bedroom apartments. If the light and view are removed, the natural light and view would be removed from the entire home. This will impact the desirability and liveability of the residences. - Some apartments would receive less than two hours of direct sunlight per day, a threshold that has been linked to adverse mental health outcomes. Studies have shown that insufficient daylight exposure can lead to issues such as Seasonal Affective Disorder (SAD), disrupted sleep patterns, and reduced overall well-being. By significantly reducing sunlight access, this proposal will create living conditions that are not conducive to good health or quality of life. - Some dwellings will receive a minimum of only two hours of sunlight per day, as noted by Council officials at the community consultation session. This is considered unliveable. - There will be a loss of views and significant reduction in sunlight to the East Sydney	Obstruction of views/outlook A response to this objection is under the separate heading "Impact on views and outlook". Overshadowing The solar access provisions in section 4.2.3.1 of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 state that apartments in neighbouring developments must achieve a minimum of 2 hours' direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm on 21 June onto at least 1sqm of living room windows and a minimum 50% of the required minimum area of private open space, for at least 70% of the apartments in a development. Solar access is measured at mid-winter (21 June) because this is when the sun is lowest in the sky and therefore represents a "worst case scenario" for overshadowing. The proponent submitted shadow diagrams and an assessment showing impact on nearby properties for a reference scheme with a maximum building height of 25m and a maximum FSR of 3.8:1. These diagrams showed that between 9am and 3pm on 21 June: - there would be no additional shadow impact upon apartments within Park Lane Towers (1 Boomerang Place); - all apartments within Paramount Apartments (60-70 William Street) would achieve the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide solar access requirements of a minimum of 2 hours' sunlight; - there would be overshadowing of the western elevation of the "Former Hastings Deering Building" at 46-48 Riley Street between 2pm and 3pm, but this elevation will receive the required minimum of 2 hours of solar access in the middle of the day; and

Summary of submissions	Response
Private Hospital, negatively affecting conditions for patients and staff. Loss of ambient light - Some submissions state that the lower floors in the Paramount Apartments would lose ambient light from outside as a result of the proposal, which will result in these apartments becoming significantly darker throughout the day and year. This will increase the need for artificial lighting, impacting on energy consumption and sustainability. Natural ventilation - Many submissions note that Paramount Apartments have been designed to allow for good ventilation. In the larger 2 bedroom apartments, cross ventilation is achieved through openings on both the northern and southern sides of the building. Concern is raised that the proposal will block air and breezes from coming up from the harbour and through the Paramount Apartments. This will make air in the apartments stagnant and increase the use of air conditioning. Impact on energy efficiency - Paramount Apartments have tiled floors which are warmed by the sun in winter, reducing the need for heating and enabling energy efficiency. Additional overshadowing of nearby apartments will make them colder in winter and increase the need for artificial heating which will increase energy consumption. - The loss of natural light and ventilation runs counter to the City of Sydney's sustainability strategies, which emphasise climate-responsive design, energy efficiency, and reducing reliance on artificial heating and cooling. Initiatives such as the Sustainable Sydney 2030 plan prioritise the enhancement of green spaces, energy-efficient building design, and urban cooling through increased airflow. The proposed development contradicts these principles by blocking passive cooling and natural light, leading to higher energy consumption and reduced overall sustainability for all affected residents.	there would be no additional shadow impacts upon apartments within the Crown Gardens complex (63 Crown Street). If the recommendation to reduce the maximum building height to RL 25.5m and the maximum FSR to 3.2:1 is adopted, the shadowing impacts would be less. The City does not have solar access provisions for the protection of non-residential buildings. Loss of ambient light The separation distance between the southern boundary of the site and the northern boundary of the Paramount Apartments site is approximately 25.5m, which exceeds the NSW Government's minimum 24m building separation distance for residential buildings over 9 storeys. This distance, along with the recommended reduction in the maximum building height, will allow for ambient light to enter apartments within the Paramount Apartments building. Natural ventilation The separation distance between the southern boundary of the site and the northern boundary of the Paramount Apartments site is approximately 25.5m, which exceeds the NSW Government's minimum 24m building separation distance for residential buildings over 9 storeys. This allows for sufficient ventilation. The recommended reduction to the maximum building height to RL 25.5m would permit a building on the site that is approximately 2.3m higher than the neighbouring building at 43 Riley Street. Impact on energy efficiency The shadow diagrams and solar assessment submitted for the proposal (maximum height of 25m and maximum FSR of 3.8:1) indicate that all apartments within Paramount Apartments building would achieve the ADG solar access requirements of a minimum of 2

Summary of submissions	Response
Support – 1 submission Concerns about the proposed development's impact on overshadowing are overstated.	hours' sunlight between 9am and 3pm on 21 June (winter solstice). If the recommendation to reduce the maximum height and FSR for the site is adopted, overshadowing impacts will be even less. Many apartments within the Paramount Apartments will continue to achieve in excess of this minimum requirement. The separation distance between the southern boundary of the site and the northern boundary of the Paramount Apartments is approximately 25.5m, and the maximum building height is recommended to be reduced to RL25.5m. It is not considered that there would be such a significant adverse impact upon the energy efficiency of neighbouring apartment buildings as to warrant refusal of this planning proposal.
Impact on views and outlook (84 submissions)	
Objection – 82 submissions - The proposed planning controls would permit a building which would obliterate the views and outlook enjoyed by residents of neighbouring apartment buildings. The Paramount Apartment building located to the south of the subject site at 60-70 William Street would be particularly impacted. - Apartments within the Paramount Apartments building are arranged so that living areas and private balconies off these living areas look out to the north, across the subject site. The apartments have full width glazed frontages in their north facing living areas to capture the view to the north. The Paramount Apartment building was designed to optimise and rely on views to the north. While each apartment has a slightly different view, the following elements are present within views available from the living areas and balconies in the Paramount Apartments: - the view is "framed" by residential apartments in high rise buildings to the east and west; - a visually layered urban setting enhanced by mature vegetation and the tree canopy across	The most objections regarding view loss and impact on outlook came from owners and residents of apartments within the Paramount Apartment complex at 60-70 William Street, Woolloomooloo. The City's view impact assessment has concentrated on the impacts on the views and outlook available from apartments in this building on the basis that the impact is greatest on this building. City staff have undertaken an independent view impact analysis to assess the impact on the views available from apartments within the Paramount Apartments. This analysis was undertaken using the reference scheme submitted to support the proposed change of the maximum height control to 25m and the FSR to 3.8:1. The analysis has included: 3D modelling of the proposed development as viewed from within the Paramount Apartments building, and - a site inspection on 20 March 2025 where 10 apartments were visited and photos taken of the view/outlook

Summary of submissions	Response
The Domain and surrounding areas; - partial views of The Domain including open parkland areas and glimpses of the sloping lawns and open spaces of Cook and Phillip Park; - a portion of the eastern CBD edge along Macquarie Street; - profile of the Art Gallery of NSW and some exterior artworks; - for some apartments, a partial view of the iconic arch structure of the Sydney Harbour Bridge; - for some apartments, a partial view of the top of the sails of the Opera House; - for some apartments, glimpses of the waters of Woolloomooloo Bay. • A view impact analysis undertaken for residents of Paramount Apartments indicates that the proposed planning controls would result in the following impacts on the views available from the Paramount Apartment building: - for apartments on levels 1 to 3, views including sky views would be completely obliterated; - for apartments on levels 4 to 5, views of anything except the sky would be obliterated and sky views almost gone; - apartments on level 6 would lose most views except those of the sky; and - levels 7 and 8 would have views heavily interrupted. This view analysis has been endorsed by Dr Phillip Pollard, an expert in view impact analysis. • Some apartments within Paramount Apartments have views to state heritage items including the Domain, the Art Gallery of NSW and the Royal Botanical Gardens. The proposed planning controls would result in catastrophic view loss from these apartments, which is inconsistent with Sydney DCP 2012 which asks for development in the vicinity of a heritage item to minimise impact on the setting of the item by retaining and respecting significant views to and from the heritage item. • The low-rise nature of the buildings on the western side of Riley Street provides surrounding residential apartments with layered contextual views over the subject site	available from internal living spaces and on the balconies of these apartments. In the circumstances, consideration can be given to the view sharing planning principles set out in the Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council (2004) judgment, which provides a 4 step assessment process to guide whether view sharing is reasonable. These view sharing planning principles are typically applied in the assessment of development applications, where a proposal can be assessed against existing planning controls. In the case of a planning proposal which seeks approval to change the height and FSR, the application of these principles is more limited as there cannot be an assessment against these controls. To the extent that they can be applied, the view sharing principles have been used to inform the assessment. The full assessment of the proposed planning controls against the view sharing planning principles is within the post-exhibition Council report. To improve a future building's relationship with the other buildings in the street block, its visual impact on the streetscape and to reduce its impact on neighbouring properties, reductions to the maximum building height and maximum FSR are recommended. It is also recommended that there be a restriction on roof top structures above the maximum height limit. These proposed amendments to the planning proposal would have the effect of reducing the impact on the views of neighbours. City staff have undertaken an independent view impact analysis to assess the impact of a future building with these reduced controls. This assessment is within the post-exhibition council report. Even with the proposed reduced controls, view loss and impact on outlook will occur to some apartments within the Paramount Apartment complex and other nearby residential buildings. Being located in an urban context and within the City Fringe, it is inevitable that new development will affect

Summary of submissions	Response
and the adjacent buildings (being the foreground view) to a mid distance view of The Domain playing fields and lawns and the far distance/horizon view of the ridgeline of The Domain, comprising views of the mature trees along Art Gallery Road. • The proposal would allow a building which would obscure views of green spaces. For many residents in Paramount Apartments and other nearby apartments, views of nature and greenery are critical for mental health and well being. Obscuring these views will diminish connection with nature. • The proposed planning controls would permit a building that will increase the sense of enclosure experienced by residents of nearby apartment buildings. • The views available from Paramount Apartments are of iconic status, including views to iconic, recognisable and familiar landmarks of Sydney. These iconic views will be destroyed due to the height, bulk and overall scale of development that will be permitted by the planning proposal. View impact analyses • The proponent's view impact analyses are flawed, inaccurate and misleading. They ignore the substantial loss of views from nearby apartments and seek to inaccurately portray the view loss as minimal or inconsequential. • Council has relied on flawed view impact assessments submitted by the developer. There is concern that council has relied on these documents in assessing the planning proposal, and that they were accepted by council for public exhibition without testing their accuracy. • Council has ignored the view impact studies submitted by residents which illustrate the full extent of view loss from nearby apartments. • Based on documents received through GIPAA requests, it is known that the same proponent for a similar building on the same site (but 31m high), submitted a full and proper view analysis	the views and outlook of residential developments to some extent. It is considered that with the reduced controls and restrictions on roof top development, the impact on the views and outlook enjoyed by neighbouring properties will be reduced and the opportunity for view sharing increased, such that the impact on views and outlook is reasonable in the context. View impact analyses City staff have not relied upon the SJB Urban Design Report (May 2024) nor the SJB View Impact Analysis (November 2024) in the assessment of potential impacts upon views and outlook. This is because of concerns that the SJB Urban Design Report contains an insufficient analysis of potential view impacts and the SJB View Impact Analysis used an unorthodox assessment methodology to assess impacts.

