

Attachment D

Summary of submissions
--

Summary of submissions: 56-60 Pitt Street and 3 Spring Street, Sydney



Activities to support the consultation

On 25 July and 29 July 2024, the Central Sydney Planning Committee and Council respectively, approved the Planning Proposal – 56-60 Pitt Street and 3 Spring Street, Sydney for public authority consultation and public exhibition.

The consultation period ran from 1 to 28 May 2025. The following activities were undertaken to support the consultation:

- A webpage and survey were created for people to review the planning proposal and supporting documentation and provide their feedback. The webpage can be accessed at:
<https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/policy-planning-changes/your-feedback-changes-planning-controls-56-60-pitt-street-3-spring-street-sydney>.
- The survey was open for feedback from 1 to 28 May 2025. The website received 298 page visits and 209 document downloads during this period.
- A notification letter was sent to property owners and occupiers within a 75-metre radius of the site boundary, informing them of the planning proposal. 132 letters were sent. An example of the notification letter can be found at Appendix A.
- The project was included in the May edition of the Sydney Your Say eNews sent on 14 May 2025 to 5,045 subscribers. This provided a link to the webpage and survey. An image of the post can be found at Appendix A.
- The Planning Proposal was referred to Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts, Sydney Airport, Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) and Sydney Water for agency consultation and comment.

What the community told us

We received a total of 11 responses. 7 responses via the online survey and 4 by email, and 6 government agency responses via the NSW Planning Portal.

Of the 10 responses from community members, 5 were supportive and 3 were opposed, and 3 provided feedback without a position. Issues raised in submissions are summarised below.

Table 1 Responses from government agencies

Agency	Submission	City response
Ausgrid	The planning proposal was reviewed by Ausgrid, noting additional considerations for the detailed design and development application stages to ensure safety and compatibility of future development and Ausgrid assets.	Submission is noted. Any additional approvals will be considered as part of any future development application for the site
Airservices Australia	Airservices Australia raised no specific comment on this planning proposal, noting separate requirements for crane approval and for the detailed development application.	Submission is noted.
CASA	CASA did not comment on the planning proposal.	Noted.
Sydney Airport	Sydney Airport Corporation raised no objection to the erection of a development to the maximum height of 310m AHD as proposed. They noted that the proposal is taller than the height of prescribed airspace in this location and is therefore subject to the Federal Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996.	Submission is noted. Approvals to operate construction equipment and cranes will be considered as part of any future Development Application for the site.
Transport for NSW	Transport for NSW reviewed the planning proposal and accompanying Traffic Impact Assessment. They recommended updates which would take into consideration changes since the assessment was prepared, i.e. Sydney Metro opening. The subject site intersects the Sydney Metro corridor, any future development application required TfNSW concurrence. Consideration of cumulative impacts on the road network during construction was also requested.	Submission is noted. The future Development Application will be accompanied by an up-to-date traffic impact assessment, which will take place following the detailed design and will be capable of adequately assessing impacts. Similarly, an assessment of road network impacts during construction is generally submitted prior to construction, providing the City an opportunity to review at that time.
Sydney Water	Sydney Water advised following a preliminary assessment of the proposal, capacity should be available to service future development, subject to adjustments and minor extensions. They encouraged the proponent lodge a Feasibility Application as soon as possible, noting its importance in systems with limited capacity and it being possible to hold capacity for proposed developments.	Submission is noted. This information has been relayed to the proponent to review and action.