Summary of submissions	Response
which actually shows the full extent of views and outlook lost from the Paramount Apartments living/balcony doors. CoS rejected this development proposal very strongly, but with the current proposal did not impose or require a similar exhaustive view impact analysis. <i>SJB Urban Design Report (May 2024)</i> • This report does not adequately represent the view loss impacts to neighbouring apartment buildings. The report contains two indicative images of the proposal's impacts on views available from nearby apartments, but both images relate to apartments located higher than the proposed building height, not capturing the actual impacts on the views available at lower levels of neighbouring buildings. It is fundamental to examine the potential view loss impacts to neighbouring dwellings associated with the proposed height increase (from 12m to 25m), rather than assessing impacts for dwellings located at a height above the potential intrusion (above the 25m height control). • Furthermore, in this report only one view from a single apartment in the Paramount Apartment building was considered, and this relied on a photo found online in a real estate sales post. This photo is wide angled and the view is from a higher floor in the building. There is also a disclaimer in the report which notes that the views are indicative, are not survey accurate and should not be relied upon for a view impact assessment. The living areas and balconies of many apartments in the Paramount Apartments are impacted to a considerably greater extent than suggested in the SJB Urban Design Report. <i>SJB View Impact Analysis (November 2024)</i> • This analysis uses an unorthodox assessment methodology which seeks to assess the percentage of apartments within neighbouring buildings which would be affected by additional view loss and to what extent (measured as a percentage).	

Summary of submissions	Response
• This analysis is seriously flawed, bears no relationship with any established practices for the assessment of urban view impacts (such as the NSW Land and Environment Court's planning principles). The analysis contains no actual view impact images and does not consider view composition which includes views of the Domain, NSW Art Gallery, water views and the upper sections of the Harbour Bridge and Opera House. This analysis has been prepared in ignorance of the nature of the existing views available from the Paramount Apartments. There was no request from the proponent to access any Paramount Apartment to undertake a proper view impact analysis. • This analysis uses an extremely wide field of view (180 degrees), whereas a field of view on a 50mm fully framed SLR camera is approximately 40 degrees. A 40 degree field of view is of relevance because it closely approximates central vision field of view for the human eye. A 180 degree field of view is very distorted, with the percentage of view impacted greatly diluted by the extremity of field of view. • The percentages of view loss specified in this analysis are misleading as it assumes that trees which are an important and welcome part of the layered foreground view are "obstructions" and therefore contribute to an "obstructed" view, when in fact they are part of the view itself which is of very high value to residents. • The view loss percentages indicated in this quantitative analysis are ridiculously understated. <i>View sharing principles</i> • The proposal is not consistent with the view sharing principles established by the NSW Land and Environment Court. • The "Tenacity Principles" (Tenacity Consulting v Warringah (2004)) should be used to assess the proposal's impact on private views and view sharing issues.	

Summary of submissions	Response
- The lack of any appropriate view sharing with existing residents cannot be justified. Support – 2 submissions - Views cannot be owned across neighbouring properties. Nobody owns a view across a neighbouring property.	
Impact on nearby heritage items and Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area (68 submissions)	
- The heritage conservation area was established to protect the area's historical and architectural significance. The site is located in the vicinity of several local heritage items. - The proposal fails to respect and respond to the nearby heritage items that "book-end" the street block, these being Lesseys Garage at 55-61 Riley Street and Brandt Bros Ltd building at 41 Riley Street). Lesseys Garage is only separated from the site by a narrow 2 storey plus attic terrace style shop and residence building at 53 Riley Street (approx. 6m in width). The planning proposal will be contrary to the low-rise context in which these two heritage items are sited. The potential impacts of the building envelope upon the significance of the nearby heritage items needs to be considered in detail. The HIS has failed to consider the relationship between the proposed building envelope on the site and the likely form of development that may occur on the sites to the immediate south. - Reference scheme accompanying the planning proposal clearly does not achieve the objective of the current zone - <i>"Development is to respond to and complement heritage items and contributory buildings within the heritage conservation area"</i>. The reference scheme is overscaled and will dominate adjoining and adjacent buildings with an incompatible street wall height on Riley Street, excessive height and bulk, and an expansive blank southern wall. - If this development goes ahead, the area will lose its uniqueness of our past history.	The site is located in the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area and within the same street block as 2 heritage items, these being "Lessey's Garage" at 55 - 61 Riley Street and "Brandt Bros Ltd" at 41 Riley Street. Across Riley Street, on the opposite side of the road, is the "Former Hastings Deering Building" at 46-48 Riley Street, which is also a local heritage item. Under Sydney Development Control Plan 2012, the building on the site is identified as "detracting". Detracting buildings do not represent a key period of significance and detract from the character of a conservation area. As such, the building's demolition would not be considered detrimental to the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area. The Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area is characterised by a diversity of buildings of differing scale and architectural styles. The western side of Riley Street includes the one to 2 storey Inter-War Art-Deco style "Lessey's Garage", the three-storey Federation "Brandt Bros Ltd" warehouse, 2 storey Victorian terraces and a 5 storey mixed use retail and apartment building at 43-45 Riley Street. The eastern side of Riley Street includes the 8 storey Inter-War functionalist style "Former Hasting Deering Building" and the 15-storey Crown Gardens complex, directly opposite the site. It is recommended that the maximum height and FSR controls for the site be reduced, so that a future building on the site achieves a better relationship with other buildings within the subject street block, which includes 2 heritage items and a contributory building.

Summary of submissions	Response
• To treat Woolloomooloo as a mere extension or edge of the CBD for purposes of development is spurious, as its heritage significance should be recognised. • Woolloomooloo is historically different from other city fringe areas. It has its own special early history of settlement. If there is a relevant comparison of Woolloomooloo it is not actually to <i>any city fringe</i>, it is to the historic Rocks area on the other side of Circular Quay. • In this particular area, the northern end of Riley Street, a building down the road dates from 1793, one of the very earliest days of the colony housing, granted to Palmer by Governor Phillips' representative. • The proponent's Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) does not address the historic 1970s Green Bans that saved Woolloomooloo from an overdevelopment of office buildings, and secured the heritage conservation areas we now cherish. At that time Woolloomooloo was saved by the community from 'development'. Why does the City of Sydney appear to be supporting an office overdevelopment in an existing heritage conservation area that will reduce such a significant part of Woolloomooloo heritage? The Woolloomooloo community cares about its heritage. • The heritage conservation area protections need to be maintained. The development needs design responses that reflect the heritage character of the area. • The Cathedral Street locality statement in the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 states that development is to respond to and complement heritage items and contributory buildings within heritage conservation areas, including streetscapes and lanes. • The scale of the proposed building is entirely out of character with the surrounding conservation area and the proposed massing overwhelms neighbouring heritage listed buildings. The proposed building does not adequately transition with the heritage listed buildings, creating a visually overbearing	With the recommended reductions to the proposed height and FSR, the resultant scale of the proposed building envelope is not considered to be detracting within this diverse setting and streetscape. The proposed 3 storey street wall on Riley Street will step down to the 4 storey street wall at 43-45 Riley Street which then steps down again to the three-storey plus parapet street wall at 41 Riley Street, following the topography of the land. The proposed fourth storey is setback 3 metres from Riley Street boundary, reducing its visibility. The fourth storey and southern elevation wall will be visible from the south, particularly when travelling from William Street up Riley Street. A visible blank side elevation wall is considered reasonable in this context as: • the extent of the blank wall is reduced as a result of the recommended building height reduction; • a compliant scheme under the existing controls would also present a blank southern elevation wall (albeit lower); • blank elevations and elevations with minimal fenestration are already present and visible within the area including the eastern elevation of 60-70 William Street and the rear elevation of 1 Boomerang Place; and • the extent of blank facade in this instance is a product of accommodating compliant floor to ceiling heights for the proposed commercial and retail use. The DA stage will also provide opportunity for the detailed assessment of a future building in the context of the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area and impact on nearby heritage items.

Summary of submissions	Response
presence that detracts from the area's historic character.	
Potential change to Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area boundaries (45 submissions)	
• Council has a separate planning proposal which has received Gateway approval but is not yet on public exhibition, to remove this site and others from the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area (C71). • There is widespread concern that the planning control changes to 47-51 Riley Street are being proposed at the same time as plans to remove the site and land around it from the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area (C71). • This portion of Riley Street (from William St down to Cathedral St) is an integral part of the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Zone, marking as it does the border of the earliest boundary of the colony, as well as being the site of the last remnant of the circa 1819 sandstone wall surrounding the kitchen garden for Hyde Park Barracks. Development on Riley Street should enhance, not further deplete, the heritage character of the neighbourhood. • The boundaries to the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area should not be altered, the Conservation Area status should be retained to protect the neighbourhood character. • There is concern that there is a wider plan to change the character of Riley Street away from its heritage features and abolish its heritage importance. • There has been a lack of transparency concerning the removal of some properties from the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area. • This development sets a dangerous precedent for future proposals given that the City of Sydney is advocating for lifting of Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation area (C71), which includes this part of Riley Street.	The proposed adjustments to the boundary of the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area are part of a separate planning proposal that has not yet proceeded to public exhibition. Concerns regarding the proposed adjustments to the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area boundary should be raised when submissions are invited on that proposal during the public exhibition period. The subject planning proposal has been assessed against current planning provisions, with the site still being located within the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area. The subject proposal is not dependent upon the proposed adjustment to the heritage conservation area to proceed. It is considered that with the recommended reductions in height and FSR, along with the recommended restrictions on roof-top structures, a future commercial building on the site will be able to respect the character of the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area and maintain the significance of nearby heritage listed buildings.

Summary of submissions	Response
• A building like the Reference Scheme would negatively impact the future context of the listed heritage and contributory buildings and this would establish an unsatisfactory precedent for further redevelopment of this local area should the proposed changes to the conservation area boundaries proceed. • The proposed change to remove the site from the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area (C71) appears to be designed purely to facilitate height intensification rather than align with existing planning policies. The nearby heritage listed buildings will be overwhelmed by this development, further eroding the character of the area. • Removing the site from the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area more broadly undermines protections intended to preserve the unique character of the neighbourhood.	
Precedence for similar large scale developments in Woolloomooloo (61 submissions)	
Objection – 60 submissions • Many submissions raise concern that this proposal would set a precedent for similar other large scale developments in Woolloomooloo. There are concerns that amending the planning controls for this site could lead to a cascade of changes in planning controls (particularly the development standards outlining maximum height of building and floor space ratio) for other sites in the immediate vicinity. • The doubling of the permitted height for a building in this street block will set a dangerous precedent for other redevelopments in the area. • This planning proposal sets a dangerous precedent of further high rise development encroaching on historically protected zones leading to the gradual erosion of Woolloomooloo's unique character. • This proposal would allow not only this specific high rise commercial development but would also likely lead to similar calls for increased height controls on the adjoining site, which	This planning proposal has been prepared in response to a request from the property owner to amend the planning controls for the subject site. The request has been assessed in accordance with the NSW Government's Local Environmental Plan Making Guideline. The request has also been assessed against the NSW Government's Greater Sydney Region Plan, Eastern City District Plan and the City's Local Strategic Planning Statement. It is considered that with the recommended reductions to the maximum height and FSR, the proposal demonstrates both strategic and site-specific merit. Any other planning proposal request made by a property owner to increase building height or FSR beyond the existing planning controls would go through the same plan making process, and would be assessed on its own individual merits. It would need to be able to

Summary of submissions	Response
would dramatically change the living environment in the Paramount Apartments. • The proposed floor to ceiling heights are excessive and could set an unreasonable precedent that could lead to further over scaled developments. • This increased building and height control would create a precedent for other development sites to the area to the north of Paramount. • This increased height control would create an unfortunate precedent for development to the area to the north of the subject site which will negatively impact future residential amenity, contrary to Council's desire to encourage and support the quality of inner city residential living. Support – 1 submission • Claims that this development will set a precedent for excessive height increases are unfounded, as the area already has a mix of building heights.	demonstrate both strategic and site-specific merit. If a land owner opts not to proceed with a planning proposal to achieve uplift, then any future development of their site would need to comply with existing planning controls.
Inadequacies and errors in documents used to support planning proposal (26 submissions)	
• Insufficient, inadequate and erroneous documents have been submitted in support of planning proposal request. These documents cannot be relied upon for the assessment of site specific merit or to justify uplift in planning controls. • Additional analysis should be carried out at the planning proposal stage and not deferred to the development application phase, as once uplifted controls are finalised future proposals would seek to maximise development potential within control parameters. View impact analyses • Many submissions criticise the view impact analyses submitted by the proponent in support of the planning proposal, arguing that they are flawed, inaccurate and misleading.	The City has not relied solely on the proponent's documents, such as the view impact analysis, heritage impact statement, photomontages and traffic reports in its assessment of the planning proposal. Rather, the City has conducted its own assessment of the proposal, and where considered necessary has prepared supplementary documentation for Council's consideration. City staff have not relied upon the SJB Urban Design Report (May 2024) nor the SJB View Impact Analysis (November 2024) in the assessment of potential impacts upon views and outlook. This is because of concerns that the SJB Urban Design Report contains an insufficient analysis of potential view impacts and the SJB View Impact Analysis used an unorthodox assessment methodology to assess impacts. City staff have undertaken view impact analyses to assess the impact on

Summary of submissions	Response
• The view impact analyses are discussed in more detail under the “View loss / impact on outlook” heading of this Attachment. Heritage Impact Statement • The Heritage Impact Statement does not sufficiently address the relationship of the proposal with nearby heritage items – Lessey’s Garage at 55-61 Riley Street and the Brandt Bros building at 41 Riley Street. It also does not adequately address the proposal’s relationship with the 2 storey terrace building immediately to the south at 53 Riley Street which has contributory values. • Insufficient weight is given in the heritage assessment to the battle to save Woolloomooloo which took place in the Green Bans in 1970s, when activists succeeded in halting overdevelopment so as to keep Woolloomooloo’s one and two storey heritage. Other inadequacies with documentation • The planning proposal does not adequately address the impact of the proposal’s bulk and scale on the public domain. • The photomontages accompanying the planning proposal are not accurate in that they are taken from an elevated view point rather than at pedestrian eye level. • Council should require a comprehensive noise impact assessment, including projected noise levels during construction and operation, as well as mitigation strategies. • Council should require a detailed traffic management plan that mitigates the impact of increased traffic on Busby Lane. • Council should require a detailed plan on how the increased servicing of the location will be conducted.	the views from the Paramount Apartments building, which can be viewed at Attachments F and G to the Council report. Objector concerns in relation to the proposal’s height, bulk and scale, and impacts in terms of views, heritage, noise, traffic and site servicing are addressed separately in this summary of submissions.

Summary of submissions	Response
Flawed planning proposal process, lack of transparency in decision making, lack of community consultation (25 submissions)	
History of proposals - The Rose Group has had many attempts to propose changes to this site, which have been consistently rejected by Council staff based on excessive scale: - December 2021 – A pre-DA proposal for a 24m high building was rejected due to its failure to demonstrate strategic merit; - December 2022 – A planning proposal for a 31m height control was rejected as it lacked strategic and site-specific merit and was inconsistent with Council’s planning objectives; - Mid 2023 – A pre-lodgement submission for a 16-18m height proposal was rejected for excessive massing, overbearing scale and inappropriate transition to heritage structures; and - Now – Council has endorsed a Planning Proposal change with a 25m height limit despite its greater impact on neighbouring buildings and residents. - While it is understood that this is a Planning Proposal for site specific control changes and not a pre DA, the council's own documents say that the 16-18m proposal was out-of-character, overbearing and inappropriate, yet the commentary from Council staff has been that a 25m height proposal was deemed appropriate to support this time. Why would a higher proposal be supported? It is still out-of-character and overbearing. - There is an inconsistency in Council’s position and it raises serious concerns about fairness and transparency about how decisions will be made. It is hard to understand how the Council staff can have a change of heart. While the current proposal is 25m not 31m, simply knocking off 6m from the new proposal does not address it’s lack of context and character and the impact on surrounding buildings. The 16-18m proposal was also condemned by Council.	City advice on development applications and planning proposals can differ because the commentary is provided in a different context. City advice on development applications and pre-development applications is provided in the context of the existing planning controls that apply to a site. Where non-compliances are identified (e.g. height and FSR) these non-compliances are highlighted, and reasons are provided as to why they may not be supported. The context for advice on a planning proposal is different. The City must consider the request against priorities identified in the NSW Government’s Greater Sydney Region Plan, Eastern City District Plan and the City’s Local Strategic Planning Statement. This is a consideration of a proposal’s strategic merit. The City then must also consider the site-specific merit of the request. This is a consideration of site-specific and contextual issues such as overshadowing, flooding, heritage and other amenity impacts. The public exhibition process allows the City to fully test the site-specific merits of a planning proposal request. It allows the community the opportunity to comment on a proposal and for the City to give due consideration to the communities’ views in its full assessment. The City has now completed its full assessment taking into consideration public submissions. It is recommended that the maximum building height and maximum FSR be reduced so that a future building on the site better responds to the existing buildings within the street block and is acceptable in terms of visual impact on the public domain. On balance, the site-specific merits of the amended proposal are considered acceptable.

Summary of submissions	Response
- From 2021 to 2023, Council rejected multiple proposals from the land owner of the site due to excessive height, scale and the impact on heritage and surrounding buildings. Despite the rejection of these proposals, Council supported this planning proposal which is of greater scale and height than the previously rejected proposals. No new strategic justification has been identified that has led Council to now support a 25m height proposal after rejecting similar schemes. Public information session - At the public meeting held on 11 February 2025 by the City of Sydney, the community speakers at the meeting were impressive (articulate, vocal and well-informed) distressed residents. The quality of feedback from the floor was highly informative, for example about the long background history of applications and objections to Rose Group proposals for their site, which have been far less objectionable than the current one. Residents' concerns were not addressed adequately by City staff. This approach appears contrary to the council's commitment to being community-minded and environmentally responsible. - The number of attendees at the public meeting and the 700 signatures on the community led petition demonstrates the strength of negative feeling about this proposal. This strong feeling is not only from those immediately impacted but the broader community of Woolloomooloo. - There is an undisclosed conflict of interest for the City of Sydney. At the public information session it was mentioned more than once that allowing this building to go ahead would assist the City in achieving their own targets. This is clearly a conflict of interest which has not been publicly acknowledged. Other concerns with the planning proposal process - Why has the City of Sydney council itself crafted this planning proposal? The council's involvement enables one entity to circumvent current heritage requirements embedded in the local environmental plan.	

Summary of submissions	Response
• Why are we being persuaded by council to approve this proposal? Why now, and why this landowner? • The process followed for this planning proposal does not pass “the pub test”. • One wonders about the transparency of this process to object when one of the email addresses in the letter sent by the City about the proposed changes is incorrect. Seems a coincidence and makes me wonder how genuine the City is in hearing views that are contrary to their own. • The Gateway Determination process is highly flawed and works against many stakeholders impacted by a proposal. Before purchasing an apartment many residents invested time and money into research to understand the planning controls for nearby properties (including 47-51 Riley Street) to check the potential for impacts upon amenity and views. The current planning proposal was not identified, nor were the previous planning proposal attempts on the subject site. Concerns were raised that these property owners who undertook due diligence now risk their property values being significantly impacted. • Prior to the notification of this planning proposal, the council has approved several aspects of this development which directly impact our home and the homes of many other people. This lack of consultation with residents is disappointing. • The City of Sydney and Government resources engaged in responding to the multiple submissions/revisions from one proponent is not a good use of rate and tax payers contributions. It has also taken multiple residents many hours to review and respond to the documents for public review and comment. • The Rose Group who own the site are developers. Their history on another development in NSW raises legitimate concerns about their approach to planning, transparency, and community consultation in Woolloomooloo.	