Table 2 Responses from individual submitters

Issue	Key themes	City response
Support 5 submissions	Submissions supported the proposal noting that the development would assist in maintaining Sydney's competitiveness and global city status and improve its skyline. Support for increased height was also noted.	Support for the proposal is noted.
Built form 4 submissions	Submissions raised concerns over poor boundary setbacks and the bulk of the tower podium feature. The occasional tall building without a podium provides for a variety of spaces within a city, noting they add to the grandeur and spectacle of a supertall building and create a sense of space that doesn't exist when every street is walled in. Another submission suggested the building should extend to the Bridge Street building line to match the alignment of adjacent buildings. One submission commented that activation of the retail frontage would be supported with the right design and planning elements considered. While another commented that active frontages do not make an area more active outside of office hours.	The podium form is an important design feature in this instance, as it ensures good public domain amenity is maintained despite an increased building height. Wind conditions at street level will remain comfortable as strong wind gusts are redirected by the podium away from pedestrians. Upper level setbacks ensure the tower is appropriately positioned setback from the street, helping minimise adverse visual bulk and scale impacts and ensuring acceptable solar access to the public domain. An extensive and iterative design process has resulted in an appropriate podium height that maximises the benefits whilst being sympathetic to surrounding buildings. The location of the Bridge Street public plaza is intended to pick up on that of the Royal Exchange Building that was formerly on the subject site and its alignment away from the street. The plaza appropriately responds to its heritage context by opening views to the former Lands Department building when viewed along Bridge Street, giving greater prominence to the building. The podium's increased street frontage provides for additional activation space on ground floor, providing passive surveillance and contributing to an engaging and lively city life. Dedication of the new plaza and through-site link to the City delivers new connections and open space that is always accessible to the public and accommodates the anticipated increase in pedestrian foot traffic and activity in the area.
Public open space 4 submissions	One submission expressed disapproval for the podium feature and suggested it be removed and replaced with privately-owned public space, noting that privately-owned public spaces often have a different and more interesting character to the sameness of council-owned public spaces.	Among other amenity benefits, the podium allows for increased activation of the street which enhances the pedestrian experience and attractiveness of the streetscape. The proposed podium design and ground floor use supports the intentions of the City North Public Domain Plan for this area to be activated to the public. This proposal facilitates upgrades

Summary of submissions: 56-60 Pitt Street and 3 Spring Street, Sydney

Issue	Key themes	City response
	Another submission raised concern that without careful controls, the development may overwhelm the pedestrian environment and reduce walkability. The value of the proposed Bridge Street plaza was also queried, suggesting retaining the building alignment would better suit this location.	including widened footpaths and additional public space, improving connectivity and amenity. Future development will also directly improve the pedestrian environment and enhance walkability. Delivering new public open space fronting Bridge Street and through-site link, dedicated to the City, securing access and its ongoing benefit to the public. Which could not be guaranteed for privately-owned public open space. The proposed Bridge Street public plaza provides new public open space to this part of Central Sydney, providing a connection to nearby Macquarie Place Park. The plaza will maximise daylight access to the building's frontage and adjacent streets and integrate with the surrounding public domain. This planning proposal makes provision for high-quality public art in and around the subject site, including the new plaza. Future redevelopment presents an opportunity for a major piece of public artwork in a prominent location to add visual interest and communicate the site's history. The draft DCP includes public art and considerations to inform the design competition and future application.
Local character impacts 4 submissions	Submissions raised concerns that the proposal will negatively impact the existing built form and streetscape character of the area due to its imposing nature. Suggesting the proposal is out of context with the aesthetics and heritage character of Bridge Street, noting that without careful controls and high quality design, the development may diminish the character of one of Sydney's most historic streets	The site-specific DCP includes provisions which will ensure future development is contextually appropriate and in-keeping with the existing and desired future character of the area. Bridge Street's strong heritage character is acknowledged and respected through a strong podium form aligned with parapet datum of neighbouring heritage buildings. Further, the site specific DCP requires the development to respond to and maintain significant view corridors along Bridge and Spring Streets to highlight and celebrate these character buildings. The proposals generous setback to Bridge Street and Gresham Street provides visual separation between adjacent heritage buildings. Furthermore, an increased setback is also provided to the southern boundary that adjoins a local heritage item at 62 Pitt Street. Local character will be maintained and further improved through the proposal's provision of a new public plaza, through-site link and ground floor retail activation for an enhanced pedestrian experience.