Summary of submissions	Response
Benefit to one commercial developer/land owner while impacting on many residential neighbours (43 submissions)	
• The proposal prioritises commercial gains at the significant expense of local residents. • Doubling the height limit from 12m to 25m on this site will cause an unreasonable loss of amenity for over 50 residents in the Paramount Apartments and many others in nearby apartment buildings – prioritising the interests of a single commercial developer over those of long standing residents. • The proposed development would permanently diminish the quality of life for existing residents and businesses in the area, while its commercial nature means it will only be actively used by office workers during business hours, leaving the community to bear its negative impacts 24/7, every day of the year. • More residents' amenity will be compromised for the profit of a developer, on the highly contentious promise of commercial benefit for all of Sydney.	The proposal has been assessed against the NSW Government's Greater Sydney Region Plan, Eastern City District Plan and the City's Local Strategic Planning Statement and has been determined to have strategic and site-specific merit. The impacts of the proposal have been ameliorated through the recommendations to reduce the building envelope by reducing both the maximum building height and maximum FSR. On balance, the impacts of the amended proposal are considered to be acceptable. The proposal supports employment growth in the City Fringe by facilitating future development of additional commercial floor space that can be adapted to a variety of business uses in line with the City's Local Strategic Planning Statement.
Planning certainty (27 submissions)	
• Property owners in the surrounding high rise apartment buildings (Paramount Apartments, Park Lane Towers, Crown Gardens) purchased their homes based on the subject site having a 12m height limit and being part of the Woolloomooloo Heritage Conservation Area. These planning controls were factored into purchasing decisions and gave residents certainty. • The Rose Group purchased their site in 2001, knowing the height restriction in place at the time was 9 metres. In 2011, this was increased to 12 metres. It would be unreasonable for 47-51 Riley Street to be granted an exception to long standing planning controls. • The market has priced in the 12 metre height restriction for the site, and the developer and residents made financial commitments with the expectation that this rule would remain in place. A change to the height control for the site to 25 metres disproportionately benefits	The City is required to consider all requests to change planning controls under the NSW Government's Local Environmental Plan Making Guideline and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and Regulation. A failure to do so would be considered a failure to exercise its planning functions. The City has an endorsed Local Strategic Planning Statement that outlines that it will consider site specific planning proposals for employment related developments to meet our NSW Government imposed jobs target. In considering planning proposal request, the City must consider a proposal's strategic and site specific merits, and if there are any issues that would mean that such a proposal could not be supported. The City has now completed its full assessment of the proposal. An amended

Summary of submissions	Response
the developer while harming long term residents. - Many residents invested in this area based on the certainty of the 12m height limit, and the change proposed would have a negative financial and lifestyle impact on these residents. - This planning proposal disregards the values and rights of many existing home owners in the area who bought their homes based on the existing development controls. It is totally unjust that one commercial entity owner can expect to be granted new development rights at the expense of hundreds of other existing owners. - It is unfair and selfish for one commercial private entity to be considered for such development privileges when so many other existing property owners already invested in Riley Street are being asked to sacrifice so much for one office development. - Residents in the neighbouring residential apartments purchased their homes with an expectation that the planning controls (including the 12m height limits and conservation zone protections) would be maintained, or, if modified, modified in a sensitive and sympathetic manner to the local context, rather than being removed or altered significantly and detrimentally by piecemeal site specific changes.	proposal is recommended with reductions to the maximum building height and maximum FSR to ameliorate concerns raised during the public exhibition period. On balance, the impacts of the amended proposal are considered to be acceptable. The City will continue to change and grow. By 2036, the NSW Government requires the City to accommodate an additional 32,000 new homes and space for an extra 200,000 new jobs. Accommodating this growth means the city will change, including within heritage conservation areas. By maintaining our planning powers, the City is able to manage this growth in consultation with community whilst advancing the strategic priorities identified in our Local Strategic Planning Statement.
Impact on property values (39 submissions)	
- The significant loss of views caused by the proposal would severely reduce the value of nearby apartments. - A reduction in the value of nearby apartments is an unfair outcome of increasing the development potential and value of one site. - The proposed development will eradicate all views from many apartments. This is not a minor obstruction - it is a drastic loss that devalues the investment of over 50 apartments in the Paramount Apartment building.	The value of surrounding properties, and how a nearby development proposal may impact on those values, is not a planning consideration. The proposal's impact on the views and outlook enjoyed from nearby private properties has been addressed separately in this summary of submissions and also in the post exhibition Council report.

Summary of submissions	Response
• The valuation report prepared on behalf of the Owners Corporation of Paramount Apartments assesses the market value diminution of apartments in the building should the planning proposal proceed and the site be developed to the full permitted maximum height of 25m. This report finds reductions in values ranging from \$112,500 to \$488,775 per apartment. The indicative market value diminution for the overall building is in the aggregate sum of \$21.4 million (as valued at 8 January 2025). • For many apartment owners, the financial loss will be in excess of \$300,000 per apartment. A loss of value to this extent may place home owners in breach of the Loan to Value ratios imposed by banks and other lenders. If so, it may place home owners in severe financial distress, including forcing them to sell their properties. Significant financial detriment to a cohort of local residents should not be the outcome of planning decisions by Council. • This is a major and unforeseeable negative impact on all owners of apartments within Paramount that is contrary to current planning controls which affected residents of Paramount believed protected our future security. To impact so many residents, through a single commercial development of double the height and FSR allowed by current planning controls, seems an unreasonable outcome that should be considered by Council when assessing this planning proposal.	
Traffic congestion, parking, safety (70 submissions)	
Traffic congestion • Riley Street and Busby Lane are already under significant pressure from local traffic. The introduction of a large office complex would exacerbate congestion, creating further stress on an already constrained road network. • The development will introduce additional vehicle movements, including servicing vehicles, delivery trucks, and office workers. With limited on-site parking proposed, there is a real risk of overflow parking into neighbouring streets and an increased demand for street access at peak times.	The recommended planning controls (as reduced) are not considered to be a significant intensification of land use. The proposed maximum FSR of 3.2:1 represents an additional 696 square metres of commercial floor space above what would already be permitted under the existing planning controls for the site. The site is well serviced by public transport connections. It is located within walking distance of the Sydney CBD. It is well positioned to take advantage of the metropolitan transport network, including rail, light rail and Metro connections as well as

Summary of submissions	Response
- Any increase in traffic would further exacerbate the already troublesome Riley/Crown street intersection. On a daily basis there are near-misses of vehicle crashes and pedestrian near-misses with frustrated drivers at this intersection. This is already a significant risk that requires fixing, and the risk will be further increased if this new office block results in additional traffic chaos. - The recent approval by City of Sydney for the St Mary's Cathedral College on William Street will continue to add to traffic pressure, worsening congestion and increasing demand for parking. Residents are yet to see the impact of the expansion of the school on local traffic so to approve a proposal that would increase local traffic especially in regard to Busby Lane without waiting for the impact of developments already underway would be premature. - Residents vividly recall raising concerns about traffic congestion during the development application for St Mary's Cathedral College on William Street. This planning proposal is supported by another traffic study which grossly underestimates impact, dismissing significant congestion risks as "minimal." Residents who navigate these streets each day know otherwise. It is imperative that Council listens to the lived experience of its constituents rather than the self-serving reports of developers. - The Traffic Assessment study is incorrect and misleading in its assertion about the proposed development having very low traffic generation without noticeable impacts on the surrounding road network.	nearby bus services and cycleways. It is expected that future workers on the site will take advantage of these excellent public transport connections. The existing basement carpark on the site has 14 car parking spaces. The reference scheme that was part of the exhibited planning proposal showed a basement plan with 7 car parking spaces (inclusive of 1 visitor space) and 1 loading space. This reduction in on-site parking is reflective of the proposed commercial use being a low traffic generating use. The proposed commercial use is unlikely to have a noticeable effect on the operation of the surrounding road network. A swept path diagram has been provided which shows basement ingress and egress to the loading zone for service vehicles can be achieved. The loading bay provides for vans and courier sized vehicles. The car park will need to be designed in accordance with Australian Standards and provide appropriate access for these vehicles. Further consideration will be needed at the DA stage regarding the most appropriate arrangements for waste servicing. Concerns regard congestion and safety within the surrounding street and laneway are noted. The proposal does not represent a significant intensification of land use on the site. The proposal is unlikely to exacerbate these issues to an unreasonable extent. The traffic congestion concerns are consistent with what can be expected in such a highly urbanised environment. If there are safety concerns which extend beyond what can be reasonably managed by appropriate use and sharing of the road way, they should be raised with the City to investigate further. These issues don't warrant refusal of this planning proposal.
<i>Busby Lane / McCarthy Place</i> Busby Lane and McCarthy Place are very narrow, one way service lanes which already are subject to significant vehicular traffic. The laneway services multiple residential buildings, (including Paramount Apartments and Park Lane Towers), two Flour and Stone premises that have staff vehicle and pedestrian traffic constantly moving between them in Busby Lane, as well as commercial offices at 55 Riley St. The laneway provides critical ingress and	The DA stage will provide further opportunity to assess a future building's parking, loading and servicing arrangements. The DA stage will also be the correct time to consider construction traffic impacts. A construction traffic management plan will need to be

Summary of submissions	Response
egress points for local residents' vehicles, as it is the sole access points for basement car parking of Park Lane Towers, Paramount Apartments and other neighbouring developments, including the recently approved St Mary's Catholic College expansion. • The proposed development will add further strain to the laneway, both during construction and once operational. The laneway will experience an increase in traffic because of workers accessing the site's carpark at the rear of the building, and there will also be vehicular movements associated with deliveries and building maintenance. This will exacerbate existing congestion issues, particularly during peak hours, and will impede access for local residents. • Traffic flow in Busby Lane is already difficult as vans stop in the laneway to load and unload for the retail shops on Riley Street. Residents already endure people constantly double parking to patronise the existing bakery on Riley St blocking Busby Lane. Deliveries to this one business also continue to block Busby Lane paying no attention to parking restrictions. Residents have experienced long waits to access their car parking because of retail deliveries. Busby Lane is not suitable for additional traffic, especially retail. No additional retail space should be allowed as this will increase the congestion (including the complete blockage) of Busby Lane. • Large trucks (Council/ Commercial garbage trucks, removalist trucks, delivery trucks and grease trap trucks) stop in the one-way narrow laneway to service their clients and this causes the complete blockage of the laneway for significant periods of time. These large trucks also have to mount the kerb to turn from Busby Lane into McCarthy Place. Busby Lane lacks the capacity to service the ever-increasing traffic caused by continued development. • Traffic flow in the laneway has become more difficult since construction has commenced on the St Mary's Cathedral College building at 52-58 William Street. • A significant increase in traffic from the St Mary's Cathedral College development,	prepared. It is noted that construction traffic impacts would need to be addressed with any redevelopment of the site (even a redevelopment using the existing planning controls).

Summary of submissions	Response
coupled with the traffic associated with a 5 storey office block, is going to cause severe stress on a laneway which provides the vehicular access to service multiple residential buildings (including the car park for Paramount Apartments). - Increased vehicular activity in the laneway would impact on pedestrian safety and disrupting residential tranquillity. Parking / site servicing - The development proposes a higher commercial FSR on the site without corresponding on-site parking increases. The limited number of parking spaces in the proposed basement carparking facility is unlikely to meet demand that would be generated by the commercial tenancies. - This would result in an increase in demand for the limited on-street parking and further diminish the quality of life for current residents. - Council should not support the inclusion of 14 car spaces, which would contrast with its stated transport aims. - The proposal should not be allowed any additional car parking spaces. - An on-site parking space for deliveries and an internal space to store garbage bins between collections would be needed to keep Busby Lane functional. - The proponent's Transport Study Report prepared by Colston Budd Rogers & Kafes Pty Ltd (April 2024) identifies that vehicular access will be provided from Busby Lane with up to seven parking spaces and a loading bay accommodated on site for a future commercial redevelopment. The SJB Urban Design Report and indicative concept plans (May 2024) identifies a bin holding area at ground floor level at the rear of the building, with on-street collection from Busby Lane with bins being rolled in/out of the site. The Transport Report does not provide an assessment of the impact of this servicing arrangement on the operation and access to Busby Lane.	

Summary of submissions	Response
- The servicing and collection of waste off-site (i.e. on Busby Lane) is likely to cause blockages and delays in the laneway during the morning waste collection times, which may coincide with the arrival of staff to the St Mary's Cathedral College campus and departure of residents from neighbouring residential properties. Safety - From basement and loading dock entrances on Busby Lane and McCarthy Place there is limited or no visibility of oncoming pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicles. Also, delivery vehicles, garbage trucks and removalist vehicles frequently stop on the roadway in the laneway, this creates a serious hazard to pedestrians and cyclists. This creates a serious safety risk to local residents, cyclists and pedestrians and the increased level of vehicle movement will elevate risk. - Strong concern is raised that additional traffic pressure in the locality will increase safety risks in the immediate vicinity to locals, tourists, persons with disabilities, elderly persons etc. There will also be an increase in the number of children and young families in the area with the school population for St Mary's Cathedral College. Nearly 800 students and staff will soon inhabit the school at 58 William Street, and the increased traffic movements in this area from the planning proposal will create a significant safety hazard. The planning proposal will create an inappropriate safety risk for students, nearby residents and the occupants of nearby commercial premises. - The safety of students at St Mary's Cathedral College is of the utmost importance. The combined impact of the traffic generation associated with the planning proposal and surrounding development and any required mitigation measures must be considered further at a future development application stage to ensure there is no impact on pedestrian access arrangements to the school. - Once the St Mary's Cathedral School campus is active, traffic and safety problems in Busby Lane are likely to increase with parents	

Summary of submissions	Response
attempting to pick up children from the laneway, joining with the trucks for the retail use and the residents who use it for access to their homes. - Increased vehicle movements in Busby Lane could create potential hazards for pedestrians, including schoolchildren and residents who frequently use the laneway, given the minimal pathway for pedestrians in Busby Lane. - There is concern for emergency vehicle access being impeded. - The existing challenges associated with the service laneway may impact on the safety of school staff cycling to the William Street campus, as they will access cycle parking through Busby Lane. - Workers on the site who wish to ride to work and access the site via the bicycle parking area are likely to do so via the most direct route – from Riley Street via McCarthy Place. If cyclists cycle in an east to west direction along McCarthy Place, this is contrary to the flow of traffic, posing a significant safety risk. They may also cross Riley Street and ride along Suttor Street to access the Woolworths Metro in Crown Street. Riley Street is a busy street and operates a bus route, and has become busier with the relocation of bus services from Boomerang Place and Yurong Parkway into Riley Street. The bus routes are serviced by large articulated buses turning left from William Street into Riley Street.	
Trees (42 submissions)	
<i>Street trees at the front of the site on Riley Street</i> - The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the two street trees outside the front of the site on Riley Street. These trees would require removal or significant pruning if the development were to proceed. - The large London plane tree at the front of the site is already suffering from its location next to	The proposed building design is likely to require pruning of one of the street trees which currently overhangs the building. The amount of pruning required would need to be further assessed by an Arborist. The pruning would need to be undertaken in such a way that does not impact on the health of the street tree. Any future development application will be required to submit an Arboricultural Impact

Summary of submissions	Response
the existing building at 47-51 Riley Street. Based on the arboreal paradigm whereby a tree's canopy is a direct indication of the subterranean root structure, this tree's root system extends to at least 10m under the existing building on the site. The tree canopy is unimpeded to the east, extending significantly across Riley Street towards Crown Gardens, but to the west, directly above 47-51 Riley Street there is less tree canopy. Any increase to the height of the street front structure at 47-51 Riley Street would have a further deleterious effect on the tree. Any disturbance of the soil beneath the property would have a massive impact on root structure and, thus, the health of this tree. Any development of this site should not extend the building envelope at the street front nor below street level. • The loss of street trees would be a direct contradiction of the Lord Mayor's commitment to preserving Woolloomooloo's green spaces. • The trees at the front of the site contribute to the City of Sydney's efforts to ameliorate the impact of climate change (in line with the City of Sydney's Environmental Strategy 2020-2025). • It is City of Sydney policy to improve the density of tree cover, including residential access to trees. Should this development proceed at the currently proposed scale, it will have a significant and detrimental impact on the local green canopy. Cutting down trees and adding more concrete goes against the Greening Sydney strategy. • The tree canopy from the street trees at the front of the site offers shade, privacy and green view sight lines for surrounding neighbours and pedestrians. • Riley Street's tree canopy is essential for maintaining character, contributing to the area's streetscape, providing shade, reducing noise and improving air quality. The removal of the street trees at the front of the site would impact both aesthetics and environmental sustainability. If the tree canopy is impacted, this contradicts Sydney's environmental commitments.	Assessment report prepared by a qualified Arborist. The recommended planning controls are not considered to be detrimental to the long-term viability of the existing street trees. The proposed requirement for a non-trafficable green roof will contribute to urban greening in the area. This requirement will be contained in the site specific DCP.

Summary of submissions	Response
• Trees soften urban density, reduce heat, absorb pollution, reduce urban heat island impacts and mitigate climate change impacts and support well being. Once removed, their benefits can't be replaced. Any proposal must prioritise their long term preservation. • The Riley Street tree canopy is a significant and valuable component of the outlook to the north from the Paramount Apartments. • Tree canopy must be increased, not decreased. We need more trees, not fewer. • The bulk and scale of the development should be changed to consider the impacts on the street trees. • The street trees at the front of the site must be protected. • This planning proposal threatens the local environment, removing green spaces and mature trees that are crucial for our community. • The potential loss of street trees is not reasonably compensated by shallow depth roof top planting that is proposed for the green roof. • Through the loss of trees, the proposal may disrupt local ecosystems. There may be significant disruption to local native wildlife, including birds, which contribute to the unique environmental tapestry of our area. This would diminish local biodiversity but also detract from the natural heritage of Woolloomooloo. Views of trees • Residents bought their properties because of the views of and connectivity with the green belt of trees spreading across the Domain and the tree line to the sky horizon at the Art Gallery. These views will be lost as a result of this planning proposal.	
Noise (60 submissions)	
• The current low-rise development of the subject site and other buildings along the	This application seeks approval to change the planning controls which apply to the site.

Summary of submissions	Response
western side of Riley Street ameliorate the noise pollution as the low rise development limits reverberation and permits sound to dissipate over the low rise roof tops towards The Domain. • Many residents in nearby apartment buildings are shift workers, emergency services, doctors, nurses etc. and any additional noise and vibrations will become an unbearable consequence if this proposal is approved. • Currently there is a loss of amenity due to noise reverberation with sound reflecting off the walls of the existing high rise apartment complexes that enclose the subject site, including from traffic on William Street, emergency vehicle sirens and refrigerated trucks that service the Woolworths shop on Crown Street. This noise can be significant. • Increased noise pollution due to the scale and size of the building envelope will have an adverse impact on the use and enjoyment by the residents of their living areas and balconies. The noise levels from the reverberation may necessitate the closure of the north facing glass doors (preventing natural ventilation).	It does not propose the demolition or construction of a building. Any potential noise impacts of a future development on the site will be considered as part of the future DA assessment. It is considered that any redevelopment of the site, regardless of height and FSR, would create the types of noise issues raised by objectors in their submissions. Many of these concerns relate to common noise issues experienced in highly urbanised environments. As such, the noise concerns themselves don't warrant an amendment to the proposed controls. However, the recommend changes to the planning controls do reduce the height of the proposal, further reducing exposure to blank hard surfaces. The recommended requirement for a non-trafficable green roof will increase the amount of greenery on site. A non-trafficable green roof will also mitigate against noise impacts which may have resulted from communal open space on the rooftop. The future DA process may offer other opportunities for noise attenuation when the detailed design of the development is known. Future conditions of consent can also deal with noise associated with construction, loading and unloading, waste management and use.
<i>Southern elevation - wall</i> • The large wall on the southern elevation of the building will enclose the space between the site and Paramount Apartments. This will create an echo chamber, with noise reverberating and reflecting off hard surfaces. It will amplify noise, and it will bounce around and enter apartments, impacting on residents peaceful enjoyment of their homes. • The large blank wall facing Paramount Apartments will block ambient sounds, such as church bells from St Mary's and St Stephens, diminishing the acoustic character of the area. • The Planning Proposal will permit additional high walls, in close proximity to existing apartment buildings that will increase reverberation and sound reflection, particularly for Paramount Apartments as the kitchen,	

Summary of submissions	Response
living areas and balcony will be facing a solid masonry wall. Traffic - Increased vehicle movements, particularly from delivery trucks and service vehicles, will lead to heightened noise levels and disturbance to the surrounding residential community, particularly during early morning and late-night hours. - Increased traffic on Busby Lane will increase noise in the area. Roof top communal area - The proposal for rooftop communal open space for the building's workers will result in noise impacts on nearby residential apartments. Construction noise - The existing noise and commotion from Catholic Schools building site and carpark staging area is already a huge issue for many residents. Additional noise from the 47-51 Riley Street demolition, construction and increased traffic would be a huge extra disruption.	
Blank wall on southern elevation (37 submissions)	
- The planning proposal would allow a building with excessive blank side walls. Submissions raised particular concern about the reference scheme's extent of blank wall on the southern elevation. - Given heritage restrictions, it is likely that any future development of the Lessey's Garage site would take the form of alterations and additions with any new storeys setback from the Riley Street elevation. It is also reasonable to anticipate that any future development to the terrace at 53 Riley Street would retain at least the front portion of the building, including the pitched roof form, with additions located to the rear. This would mean that the proposed building envelope for the site would result in an	The recommended reduction in the maximum building height and maximum FSR will reduce the scale of the building envelope and therefore result in a reduction in the extent of blank side walls. Having some visible blank side walls is considered reasonable in this context as: - a compliant scheme under the existing 12m height control would also present a blank southern elevation wall; - blank elevations and elevations with minimal fenestration are already present and visible within the area including the eastern elevation of the Paramount Apartments building at 60-70 William Street and the rear elevation of Park Lane Towers at 1 Boomerang Place; and

Summary of submissions	Response
exposed blank wall on the southern elevation of the building. • Ordinarily such a wall is not problematic in an urban streetscape where it is anticipated that the adjacent sites will, in due course, build against it to conceal it and create a uniform streetscape. However the heritage item at Lessey's Garage is of single storey scale and unlikely to change which will render the unarticulated southern side wall of the proposal visible in perpetuity. This will have adverse heritage impacts and result in a very poor urban design outcome. A more satisfactory solution would be for the proposal to transition to its full height from the single storey scale of the Lessey's garage heritage item, although a transition to 5-6 storeys would be difficult to achieve in the site area and width available. • The reference scheme will present an abrupt change of scale, exposing a significant portion of blank wall which will loom over the lower scaled heritage item at 55-61 Riley Street (Lessey's Garage). • The abrupt scale contrast of the southern wall of the proposed building envelope will interrupt existing "layered" views available to pedestrians in William and Riley Streets. The wall will present as a visual anomaly in the streetscape and detract from the visual quality of the streetscape when viewed from the public domain. • The replacement of the iconic views currently enjoyed with a blank masonry façade towering some 15.3metres above the adjoining 2 storey building is a major negative impact on some 56 apartments in Paramount Apartments. The southern elevation wall will dominate the direct north outlook of all apartments in Paramount Apartments. This is an unreasonable impact on existing inner city residents to advantage one commercial use. This advantage is only achieved by a doubling of existing height and near doubling of existing FSR controls on the site which residents reasonably expected would ensure their future amenity when purchasing their apartments.	• the extent of blank facade in this instance is a product of accommodating compliant floor to ceiling heights for the proposed commercial use. The DA stage will provide an opportunity for consideration of the materiality of the blank side wall so as to ameliorate its visual impact.