Summary of submissions: 56-60 Pitt Street and 3 Spring Street, Sydney

Issue	Key themes	City response
Building height, bulk and scale 4 submissions	Submissions raised concerns over the significant increase in building height, bulk and scale proposed. One submission noted a key impact of this increase was overshadowing to adjacent properties, and in particular to surrounding heritage buildings. One submission suggested tall buildings are de-humanising and Central Sydney has enough skyscrapers already.	Extensive bulk and scale testing was conducted which found that the site is able to support additional height and density due to its site area, orientation, relationship with surrounding built form bulk and scale, as well as its strategic location close to public transport, in the Central Sydney northern tower cluster, where additional building height can be accommodated subject to acceptable amenity. The increased bulk and scale on site holds strategic merit given it will enable the delivery of additional employment floorspace that supports the Central Sydney Planning Strategy. Extensive solar studies have helped deliver a built form envelope that casts appropriate shadows and allows surrounding properties and key heritage landmarks to maintain reasonable solar access. It is noted that the proposal will not impact any residential apartment's solar access. The proposal is also supported by site-specific DCP built form provisions that will ensure the building is appropriately designed, scaled and positioned on site.
Public domain amenity 2 submissions	Submissions raised concerns that the proposed tower form would compromise pedestrian and public domain amenity due to overshadowing and wind tunnel impacts. One submission suggested more planting at ground level to soften the large massing for pedestrians.	The tower has been tested to ensure good public domain amenity. In particular the podium supports good pedestrian amenity by ameliorating wind conditions and solar access to the street through upper level setbacks. Testing on the planning envelope found wind conditions surrounding the subject site would generally remain comfortable following future development of the site. Additional testing was undertaken on the Bridge Street plaza, which found conditions primarily meeting the pedestrian standing criteria. The draft DCP includes development provisions that ensure the plaza is calm and suitable for outdoor seating. Thorough solar studies and an iterative design process has prepared a planning envelope that achieves an appropriate level of daylight access to the surrounding streets. Protected public spaces such as Martin Place, Australia Square plaza and Wynyard Park achieve the required solar access and do not result in additional overshadowing at the protected times as a result of the proposal. The new public plaza fronting Bridge Street is referenced in the site-specific DCP to include generous deep soil zones to support landscaping and mature trees to help soften the development at the street interface and deliver inviting open space for the public to dwell and spend time in.

Summary of submissions: 56-60 Pitt Street and 3 Spring Street, Sydney

Issue	Key themes	City response
Design excellence 2 submissions	Submissions raised concern for a potentially sub-standard and unimaginative building on site. Noting the proposal lacks design merit. They emphasised the importance of design excellence in the development process to prevent this type of built form.	Future development has the opportunity to deliver a unique built form in Central Sydney within a tailored planning envelope that is responsive to its context, with a large indent zone that includes greater setbacks that help maintain amenity in the surrounding streets. Further, development consent may only be granted if the future development is subject to an architectural design competition and demonstrates design excellence. The City of Sydney's robust design excellence policy ensures high-quality design outcomes. Future development will be subject to a design excellence competition comprising a minimum of 6 competitors who hold a recent award in design excellence. Entries are reviewed and assessed on how best they meet the brief and address the criteria in the planning controls, including the site-specific provisions in this Planning Proposal.
Construction impacts 2 submissions	One submission raised concern for the prolonged construction disruption to nearby workers and businesses, particularly noise, traffic, large vehicle movements and vibration.	The management of construction impacts on adjoining sites and traffic would be considered as part of a future development application to minimise construction impacts. The issues identified are noted and will be closely addressed to prevent unreasonable impacts on the surrounding area. This would be reviewed by the City and Transport for NSW, with other large construction projects such as the Sydney Metro Hunter Street Station and over-station development considered.
Land use / Housing One submission	One submission objected to the proposal, commenting many Central Sydney office spaces are vacant and delivering more housing should be a priority.	Additional building height and floor space facilitated by this planning proposal is limited to employment generating uses. By delivering additional floor space, the planning proposal supports opportunities for new investment and employment growth, helping strengthen the economy, consistent with the Central Sydney Planning Strategy. The future development concept comprises premium-grade office floor space in line with the landowners' aspiration in attracting top-tier organisations, strengthening Sydney's global status. It will also take advantage of the future Hunter Street Metro station, with a wider catchment for employment opportunities. Concern regarding shortages in housing stock is acknowledged, however this proposal is focused in the commercial core of Central Sydney on a strategic employment focused location. It is noted the City actively works towards the delivery of a diverse range of new housing, including new