Summary of submissions	Response
• The proposed high blank brick wall on the southern elevation, so close to the Paramount Apartments' free and open balconies, is very discordant with the neighbourhood. • The southern wall will dramatically and adversely add wind turbulence in southerly wind conditions, as well as interfere with natural ventilation presently accessible to the Paramount Apartment units, and will block summer "cooling" NE north easterly winds from the harbour.	
Roof top (20 submissions)	
• The location and design of the lift core which provides roof top access adds to the building's dominance. • The roof top structures and garden add another 4.5m to the overall height of this large building, to be used for office workers to enjoy a lunch or after works drinks. Office workers will get to enjoy the views and outlooks that residential owners will have forfeited. • There is concern that if the planning proposal is approved with a 25m height control, the proponent may push for a roof top structure on top of that. When development applications go forward there is often leniency in allowing for a tolerance above agreed height limits. • View loss may be greater if the rooftop pergola is expanded. It is highly likely the developer would lodge an application to increase the pergola size, or even make it a more solid structure at the development application stage if this planning proposal is approved. • The proposal has a large air handling unit on the roof top directly across from balconies in the Paramount Apartments. Residents in the Paramount Apartments open their balcony doors to provide airflow. Objection is raised to the operational noise and dusty air that such units produce. • The roof top communal open space will result in privacy impacts on nearby apartment buildings and the St Mary's Cathedral College	To further reduce a future building's height and bulk and reduce impacts on neighbouring properties, it is recommended that if a 4 storey commercial building is to be pursued for the site, there be no additional allowance above the maximum height control of RL25.5m for a roof top lift overrun, building plant, pergola structure or communal open space. Rather, the building shall use a machine-room less lift, have distributed plant and a non-trafficable green roof.

Summary of submissions	Response
outdoor study area currently under construction. • The proposed rooftop patio is unnecessary in an office setting, further demonstrating the excessive nature of the design. • The proposed green roof is mere tokenism.	
Construction impacts (28 submissions)	
• A development of this scale will inevitably involve prolonged construction activity, including excavation, heavy vehicle movements, and ongoing works that may extend over a prolonged period. The impact of construction noise, dust, and vibration on the surrounding community needs to be addressed, particularly for those living or working in close proximity. • In the Paramount Apartments, living areas and balconies would be facing towards the proposed construction, so would be impacted by dust, debris drift and air pollution. • The demolition and building works will likely require road closures, delivery trucks, and site access arrangements that could significantly disrupt traffic flow in an already congested one-way laneway. • Deep excavation and heavy construction may pose risks to neighbouring structures and cause damage, particularly older buildings like 55 Riley St that may not have been designed to withstand such disruptions. • Given the location, any allowance for extended construction hours that may impact early mornings, evenings and weekends could significantly impact the quality of life for residents. Restrictions on work times should be carefully considered. • The construction process would exacerbate air pollution and disrupt local wildlife habitats, particularly considering the full site coverage of the new building envelope.	The proposal seeks approval to change the planning controls for the site. It does not propose the demolition or construction of a building. Any potential construction impacts of a future development on the site will be considered as part of the DA assessment. Construction impacts would need to be addressed with any redevelopment of the site, even under the existing planning controls.

Summary of submissions	Response
• Approving an intensive construction project will impact on the ability of nearby residents to work from home and live comfortably. • Many residents in nearby apartment buildings are shift workers, emergency services, doctors, nurses etc. and any additional noise and vibrations will become an unbearable consequence if this proposal is approved. • Approving an intensive construction project will impact on the ability to work from home and live comfortably. • Increased use of Busby Lane for construction access will potentially worsen noise and create safety issues for pedestrians and vehicles. • Increased stormwater runoff due to the lack of permeable surfaces poses a significant risk to the local ecosystem, especially given the site's location within the Sydney Harbour Catchment area. • If this development proceeds, strict conditions should be placed on construction hours, dust mitigation and truck movements.	
Impact on mental health / physical health / well being (38 submissions)	
• Research shows that access to natural light, open space, and distant views has a direct positive impact on mental health, reducing stress, improving mood, and promoting overall well-being. The daily benefits of “seeing nature” on human mental health are profound and well documented across various scientific studies. These studies collectively underscore the daily benefits of seeing nature on human mental health. The preservation and integration of natural environments in our daily lives enhances our psychological well-being, cognitive function, and overall happiness. • The City of Sydney’s Greening Sydney Strategy states that a green tree canopy coverage of at least 30% reduces mental health issues. • This planning proposal would significantly impact the quality of life for residents in nearby homes - limiting access to sunlight, reducing	The proposal’s impacts on residential amenity, views, outlook and trees are addressed under separate headings in this summary of submissions. The recommendations to reduce the maximum building height and maximum FSR will reduce the overall scale and bulk of the building envelope. With these recommended changes, it is considered that the site will be able to support a future building that is appropriate in its context. On balance, the impacts of the amended proposal are considered acceptable.

Summary of submissions	Response
ventilation, and creating a sense of being boxed in. Residents will no longer enjoy the psychological benefits of views of open space. The loss of outlook and views of greenery and nature in exchange for an overbearing facade will create a claustrophobic, oppressive environment, leading to increased feelings of isolation, anxiety, and even depression for those who live in nearby apartment buildings. • The significant and detrimental impact on the mental and social well-being of residents in Paramount Apartments by the loss of such important views and the loss of connection with place and community that these views currently offer cannot be overstated. • A research study also highlights the correlation between reduced green space and the prevalence of diabetes and cardiovascular diseases. The research suggests that urban environments with limited greenery contribute to higher incidences of these health conditions due to increased stress levels and reduced opportunities for physical activity. Increasing the density of housing and decreasing green space can have significant adverse effects on public health. Research indicates that reduced access to green spaces is associated with higher levels of stress, mental fatigue, and overall poor health. • The negative effects of this development on residents' mental health should not be dismissed, as they will be ongoing and long-term—far beyond the standard working hours of the office employees who will only use the building on the site for work purposes. • Concern is raised about the potential public health ramifications and the adverse impact on the local indigenous population. Development projects of this scale require thorough consideration of how they might contribute to public health challenges, including increased stress and reduced community cohesion. Especially during a mental health crisis. It is crucial that the interests and cultural significance of the local indigenous community are respected and safeguarded. The community in this area is fragile and any	

Summary of submissions	Response
disruption could further set back any progress made.	
Impact on nearby school and playground under construction (19 submissions)	
- It is essential that ongoing spot rezonings in the surrounding area do not negatively affect the safety and operation of the St Mary's Cathedral College campus and student capacity. - A future development on the site could create opportunities for overlooking onto the approved terrace over the carpark in the St Mary's Cathedral College campus, which may impact student privacy and amenity. The SJB reference scheme plans (May 2024) for the planning proposal orientates the roof top terrace and communal open space to the north and east of the site along Riley Street, with plant located to the rear of the site on the Busby Lane elevation. This orientation is supported by Sydney Catholic Schools. A potential reorientation of the open space towards Busby Lane would not be supported as this may cause opportunities for direct overlooking onto the school's terrace. - The overshadowing impact assessment has largely been undertaken for the neighbouring residential buildings and the façade testing only for the northern elevation of the building at 60-70 William Street. The impact of solar access on the St Mary's Cathedral School campus' terrace has not been considered. While it is noted the solar amenity controls of the Apartment Design Guide do not apply to the St Mary's Cathedral College campus, it is requested any potential loss of solar access to the terrace is considered and mitigated where possible to ensure the amenity of the school's terrace is maintained. - The development will have a psychological impact on the kids. The school's terrace area would be open to light and air, but with this development, it would be almost completely boxed in by surrounding buildings.	It is considered that in this mixed-use urban setting, any reasonable redevelopment of the site for commercial office and retail purposes would have a negligible impact on the safety and operation of the nearby St Mary's Cathedral College campus and the psychology of students. With regard to concerns about overlooking onto the approved terrace within the St Mary's Cathedral College campus, it is noted that the proposed communal open space on the roof-top is recommended for deletion from the proposal, to reduce potential impacts upon neighbouring properties. The future DA process provides an opportunity for design treatments to disrupt sightlines between the commercial office space and the school terrace, if such is considered reasonable and warranted at that time. With regard to overshadowing, the impacts will be less than with the exhibited planning proposal, given the recommended reductions to the maximum height and FSR controls. The City does not have solar access provisions for the protection of non-residential buildings.

Summary of submissions	Response
Excessive floor to floor heights (12 submissions)	
• The proposed 3.8 m floor to floor heights is excessive for an office building of this scale and function. The standard commercial floor height for buildings of this size is closer to 2.4m – 2.7m. • The additional height per floor increases the building's overall height, mass and bulk. This contributes to overshadowing, view loss, and increased visual impact on nearby residential properties. • The floor to floor heights are contrary to standard city design principles. Similar commercial buildings in Sydney do not require excessive floor heights. • The excessive floor to floor heights makes the development more imposing and out of proportion with neighbouring buildings, particularly the heritage listed properties. • No justification has been provided as to the excessive floor to floor heights. Other commercial buildings operate within standard 2.4m – 3.0m floor to floor heights without adverse impact on function.	The proposed floor to floor heights detailed in the proponent's reference scheme are compliant with the floor to floor height provisions in the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012. To further restrict the proposed floor to floor heights would unreasonably restrict the future use and adaptability of these spaces for a variety of employment uses.
Impact on archaeological history through basement excavation (1 submission)	
• The plan to excavate further to construct a basement will disrupt archaeological history which remains prevalent around Woolloomooloo. Assumptions are made regarding prior disturbance to the archaeological site and baseline assessments, but they fail to consider the additional excavation required, potentially impacting further on Aboriginal objects and other historical deposits.	The potential for archaeological relics to be found on the site during future excavation can be addressed through an archaeological assessment at the DA stage.
Additional commercial floorspace not needed / will erode residential community (28 submissions)	
• Why would the council want to increase the supply of commercial space when there seems to be little demand?	The City has endorsed a Local Strategic Planning Statement that outlines that it will consider site specific planning proposals for

Summary of submissions	Response
- Developing an office building in this location in the current market does not make financial sense. If approved, the building would ultimately be reworked to provide residential accommodation. If changed to residential, a greater volume of residential floorspace is likely to be produced with more floors within proposed envelope. That residential use may be augmented by supplementary Affordable Housing units, which would, under present law, allow for a building that is both higher and contains more floor space than is being requested at the current time for commercial use. - What is to stop the developer requesting a change of use from commercial to residential once the planning proposal is approved? Would the City be contemplating a change in density (height & FSR) for this site if a 5-storey residential building had been proposed instead? - There is no urgent need for additional office buildings in Woolloomooloo, especially given the availability of commercial spaces within walking distance in the Sydney CBD. This site would be better utilised for residential apartments, helping to address the housing crisis rather than prioritising office spaces that may remain underutilised. - If the building envelope is approved, the proponent can redesign a new building to accommodate at least 7-8 levels of residential apartments.	employment related developments to meet our NSW Government imposed jobs target. The proposed additional height and floor space will be restricted to commercial uses in Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012. The proposal is in response to a landowner request for new planning controls for a commercial use. The market will determine if and when the site may be redeveloped under the recommended planning controls. A residential proposal for the site would not be able to access the additional height and floor space available through this site specific clause in the LEP. A residential proposal would need to comply with the existing planning controls that apply to the site.
Privacy/overlooking (19 submissions)	
- The loss of privacy is of concern – the thought of looking into somebody else’s unit, rather than St Mary’s Cathedral is very disconcerting. - The proposed commercial building will overlook the surrounding area, impacting amenity, light and views. - The proposal will result in two way sight issues between apartments and offices. - There are major privacy issues with the outdoor study area that is being constructed	To reduce impacts on neighbouring properties, it is recommended that if a 4 storey commercial building is to be pursued for the site, there be no additional allowance above the RL25.5m maximum height control for a pergola structure or communal open space. Rather, the building shall have a non-trafficable green roof. The future DA stage will provide opportunity for privacy treatments to be integrated with the building design, if such is considered reasonable and warranted. Privacy

Summary of submissions	Response
as part of the St Mary's Cathedral School campus with frontage to Busby Lane. The rear of the development at 47-51 Riley Street will have direct views of children in the roofed seating pods. The development will overlook, at very close quarters, the playground. Parents should be made aware of this when choosing a school for their children. • Sydney Catholic Schools are concerned that a future development of the site could create additional opportunities for overlooking onto St Mary's Cathedral School's outdoor terrace (under construction) which may impact student privacy and amenity. The reference scheme orients the development's terrace and roof top open space to the north and east of the site along Riley Street, with plant located to the rear on the Busby Lane elevation. Sydney Catholic Schools supports this orientation. A potential reorientation of the open space towards Busby Lane would not be supported by Sydney Catholic Schools given opportunities for direct overlooking onto the terrace. • The height of the building will have an impact on neighbouring buildings in terms of privacy, particularly to and from the communal open space on the rooftop. • The proposal will erode privacy for existing residents. People using the roof top of the development will have direct views into the living spaces of multiple neighbours, as well as a school playground and childcare facilities. • Four existing residential towers will be seriously impact by privacy issues – Park Lane Towers (both North and South Towers), Paramount Apartments, The Riley Apartments and Crown Gardens. The proposed extra upper floors have windows looking into Busby Lane as well as across the road into Riley Street. Many residents in Park Lane towers will look straight into the high rise office tower and the office works will look into apartments. A half metre setback is inappropriate. • The existing restricted building heights for properties between 13 and 47 Riley Street maintains privacy for nearby residents.	treatments may reduce opportunities for overlooking into nearby residential properties and the St Mary's Cathedral College campus.

Summary of submissions	Response
The roof top will directly overlook the neighbouring apartment complex to the immediate north.	
Wind impacts (7 submissions)	
- With height increases come unpleasant wind tunnel effects. - Taller buildings can contribute to wind tunnelling effects, impacting pedestrian comfort and making the surrounding area less pleasant to navigate. - Riley Street is narrow and congested and the proposed design would only create more shadowing and increase the current problem of wind tunnelling, especially severe during Sydney's often occurring southerly winds. - Residents who live in the block in Riley and Crown streets before William St know that both streets are already subject to a 'tunnel' effect of wind when a southerly is blowing. It is caused by the higher buildings that have crept down them, combined with the narrowness of the streets and their north-south orientation. It is already severe enough to make it difficult at times for pedestrians heading south. Another large building will add to the impact. - The proposed building's southern wall will dramatically and adversely add wind turbulence in southerly wind conditions. This large wall is likely to create a wind tunnel.	The recommended reduction to the maximum height and FSR controls will result in a building envelope that is considered reasonable in its urban context. It is not considered that the building will be of such a scale as to introduce negative wind impacts.
Busby Lane subsidence, repairs and maintenance (9 submissions)	
Busby Lane has had many sinkholes and drainage issues over the years, linked to it being above an offshoot of Busby's Bore. There have been many road plates and operations designed to fix problems in the short term, but these solutions have never lasted. An increase in the traffic that will come with an increase in the commercial workforce and the potential retail workforce will worsen these problems.	Subsidence, repairs and maintenance issues related to Busby Land are not considered reasons why this planning proposal cannot be supported. These are issues that the City routinely manages as the local road authority in collaboration with Sydney Water as the other major drainage asset owner in the area.

Summary of submissions	Response
• Danger that a sink hole may appear in Lane due to old pipes and water channels beneath Busby Lane, potentially resulting in tragedy. • Busby Lane suffers from subsidence, most likely due to underground water flow and/or the failure of drainage or sewerage pipes that run under the laneway. An increase in road traffic, especially heavy construction vehicles and service vehicles, may cause further subsidence and damage to colonial era works and artefacts.	
Increased demands on local infrastructure (7 submissions)	
• Increased development density and changes in land use could result in higher traffic volumes in the local road and pedestrian network, increased pressure on local facilities and open spaces and potential safety issues for students of St Mary's Cathedral College. • More than doubling the size of an already large building in the middle of the block will cause an increase in traffic and congestion along the already stretched areas of William Street, Riley Street and Yurong Parkway. Adding more vehicles to the area without adequate infrastructure improvements would create serious accessibility issues. • The proposal will impose additional demands on local roads, sewerage, water pipes and electrical grids, leading to an increase in issues for the surrounding area and necessitating costly infrastructure upgrades. • The planned basement parking is insufficient to accommodate increased parking demand, further straining local infrastructure. • The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site, and introduces a commercial use that is not in keeping with the predominantly residential character of the area. This will result in additional strain on local infrastructure, parking availability and public services, which are already under pressure.	The site is well serviced by public transport, and is a short walk from Central Sydney. It is expected that many of the future workers at the site will rely on public transport to commute to and from the site. The reference scheme submitted in support of the proposal showed a reduction in on-site parking when compared to the existing on-site parking, which is reflective of the proposed commercial use being a low traffic generating use. The proposed commercial use is unlikely to have a noticeable effect on the operation of the surrounding road network. Any future redevelopment of the site which results in additional floor space will be subject to section 7.11 development contributions under the City of Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2015, to ensure that the additional demand for infrastructure generated by the proposal can be met through the provision of new or improved infrastructure.

Summary of submissions	Response
Flooding (6 submissions)	
• The Flood Impact Assessment (March 2024) identifies that the proposed ground floor retail and lobby areas are below the 1% AEP flood level, increasing the risk of flooding and water ingress. • The Gateway Determination Report (10 October 2024) requires an emergency flood management plan, confirming concerns about site safety during extreme weather events. • The Sydney DCP 2012 (Clause 3.5.2) mandates that new developments must not increase flood risk to neighbouring properties, yet the proposed design risks water pooling and drainage issues. • The area has a history of flooding, at times the flooding on Busby Lane can be knee deep. This is one of the lowest parts of the area and turning it into a high density space could exacerbate flooding risk. Proper flood management strategies will help avoid worsening the flood risk faced by the neighbourhood. • No comment or explanation has been made about the flood potential for this area. Busby Lane is lower than Riley Street and underground car parking in this building sits below Busby Lane. • The proposal ignores issue of water flow. • Localised flooding is one impact of the subsidence experienced in Busby Lane.	The proposal is supported by a detailed flood impact assessment and flood emergency management strategy. The proposed retail and lobby areas are capable of being raised above the appropriate flood planning levels without impacting on the height of the building. The proponent's emergency flood management plan is considered acceptable. A detailed assessment of how the development can mitigate against flood risk can be made at DA stage when the detailed design of the development is known. Sufficient information has been provided to determine that the development is capable of managing the associated flood risk. The proposed development also does not pose a risk in terms of increasing flood risk to neighbouring properties.
Lift core adds to building envelope's dominance (4 submissions)	
• The location and orientation of the lift core on the southern side of the site contributes to the dominance of built form when viewed from pedestrian areas in proximity to William Street. • The location and orientation of the reference scheme's vertical circulation and the lack of southern wall setbacks prioritises views and solar amenity for the enjoyment of occupants of the rooftop level of the future commercial building, at the expense of obstructing views	To reduce the height and bulk of the development and impacts on neighbouring properties, it is recommended that if a 4 storey commercial building is pursued for the site, there be no additional allowance above the RL25.5m maximum height control for a roof top lift overrun, building plant, pergola structure or communal open space. Rather, the building shall use a machine-room less

Summary of submissions	Response
from a significant number of neighbouring residential apartments and exposing blank wall areas to both public and private domain vantage points.	lift, have distributed plant and a non-trafficable green roof.
Street wall on Riley Street elevation (3 submissions)	
• 3 storey street wall fails to respond to the existing street wall scale defined by adjoining property to the north (at 43-45 Riley Street) • Rather than contributing to a cohesive street wall alignment and a cohesive urban block, the reference scheme makes no attempt to respond to the scale and alignment of neighbouring development. • Locality statement of Cathedral Street Precinct includes as a principle for development: <i>“Encourage a 3 storey street wall along Riley Street to define the streetscape and provide a transition to taller development along William Street”</i>. • Proposed 3 storey street front wall to Riley Street is not consistent with the existing scale of the surrounding buildings to the Riley Street elevation (significantly higher and does not reinforce existing scale). • Three storey wall proposed on Riley Street does not respond to existing street wall scale. Floor to floor heights are considerable and not consistent with adjoining buildings resulting in an overscaled proposed street wall. Reference scheme dominates the local streetscape rather than contributing to cohesive street wall alignment.	As recommended to change, the reduced scale of the proposed planning envelope is not considered to be unreasonable within this diverse setting and streetscape. The proposed 3 storey street wall on Riley Street will step down to the 4 storey street wall at 43-45 Riley Street which then steps down again to the 3 storey plus parapet street wall at 41 Riley Street, following the topography of the land. The immediately adjoining building to the north at 43-45 Riley Street is a mixed use building with residential floors above the ground floor retail premises, and as such has lower floor to ceiling heights. The proposed floor to floor heights in the proponent’s reference scheme are compliant the floor to floor height provisions in the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012. To further restrict the proposed floor to floor heights would unreasonably restrict the future use and adaptability of these spaces for a variety of employment uses. The DA stage will provide an opportunity for the detailed design of the building to be developed to address how it sits within the streetscape.
Overshadowing non-residential neighbouring properties (3 submissions)	
• The increased height is likely to create shadowing issues for surrounding properties, limiting natural light access, particularly in winter months. • Sydney Catholic Schools note that the impact of solar access on the St Mary’s Cathedral School campus’ terrace has not been considered. While it is noted the solar amenity controls of the Apartment Design Guide do not	The overshadowing impacts of a future development will be less than indicated with the exhibited planning proposal, given the recommended reductions to the maximum height and FSR controls. The City does not have solar access provisions for the protection of non-residential buildings.