Summary of submissions: 56-60 Pitt Street and 3 Spring Street, Sydney

Issue	Key themes	City response
		controls to help improve the delivery of new build-to-rent and co-living development and policies to streamline new affordable housing projects. Residential uses and new housing will remain permissible on the subject site. Zoning for the site will not change and a wide range of uses remain permissible, including business and retail uses, as well as residential and visitor accommodation. Any future redevelopment of the site for residential or serviced apartment uses will however be limited to the current building height and floor space controls contained in the LEP.
Public art One submission	One submission stated that the proposal would negatively impact nearby public art, which would be further detracted by any additional public art.	The proposal will provide an opportunity for new public art that will contribute to the public domain. The new building is sufficiently separated from any existing public art or statues such that they will still be able to be appreciated.
Public benefits One submission	The value of the public benefits was raised in one submission, querying if they are commensurate to the development's scale. The contribution of the pedestrian through-site link, logistics hub and environmental commitments to Central Sydney were also critiqued. The submission requested Council negotiate with the developer to secure better public benefits.	The Voluntary Planning Agreement secures public benefits including a through-site link and logistics hub to serve businesses in the area, as well as ensuring environmental commitments are delivered. Infrastructure and affordable housing contributions will also apply to the development. These public benefits and the additional height and floor space are consistent with the City's strategies including the Central Sydney Planning Strategy.
Road network impacts One submission	One submission raised potential impacts to the road network resulting from future development on the subject site. Issues such as traffic generation, street closures and relocation of bus and on-street loading zones were highlighted.	No changes to the road network, including the relocation of any on-street parking spaces, bus stops or loading zones, are included in this planning proposal. Future development has however been prepared to respond to the actions identified in the City North Public Domain Plan. Delivery of the future public domain upgrades identified in the Plan are yet to be finalised and still require detailed design development, at which time consultation with affected landowners will take place.

Appendix A



City of Sydney
Gadigal Country
456 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2000

+61 2 9265 9333
council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
GPO Box 1591 Sydney NSW 2001
cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

4 November 2024

Our Ref: X101286

Proposed changes to planning controls for 8-24 Kippax Street, Surry Hills

We invite your feedback on proposed changes to the planning controls for 8-24 Kippax Street, Surry Hills.

The proposal is to increase the maximum height to 44m and the floor space ratio to 10.2:1. This is an additional 14m in building height and 1,130sqm of commercial floor space.

These changes will allow 2 levels to be added to the existing 10-storey commercial building and support its adaptive reuse as high-end office space.

We invite your feedback on the planning proposal to amend the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and a draft development control plan from 4 November to 2 December 2024.

The results of your feedback will be reported to Council and the Central Sydney Planning Committee.

If Council approves this planning proposal, it can amend the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 on behalf of the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.

You can view the proposal and give your feedback at sydneyyoursay.com.au by 5pm on **Monday 2 December 2024**.

Feedback can be made online, by email or post to Project Officer, City Engagement, City of Sydney, Town Hall House, Level 7, 456 Kent Street, Sydney NSW 2000.

Feedback should quote 'Reference X101286 – 8-24 Kippax Street, Surry Hills'.

For more information or any queries about this project, contact Daniel Thorpe, specialist planner on 02 9268 9333 or sydneyyoursay@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au.

Your sincerely

Sally Peters
A/Executive Manager, Strategic Planning and Urban Design
City Planning | Development | Transport



Image: fjcstudio

Changes to planning controls for 56-60 Pitt Street and 3 Spring Street, Sydney

We propose to increase the maximum height and floor space ratio to support a commercial development.

Read the proposal and provide your feedback by Wednesday 28 May.

[Read more](#)