Summary of submissions	Response
apply to the St Mary's Cathedral College campus, it is requested any potential loss of solar access to the terrace is considered and mitigated where possible to ensure the amenity of the school's terrace is maintained. The increased height will reduce the sunlight to the surrounding buildings and for pedestrians enjoying the area. Two hours per day is not enough sunlight for healthy wellbeing.	
Activation of Riley Street (21 submissions)	
- There is support for the activation of Riley Street at street level, but this can be achieved without the excessive scale of this planning proposal. - The rejuvenation of Riley Street is welcomed, as it currently lacks character and is not appealing. - Ground floor retail will improve street activation and enhance the pedestrian experience. - The inclusion of retail space at the ground level fronting Riley Street will attract foot traffic, create a vibrant street presence and contribute to the character and amenity of the street.	Noted.
Promotes economic growth, fostering investment and employment opportunities (12 submissions)	
- The proposal aligns with strategic planning objectives, promotes investment, business and employment opportunities in a well-positioned location. - Progress should continue to be made with the development of the Woolloomooloo area, particularly for new retail and office spaces. - Development brings more diversity, attracts other businesses like cafes, restaurants and more residential projects, which help the community grow.	Noted.

Summary of submissions	Response
• NIMBYism from people who have benefitted from the area's development holds back the progress and improvement of our City. • The area is in the middle of the City surrounded by large numbers of people. It needs an upgrade and a change like this could help. • Woolloomooloo is well suited for increased density given its proximity to the City and strong public transport links. • The proposed planning control changes present an exciting opportunity for the site. Allowing a new 5 storey commercial development on the site will enhance the site's potential and contribute to the area's economic growth. • The office spaces within the building will provide valuable opportunities for businesses to thrive.	
Improvement on current building on site, aesthetically pleasing (10 submissions)	
• The existing building is an eyesore and has no heritage value. The proposed design fits well in the area. • The low quality of many of the existing 1950-1980 era buildings needs to be addressed. Replacing these buildings with higher quality new buildings is a welcome move. • The proposal is architecturally and aesthetically pleasing compared to the current building on the site. • The development will enhance the visual appeal of the site, providing a significant improvement over the current old building that is currently there. • A fabulous proposal given such an ugly existing building on the site.	Noted.

Summary of submissions	Response
Changes benefit community (5 submissions)	
• The changes are positive and will bring a dynamic and beneficial transformation to the community. • The changes will create new commercial workspace and attract more retail, which will benefit people living or working nearby. • The changes will bring a new much better and refreshed look to the area. • The development presents a great opportunity to increase economic activity which will reinvigorate the area. • The building will transform the neighbourhood which will benefit both residents and businesses alike. • The proposal will benefit the community and revitalisation of the area. • By allowing for a new 5-storey commercial development, these adjustments will significantly enhance the site's potential and contribute to the area's economic growth. The inclusion of retail space at the ground level fronting Riley Street will likely attract foot traffic and create a vibrant street presence, while the office spaces throughout the rest of the building will provide valuable opportunities for businesses to thrive. Overall, these changes promise to bring a dynamic and beneficial transformation to the community.	Noted.
Waste collection should be onsite (1 submission)	
• Sydney Catholic Schools strongly recommends that at the DA stage, the applicant accommodate onsite waste collection from an internal loading bay. Further consideration of the cumulative impacts of servicing, waste and vehicular movements on Busby Lane is required at a future DA stage.	Waste collection will be addressed at the DA stage once the detailed design of the development is known. The proponent's reference scheme provides for a waste holding area fronting onto Busby Lane so that waste contractors can access bins directly from Busby Lane so bins are not stored on the laneway.

Summary of submissions		Response
Sustainable development (1 submission)		
The planning proposal's design considerations, including the provision of a green roof, demonstrate commitment to sustainable development.		Noted.
Public transport improvements needed (1 submission)		
- Public transport improvements should be considered. - Extending the Park Street bus lanes along William Street to Kings Cross would discourage occupants of the new building from driving.		This site located in close proximity to the Sydney CBD and is well serviced by existing public transport.
Support building greenery (1 submission)		
The greenery proposed on the upper floors and rooftop would be nice to look at from neighbouring buildings.		Noted.

Public Authority Submissions

The Gateway Determination provided by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure required consultation with the following public authorities:

- Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts;
- Sydney Airport;
- Civil Aviation Safety Authority;
- Airservices Australia;
- Utility providers, including Sydney Water

Summary of submission	Response
Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts	
• Land-use planning and development proposals in the vicinity of Federal Leased Airports (FLAs) may be subject to certain considerations and constraints in relation to airport safeguarding and airspace protection. This includes proposed changes to State and Local government's planning controls. • The Department recommends NSW Planning and City of Sydney engage with relevant Federal Leased Airports (FLA) (in this case, Sydney Airport). FLAs as referral authorities, are best placed to assess the potential impacts of proposals on airport operations. FLAs liaise with aviation agencies (the Civil Aviation Safety Authority and Airservices Australia) and refer proposals to the Department for assessment under the Airports Act and Regulations where appropriate. FLAs will also liaise with proponents and NSW Planning where required to discuss any planning constraints, mitigations or conditions that NSW Planning would need to have regard to in making its determination.	Noted. Further engagement will occur at the DA stage.

Summary of submission	Response
Sydney Airport	
Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) • The height of the Sydney Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) has a height of 156.00 metres above Australian Height Datum (AHD). • Any proposed structures taller than 156m AHD, within the proposal, would constitute a controlled activity and be subject to the Federal Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996 • The approved height is inclusive of all lift over-runs, vents, chimneys, aerials, TV antennae, construction cranes etc. • Construction cranes may be required to operate at a height significantly higher than that of the proposed development and consequently, may not be approved under the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations. • Sydney Airport advises that approval to operate construction equipment (ie cranes) should be obtained prior to any commitment to construct. Planning for aircraft noise and public safety zones • Current planning provisions (s.117 Direction 3.5 NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979) for the assessment of aircraft noise for certain land uses are based on the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF). The current ANEF for which Council may use as the land use planning tool for Sydney Airport was endorsed by Airservices in December 2012 (Sydney Airport 2033 ANEF). • Whilst there are currently no national aviation standards relating to defining public safety areas beyond the airport	Noted. Further engagement will occur at the DA stage.

Summary of submission	Response
boundary, it is recommended that proposed land uses which have high population densities should be avoided.	
Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA)	
• The maximum proposed building height is approximately RL33 (rounded up) or 25m Above Ground Level. • The Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) Outer Horizontal Surface for Sydney Airport over the area is RL156m. Therefore, the building would be under the OLS (by a significant margin) and will not need to be assessed under the Airspace Regulations. The building at 60-70 William Street (about 40m away) is about 14 storeys. Aviation Safety is not an issue (the proposal could be 5 times as high and still not be an issue). • Notwithstanding that CASA is not an Approval Authority, CASA does not object to the Planning Proposal.	Noted. Further engagement will occur at the DA stage.
Airservices Australia	
• Airservices Australia have no comments on this rezoning proposal. • Any proposed developments or cranes required during construction within the rezoned area may need separate assessments. • Noting the proximity to Sydney Airport, any future proposals should be submitted to Sydney Airport in the first instance. Sydney Airport will then refer the proposal to Airservices Australia if required to ensure compliance with regulations surrounding developments near federally leased airports.	Noted. Further engagement will occur at the DA stage.

Summary of submission	Response
Sydney Water	
• Sydney Water's preliminary assessment indicates that water and wastewater servicing should be available for future demand. Amplifications, adjustments and/or minor extensions may be required for future development works. Further servicing requirements will be provided at the development application stage. • If the development is anticipated to generate trade wastewater, the developer must submit an application requesting permission to discharge trade waste water to Sydney Water's wastewater system. An applicant must wait for approval and the issue of a permit before any business activities can commence. • Further advice from Sydney Water may be offered during the exhibition, the feasibility or, Section 73 stages with regards to the protection of existing and proposed assets/easements and any requirements pertaining to building over or adjacent to Sydney Water assets. These aspects will be investigated as Sydney Water receives more detail, and specific protection requirements, objections or amendments will be documented as they progress. • The proponent should complete Sydney Water's Growth Data Form as part of a Section 73 submission. • Council is advised to provide the proponent with the Sydney Water Planning Proposal Information Sheet to assist the proponent in progressing their development, which contains information on how to make further applications to Sydney Water and further information on Infrastructure Contributions.	Noted. Further engagement will occur at the DA stage.

Summary of submission	Response
Ausgrid	
- Ausgrid requires that due consideration be given to the compatibility of the proposal with existing Ausgrid infrastructure including: - electrocution, - fire, - Electric & Magnetic Fields (EMFs), - noise - visual amenity, and - other matters that may impact Ausgrid or the proposal. - Consent authorities are obliged to consider the suitability of a proposal including its compatibility with surrounding land uses and the existing environment. Where the consent authority considers that a proposal is suitable and involves a development type that could impact on electrical assets/infrastructure, then Ausgrid requires development consent conditions to be imposed to ensure safety and compatibility of both the development and Ausgrid's assets.	Noted. Further engagement will occur at the DA stage.
Jemena	
Jemena raises no objection to this planning proposal.	Noted.